
Evaluating the Ideological Stances in the speeches of British Political Leaders on the Syrian Refugees' Crisis: An Appraisal Approach¹

Hany Ramadan Mohamed

MA candidate in applied linguistics, Helwan University

Corresponding email: Hany.Ramadan@bbc.co.uk

ARTICLE DATA

Received: 04 June 2022

Accepted: 01 August 2022

Volume: 2

Issue: 3 Summer 2022

DOI: 10.54848/bjtll.v2i3.37

KEYWORDS

linguistics, Appraisal Model, Systemic Functional Linguistics, ideologies, Syrian refugees' crisis, British politics.

ABSTRACT

This study is an attempt to analyze the speeches of leaders of the main UK political parties on the Syrian refugees' crisis following the spread of horrific images of Syrian families and children facing death in the Mediterranean Sea on their way to Europe to escape the ongoing war in their home country. The study applies the Appraisal Model as the main approach of analysis, as the researcher seeks to investigate how the Syrian refugees are represented in the political speeches of prominent party leaders in the UK. In addition, the study explores how the western values of democracy and human rights are maintained or overlooked while dealing with the Syrian refugees escaping the war in their homeland to some European countries and the UK. The study consists of four sections. The introductory one outlines the context, objective, significance and the methodology of the study. Section two outlines the review of literature, while section three deals with the analysis and discussion of data, and section four presents the findings and conclusion of the study.

1. Introduction

The speeches of politicians are often loaded with ideologies, political tendencies and attitudes that are recurrently reproduced in the language they use. Thus, attempting to linguistically analyze the speeches of politicians is very essential in unravelling their ideologies and revealing their attitudes to the public. Whether aware of that or not, politicians often opt for specific language choices in order to deliver particular messages, to their proponents or opponents, in an effort to influence them, and to persuade their supporters to adopt their own ideologies and stances, or at least to neutralize those who oppose them.

Recent approaches of linguistic studies provide us with proper tools of discourse analysis that help identify and detect such ideologies and attitudes that politicians may not be willing to explicitly declare in their speeches, so as to maintain specific political balances, avoid public anger or criticism, or to show political correctness.

This study is an attempt to fathom attitudes and ideologies of some key politicians in the UK towards the Syrian refugees' crisis that has dominated the international political debates since 2015, when images and videos of drowning immigrants in the Mediterranean Sea, and particularly the image of a drowned three-year-old Syrian child, imposed themselves on the headlines of the world media outlets.

¹ This study is part of the researcher's thesis submitted in fulfilment of an MA Degree in English Linguistics, at Helwan University, Egypt.

In March 2011, street protests started in different parts of Syria, resonating with other protests in several Arab countries in what some called "the Arab Spring". But the Syrian protests have ended up with a prolonged civil war that led to one of "the world's worst humanitarian catastrophes in recent history", according to the United Nations (UN, 2018). The Syrian crisis has forced more than half of the population of the country to flee their homes and to become displaced either domestically or abroad, with more than five million people made their way abroad to other countries by the end of March 2018. (UN, 2018)

Europe has been considered a preferred destination for many Syrian refugees, like other nationals from countries facing similar crises. This may be mainly because Europe is seen to give help and pay more attention to humanitarian crises and is said to have higher standards of dealing with refugees and asylum seekers based on the UN relevant charters, compared to other parts of the world, and because of the fact that most European countries have better living conditions, better health care facilities, and better education systems.

These factors may have made many Syrians look forward to travelling to different European countries including the UK, through crossing the tough Mediterranean Sea to reach Europe, then those countries. They often travel illegally using poorly maintained boats, despite the highly expected death risks they may face and the uncertain destiny that may find, given the fact that not all people in Europe welcome refugees or are ready to help them be integrated into their new communities. This comes amid alarming news headlines about rising xenophobic or Islamophobic incidents related to some Syrian and Arab refugees who have recently reached Europe.

1.1 Context of the study

The UK has found itself in the heart of a domestic heated debate about whether or not to open the borders to receive the Syrian refugees willing to stay in Britain, following wide street protests in London with people calling for receiving them. What makes the debate so intense in the British public sphere and media outlets is the polarized political scene and the competing stances on this crisis in particular, with the main opposition party, the leftist Labour Party, calling for allowing the Syrian refugees to enter the UK without any conditions, and the far right party, the Independence Party, calling for stopping the refugees from coming and closing the borders against them. Between those two sides, there is the ruling Conservative party which apparently prefers to be seen as taking a middle position, amid a wave of public criticism in many newspapers and news channels.

Through closely examining the speeches of the UK prominent political leaders, this research seeks to identify how the Syrian refugees are represented in the political discourse of the most influential party leaders of the country, namely; Theresa May, leader of the ruling Conservative Party; Jeremy Corbyn, leader of the leftist Labour Party, and Nigel Farage, leader and head of the far-right UK Independence Party (UKIP), who spearheaded the Brexit referendum.

This study employs the Appraisal Model, as it is mainly concerned with investigating how the language of evaluation is applied in political discourse. This Model of Martin and White (2005) provides researchers with a wider framework for analyzing the political discourse of evaluation and stances of politicians. Language evaluation discussed in this context is defined by Hunston and Thompson (2003) as follows:

"[A] broad cover term for the expression of the speaker or writer's attitude or stance towards, viewpoint on, or feelings about the entities or propositions that he or she is talking about". (p.3)

The language of politicians can be analyzed from different perspectives, and is usually tackled in the frame of political discourse analysis where power relations are emphasized. Political discourse analysis in this context is more viewed as related to reproducing political power, power abuse or domination through political discourse, and the consequences of social or political inequality. (van Dijk 1997)

Political discourse in particular has some key characteristics that need to be highlighted in the context of the appraisal theory, which would help examine politicians' discourse in a wider frame that uncovers the rhetorical tools they make use of to convey their attitudes and stances, and achieve one of their main goals of giving speeches, which is persuading the audiences.

To see how this works, it is important to consider how politicians utilize rhetoric and persuasive devices, such as metaphors, contrastive pairs, and statements of three (three-part lists) as means of persuasion and gaining support and approval of the public. (Beard 2000).

Aristotle classified the forms of persuasion into three categories: persuasion through personality and stance (ethos), persuasion through the arousal of emotion (pathos), and persuasion through reasoning (logos), as described by Cockcroft and Cockcroft (2005). But Beard (2000) argues that these persuasive forms often need to work together, as they are used by speakers as part of their performance, and therefore the way they are constructed and how the members of the audience respond to them will determine whether the politician is seen as sincere or manipulative.

1.2 Objective of the study

The study seeks to investigate how the Syrian refugees are represented in the discourse of prominent British politicians. The focus is on the language of evaluation as in the appraisal model, as well as how the crisis is seen from the spectrum of van Dijk's ideological square and the rhetorical devices used by the involved politicians.

The above strategies of analysis are used to help perceive the political atmosphere in Britain when it comes to understanding the views and policies of dealing with the Syrian refugees' crisis. The political stances of the UK political spectrum, from left, right and centre, is addressed by the study in terms of the diverse discourse strategies and techniques utilized by party leaders in their language choices to consolidate, and most importantly to propagate, their views and stances to achieve the most possible political gains.

1.3 Research questions

The researcher seeks to answer these questions:

- 1- How does Martin and white's (2005) appraisal model reveal the way the Syrian refugees in Britain are seen by the country's political leaders?
- 2- How is the refugees' crisis perceived from van Dijk's ideological square and the rhetorical devices used by the UK selected politicians?
- 3- How do concepts of ideology and power affect the content of political speeches on the Syrian refugees in the UK?

