

PEOPLE'S DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF ALGERIA  
MINISTRY OF HIGHER EDUCATION AND SCIENTEFIC RESEARCH  
IBN KHALDOUN UNIVERSITY OF TIARET  
FACULTY OF LETTERS AND LANGUAGES  
DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH



**Comparative Critical Discourse Analysis of Algerian Presidents' Political Speeches**

**The Case of President A. Bouteflika (1999) and President A. Tebboune (2019)**

**A Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of  
Master in Linguistics**

**Submitted by:**

Ms. Aicha Louddad

Ms. Lamia Rahou

**Supervised by:**

Dr. Moulai Hacene Yacine

**Examination Panel**

**President: Dr. Youcef Benamor (MCB)**

University of Tiaret

**Supervisor: Dr. Hacene Yacine Moulai (MCA)**

University of Tiaret

**Examiner: Dr. Louiza Belaid (MCB)**

University of Tiaret

**Academic Year: 2022 - 2023**

## **Dedication**

To our incredible parents, brothers and sisters who have been the unwavering pillars of our life. You have loved us unconditionally, guiding us through every triumph and tribulation. Your unwavering support, wisdom, and sacrifices have shaped us into the persons we are today. We still forever grateful for the love and values you have instilled in us. This dedication is a testament to your profound influence and the gratitude that fills our hearts.

To our dearest cousins and friends, true companions who have stood by our side through thick and thin. You have been our confidants, cheerleaders, and our rocks. Your presence has illuminated our darkest days and amplified our happiest moments. Your unwavering loyalty, compassion, and laughter have enriched our life in countless ways. This dedication serves as a tribute to the bond we share and the invaluable friendship that I cherish...

Thank you for being the extraordinary individuals that you are.

## **Acknowledgements**

First and foremost, this work would never have been accomplished without the strength, patience, and wisdom that Allah Almighty has given us to overcome the challenges in our path, all praise is to Allah alone.

We would like to take a moment to express our deepest appreciation and gratitude to our supervisor, Dr. Hacene Yacine Moulai for his guidance, motivation, help, and all his efforts during these few months.

To our teacher Dr. Louiza Belaid, for accepting to be a part of the examination board and for giving part of her time to read and evaluate our research. We would like also to address our gratitude to her for being our role model and source of motivation these two years by creating the most comfortable learning atmosphere.

A special thanks to Dr. Youcef Benamor for doing the honor of accepting to be a part of the panel of examiners and for devoting part of his time to evaluate our research work.

Last but not least, our thanks to Dr. Allel Bilel Fasla, who helped us without hesitation, doing his best to provide us with the translation of the selected passages of the political speeches.

### **Abstract**

This research study aims to uncover the discursive devices utilized by President Abdelaziz Bouteflika during his speech on April 15, 1999, and those used by President Abdelmadjid Tebboune during his speech on December 19, 2019. The study also seeks to reveal the implicit ideologies conveyed in their speeches. The main question raised in this research is how CDA can uncover discursive devices and ideologies in political speeches. To address our research question and meet the requirements of our investigation, we will conduct corpus research using corpus linguistics. Additionally, we will utilize Van Dijk's model of Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) as a framework. Consequently, analyzing the speeches using this framework requires both a micro-level and macro-level analysis. At the micro-level, we count the frequency and percentage of discursive devices used by both Presidents. At the macro-level, we compare the usage of positive self-representation and negative other-representation strategies in both Presidents' speeches. This approach allows CDA to reveal discursive devices and ideologies present in political speeches. The findings show that the president Bouteflika used seven devices out of 25 and used positive-self representation explicitly whilst he used negative-other representation implicitly in his speech. Whereas, the president Tebboune used 10 devices out of 25 and he only employs positive-self representation.

**Keywords:** Critical discourse analysis, discursive devices, political discourse, speech of Abdelaziz Bouteflika, speech of Abdelmadjid Tebboune, Van Dijk's theoretical approach



### **List of Abbreviations**

**ADA:** Algerian Dialectical Arabic

**DA:** Discourse Analysis

**CDA:** Critical Discourse Analysis

**FLN:** National Liberation Front

**MSA:** Modern Standard Arabic

**MSP:** Movement of the Society of Peace

**PDA:** Political Discourse Analysis

**RCD:** Rally for Culture and Democracy

**SFL:** Systematic Functional Linguistics

**List of Tables**

***Table 3.1: Discursive Devices Used by President Abdelmadjid Tebboune. .... 53***

***Table 3.2: Discursive Devices Used by President Abdelaziz Bouteflika..... 56***

## Table of Contents

|  |           |
|--|-----------|
| Dedication .....                                 | i         |
| Acknowledgements.....                            | ii        |
| Abstract .....                                   | iii       |
| List of Abbreviations.....                       | iv        |
| List of Tables.....                              | v         |
| <b>GENERAL INTRODUCTION .....</b>                | <b>1</b>  |
| <b>CHAPTER ONE: CRITICAL DISCOURSE ANALYSIS</b>  |           |
| <b>Introduction .....</b>                        | <b>3</b>  |
| <b>I. KEY CONCEPTS AND TERMINOLOGIES.....</b>    | <b>3</b>  |
| 1. Defining Discourse.....                       | 3         |
| 2. Definition of Discourse Analysis.....         | 5         |
| 3. Discourse Markers.....                        | 7         |
| 4. Meta Discourse Markers.....                   | 8         |
| 5. Critical Discourse Analysis.....              | 9         |
| 6. Tenets of CDA.....                            | 10        |
| <b>II. CDA MAJOR FRAMEWORKS.....</b>             | <b>11</b> |
| 1. Fairclough’s Three-Dimensional Model.....     | 11        |
| 2. Van Dijk’s Socio-Cognitive Model.....         | 12        |
| 3. Wodak’s Discourse Historical Approach .....   | 17        |
| <b>III. CONCEPTS RELATED TO CDA .....</b>        | <b>19</b> |
| 1. Ideology.....                                 | 19        |
| 2. Power .....                                   | 20        |
| 3. Rhetoric .....                                | 21        |
| <b>Conclusion.....</b>                           | <b>22</b> |
| <b>CHAPTER TWO: POLITICAL DISCOURSE ANALYSIS</b> |           |
| <b>Introduction .....</b>                        | <b>23</b> |
| <b>I. POLITICAL DISCOURSE.....</b>               | <b>23</b> |
| <b>II. POLITICAL DISCOURSE ANALYSIS .....</b>    | <b>24</b> |
| <b>III. LANGUAGE OF POLITICS .....</b>           | <b>26</b> |
| 1. The List of Three .....                       | 26        |



|   |   |    |
|---|---|----|
| 2.  | <b>Contrastive Pairs</b> .....                                | 27 |
| 3.  | <b>Metaphor, Metonymy, and Analogy</b> .....                  | 27 |
| 4.  | <b>Pronoun Reference</b> .....                                | 28 |
| 5.  | <b>Favorable References to Persons</b> .....                  | 28 |
| 6.  | <b>Favorable References to « us »</b> .....                   | 28 |
| 7.  | <b>Unfavorable References to « Them »</b> .....               | 29 |
| 8.  | <b>Projecting a Name</b> .....                                | 29 |
| <b>IV.</b>  | <b>POLITICAL BODY LANGUAGE</b> .....                          | 29 |
| <b>V.</b>   | <b>FIELDS RELATED TO POLITICAL DISCOURSE</b> .....            | 31 |
| 1.  | <b>Prosody and Politics</b> .....                             | 31 |
| 2.  | <b>Grammar and Politics</b> .....                             | 32 |
| <b>VI.</b>  | <b>POLITICAL SPEECHES</b> .....                               | 34 |
| 1.  | <b>The Use of Humor in Political Speeches</b> .....           | 36 |
| 2.  | <b>Gender Differences in Political Speeches</b> .....         | 37 |
| 3.  | <b>Emotions in Political Speeches</b> .....                   | 38 |
| 4.  | <b>Topics in Political Speeches</b> .....                     | 39 |
|   | <b>Conclusion</b> .....                                       | 40 |
| <b>CHAPTER THREE: METHODOLOGY AND DATA ANALYSIS</b> |   |    |
|   | <b>Introduction</b> .....                                     | 41 |
| <b>I.</b>   | <b>SCOPE OF THE STUDY (ALGERIAN POLITICAL HISTORY.)</b> ..... | 41 |
| <b>II.</b>  | <b>RESEARCH METHODOLOGY</b> .....                             | 43 |
| 1.  | <b>Data Collection Tools</b> .....                            | 43 |
| A.  | Selected Passages from President Tebboune’s Speech .....      | 44 |
| B.  | Selected Passages from President Bouteflika’s Speech .....    | 47 |
| 2.  | <b>Procedures</b> .....                                       | 50 |
| 3.  | <b>Data Analysis</b> .....                                    | 51 |
| A.  | CDA of President Abdelmadjid Tebboune’s Speech.....           | 51 |
| B.  | CDA of President Abdelaziz Bouteflika’s Speech.....           | 56 |
| 4.  | <b>Discussion of Findings</b> .....                           | 61 |

|                                 |    |
|---------------------------------|----|
| <b>Conclusion</b> .....         | 62 |
| <b>GENERAL CONCLUSION</b> ..... | 63 |
| <b>References</b> .....         | 65 |
| <b>Appendices</b>               |    |

## GENERAL INTRODUCTION

Behind each word lies meaning, and behind each meaning are multiple concepts that connect language and society. The field that studies the relationship between language and society is called "Sociolinguistics," which focuses on the sociological aspects of language and the impact of factors such as age, gender, religion, and ethnicity on word usage and utterances. Sociolinguistics provides tools and models to analyze speech and understand its semantic meaning and implications. Among the various types of speeches, political discourses are particularly attractive from a linguistic perspective due to their different contexts, goals, effects, influence, and ideologies. This research serves as a written guide to selecting information about political speeches and their linguistic analysis.

The aim of our research is to extract the discursive devices used by President Abdelmadjid Tebboune and President Abdelaziz Bouteflika, as well as the implicit ideologies present in their speeches. The significance of this work lies in the critical examination and analysis of discourse to unveil political ideologies as well as its contribution to the policymaking process by revealing the discursive construction of policies and their consequences. To achieve this goal, we utilize corpus linguistics (corpora research) and Van Dijk's socio-cognitive model as a framework.

Politicians often employ specific language and rhetorical styles to influence people's thoughts and opinions. They also express their ideas and beliefs implicitly in their speeches, making it challenging for individuals to fully comprehend their intentions. To reveal these strategies and implicit ideas, the main question of this study is:

- How can Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) reveal discursive devices and implicit ideologies in political speeches?

To answer the research question, several sub-questions are considered to investigate the broader context of our inquiry:

- What rhetorical styles are used by the participants?
- How is Van Dijk's model suitable for analyzing these speeches?
- How do the presidents persuade their audience?
- What is the effect of the presidents' ideological stance on Algerian society?

The following hypotheses can be derived from the research questions:

- ✚ The Presidents use various rhetorical styles such as hyperbole, metaphor, and national self-glorification.
- ✚ Van Dijk's model is suitable for analyzing these speeches because it specifically focuses on political discourse.
- ✚ The presidents persuade their audience by employing certain discursive devices.
- ✚ The presidents' ideologies influence Algerian society by convincing them of their viewpoints.

In order to validate or invalidate the aforementioned hypotheses, the current research is divided into three chapters. The first chapter, is about critical discourse analysis, it provides a broad overview of the basic terminology and the major frameworks of CDA as well as concepts related to this field. The second chapter is dedicated to political discourse analysis and its emergence, it aims also to show the relationship between language and politics. The third chapter is dedicated to data collection and methodology, in addition to the analysis of the collected data and the discussion of the findings.

## CHAPTER ONE: CRITICAL DISCOURSE ANALYSIS

### Introduction

Communication is one of the basics of life, which makes it easy and tricky at the same time. With words, humans can express their thoughts and feelings. However, the difficulty of communication begins in translating the meaning to be conveyed. Therefore, linguists resort to specialized methods in studying, analyzing discourse, and extracting ideologies. This chapter simplifies the meaning of Discourse from different points of view according to several scholars, such as Van Dijk and Sarangi. Besides, we move to Discourse Analysis explaining the basics and theories, and then we thoroughly discuss Critical Discourse Analysis, its emergence, and its basic principles. Finally, we shed light on the most recognized approaches of this discipline as well as crucial concepts that are frequently repeated in CDA, such as power and ideology.

### I. KEY CONCEPTS AND TERMINOLOGIES

Critical discourse analysis is an approach that examines power relations and implicit ideologies in different types of discourse. But before discussing CDA, there are some terminologies that are crucial to comprehend, such as discourse and discourse analysis. Therefore, this part will be a definitions of these terminologies in detail in order to provide a foundation for understanding CDA.