These questions lead the researcher throughout the study in an attempt to discover some important aspects of the UK political discourse on the Syrian refugees' crisis, which emphasizes how the world of today has become, as often said, a small village where events in the East could raise not just public debates, but also political disputes in the West.

1.4 Significance of the study

The Syrian refugees' crisis has become a global issue for the last few years, impacting several European countries, including the UK. The study seeks to show how the British values of democracy and human rights are maintained or overlooked while dealing with the Syrian refugees escaping the war in their homeland, and trying to find a safe haven in the UK.

The study gains its importance from the fact that the Syrian refugees' crisis has triggered a wide debate all over Europe, the Middle East, and inside the UK, and has contributed to several TV talk shows, news headlines and opinion pieces in newspapers, on the stances of major political parties in Britain on the Syrian refugees' crisis.

This on-going debate has shown the need for an in-depth analysis of the linguistic features of political speeches of influential politicians in Britain, to unravel the ideologies and attitudes of those who either oppose or support the calls for receiving the Syrian refugees into the UK.

2. Literature Review

2.1 The appraisal model: Overview

Many linguists have contributed to the development of the Appraisal Model or Framework as an approach of language analysis. The development of the Appraisal Model, which is deeply rooted in Halliday's (1994) Systemic Functional Linguistics, has primarily come from research conducted in the 1980s and 1990s for the *Write it Right project* of the NSW Disadvantaged Schools Program, in which researchers explored the literacy requirements of the discourses of science, technology, the media, history, English literature studies, geography and the visual arts (White 2001).

2.2 Systemic Functional Linguistics

Since the Appraisal Model is rooted in Halliday's (1994) Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL), so to contextualize this model within its broader framework, it is important to highlight the SFL theoretical background.

Halliday and Matthiessen (2004) argue that SFL is a language theory which is based upon making meaning, and which is mainly concerned with the different functions of language, which Halliday calls "metafunctions" of language. Such a term is used to distinguish it from the traditional way of talking about the function of language as a purpose or a way of using language, with no significance for the analysis of language itself. (Halliday and Matthiessen 2004)

Within the SFL metafunctions scope, language has three broad modes of meaning or resources: the *Ideational*, *Interpersonal* and *Textual* resources.

According to Martin and White (2005), SFL is a multi-perspective model designed to:

[P]rovide analysts with complementary lenses for interpreting language in use. One of the most basic of these complementarities is the notion of kinds of meaning – the idea that language is a resource for mapping ideational, interpersonal and textual meaning onto one another in virtually every act of communication". (p.7)

Martin and White (2005) argue that the ideational resources are concerned with construing experience of what is going on, the participants involved, the time and space circumstances, why and how, and the logical relation of one event to another.

The interpersonal resources, on the other hand, are concerned with negotiating social relations, so they are more concerned with how people are interacting, and what feelings they try to share. The textual resources are concerned with the ways in which ideational and interpersonal meanings are distributed in waves of semiosis, "including interconnections among waves and between language and attendant modalities (action, image, music, etc.) These highly generalised kinds of meaning are referred to as metafunctions". (Martin and White 2005, p.7)

Halliday (1994) explains that SFL views language as a systematic resource for expressing meaning in context. It focuses on meaning making in interactions and how people exchange meanings through such interactions.

2.3 The Appraisal Model

The Appraisal Model or Framework is mainly concerned with the linguistic resources through which speakers express and negotiate their subjective and ideological positions. So, within this particular scope, this theory is more concerned with the

language of evaluation, attitude and emotion, and with a set of resources that explicitly position a text's propositions interpersonally (White 2001).

Interpersonal meaning in text, or the negotiation of social relationships by communicating emotion, judgement and appreciation, is a key element within this framework (Martin and White 2005). According to White (2015), this framework provides for analyses of those meanings by which texts convey positive or negative assessments, by which the intensity or directness of such attitudinal utterances is strengthened or weakened and by which speakers/writers engage dialogistically with prior speakers or with potential respondents to the current proposition. In general, the Appraisal Model makes use of three main subsystems: *Attitude*, *Engagement* and *Graduation*. The three subsystems are tackled in details as follows.

2.4 Attitude

Within the appraisal literature, the term “*Attitude*” is used to reference the subsystem of evaluative meanings by which addressees are positioned to adopt a positive or negative view vis-à-vis experiential phenomena or propositions about those phenomena (White 2015).

Attitudinal meanings, within the appraisal literature, are divided into three broad subtypes: Affect, Judgement and Appreciation. White (2015) explains that *Affect* focuses on positive or negative assessment as emotional reactions, while *Judgement* focuses on positive or negative assessment of human behaviours by reference to ethics/morality and other systems of conventionalized or institutionalized norms. On the other hand, *Appreciation* is concerned with assessments of objects, texts, states of affairs, and processes in terms of how they are assigned value socially. That is in terms of their aesthetic qualities, their potential for harm or benefit, and their social salience. The three values are detailed below.

2.4.1 Affect

The Affect subtype of attitudinal meanings is more concerned with construing emotional reaction to events, for example, feelings of shock, elation and so on (Martin and White, 2005).

Martin and white (2005) argue that Affect, based on Halliday's (1994) terms as a resource for construing emotional responses, can be realised across a range of different terms, as shown in the table below:

Affect as quality		
- Describing participants	a sad captain	Epithet
- Attributed to participants:	The captain was happy	Attribute
- Manner of processes:	The captain left sadly	Circumstance
Affect as process		
- Affective mental	His departure upset him	Process (effective)
	He missed them	Process middle
- Affective behavioural	The captain wept	Process
Affect as comment		
- Desiderative	Sadly, he had to go	Modal adjunct

This table is based on Martin and White (2005), p.46

According to White (2001), the *Affect* positioning can be indicated through four ways: Verbs of emotion (mental processes), like: love, hate, interest, bore, enrage, please, adverbs (typically Circumstances of Manner), like: happily and sadly, or adjectives of

emotion, like: worried, confident, frightened and proud, or through nominalization (turning verbs and adjectives into nouns), like joy, fear, and confidence.

According to Martin (2000), *Affective* meanings can be classified into *realis affect* and *irrealis affect*. The *realis affect* has three subtypes, such as un/happiness, in/security and dis/satisfaction, while *irrealis affect* can be divided into fear and desire. Fear can be shown in words such as tremble, shudder, terrorized, while desire can be shown in words such as miss, long for, suggest, and request.