#### 1. Defining Discourse

Linguists consider the definition of the term "Discourse" challenging, as it is difficult to agree on a unified definition. For a start, the word "Discourse" is taken from the Latin origins that state the meaning of "Conversation and this is what it is in the modern English vocabulary. A class of scholars considers discourse as a manner of speech or use of language. Hence, the use of language differs from a singular to another by taking into consideration social factors (age, gender, social class, and educational level). ( Fairclough, 2003)

According to ( Jorgensen and Philips 2002)

« In many cases, underlying the word “Discourse” is the general idea that language is structured according to different patterns that people's utterances follow when they take part in different domains of social life. It means that “Discourse” imposes on the individual speaker a particular scheme to follow to produce successful utterances and a purposeful conversation. (p.1)

Discourse refers to the way people communicate with each other in different contexts, such as in a conversation, a discussion, a debate, or a written text. It involves the context in which the language is used, the body language, and many other forms of communication that express thoughts and ideas. Discourse can follow both formal and informal forms according to the situation (speaker, goals, and setting). However, academically, discourse analysis focuses on the study of a given language in use related to social interaction, with a focus on how language reflects and shapes social structures, power relations, and cultural norms. (Johnstone, 2009)

Furthermore, discourse plays a significant role in shaping and values. The way people communicate with each other through language in which it creates, reinforces, or challenges cultural beliefs and practices. Besides, in this sense, discourse is not just a reflection of society, but also a tool for constructing and maintaining it. For example, certain discourses may perpetuate dominant power structures and marginalize marginalized groups. Discourses that are based on stereotypes or biases can lead to discrimination and exclusion, while discourse that challenges these norms can promote social justice and equality. Discourse can also be used to shape public opinion and influence policy decisions, as politicians, media outlets, and other influential actors use language to persuade and mobilize their audiences. (Johnstone, 2009)

On closer scrutiny of the definitions of this term, some scholars found a separate definition. In the field of modern linguistics, the word "Discourse” represents the relationship between language and its disorders contexts, in addition to how language can

transmit particular thoughts and beliefs; for instance, feminism's discourse and environmentalism's discourse are oriented to a particular social group. Furthermore, the conceptualization of discourse varies from one linguist to another. On the one hand, Foucault states in his words that discourse produces a specific topic and manages the centered subject.

In addition to Foucault's theory, Sarangi bases his argument in his book (2010) on the fact that to study a global conversation in its two distinct types (spoken and written), linguists should take into account the smallest grammatical units such as phonemes and morphemes. Hence, the term "Discourse" can represent the shortest phrases as "Goodbye," clauses, and even the longest pieces of literature as novels. ( Wodak & Meyer, 2001)

Discourse is the key to communication that allows humans in comprehending, expressing and producing by which Van Dijk claims in his argument that the concept of discourse is based on the language in use ( who, how, where, and when ) and that the context has an impact on the spoken utterances and the manner of using terms.

Moreover, Mills (1997) adds to the previous research that discourse is a basis represented in several fields such as politics, linguistics, and history. Discourse refers to the way in which people communicate and exchange ideas, opinions, and information on a particular topic or issue. It involves a structured and organized discussion, debate, or conversation among individuals or groups who share common interests, values, or goals. Discourse can take many forms, including verbal, written, or visual, and can be conducted in various settings, such as academic, political, or social contexts.

## **2. Definition of Discourse Analysis**

As stated above, discourse is related to language and context by following a particular scheme to produce a successful utterance. The field of "Discourse Analysis" studies and analyzes

discourses academically by following some theories and schemes. Moreover, many theories are proposed by linguists as methods to extract national ideologies and identities.

John Flowerdrew (2008) decided that discourse analysis is a kind of discourse studies in that its main role starts at the extraction the speech's hidden meanings, as an illustration, the written language, which is represented in press articles, and the spoken form, such as presidential pre-election speeches. In two senses, discourse analysis comes with its theories to extract the hidden meaning. Many language specialists believe that discourse analysis combines sociology and language.

Thus, each society has its own specificities, for instance, if we tried a newspaper article directed at the British people according to the standard of British society, it would not have the same moral and psychological impact. Therefore, some researchers believe that DA is the main method in the qualitative research that studies media and transmitting news and information.

Snape and Spencer (2003, p. 200) stated that Discourse analysis originates from sociology and is about: « Examining the way knowledge is produced within different discourses and the performances, linguistic styles, and rhetorical devices used in particular account ».

Harrison (2004) declares that discourse analysis focuses on long utterances by combining highly successive terms and phrases. However, Dr. Hansen confirmed the importance of the combination between language and communication, which have to be connected to the manner of the information's presentation, such as the formulation of utterances and exchanging conversations. In other words, DA represents the interdisciplinary approach that seeks to examine language in use by analyzing shapes and reflecting social realities.

This field states the relationship between language and its relations with different disciplines such as psychology, politics, and pathology. Furthermore, it is used as a tool for



identity extraction for social identities and their relation to power and influence. It investigate the role of language in social and political processes, including the construction of ideology and the formation of public opinions.

Overall, identity analysis offers a rich and nuanced approach to the study of language and society. It provides a powerful tool for uncovering the ways in which language is used to construct and maintain social structures and for challenging dominant discourses that perpetuate inequalities and oppressions.

### **3. Discourse Markers**

Discourse markers are linguistic elements that signal the relationship between different parts of a discourse, such as conversation or written texts. They serve as connectors between utterances or sentences, helping to indicate the structure of the discourse and the speaker's intention. Discourse markers can be single words, phrases, or even entire clauses. Some common examples of discourse markers include “well,” “so,” “actually,” “you know,” “I mean,” “In other words,” and “nevertheless.” These markers can serve a variety of functions, such as indicating a change in a topic, marking a contrast or concession, expressing uncertainty or hesitation, or emphasizing a point.

Discourse markers are particularly important in spoken discourse, where they can help speakers manage turn-taking and maintain coherence in the conversation. In written discourse, they can help readers follow the flow of the argument and understand the author's intentions. While markers can be useful in facilitating communication and helping to clarify meaning, they can also be misused or overused to ambiguity or confusion. For example, using too many types of filler like “um” or “ah” can make a speaker sound hesitant or unsure, while using too many connectors can make a text sound choppy or repetitive.

#### 4. Meta Discourse Markers

Meta discourse markers are a type of discourse marker that signals the speaker's own comments on the discourse itself. They are often used to indicate the speaker's attitude or stance towards the discourse or to comment on the process of communication itself.

Examples of Meta discourse markers include "I think," "in my opinion," "to be honest," "Frankly speaking," and "as far as I am concerned." These markers indicate that the speaker is expressing his own subjective perspective or evaluation of the discourse.

Some linguists state that the main function of Meta discourse markers is to indicate the structure of a text or a speech; as an illustration, the phrases "firstly," "secondly," and "Finally" signal the order of information being presented. Similarly, the phrase "in conclusion" signals the end of a text or speech. These markers help the reader or the listener to follow the structure of discourse and understand its organization.

Another important main function is to signal transitions between ideas. For example, the phrases "on the other hand," "in contrast," and "however" are used in shifting between arguments to clarify the relationship between the ideas and how they are connected.

On the other hand, Meta markers can be used to emphasize certain points or ideas by using "it is important to note that," which represents that the speaker is drawing attention to a particular point. Similarly, the phrase "in fact" signals that the speaker is presenting evidence to support his arguments.