2.4.2 Judgement

Judgement is related to meanings construing our negative or positive attitudes to the people and the way they behave, i.e. their character. (Martin and White 2005)

Judgement can be classified into two main categories: Judgements of "social esteem", which have to do with "normality", (or how unusual someone is), "capacity" (how capable they are), and tenacity (how resolute they are), and judgements of "social sanction", which have to do with "veracity" (how truthful someone is) and "propriety" (how ethical someone is). (Martin and White 2005)

Social Esteem	Positive (admire)	Negative (criticize)
Normality (how special?)	Lucky, fortunated, charmed, normal, natural, cool, stable, fashionable...	Unlucky, odd, peculiar, unpredictable, obscure...
Capacity (How capable)	powerful, vigorous, robust, healthy, fit, witty, experienced, humorous, insightful, clever, gifted balanced...	immature, childish, helpless, dreary, grave, insane, naive, inexperienced, inexpert, incompetent, ignorant, unproductive...
Tenacity (how dependable?)	brave, heroic, cautious, wary, patient, careful, thorough, meticulous, tireless, persevering, resolute, dependable, reliable, faithful, loyal, flexible, accommodating...	timid, cowardly, gutless, impatient, impetuous, rash, hasty, reckless, week, unreliable, unfaithful, disloyal, stubborn, obstinate, wilful...
Social sanction	Positive (praise)	Negative (condemn)
Veracity [Truth] (How honest?)	truthful, honest, credible, frank, candid, direct, discrete, tactful...	dishonest, deceitful, lying, deceptive, manipulative, devious blunt, blabbermouth...
Propriety [ethics] (how far beyond reproach?)	good, moral, ethical, law abiding, fair, just, sensitive, kind, caring, modest, humble, polite, respectful, reverent, altruistic, generous, charitable	bad, immoral, evil, corrupt, unfair, unjust, insensitive, mean, cruel, vain, snobby, arrogant, rude, discourteous, irreverent, selfish, greedy, avaricious...

This table is based on Martin and White (2005), p.53

2.4.3 Appreciation

With *Appreciation*, we are mainly concerned with meanings that are construing our evaluation of things, "especially things we make and performances we give, but also natural phenomena- what such things are worth (how we value them)". (Marine and White 2005: p. 52)

Appreciation, based on Martine and White's (2005) classification, can be divided into "reactions" to things (do they catch our attention, do they please us?), their "composition" (how balanced or complex they are?), and their "value" (how innovative, authentic, timely, etc.).

Types of appreciation	Positive	Negative
Reaction: impact (did it grab me?)	fascinating, exciting, moving, lively, dramatic, intense, remarkable, notable, sensational	dull, boring, tedious, predictable, monotonous, unremarkable, pedestrian
Reaction: quality (did I like it?)	okay, fine, good, lovely, beautiful, splendid, appealing, enchanting, welcome...	bad, yuk, nasty, plain, ugly, grotesque, repulsive, revolting, off-putting
Composition: balance, (did it hang together?)	balanced, harmonious, unified, symmetrical, proportioned, consistent, considered, logical	unbalanced, discordant, irregular, uneven, flawed, contradictory, disorganised
Composition: complexity, (was it hard to follow?)	simple, pure, elegant, clear, precise, rich, detailed...	ornate, extravagant, byzantine, poor unclear, woolly, monolithic, simplistic...
Valuation: (was it worthwhile?)	penetrating, profound, deep, innovative, original, creative, authentic, real, genuine, timely, long awaited, landmark, valuable, priceless, worthwhile, useful, effective	shallow, reductive, insignificant, dated, overdue, untimely, fake, bogus, glitzy, worthless, pricey, ineffective, useless, write-off.

This table is based on Martin and White (2005), p.56

It is important here to make a clear distinction between construing emotions of someone, which is related to the **Affect** subtype of attitude, like in: *I'm happy*, and ascribing the power to triggers such feelings to things, which is related to the **Appreciation** subtype of attitude, like in: *a happy song*. It is also important to make a similar distinction between judgements of someone's behaviour and evaluation of things. For instance, describing someone as *a brilliant scholar* is classified as a *Judgement* of capacity, while describing something as *a deep analysis*, is classified as *Appreciation* of valuation. (Martin and white, 2005)

2.5 Engagement

The engagement subsystem is mainly concerned with a range of resources through which speakers or writers negotiate or adjust their utterances. It encompasses terms that have been tackled and discussed under diverse headings like, among others, modality, hedges, boosters, and polarity. (White, 2001)

The *Engagement* subcategory is based upon the notions of "dialogism" and "heteroglossia", and they both place meaning-making within the context of the multitude of "voices" or texts on the same subject. Therefore, it is concerned with "the sourcing attitudes and the play of voices around opinions in discourse". (Martin and White, 2005)

2.6 Graduation

White (2001) argues that graduation subcategory refers to the set of resources "by which (1) speakers graduate (raise or lower) the interpersonal impact, force or volume of their utterances, and (2) by which they graduate the focus of their semantic categorizations". (p.3)

Examples of the *Force* resources include: *slightly, somewhat, very, and completely*. While examples of the *Focus* resources include: *They effectively signed his death warrant, and a true friend*. (White, 2001)

2.7 Ideology and Appraisal Studies

Ideology is one of the major concepts used in Appraisal studies. Drucker (1974) traces the origin of the term ideology and argues that it was coined by the French theorist Destutt de Tracy in 1879. Drucker (1974) writes: "This author, a founding member of the Institute National introduced the word as the name of a newly conceived science - the 'science of ideas'. He recognized that although the name was new, the science has a considerable pedigree." (p. 3)

According to Fairclough (1989), "Ideologies are closely linked to language, because using language is the commonest form of social behaviour, and the form of social behaviour where we rely most on 'common-sense' assumption". (p.2) He believes that ideology constitutes a representation of "imaginary relation of individuals to the real condition of existence". (p.10)

According to van Dijk (1996), "Ideologies are conceived as basic systems of shared social representations that may control more specific group beliefs (knowledge, attitudes), and influence models via the instantiation of such beliefs in concrete models of situations and experiences." (p.7)

Van Dijk (1998) argues that ideologies are not merely defined in cognitive terms, but also in terms of social groups and group relations. He believes that ideologies are "constructed, used and changed by social actors as group members in specific, often discursive, social practices. They are not individual, idealistic constructs, but the social constructs shared by a group". (p.9)

Fairclough (1989) explains that people who defy or question the dominant ideology "often appear not to make sense; what they say will not sound logical to anyone who holds that ideology. In extreme cases, people who ask such questions may even appear mad, so while it is possible to question the dominant ideology, there is often a price to be paid for doing so". (p. 34)

Van Dijk (1997) explains that political discourse in particular is viewed as the medium by which ideologies are persuasively communicated in society, and thus they help reproduce power and dominance for specific groups or classes (p. 25)

He elaborates by claiming that so as to be able to keep their dominance, the ruling groups need to reproduce their ideology to the society, and their ideology can be taken for granted if they succeed to bring awareness to the given audience. (Van Dijk, 1997)

2.8 Van Dijk's Ideological Square:

Van Dijk (1998) argues that the concept of Ideological Square he proposes is based upon the idea that it is:

[P]art of an overall strategy of ideological communication that consists of the following main moves:

1. Express/emphasize information that is positive about us.
2. Express/emphasize information that is negative about them.

3. Suppress/de-emphasize information that is positive about them.
4. Suppress/de-emphasize information that is negative about us. (p. 267)

Van Dijk (1998) believes that these four moves "play a role in the broader contextual strategy of positive self-presentation or face-keeping and its outgroup corollary, 'negative other-presentation'". (p. 267)

Van Dijk (2004) argues that whatever else ideologies are, "They are primarily some kind of ideas, that is, belief systems. This implies, among other things, that ideologies, as such, do not contain the ideological practices or societal structures (e.g., churches or political parties) that are based on them". (p.2) He also believes that "a theory of ideology needs a cognitive component that is able to properly account for the notions of 'belief' and 'belief system' for instance as these are dealt with in contemporary cognitive science". (p.2)

According to Van Dijk (2006), ideologies have many cognitive and social functions. He summarizes that stating:

"First of all..., they organize and ground the social representations shared by the members of (ideological) groups. Secondly, they are the ultimate basis of the discourses and other social practices of the members of social groups as group members. Thirdly, they allow members to organize and coordinate their (joint) actions and interactions in view of the goals and interests of the group as a whole. Finally, they function as the part of the sociocognitive interface between social structures (conditions, etc.) of groups on the one hand, and their discourses and other social practices on the other hand." (p. 115)

In addition to his ideological square, Van Dijk (2006) suggests some ideological strategies that are helpful in constructing the strategies of positive self-presentation and negative other-presentation. These strategies mainly include categorization, comparison, repetition, disclaimer, hyperbole, selecting specific topics, generalization, lexicalization, national self-glorification, metaphor, polarization, numbers game, euphemism and victimization.

Some of these ideological strategies proposed by van Dijk reflect a rhetorical function of the discourse as well, which is mainly utilized to help with persuading audiences with the speakers/writers' stances and ideologies.

2.9 Rhetoric and persuasive discourse:

To discuss political discourse, it is important first to look at what politics is all about, and how it is largely related to the field of discourse analysis. As discussed above in brief, politics is mainly concerned with power, which is the tool through which politicians make decisions, control resources or other people's behaviours, or even control people's values. (Jones and Wareing, 1999)

Power can be practised through different ways, like imposition of laws and rules, but in this linguistic context, it can also be practiced through well prepared rhetoric of politicians who are usually experts at using effective ways of persuasion, which means, according to Fairclough (1989), "to exercise power through the manufacture of consent..., or at least acquiescence through it". (p. 4)

Cockcroft & Cockcroft (2005) emphasize that rhetoric, which is defined by Aristotle (1926) as the "art of persuasive discourse", is one of the oldest systematic disciplines in the world, and its techniques are still largely valid due to its capacity "to adapt to ideological and social change".

The two authors give accounts to the history and development of rhetoric as an essential "means of persuasion" in their valuable book: *Persuading the people: An introduction to Rhetoric* (2005). They refer to a historically common negative view of rhetoric as a possible tool of manipulative discourse, which "fed an anti-rhetorical tradition which began with Plato and continues right up to the present day" (p.1).

They also highlight the significance of the work of Billig (1987), *Arguing and Thinking*, which explains rhetoric as a dialogue of a social context- rather than a monologue- where every argument or generalization invites a counter-proposal from the people who are invited to listen, whether their response is openly expressed or not.

Cockcroft & Cockcroft (2005) explain how dialogue in Billig's view, has more to do with modern linguists' view of *interaction*:

"Dialogue is not only a technical term used by Billig in his definition of rhetoric; it is also a familiar word used to denote conversation, discussion or debate. Linguists have a more precise and revealing term (...), which is interaction. This term is important because rhetoric (...) is a persuasive dialogue, and as such it depends on a controlled interaction. The rhetorician seeks specifically to exploit the ideological, personal and situational elements involved in every interaction." (p.4)

According to Cockcroft & Cockcroft (2005), the origins of rhetoric get back to the cultural traditions of Greece and Rome, where it grew with their flourished democracies, political assemblies and law courts. They explain that "throughout the Middle Ages, though relatively fragmented and narrowly channeled by Church and State, rhetoric remained central to the evolving culture, and was then revived as a complete system (based on rediscovered texts) during the Renaissance. It has flourished as a practical political instrument since the seventeenth Century." (p.5)

Beard (2000) emphasizes that the definition of rhetoric given by Aristotle, simply as the art of persuasive discourse, is still of large significance till today, despite the fact that it was written more than 2,300 years ago. Aristotle's rediscovered works on rhetoric were collected in the book, *the Art of Rhetoric*, which is still considered a primary text for the study of rhetoric until today.

Rapp (2010) gives some details on how Aristotle views both rhetoric and the role of rhetorician, as follows:

"Aristotle defines the rhetorician as someone who is always able to see what is persuasive... Correspondingly, rhetoric is defined as the ability to see what is possibly persuasive in every given case. This is not to say that the rhetorician will be able to convince under all circumstances. Rather he is in a similar situation as the physician: the latter has a complete grasp of his art only if he neglects nothing which might heal his patient though he is not able to heal every patient. Similarly, the rhetorician has a complete grasp of his method, if he discovers the available means of persuasion, though he is not able to convince everybody".

Aristotle classified the forms of persuasion into three categories: persuasion through personality and stance (ethos), persuasion through the arousal of emotion (pathos), and persuasion through reasoning (logos), as described by Beard (2000), and Cockcroft and Cockcroft (2005).

The main rhetorical devices used in this research can be summarized as follows:

2.9.1 Three-part lists

Politicians usually use listings, or series of utterances or phrases of similar structures, as a rhetorical tool for persuading the public, and sometimes as a tool of mystifying some important parts of the speech. According to Fairclough (2000), "Lists have the effect of obscuring important differences. On the other hand, they can be rhetorically effective in persuading people through the abundance of examples. (p. 45)

Charteris-Black (2005), explains that the first part, in the three-part lists, is to initiate an argument, while the second part is to emphasize or respond to the first part, and the third part comes as a reinforcement of the first and second parts, and also as a sign that the idea presented is completed, which is to help the audience decide when it is appropriate to applaud the speaker.

Charteris-Black (2005) argues that the three-part lists are significant in political speeches because "they follow a traditional social behaviour in the western world". (p.6)

Jones and Wareing (1999) emphasize the significance of the number three, which is viewed as an important cultural element in the western world, as for example indicated by the name of *The Holy Trinity*.

For Jones and Wareing (1999), "repeating certain phrases contributes towards making the idea contained in them seem common sense." (p. 39). Another function of repeating particular phrases of the speech is to "hold the speech together", and "to emphasize moral values" (Beard 2000, p. 39)

2.9.2 Contrastive pair

This is a common feature of the political speeches, which gets back to the age of Greek and Roman writers on rhetoric, which they called *antithesis*. (Beard 2000)

While the three-part list contains three parts which essentially complement each other, the contrastive pair "contains two parts which are in some ways in opposition, but in other ways use repetition to make the overall effect. (Beard 2000, p. 39)

Beard (2000) argues that contrasts or antithesis are used to point out a difference between two ideas or a difference in time, "as in between *then* and *now* by stating what something is and then contrasting it with what it is not".

2.9.3 Nominalization

As discussed before, nominalization is one of four ways through which the appraisal subsystem of affect can be indicated. It simply means turning verbs and adjectives into nouns, like joy, fear, and confidence. Halliday (1994) refers to a number of what he calls "grammatical metaphors", which include nominalizing qualities and processes. Thus, it can be considered one of the common rhetorical tools used in the of discourse of persuasion.

When speakers or writers want their claims to be considered as existing facts, and in order to avoid negotiation from the side of hearers or readers, they utilize nominalization, according to Thompson, (1996). He believes that nominalization, as a technique of persuasion, is used "so as to make it more difficult for the reader or hearer to disagree with it." (p. 250)

Thompson (1996) argues that one important function of nominalization is *encapsulation*. He states that "By 'nouncing' a process, writers can reflect the fact that they have negotiated and established the meaning of the clause centered around the process – in other words, that meaning can now be treated as existing, as a kind of abstract 'thing'" (p. 244).