Meta discourse markers can also be used to provide an indication of the speaker's or writer's level of certainty or doubt about what they are saying. For example, "I believe" means that the speaker is expressing his opinion, whereas "studies show" declares that the speaker is basing his argument on a research.

## 5. Critical Discourse Analysis

Critical discourse analysis (henceforth CDA) is a method that is often used to study different types of discourse. It is referred to as a multidisciplinary, problem-oriented sphere because it incorporates a range of methodologies and various theoretical models from different disciplines, but all of these approaches analyze social and political issues. Moreover, CDA studies power abuse, inequality, and ideology that are generally hidden in discourse; it is also concerned with the use of rhetoric that impacts people's actions and thoughts. (Wodak, 2004)

Critical discourse analysis, or as it is called by most scholars in these late days, "critical discourse studies," emerged from critical linguistics in the late 1970s by some researchers, including George Fowler and Gunther Kress at the University of East Anglia, whose approach was based on Halliday's systematic functional linguistics. (Wodak & Meyer, 2001)

The real debut of CDA was when Van Dijk released his journal *Discourse and Society* in 1990, as well as other books published by other scholars at the same period of time. Furthermore, In 1991, scholars like Teun Van Dijk, Theo Van Leeuwen, Norman Fairclough and Ruth Wodak organized a meeting at Amsterdam University wherein they talked about critical discourse analysis and discussed their approaches as well as different methodologies to CDA. Ever since, CDA maintain to evolve and become a linguistics field. (Wodak & Meyer, 2001)

When talking about critical discourse analysis, the word "critical" or "critique" cannot be disregarded; it is generally misunderstood for criticizing in a negative manner or discussing serious or negative social and political dilemmas, whereas "critical" actually means unveiling the hidden meanings in discourse as well as implicit ideologies and power relations. . (Wodak & Meyer, 2001)

## 6. Tenets of CDA

Many scholars of CDA introduced principles to critical discourse analysis. Nevertheless, the eight tenets given by Norman Fairclough and Ruth Wodak are the most widely recognized principles. They are represented in (Van Dijk, 2011) as follows :

- ❖ *CDA addresses social problems* : The first principle explains that critical discourse analysis focuses on studying social phenomena like asymmetrical relations of power.
- ❖ *Power relations are discursive* : The second principle discusses the way relationships of power are practiced in different kinds of discourse; in other words, CDA gives attention to the ability of powerful people in a society to affect other people's actions and beliefs.
- ❖ *Discourse constitutes society and culture* : This principle clarifies that discourse both forms and is influenced by society and culture, which means that discourse influences what and how people think about certain topics as well as influencing their behavior.
- ❖ *Discourse does ideological work* : This principle points out that ideologies are acted upon through discourse; they are generally implicit.
- ❖ *Discourse is historical*: This principle highlights that taking context into account is a necessity for comprehending discourse. And since discourses can cross between each other and texts can refer to other texts, then interdiscursivity and intertextuality can be incorporated in the context.
- ❖ *The link between text and society is mediated*: The following principle draws attention to the connections between textual analysis and sociocultural practice.
- ❖ *Discourse analysis is interpretative and explanatory*: This principle mentions that text and talk can be understood diversely, and this is based on the context and the spectators.

- ❖ *Discourse is a form of social action*: This principle explains that the main goal of CDA is to reveal opaqueness and power relations in discourse. Moreover, CDA is a field that seeks to alter socio-political practices.

## II. CDA MAJOR FRAMEWORKS

There are a plethora of CDA frameworks, and each one of them analyzes discourse differently. But the most known and used frameworks are Fairclough's three dimensional model, Van Dijk's socio-cognitive model, and the discourse-historical approach of Wodak.

### 1. Fairclough's Three-Dimensional Model

Norman Fairclough is a professor of linguistics at Lancaster University. He is one of the major contributors to the critical discourse analysis field, along with Gunther Kress, Ruth Wodak, and Teun Van Dijk. He is one of the first scholars who brought up a CDA Approach. His framework is based on Halliday's systematic functional linguistics. ( The Lingwist, 2020)

The framework is referred to as "the Three Dimensional Model" since it consists of three interrelated dimensions and because it analyzes language from three different perspectives, which include: text; which can be written, oral, or visual in addition to texts that incorporates both words and images; discursive practice, that includes processes of text production, distribution, and consumption; also the sociocultural practice dimension. These dimensions also presented as: description, interpretation, and explanation. ( Fairclough, 2010)

- *Textual Analysis*:

Fairclough (2010) considers discourse as a social practice; therefore, in this stage, it is compulsory to concentrate on all levels of the text, including the whole formation of text, cohesion, which presents relationships among phrases, grammar that involves transitivity and modality, and vocabulary. Nevertheless, Fairclough provides other things in the textual analysis;

these are interdiscursivity and conversation analysis (turn taking and force of utterances). Moreover, this dimension is also known as the "description dimension."

- Discourse Practice (Interpretation)

This stage involves crucial steps that need to be examined, which are text production, text consumption, and the interpretation of text. It is requisite to give a thorough explanation of how people make and understand texts. In the level of text production, the writer selects the spectators and conceals beliefs in the text, whilst in the next level; the audience extracts hidden meanings and implicit ideologies based on their assumptions, background information, and prior experiences. . ( The Lingwist, 2020)

- Sociocultural Practice (Description)

The last dimension of the framework. This level is concerned with how discourse functions in different social contexts with respect to issues of power and dominance. In addition, the linkage between text and social practice is mediated by discourse practice.

Fairclough's approach provides a link between micro and macro analysis of discursive practice. Moreover, his approach is conducive because it is an interrelated framework; therefore, it is not necessary to start with a certain kind of analysis as long as they are all included and explained in detail. ( The Lingwist, 2020)

## **2. Van Dijk's Socio-Cognitive Model**

Teun Adrianus Van Dijk is one of the cornerstones in the CDA domain; he is a linguist renowned for developing the socio cognitive approach of CDA. His approach sees discourse as a social practice, in line with Fairclough's critical approach. ( The Lingwist, 2020)

The framework provides a broad overview of how ideology is exercised through discourse. It is represented in the form of triangle that is made up of important conceptualizations, which are cognition, society and discourse. That is to say, the internal structure and function of ideology is needed to be studied rigorously; these functions are not just cognitive; instead they can be political, social, and so forth. Further, beliefs are altered and reproduced through socially situated language use. This model also analyzes phenomena such as power and dominance. (Van Dijk 1998)

Van Dijk considers critical discourse analysis as a field of study that investigates power abuse, dominance, and inequality, and how they are expressed through discourse in different contexts. In light of this, Van Dijk's theory, like most CDA Approaches, also aims at discussing social issues in addition to ideology. These aforesaid dilemmas can be revealed by applying the framework that consists of micro-level and macro-level analysis: the micro level is concerned with rhetoric styles and coherence; it is needed in this level to identify the discursive devices and count the frequency and percentage of their usage and the next level has to do with in-groups and out-groups description in which, it is needed to identify the positive-self representation and the negative-other representation strategies and see their usage.