According to Thompson (1996), nominalization is available to function as "a participant in another process. It can also, therefore, function as Theme. One pattern found in formal discursive text is where a meaning is brought in as a full clause, and is then encapsulated in a nominalization that serves as the starting point for the next or a later clause". (p. 244)

2.9.4 Metaphor

As considered one of the commonest tools of persuasive devices, metaphors are frequently used in the language of politics, and are usually analyzed in the frame of political discourse, according to Beard (2000). He explains that metaphor “refers to when a word or a phrase is used which establishes a comparison between one idea and another”. (P. 19) Beard argues that in politics, metaphor is widely used as if politicians are in warfare, where everyone “targets” their opponents, or achieves “triumph” in political conflicts.

Mio (1997) points out that the significance of metaphor as used in the language of politics lies in persuading the audience through a concealed or symbolic representation, as political issues are mainly hypothetical and not usually rejected by everybody.

Some metaphors may be hard to detect in speeches or texts, according to Beard (2000), due to the fact that their metaphorical origins have become widely used and embedded in the language. Goatly (1997) is quoted by Beard as using the term “inactive” to describe metaphors which over time “have become ‘lexicalized’- defined in dictionaries with their new meanings” (p. 21)

Beard (2000) gives an example of that with the word ‘star’, which is used technically as a metaphor, but is also used so frequently to refer to famous people and celebrities, as many dictionaries have included a reference to those people as one of the definitions of the word ‘star’. (p. 20)

Emphasizing “the power of metaphors”, Beard (2000) explains that they are deeply embedded in the way we construct the world around us, and the way that world is constructed for us by others”. (p. 21)

2.10 Previous studies

There are several studies that have tackled the Appraisal theory within the field of linguistic research. However, no studies are believed to have been carried out on the linguistic evaluative features of stances of the UK political party leaders on the recent Syrian refugees' crisis in the British society, given the recentness of the current Syrian crisis.

This new wave of immigration has been gaining momentum in the aftermath of the Syrian civil war, and the reported deaths of tens of hundreds of Syrians and Middle Easterners in the Mediterranean Sea, that are reported in the news from time to time, till the day this thesis is being written.

There is a relevant study by Mona Attia (2003), that uses the appraisal model of (Martin 2000, 2003, white 2002, 2003), and focuses on how the language of the media discourse is used "to evaluate, to adopt stances and to manage intersubjective positioning". (p.143).

The author states that the objective of the study – entitled *Attitudinal and Intersubjective Positioning: The Appraisal Model*, is to investigate "how different text types employ different evaluative and rhetorical strategies in order to position their writers attitudinally and intersubjectively". (p.143)

Attia’s study focuses on the concept of evaluation and how it is an important system, within the appraisal model, with its different parameters and functions. The author tackles evaluation in its broader scope within Halliday’s SFL, and argues that the SFL studies evaluation and other related aspects, as "the interpersonal function encodes modality, evaluation and negotiation". (p.145).

Attia’s research is based on the data gathered from Al-Ahram daily newspaper, with 15 texts analyzed, as it is concerned with the evaluative use of language in written media discourse. The chosen domains of texts analyzed are: cultural, political and social. The author concludes that there are similarities and differences among the three domains in relation to the use of the appraisal model resources. While the similarities, as Attia explains, are because the texts belong to one genre, that of the media discourse, the differences are due to the different text types used in the study.

There is a PhD study by KhosraviNik (2009) that tackles the representation of refugees in the British newspapers using the historical DA as its approach to provide an investigation on the strategies followed by the British newspapers between 1996 and 2006 to represent refugees and asylum seekers in the UK society.

KhosraviNik uses a combination of quantitative and qualitative down-sampling technique to restrict the number of news articles to a meaningful sample that takes into account the UK newspapers' ideological background. KhosraviNik concludes that the UK tabloid newspapers, when compared to the conservative ones, generally promote a case of panic among the British readership through a sharp and negative categorization of immigrants and asylum seekers as "them". KhosraviNik (2009) believes that this process of categorization "attributes only a negative evaluation to all people who are perceived as 'the other' overwhelmingly" (p.21).

There is another PhD thesis by Zaghoul (2010) which is considered a primary source for studying the linguistic features of contemporary religious booklets in Arabic. It focuses on the discourse of the contemporary Islamic booklets written by popular writers and preachers, and highlights how the Appraisal Model's "authorial positioning" is utilized to understand how the target speakers and writers convey their messages, seeking to achieve two main goals of motivating the readers and establishing solidarity with them.

The thesis makes use of three approaches and levels of analysis. The first is the socio-pragmatic level that focuses on the diverse strategies used by authors to boost solidarity with the readers. The second is the dialogistic and intertextual level, within the Appraisal Model, to deal with motivation. The third is the cognitive level that is discussing motivation using other several theories. The thesis concludes that the contemporary Islamic preachers are employing several linguistic strategies in order to enhance their competence of persuasion and show solidarity with their readers. These strategies include claiming common ground with the readers through, for instance, the multiple uses of inclusive "we", the use of self and other presentation, and the use of several quotations from the Quran and Hadeeths that are both accepted as key references by both authors and readers.

Most importantly to the current research and through using the Engagement subsystem within the Appraisal Model, Zaghoul's thesis also concludes that Islamic preachers employ the dialogistic resources to multiply their voices "to keep their readers interested and attentive", which boosts both motivation and solidarity.

There is another PhD thesis by Al-Attar (2017) which investigates how the promotional discourses used in advertisements make use of various linguistic tools to have the power to convince customers with specific products.

Al-Attar's study uses a range of methodologies and approaches to achieve its goals, and focuses on genre, descriptive and discourse analysis approaches along with the appraisal model. For that purpose, the thesis studies print magazine adverts, Facebook posts, Facebook comments, customer reviews, and interviewees' responses using a number of frameworks, such as the social actor framework, genre analysis, the move-structure approach, and Martin and White's (2005) appraisal framework.

Al-Attar's (2017) thesis findings include that despite the heterogeneity of these discourse types, Facebook and the review websites share most of the situational (technological) characteristics but with different bearings, and that more than one factor can explain the occurrence of a specific move.

It also concludes that in line with the companies' purpose of promoting products, the print adverts are centred on products as the most often included entity, while the focus of the Facebook posts is slightly different from that of the adverts in that the customers inside the posts are the centre of discourse, while products are just promoted along with other participants and interactive material.

3. Methodology

The study uses Martine and White's (2005) Appraisal Model as its main approach, to investigate the different linguistic features used by the UK political figures to address the British society on the crisis of the Syrian refugees.

3.1 Tools of analysis

The tools of research include, among others: The Appraisal Model, Systemic Functional Grammar, including lexical choices, in addition to some concepts and strategies that are of great significance to the study, such as ideology, and van Dijk's ideological square, which provides the strategy of positive self-presentation versus negative other- presentation. The study also makes use of some common rhetorical tools used frequently by politicians in their public speeches in order to ideologically influence their audiences and persuade them of certain attitudes and stances. These rhetorical devices are mainly the three –part lists, contrastive pairs, nominalization and metaphors.

3.1.1 Martin and White's appraisal Model

The Appraisal theory is considered to be an extension of Halliday's Systemic Functional Linguistics, and provides us with different tools that help perceive the stances of speakers or writers, and the implied meanings in their utterances.

The Appraisal framework includes three main subsystems: *Affect*, *judgement* and *appreciation*. The *Affect* subsystem is related to the positive or negative emotions expressed by speakers or writers in the text. The *Judgement* subsystem is related to the positive or negative moral assessment of human behaviours, while *Appreciation* is related to the aesthetic assessment of objects and state of affairs.

3.1.2 van Dijk's Ideological Square:

The concept of Ideological Square proposed by van Dijk is based upon the idea that it is part of a comprehensive strategy that stresses positive information related to the speaker/writer, while ignoring such information when it is related to others, and stresses negative information related to others, while ignoring such negative information when it is related to the speaker/writer. (Van Dijk, 1998)

3.1.3 Rhetorical devices and functions of "we" versus "they"

Many linguists see that pronouns such as "we" and "they" as both, a rhetorical tool, in the case of using the inclusive *we*, that indicates unity and collectiveness, and a tool of polarization, in the case of *they*, that separates those who adopt our thoughts and ideologies, from those who are different from us.

Politicians usually use listing, or series of utterances or phrases of similar structures, contrastive pairs, nominalizations, generalizations, and metaphors as key rhetorical devices for persuading the public, and sometimes as a tool of mystifying some important parts of the speech.

As mentioned above, Beard (2000) emphasizes that the definition of rhetoric given by Aristotle, simply as the art of persuasive discourse, is still of large significance till today, despite the fact that it was written more than 2,300 years ago.

3.2 Data

The main source of data for this research is from three credible British news websites: The BBC News, the Independent, and the Telegraph. The researcher focuses here on analysing three speeches: The first one is delivered in 2015 by Theresa May, the then

UK Home Secretary, to the Conservative Party annual conference, and published (in full text) by the Independent news website (The Independent 2015). The second speech is given by opposition leftist leader Jeremy Corbyn, leader of the Labour Party. His speech is delivered in front of a rally supporting refugees in London and calling for the UK government to receive many refugees from those coming to Europe. It is published by the BBC News. (BBC 2015)

The third speech is delivered by far-right leader Nigel Farage, former head of the UK Independence Party (UKIP). His speech comes to launch his party's campaign to get Britons to vote for "Brexit", to leave the European Union. It is published inside a news story with an embedded video by the Telegraph. (The Telegraph 2015)

The three speeches are particularly selected because they show the official UK response to the international pressures on Britain and Europe in general to accept more refugees from Syria, following the tragic death of the Syrian child Alan Kurdi, the three-year-old boy who drowned in the Mediterranean Sea on the second of September, 2015.

The image of the drowned child on a Turkish beach made global headlines and was used to launch several international campaigns calling for accepting more Syrian refugees into the UK and Europe. So, the timeframe of this research is 2015 that marks an important year for the immigration crisis in the UK and Europe as a humanitarian crisis that has been widely discussed, studied and followed by most world news media.

4. Sample Analysis and findings

The main approach of this study is the Appraisal model and its different tools of analysis. The study also makes use of other strategies of analysis such as van Dijk's ideological square, the use of personal pronouns, and the rhetorical devices of three-part lists, contrastive pairs, and metaphors.

4.1 Affect Analysis

The Affect values are related to language of emotions. Speakers/writers use such values to invite their audiences to share the same emotions, as a way towards enhancing solidarity with them and convincing them.

Some examples from the data can be analysed as follows.

1- "There are millions of people in poorer countries who would love to live in Britain, and there is a limit to the amount of immigration any country can and should take." (The Independent 2015)

2- "Their desire for a better life is perfectly understandable, but their circumstances are not nearly the same as those of the people fleeing their homelands in fear of their lives." (The Independent 2015)

3- "We have a proud history of relieving the distressed and helping the vulnerable." (The Independent 2015)

4- "And I do that because we are all humans, we all have a sense of decency and humanity and reaching out to others. And I am shocked beyond appalled at the way so many and so much of our media over so long, endlessly describe desperate people in desperate situations as 'the problem'"(BBC 2015)

5- "They are victims of war, they are victims of environmental degradation, they're victims of poverty, they are victims of human rights abuses all over the world." (BBC 2015)

The first three examples above are from Theresa May's speech. Speaking as the then UK home secretary, she represents both, the Conservative ruling party and the government. So, in these examples, she tries to avoid an increasing criticism of the government as not making enough efforts to save those drowning in the sea or to accept a large number of refugees.

In the first example, she uses a non-authorial positive affect value of "love", to claim that "millions" in poorer countries "love" to come and live in Britain, but in this situation, and when it comes to refugees fleeing the war, she can be easily challenged by

the answer that the Syrian refugees, or any other refugees from the Middle East, like Iraq or Libya, are not fleeing their countries because of poverty, but because of wars, and they are just looking for a safer alternative for their families and children. We can claim that those millions are actually forced to find another country that can accept them legally as refugees, according to the Geneva Convention of 1951, signed almost by all European countries, which gives those escaping wars or fleeing for their lives and safety an asylum status once they put one foot on the soil of any EU member state.

In the second and third examples, May uses a non-authorial affect as in "desire", and another non-authorial negative affect as in "in fear of their lives". Through such few uses of affect values, the speaker aims at inviting the audience to share the same views, and this in turn would help enhance solidarity between the speaker and the listeners. If such "empathetic connection" is established, then there is a possibility that the audience will be more ready to accept the wider ideological views of the speaker. (White 2001)

In the fourth example, the speaker is Jeremy Corbyn, the leftist leader of the labour party. Corbyn uses two authorial negative affect values of "shocked" and "appalled" to express his emotions and at the same time to criticize the media describing the refugees as 'the problem'. He also uses two authorial positive affect values implied in "we all have a sense of decency and humanity" to remind his listeners of the basic human values that invite them to be decent and merciful to others in need of help. In the fifth example, Corbyn uses a negative non-authorial affect value in "victims", which he repeated four times in this short utterance.

It seems he wants to stress the importance of such affective values in establishing a common ground with the listeners. These affective values are used to help the listeners easily share the same values and to establish solidarity with them. This is to prepare them to adopt his view of looking at refugees as "desperate" people in need of help. If they accept his view in that event, they will probably join him in calling for the government to allow more refugees into the UK.

4.2 Judgement

Judgement is related to meanings construing our negative or positive attitudes to the people and the way they behave, i.e. their character. (Martin and White 2005)

Examples from the data are as follows.

- 1- More than 600,000 Syrians **are taking refuge** in Jordan
- 2- These people **are fleeing** a civil war
- 3- These militias (ISIL) in turn are often **backed by powerful** foreign sponsors

Through the examples 1, 2, and 3 below, Theresa May tries from the beginning of her speech to give her audience the impression that she judges the Syrian refugees positively and has a stance of sympathy towards them, despite her party's conservative policy towards receiving refugees.

- 4- "We will **not be able** to solve all the world's problems, we **won't be able** to help every single person **in need**".

In example 4, Theresa May apparently wants, through the use of these negative judgement values of social esteem of capacity, to convey the message that the refugees' crisis is a world one, and that her government is unable to solve it, which is an implied message that means the UK government will not be able to receive the Syrian refugees coming to its borders.

- 5- "let Britain **stand up** for **the displaced, the persecuted, and the oppressed**".

In this example 5, May seems to convey a message that her country has been supportive of those helpless refugees and that her country still sympathises with the refugees and wants to help them, although this message comes after a clear stance mentioned

previously that her country is "unable" to open the borders for the Syrian refugees, and comes after some justifications presented in defence of the policy of rejecting the calls for opening the borders for the refugees.

6 - "... Our media over so long, endlessly describe desperate people in desperate situations as 'the problem'; desperate people in desperate situations, as people who are trying to travel or move illegally".