He identifies different sorts of social power, which are: power as control when a group dominates another group in the sense that they have the ability to control their actions; coercion power, which is generally exercised by men or armed force since such power requires strength and violence; in addition to persuasive power that has to do with the beliefs, in other words, the control is no more over actions rather than the minds of people. (Van Dijk, 1998)

Further, in order to examine ideologies that are covered in discourse, Van Dijk proposes an ideological square. It extracts ideologies from two different groupings known as "us and them," which Van Dijk calls "in-group and out-group." He basically positively describes the

in-group members by calling attention to their good things and overlooking their bad things. On the contrary, he presents the out-group members negatively or neutrally, depending on the context. (Van Dijk, 1998, p. 267)

Additionally, Van Dijk (2006) identifies 25 discursive devices that need to be analyzed, these devices are divided into different categories like rhetoric, meaning, argumentation, topos, and so on. The purpose behind them is to demonstrate how different ideologies are expressed in various contexts in discourse. They are euphemism, hyperbole, irony, metaphor, vagueness, lexicalization, disclaimers, implication, Presupposition, example/illustration, comparison, authority, categorization, actor description, evidentiality, generalization, consensus, counterfactuals, national self-glorification, burden, victimization, norm expression, polarization/us-them categorization, number game, populism. (pp. 735-739)

○ **Definition of the Discursive Devices**

- ❖ *Actor Description*: Actor description is a strategy in which politicians describe in-group members and out-group members, positively or negatively. According to the viewpoint of the politician giving the description. (Van Dijk, 2006)
- ❖ *Authority*: Authority is an argumentative strategy in which politicians mention authorities, presidents, or international organizations to persuade the audience and to talk about the achievements of the country. (Van Dijk, 2006)
- ❖ *Burden ( topos )* : Topos is a strategy used by presidents to talk about the financial or human losses of their in-groups to gain support and empathy of the audience. (Van Dijk, 2006)
- ❖ *Categorization*: Categorization is classifying people into groups, based on several factors such as, race, ethnicity, gender, and so on. It is used in political discourse that involves “others” to categorize individuals into in-groups and out-groups. (Van Dijk, 2006)



- ❖ *Comparison*: Generally speaking, comparison stresses similarities and differences between two things. It is utilized in political discourse to compare in-groups and out-groups in order to support a strong claim. (Van Dijk, 2006)
- ❖ *Consensus* : Consensus is a political strategy employed in political discourse to defend a country when facing a threat, for example, immigration. (Van Dijk, 2006)
- ❖ *Counterfactuals*: A counterfactual is a sentence that describes what something or somebody would be like if some circumstances were different. (Van Dijk, 2006)
- ❖ *Disclaimers*: Disclaimers are frequently used in political discourse to support one's stance while simultaneously undermining those of others, by highlighting one's positive self characteristics whilst concentrating on others' negative characteristics. (Van Dijk, 2006)
- ❖ *Euphemism*: Euphemism is a rhetorical strategy used in political discourse to prevent the formation of negative impressions by using a phrase that is less negative, more vague. (Van Dijk, 2006)
- ❖ *Evidentiality*: Evidentiality refers to the way spokesmen provide evidence to support their arguments. This can be through many strategies, such as referring to authorities and organizations or by providing precise information regarding how or where the speaker received their information. (Van Dijk, 2006)
- ❖ *Example/ Illustration*: Illustration is an argumentation strategy used by politicians by giving concrete evidence to support their arguments. It can be accomplished by giving an example or telling a story, since the audience can be more emotionally affected by concrete stories, which are often easier to remember than abstract reasoning. (Van Dijk, 2006)

- ❖ *Generalization*: Generalization is to make broad assertions about a certain group or phenomenon; this can be by applying positive or negative characteristics of the group. (Van Dijk, 2006)
- ❖ *Hyperbole*: Hyperbole is a rhetorical device that involves using exaggeration to emphasize a point or to leave a permanent impression on the audience by stressing negative traits of “others” and diminishing positive characteristics of the "in-groups". (Van Dijk, 2006)
- ❖ *Implication*: Implication refers to the meaning that is applied or used implicitly in discourse, which can be understood by the audience based on their common knowledge. (Van Dijk, 2006)
- ❖ *Irony*: Irony is a rhetorical technique in which the opposite of what is intended is said, generally for humorous effect. It is used in debates to make allegations or criticism in a less harsh manner than a straight allegation. (Van Dijk, 2006)
- ❖ *Lexicalization*: Lexicalization is the process of expressing opinions and concepts by choosing certain lexical items that present in-groups positively and out-groups negatively. (Van Dijk, 2006)
- ❖ *Metaphor*: Metaphor is a persuasive rhetorical technique that involves describing something in terms of something else to make complicated ideas more concrete, understandable, and common. (Van Dijk, 2006)
- ❖ *National self-glorification*: National self-glorification is used in political discourse. It is presenting one's own country positively by praising the country, traditions, and history. (Van Dijk, 2006)
- ❖ *Norm expression*: Norm expression is conveying the norms of behavior that are expected in certain situations. As Van Dijk explains it, “What one should or should not do.” (Van Dijk, 2006, p. 738)

- ❖ *Number game*: Number game is an argumentation strategy that involves the utilization of numbers and statistics in order to increase the credibility of the speaker and convince the audience. (Van Dijk, 2006)
- ❖ *Polarization*: Polarization is categorizing people into in-groups and out-groups based on certain characteristics such as perspectives, ideologies, and so on. It also involves describing in-groups positively and out-groups negatively. (Van Dijk, 2006 )
- ❖ *Populism*: Populism means that society is divided into two groups, in which the interests of ordinary people are ignored by the elite group. (Van Dijk, 2006 )
- ❖ *Presupposition*: Presupposition refers to the meaning implied in discourse; it is used to persuade people about particular propositions without providing explicit evidence. (Van Dijk, 2006 )
- ❖ *Vagueness*: Vagueness is talking about concepts in a general way, by using expressions that lack precise meaning or by the use of quantifiers like a lot, many, and so on. (Van Dijk, 2006)
- ❖ *Victimization*: Victimization is the categorization of people into two groups to emphasize the negative characteristics of out-groups and represent in-groups as a victim. (Van Dijk, 2006)

### **3. Wodak's Discourse Historical Approach**

Ruth Wodak is one of the main characters in the realm of Critical Discourse studies. She is a professor of linguistics at University of Vienna, who developed a theory called the Discourse Historical approach.(Lancaster University, n.d) This approach is multidisciplinary and uses diverse methods; it examines political discourse and discourses about bias and racism, one of the main objectives of her model is to show the connection between fields of action, genres, texts, and discourses. (Wodak & Meyer, 2001)