In this example, Corbyn opts for using a negative judgment of capacity in describing refugees as "desperate people", seemingly in an attempt to engage the listeners and invite them to judge those refugees as helpless people who are looking for help and need it immediately. He also criticizes those who consider them "the problem", and rejects the way they are portrayed as travelling "illegally", a negative judgement of social sanction, by which they indicate a negative image about refugees.

7- We're all human beings who want to live

8- they too are ambitious.

9- Their children too want to be artists, poets, writers, engineers, lawyers, journalists... doctors and everything else.

10- who need somewhere safe to live

These examples show how Corbyn thinks of refugees as all equal human beings who want to live, to learn, and to become engineers or doctors, for instance, as everybody else. He uses these positive values of social esteem of tenacity to convey the message that refugees are independent, resolute, and equal to all other people, and that they are ambitious too, and have dreams for themselves and for their children, whom they want to be of great contributions inside their new societies.

4.3 Appreciation

1- "While we must fulfil our moral duty to help people in desperate need, we must also have an immigration system that allows us to control who comes to our country. Because when immigration is too high, when the pace of change is too fast, it's impossible to build a cohesive society. It's difficult for schools and hospitals and core infrastructure like housing and transport to cope. And we know that for people in low-paid jobs, wages are forced down even further while some people are forced out of work altogether."

2- "I've never seen Parliament Square looking so filled, so beautiful and so happy as on this day. Thank you all for being here today".

3- "That photograph of the dead three-year-old boy, which I think has touched everybody in this country, in Europe and across many many parts of the world. And I think the question we need to ask ourselves is 'how do we prevent appalling photographs like that?'..."

In the first example, Theresa May uses seven *appreciation* values (moral, desperate, high, fast, impossible, difficult, low-paid), to stress her point of view. She uses only one appreciation value, "moral", in this example to claim that the government has a moral duty towards helping the refugees, while she uses the six other appreciation values at the same time to indirectly indicate that she is against the idea of receiving more refugees. So, she claims that if the country opens its doors for refugees, especially when the immigration is too "high", and the pace of change is too "fast", it will be "impossible" for the British society to keep its cohesion, and it will be "difficult" for the country's hospitals, schools and other national services to cope with large numbers of refugees. She wants to convey that there is an equation that should be taken for granted, which has one negative and doomed result: Our society will not be cohesive any more if we accept more refugees, and our infrastructure and public services will not be working properly.

In the second example, Jeremy Corbyn starts his speech, talking to a rally in London's parliament square in support of refugees, by an utterance that includes three positive appreciation values (*so filled, so beautiful, so happy*) to describe the square where hundreds of supporters of refugees are gathered, adding such human features of beauty and happiness to such a place in order to touch the souls and hearts of the listeners, and to encourage them to stand on a common ground with him and be convinced with his views and stances. Generally, He uses a combination of values of Affect, judgement (see previous examples) and appreciation in his speech so as to form a solid alliance and a deep association with his audience, and that in turn will probably help him pass his views and stances to them, and will probably help them adopt those same views and stances in support of refugees.

In the third example, far-left leader Nigel Farage speaks to his party supporters initiating a campaign to vote for the Brexit (leaving the EU) to avoid the EU policy of accepting refugees and asylum seekers upon arriving to the EU soil. He uses a negative *Appreciation* value of "appalling" describing the photograph of the Syrian drowned boy. This type of value, and similar values, are seemingly used by the speaker, who is against accepting refugees to the UK like this same young boy, to indicate that he is also touched by the death of the boy, and to avoid any blame or criticism that may be directed to him and to his party members because of their anti-refugees policies. In this utterance, using two negative values of *Affect* (touched) and *Appreciation* (appalling) is chosen to probably indicate the existence of a common ground with the listeners, as a preparatory technique to express his views calling for preventing such deaths by preventing all sea journeys from coming to Europe.

4.4 Analysis of Ideological square and rhetorical devices

1- *Thanks to our help, hungry families are getting food, thirsty people are getting clean water, and children who have been orphaned or separated from their parents are getting help.*

The speaker, Theresa May, utilizes the first aspect of van Dijk's ideological square to emphasize positive information about her in-group as the social actors. She also makes good use of the first personal pronouns of "we" and "our" to boast the amount of money spent by her country and government in support of the Syrian refugees. However, the speaker seems to send a message to her supporters and maybe her opponents as well, that her government is spending much money for such a humanitarian cause of the Syrian refugees, and that could be a valid justification for not allowing the Syrian refugees to come in through the British borders, and for not support the calls for opening the borders for them, compared to the German government that opens its borders for them to come and stay.

When the speaker says "hungry families", "thirsty people" and " children who have been orphaned", she uses a number of contributions of her country and government for the sake of the Syrian refugees, through using the three-part list rhetorical device that provides her with a significant tool of persuasion and influence that brings her audience closer to accepting her political and ideological stances.

2- *I've never seen Parliament Square looking so filled, so beautiful and so happy as on this day*

The speaker, Jeremy Corbyn of the Labour Party, talks to his supporters 'filling' a square in London in an emotional way stressing an implied positive 'us', filling the place and making it so beautiful and so happy. The use of such implied positive self-presentation strategy echoes the first aspect of van Dijk's ideological square of emphasizing positive information about the speaker and his group of supporters as the social actors here. The three-part list of 'so filled, so beautiful, so happy' is a well-crafted rhetorical device Corbyn uses in his first sentence of the speech to help with attracting his audience's attention from the very beginning, an help with facilitating his mission of persuading them.

The lexical items of 'beautiful' and 'happy' indicate a rhetorical use of personification that uses human characteristics of beauty and happiness to describe a square where Corbyn's supporters are demonstrating for supporting the Syrian refugees. The use of

'so' as a synonym of 'very' is deemed an ideological tool of hyperbole, as proposed by van Dijk (2004), that indicates an exaggeration of the description of a square full of demonstrators supporting the refugees, which helps the speaker in convincing his audience of his political and ideological stance.

3- and we do take refugees, it's a sort of myth that the UK does not take refugees, we do take refugees, we take refugees every year.

The speaker, Nigel Farage, uses a self-positive presentation as in 'we do take refugees', as a way of showing sympathy towards the global crisis of refugees. He also uses the rhetorical device of three-part lists, in 'we do take refugees', to emphasize the point that his country does take refugees and thus he seemingly wants to convey a message to his critics that the UK sympathizes with the refugees despite the fact that he wants his country to avoid receiving any refugees who may increase the suffering of his country's infrastructure. Farage stresses the fact that his country takes refugees, but at the same time his general views are focused on rejecting the refugees as they are part of the UK problems of *lack of primary school facilities*, the *compression of wages*, and *the pressure on the health services*, as he mentions in previous parts of his speech. But the repetition used here by Farage as an ideological strategy is to help him express his political and ideological views and stances in a strong language that facilitates his mission of being persuasive and being of influence to his supporters and his opponents as well.

4.5 Findings and Conclusion

Through the Appraisal Model analysis, this research finds that the use of language of evaluation to tackle the Syrian refugees' crisis plays an important part in delivering strong speeches by the politicians who seek to convince their respective audiences of their political stances. The use of attitudinal values in particular, i.e. the Affect, Judgement and Appreciation values, also shows to be intensively utilized in the speeches of those political leaders as apparently a strong linguistic strategy of consolidating ideologies, attitudes and political stances, in addition to creating common grounds with their respective audiences, to help ease the mission of persuading them.