The Discourse Historical approach is a triangulatory approach that uses multiple methods and takes the background information and historical background of the issues analyzed into consideration. The purpose of this approach is not to show the problems examined as positive or negative, but rather to make them clear and translucent. Also, the context in this model is historically comprehended. (Reisigl & Wodak, 2009)

Wodak believes that discourse and discourse topics can overlap and cross between fields; in other words, they are linked to each other. Therefore, intertextuality and interdiscursivity are crucial aspects of her model. She clarifies that intertextuality is when text refers to other or previous texts, and this could be in a multiple ways: by referring to the same incidents and events in other texts, or exchanging arguments from text to text, and so on. Whereas interdiscursivity is a crossing between discourses. (Reisigl & Wodak, 2009, p. 88- 90)

Wodak (2001, p.93) sums up the main steps used in her Discourse Historical approach:

- Gathering data about the text.
- Founding intertextuality and interdiscursivity after determining the genre that the text pertains to.
- Forming research questions based on the problem examined.
- Setting up the questions to linguistic categorizations.
- Employing the categories to the text and trying to comprehend meanings arising from the questions by using different methods.
- Formulate an outline of the context of the text.
- Understanding the object of investigation adequately.

### III. CONCEPTS RELATED TO CDA

Ideology, power, and rhetoric are some of the terms that are regularly employed in the field of CDA and are important to be familiar with. The following paragraphs provide an explanation of these concepts.

#### 1. Ideology

The concept of “ideology” is a contentious term that carries a negative meaning; it is defined as sort of idea as well as a set of beliefs. Its bad signification dates back to Marx and Engels, who consider ideologies to be a type of “false consciousness,” and it is used in contrast to real knowledge. In that matter, (Knight, 2006, as cited in Wodak and Meyer 2009) mentioned that « it is not easy to capture ideology as a belief system and simultaneously to free the concept from negative connotations. » (p. 625)

Ideology is both social and cognitive; socially, it means that members of a community who belong to a particular group share the same beliefs. Besides, ideologies resemble languages. Therefore, just as there are no private languages, there are no private ideologies. Whereas, cognitively means ideologies, which are considered to be a system of ideas, are preserved in long-term storage. Moreover, ideology permits misuse of power by authorities; when passive groups consider dominant ideology as a normal thing, then it can spread quickly in society. Also, Beliefs are used in modern politics to describe political thoughts. (Van Dijk, 2006)

Ideology is a topic of concern in critical discourse analysis, especially the hidden type of ideologies that are applied in discourse through manipulation. Therefore, CDA has some strategies in order to reveal the implicit ideologies and some of the several methods to detect them are: lexical choice, which is the selection of terms in certain texts that makes the ideology clear; agency (through personification and nominalization); modality like the use of adjectives and adverbs; and lastly, point of view through personal narration, which describes personal

opinions including emotions; impersonal narration that appears in the third person; and assertive phrases; as well as authorial voice, in which the author explains thoughts of characters of the text without giving any personal views. (Jackson & Stockwell, 2011, pp. 196-198)

## **2. Power**

Power is a nebulous concept that is mentioned in the majority of critical discourse analysis approaches, particularly social power. In fact, it is seen as inequality between groups in a community. By “social power,” it is not meant just the physical power or that it is based on violence, which is known as coercive power, but also the power of influencing people’s thoughts and opinions, in other words, the persuasion power. There are other forms of social power as well, such as control, which is manifested in controlling actions of other groups. ( Van Dijk, 2015)

Other than social power, which is renowned as « the control of one group over other group », another type of power exists, and that is power abuse. Power abuse basically occurs when dominant people have control over discourse, for instance, politicians, who have the ability to control political discourse, that is to say, when they dominate influential Text and talk, they are considered to be powerful. However, not everyone can have access or are powerful to the extent that they control discourse. This kind of power is exercised in official text and talk like political discourse, media discourse, and so forth. Additionally, if people can practice power in discourse, they can dominate the minds of others in the sense that they can shape and change their opinions. ( Van Dijk, 2015)

Moreover, CDA is interested in power. It focuses on social power abuse and inequality and how they are exercised through various types of discourse. In addition, it examines the outcomes of these problems in discourse. ( Van Dijk, 2015)

### 3. Rhetoric

Rhetoric is known as the art of persuasion in language. It is used in discourse with the intention of informing and convincing people. The origin of the term “rhetoric” is traced back to the Latin word “rhetorice,” which is derived from the Greek term “rhetorikotekhnē,” which means “art of oratory.” ( Etymoonline, 2021) Previously, rhetoric was used often in speeches rather than written texts. However, now it includes visual rhetorics like videos in addition to speeches and written works. Its scope is not really undefined since it has always been debated by scholars. For ancient scholars, rhetoric is related only to political discourse, while contemporary scholars have broadened it to almost all fields. ( Masterclass, n.d)

In the view of John Holmes (1739) rhetoric is speaking beautifully and ornately. Besides he considers it to be an art of persuasion. He defines it as:

- A. RHETORIC is the Art of Speaking or Writing well and ornamentally on any Subject. Its Principal End is to Instruct, Persuade, and Please. Its Chief Office is to seek what may be most conducive to Persuasion.
- B. the Subject it treats on is any Thing whatever, whether it be Moral, Philosophical, or Divine. (p. 1)

In addition, in the field of rhetoric, Aristotle offers three techniques to persuade an audience, these are ethos, pathos, and logos. He describes Ethos as the strategy by which the author persuades people that he is a reliable source and is deserving of their attention. Pathos is used by the writer to convince his readers by playing with their feelings, one purpose of pathos is to make the audience feel the same way the author needs them to, whether that be a positive or negative emotion. Logos, on the other hand, is about logic; it occurs when the author uses factuals and supports ideas with commonsensical evidence for the purpose of persuading viewers and listeners. ( Ethos, Pathos, Logos Definition and Examples, 2005)

---

## **Conclusion**

In general, this chapter emphasizes the value of critical discourse analysis as a method for examining the ways in which language is used to convey ideas and form social reality. Also, it stresses how crucial discourse analysis is for understanding the intricate and effective ways in which language is used to clarify ideas and reveal beliefs. It also highlights the main concepts that are often used in CDA realm and major theories that are used to analyze discourse.



## CHAPTER TWO: POLITICAL DISCOURSE ANALYSIS

### Introduction

In the last years, researchers in the critical discourse analysis field have focused their attention on analyzing political discourse. In light of this, this chapter provides an overview of political discourse and political discourse analysis; it highlights the importance of language and body language used by politicians when delivering their speeches. In addition, it addresses political speeches thoroughly as well as the topics discussed in them and the gender differences in political speeches.

### I. POLITICAL DISCOURSE

Political discourse studies political topics; it is the discourse of politicians or political organizations like governments and Congress, whether that is orally or written. Thus, referring to political discourse as related only to actors, events, or institutions would be an inadequate definition because it does not involve only politicians and leaders but also citizens, people who vote for presidents, minority groups, and so on. ( Van Dijk, 1997)

Political discourse is generally about politics since it addresses political matters, political systems, and ideologies. Politicians talk about elections, themselves as candidates, and why people should vote for them; they also discuss their policies, as well as other presidents' poor policies. However, political text and talk can almost be about any subject because, other than the political field, they incorporate issues from other social fields. (Van Dijk, 1997, p. 26)

Moreover, political text and talk involve discourses about immigration, minority groups, and exiles, in which politicians ascribe these groups negatively or unfavorably, which leads, as a result, to the spread of racism in communities. In other terms, political discourse, especially that of elites, may skillfully influence people's opinions. ( Van Dijk, 1997)

Also, political discourse discusses other phenomena outside racism and immigration, such as relations of power, bias, as well as group interests which are generally hidden or implicit in discourse; these subjects have lately been examined from the perspectives of discourse analysis and critical discourse analysis. (Van Dijk, 1997, pp. 39-44)

## II. POLITICAL DISCOURSE ANALYSIS

Political Discourse Analysis (referred to as PDA) concentrates on the examination of the political text and talk that are created by politicians, namely, presidents, ministers, members of parliament, the government, etc. On the other hand, PDA is also a critical activity in the sense that it focuses on the exercise of power abuse, domination, and the struggle over power in political discourse, as well as the results of such activities in a society like inequality between social groups. Also, CDA explains and analyzes the rhetorical strategies that are used in political speeches, along with their purpose of usage. Additionally, PDA analyzes political ideologies, which are characterized as a shared set of beliefs among political groupings. Democracy, liberalism, and communism are examples of political ideologies. (Fairclough, 2012)

Political discourse analysis is pertinent to the emerging interdisciplinary field of discourse studies. In fact, linguists and discourse analysts make up the vast majority of pioneers who study PDA. However, the actual relationship between politics and language goes back to Aristotle's politics, in which he characterizes humans with the capacity of speech, which is useful in distinguishing between things that are fair and unfair, good and bad, right and wrong, helpful and damaging, and so forth. (Fairclough, 2012, p. 19)

Aristotle draws a linkage between the political essence of humans and the influence of words; according to him, the purpose of speech in politics is related to rhetoric, which seeks to persuade an audience by using words that will have an impact on them, and so consequently, the

use of language is vital for political practices. Since politics also aims to influence people's thoughts and opinions through the power of speech. (Fairclough, 2012, p. 19)

In the 18th century, the power of language was questionable; however, rhetoricians and politicians kept using their rhetorical skills. After almost two centuries, linguistics experienced a significant advancement, and researchers started to consider language as an innate component of the human brain. Nevertheless, they did not focus deeply on the relationship between language and politics, but rather on the language as associated with syntax and isolated from other faculties. (Chilton, 2004, preface)

Other European scholars were interested in the way language was used in society. In Germany, the Frankfurt School and critical theory pioneers like Habermas made the strongest connection between language and politics. Besides, the relationship between language and politics was a subject of interest in the fields of linguistics and humanities. (Chilton, 2004, preface)

In England, a group of researchers led by Fowler developed critical linguistics. They did not adopt Chomsky's theory, which regards language as an innate component in the mind, but they based their theory on Halliday's systematic functional linguistics, which views language as a social activity. These researchers and the scholars of CDA used language to fight social problems like inequality and racism as well as political concepts like ideas and beliefs.

All of these domains that link language with politics and culture contributed to the emergence of Political Discourse Analysis. (Chilton, 2004, preface)

Political linguistics, which emerged in Germany, was the first trial in establishing a field or a discipline to study political text and talk. Most of the works about language and politics emerged in that period of time, especially through scholars like Harold Lasswell and Nathan

Leites. All of those studies appeared mostly because of the utilization of propaganda in the Second World War (Wodak in Voda 2009) as another weapon to control the minds and opinions of people; this led the researchers to concentrate on the language that was used to manipulate public opinion.

Since 1990, research in the domain of political discourse has continued to develop, starting with sociological and sociolinguistic methods, it enlarged to include the language use of political institutions, and finally to the distinctive oratory skills of politicians in political speeches. (Voda 2009)

### III. LANGUAGE OF POLITICS

Political orators are the most renowned speakers for their remarkable capacity of persuading audiences. Although they represent a huge variety of viewpoints and ideologies, they can fascinate people with their skills in influencing public opinion. (Atkinson, 1984 )

Politicians are acutely conscious of the significance of audience responses to their speeches, and so they use certain strategies in order to manipulate crowds and catch their attention. Some of their strategies involve the use of rhetoric, which, as mentioned earlier, targets feelings, logic, and character.( Beard, 2000) In addition to Rhetoric, they use other techniques, which are:

#### 1. The List of Three

A list of three is one of the most common techniques used by politicians to win the audience's attention and acceptance of their talk. Actually, it is not used only in political speeches but also in normal parlance since it is employed to give a meaning of completion. In political discourse, these lists are commonly a repetition of one word or various terms that share the same meaning and significance. Nevertheless, their influence does not depend completely on the

repetition of the terms but also on the body language and the voice tone of the speaker. For example: Education, Education, Education. (Beard, 2000)

## **2. Contrastive Pairs**

Politicians use contrastive pairs consistently in their speeches. It is also known as « antithesis » in the domain of rhetoric. As opposed to the list of three, which consists of three pieces that basically complete one another, contrastive pairs contain only two components that are, in some respects, contradictory but, in all other respects, apply repetition to give a full impact, such as: One small step for man: One giant leap for mankind (Beard, 2000)

## **3. Metaphor, Metonymy, and Analogy**

Metaphor and metonymy are both employed in political language, and despite the fact that they represent only one part of political discourse, they serve as helpful places to begin with when examining politicians' language and detecting their ideologies.

Metaphor is basically comparing between two conceptualizations; it is utilized not only in political speeches but also used in casual discourse. The metaphors in politics generally originated from sport and war since both include a kind of competition and force, so they are frequently used by politicians in elections. Whereas metonymy occurs when a concept is identified by a thing or another idea that is related to it, nonetheless, it does not represent the entire thing and the exact meaning. Therefore, metonymy can impact how the crowd views and feels about the original idea. . (Beard, 2000)

Additionally, analogy is used to present politicians' beliefs as well. It is a comparison between two dissimilar things that share some aspects together, so analogy explains that if these two objects share some things together, then as a result, they have other features in common as well. . (Beard, 2000)

#### **4. Pronoun Reference**

Referencing a pronoun is used in political discourse as a persuasion method. Politicians refer to specific pronouns such as « you » or « we » to give the public the feeling of being targeted in person.