Moreover, what can be noted from the analysis of the data is that the leftist leader of the Labour party, Jeremy Corbyn, uses more *Affect* values in his speech compared to the two other leaders of the rightist and conservative parties. This can be explained by looking at Corbyn's stance which is supporting the right of the refugees to freely enter and settle in Britain or any other country in Europe. His speech shows many emotional utterances using strong affective values to sympathise with the refugees, to welcome them, and also to thank all those in Europe who show support to them and sympathise with them, or open their houses and institutions to host them.

On the other hand, the Conservative ruling party leader, Theresa May, uses more appreciation values, especially when she tries to avoid criticism against her party and to show pride of the history of her country in dealing with people in need of help, as a technique to indirectly refuse accepting more refugees to her country at such time, but at the same time not declaring it in a direct and straight way. As shown in the sample analysis section, the evaluative language seems to help the speakers in their attempts to effectively influence their audiences so as to encourage them to adopt certain political views and stances.

In addition, the use of other linguistic features, like van Dijk's ideological square, plays also a significant role as well in the political speeches, when speakers want to positively introduce themselves, their views and their own political tendencies, and when they want to negatively introduce those who are adopting different political stances or other views and ideologies. A similar attitude is also demonstrated in the analysis through the speakers' rhetorical use of pronouns like "we" and "they", or the rhetorical use of three-part lists and metaphors.

References

- Al-Attar, Maryam Hikmet (2017). PhD Thesis: *A Multimodal Analysis of Print and Online Promotional Discourse in the UK*. UK: University Of Leicester.
- Attia, M. (2003). "Attitudinal and Intersubjective Positioning: The Appraisal Model". *ELLS* Vol. II, No. II. pp.143-199. Cairo: ELLS
- Beard, A. (2000). *The language of politics*. London: Routledge.
- Billig, M. (1987) *Arguing and Thinking: A rhetorical approach to social psychology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Charteris-Black, J. (2005). *Politicians and Rhetoric: The Persuasive Power of Metaphor*. Hound mills, Basingstoke, Hampshire, New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Cockcroft, R. & Cockcroft, S. (2005). *Persuading People: An Introduction to Rhetoric*. Second ed. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Conrad, S., & Biber, D. (2000). *Adverbial Marking of Stance in Speech and Writing*. In S. Hunston, & G. Thompson (Eds.), *Evaluation in Text: Authorial Stance and the Construction of Discourse* (pp. 56-73). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Drucker, T.A. (1974). *Political Uses of Ideology*. London & Basingstoke: The MacMillan Press.
- Fairclough, N. (1989). *Language and power*. London, New York: Longman.
- Fairclough, N. (2000) *New Labour, New Language?* London: Routledge.
- Halliday, M. A. K. (1994). *An introduction to functional grammar*. London: E. Arnold.
- Halliday, M. A. K., & Matthiessen, C. (2004). *An introduction to functional grammar* (3rd edition). London: Edward Arnold.
- Jones, J. & S. Wareing. (1999). *Language and Politics*. In: Thomas, L. et al. (eds), *Language, Society and Power*. London: Routledge, pp,31-47.
- KhosraviNik, M. (2009). *The representation of refugees, asylum seekers and immigrants in British newspapers, during the Balkan conflict (1999) and the British general election (2005)*. *Discourse & Society*, 20 (4), 477-498.
- Machin, D., & Mayr, A. (2012). *How to do critical discourse analysis: A multimodal introduction*. Los Angeles: SAGE
- Martin, J.R. 1992. *English Text: System and Structure*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Martin, JR. (2000) *Beyond Exchange: Appraisal Systems in English*. In Hunston, S. And Thompson, G. (eds.) *Evaluation in Text: Authorial Stance and the Construction of Discourse*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. pp. 142-175.
- Martin, J.R. 2003. *Introduction*. *Text* 23 (2): 171–81.
- Martin, J.R. 2014. *Evolving systemic functional linguistics: Beyond the clause*. *Functional Linguistics* 1(3): 1–24.
- Martin, J.R., and D. Rose. 2007. *Working with Discourse: Meaning beyond the Clause*. London: Continuum.
- Martin, I. R, and White, P, R. (2005) *The Language of Evaluation: Appraisal in English*. Palgrave Macmillan: Hampshire.
- Mio, J. S. (1997). *Metaphor and politics*. In *Metaphor and symbol*, 12(2), 113-133. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327868ms1202_2 (visited on 21 Jan, 2021)
- Rapp, Christof (2010), "Aristotle's Rhetoric", *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Spring 2010 Edition), Edward N. Zalta (ed.) <https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/spr2010/entries/aristotle-rhetoric>. (visited on 15 Oct. 2020)
- The BBC (2015, September 12). *Jeremy Corbyn addresses London refugee rally*. Available at: <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-34234679>
- The Independent (2015, October 6). *Teresa May's speech at the Conservative Party Conference in full*. Available at: <https://www.independent.co.uk/news/uk/politics/theresa-may-s-speech-to-the-conservative-party-conference-in-full-a6681901.html>

- The Telegraph (2015, September 4). *Thousands of Isis fighters could use Migrant crisis to 'flood' into Europe*, Nigel Farage warns. Available at: <https://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/politics/nigel-farage/11844290/Thousands-of-Isil-fighters-could-use-migrant-crisis-to-flood-into-Europe-Nigel-Farage-warns.html> (visited on 15 April, 2018)
- Thomas, L., & Wareing, S. (1999). *Language, society and power: An introduction*. London: Routledge.
- Thompson, G. (1996) *Introducing Functional Grammar*. London: Arnold.
- Thompson, G. and Hunston, S., 2000. *Evaluation: An Introduction*. In: Hunston, S. and Thompson, G., eds. *Evaluation in Texts: Authorial Stance and the Construction of Discourse*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp.1-27
- Van Dijk, T.A. (1996). *Discourse, Opinion and Ideologies*. In Christina Schaffner & Helen Kelly-Holmes (Eds.), *Discourse and Ideologies*, (pp. 7-37). Clevedon: Multilingual matters Ltd.
- Dijk, T. A. van (1997). *What is political discourse analysis?*. In Blommaert, J. and Bulcaen, C. (Eds), *Political Linguistics*, (pp. 11–52). Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (1998). *Ideology: A multidisciplinary approach*. London: Sage Publications.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (2004). *Ideology and discourse analysis*. Paper presented at Ideology Symposium, Oxford.
- White, P.R.R. (2001). Appraisal: An Overview. Appraisal Website. www.grammatics.com/appraisal/AppraisalGuide. (visited on 20th of April, 2018)
- White, P. R. R. (2002). *Appraisal—The language of evaluation and stance*. In J. Verschueren, J. O. O’stman, J. Blommaert & C. Bulcaen (Eds.), *Handbook of pragmatics* (pp. 1–27). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- White, P. R. R. (2003) ‘*Beyond modality and hedging: A dialogic view of the language of intersubjective stance.*’ *Text* 23/2, 259-284.
- White, P.R.R. (2015). “*Appraisal Theory*”, in *International Encyclopaedia of Language and Social Interaction*. Hoboken, USA: Wiley-Blackwell.
- UN news website (2018, February 4). *UN Brief on Syria*: <https://news.un.org/en/focus/syria> (visited October 2018)
- Zaghloul, M. S. A. (2010). PhD Thesis: *Solidarity and Motivation in Contemporary Religious Discourse: Social-Pragmatic and Cognitive perspectives*. Cairo: Helwan University.