« You » addresses the whole public, including people who watch the politicians talk in their houses, and not just one person, « we » on the other hand, denotes unity and completeness of people. Therefore, politicians like to imply pronoun reference strategy to manipulate the crowd that they accept politicians' views and beliefs despite the efforts they make to persuade the audience. (Beard, 2000)

Politicians use language to manipulate and persuade people, but they also use other strategies to gain public positive responses and cheering, like clapping for them. These strategies are:

#### **5. Favorable References to Persons**

Favorable references to individuals are employed in multiple public situations outside of political conferences. They are often seen at the start and closing of political speeches. Favorable references are usually utilized to introduce the next speaker. Hence, politicians praise the person introduced in order to increase the appreciation of the public. (Atkinson, 1984, p.35)

#### **6. Favorable References to « us »**

Another method that frequently elicits a positive response or applause from the crowds is praising « our groups » or « us » by using statements that express favorable assessments about « our accomplishments. » It is not only used by the elites but is also used by representatives of minorities when talking about their expectations for politicians' promises.

In addition, it includes mentioning « them » or « others » negatively as evil or feeble. However, when politicians talk about « them » in a bad manner, they do it explicitly to win the audience's trust and positive response. (Atkinson, 1984)

### **7. Unfavorable References to « Them »**

Unfavorable references to « them » or « the other » is a powerful technique to boost the confidence and unity of the audience. Politicians use it to take advantage of the opportunity to paint a picture of « them » as the antagonist, the threat, and the real reason for « our » issues. This technique was used by many presidents, such as Adolf Hitler, because the audience always reacts positively to it. (Atkinson, 1984, p.40)

### **8. Projecting a Name**

Is a type of « claptrap » that is used by politicians as a trick to make the audience applaud for them. Politicians use this strategy by identifying the individual, describing him briefly, and finally naming him. This gives the crowd a chance to recognize that it is time to show their approval and cheer.

At the start of sentences that project a name, there are terms like « now » or « however » that are frequently used since they give spokesmen an uncomplicated manner to let the public know he is about to start speaking about another thing from what was discussed before; that deserves more attention and appreciation. However, it is not necessary for the individual called to be presented directly; spokesmen occasionally mention the person implicitly and let the crowd predict who he is. (Atkinson, 1984)

## **IV. POLITICAL BODY LANGUAGE**

Politicians' body language can play a key role in their communication strategy. By being mindful of their non-verbal cues, politicians can effectively communicate their message and

build a connection with their audience. Political body language refers to gestures and non-verbal communication to convey a message and establish authority. This term can include facial expressions, hand gestures, posture, and even clothing choices. . ( Political marketer, 2021)

First of all, politicians often use hand gestures to emphasize their points or show confidence. For example, they may use a « thumbs up » gesture to show approval or a « pointing finger » gesture to emphasize a particular point. Besides, facial expressions are another important aspect of political body language by which politicians may use a variety of expressions, such as smiling, frowning, or furrowing their brows, to convey their emotions and feelings as a message. ( Political marketer, 2021)

Furthermore, the speaker often uses postures to convey his authority and confidence. He may stand up straight with his shoulders back and chest out and use eye contact with people while speaking and also have a handshake, or they may lean forward to emphasize a point and avoid being severe. In addition, his clothing choice plays a serious role as an important aspect of political body language. He may choose to wear certain colors or styles of clothing in order to convey a particular image to represent, such as professionalism and being aware that he represents himself in public. As an illustration, The Jordanian official hat, called «Thagiyah, » and a scarf-like head cover, which are worn by their king and his court, represent royalty and strength. . ( Political marketer, 2021)

Political attitudes, beliefs, and ideologies are shaped by a variety of factors, including our upbringing, education, and life experiences. Social psychology can help us understand how people form these beliefs to make their speeches and how these speeches can be influenced by factors such as identity, social norms, and cognitive biases. However, effective political communication requires an understanding of how people process information and makes judgments, and using communication research as a helpful tool to understand how to make



messages that are persuasive and effective in changing others' attitudes and behaviors . ( Day Translations, 2018)

Thus, it is important to note that political body language can vary depending on cultural and regional differences. What is considered appropriate or effective body language in one culture may not be in another. According to Asian body language, some gestures that could be universally accepted are considered as rude or taboo in the political speeches of this region, such as the handshake, V sign, and pointing fingers. ( Day Translations, 2018)

## **V. FIELDS RELATED TO POLITICAL DISCOURSE**

Political discourse is related to other fields such as, phonetics, phonology and all that have to do with sounds, under the name of prosody. Political discourse is also related to grammar.

### **1. Prosody and Politics**

Researchers concentrate on the language use and body language of politicians in political discourse; however, they also focus on the utilization of phonetics and phonological features by politicians in order to achieve some effects on the audience, as some studies show that the way orators sound affects the way the crowd views them in terms of their cleverness, attractiveness, and reliability. (Wilson, 2015)

Studies in prosody in politics demonstrate that politicians are fluid in using rhythm and brief pauses in a suitable place while talking in order to persuade people and make them vote, as well as changing the rate of articulation according to their position, which indicates a person's power. (Wilson, 2015)

Prosody is also incorporated with pragmatics and discourse; according to scholars, lexical and syntactical elements can be combined with tone and intonation, or what is known as suprasegmental traits, to produce unique political impacts. They indicate that prosodic aspects

in political arguments can correspond to arguing purposes such as irony. Therefore, sounds are crucial to understand when examining political discourse. Thus, this section merits deeper research in order to comprehend how it interacts with other sections of discourse-making. (Wilson, 2015)

## 2. Grammar and Politics

In 1997, Roger Fowler, Gunther Kress, and other scholars developed their theory based on Halliday's SFL, which considers language as a « social activity. » They proposed that language's surface realization designates the modification of a fundamental truth. In this perspective, they see grammar as a study of social and cognitive features, and consider politics and beliefs as manifested through grammatical structure. This kind of language analysis is recognized as "critical linguistics. » Since then, this theory has developed, and it is considered to be an important element of CDA nowadays.

Despite the fact that grammar continues to be a key explanation of how ideology, dominance, and power are formed through linguistic structures, some pioneers argue that CDA shifts «linguistic » to an « interdisciplinary » and «multi-methodic » stage. Van Dijk on the other hand, views critical discourse analysis not as a « method» but rather as a critical theory fulfilled by discourse analysts, who are interested in politics, which aims to employ various methodologies to analyze abuse of power and inequality between groups in a community. ( Wilson, 2015, p.781)

In addition, CDA has been reviewed for its assertion that it can corroborate types of power abuse through linguistic analysis. Because of its critical focus, theorists like Widdowson content that CDA is related to sociology or to sociopolitics but not linguistics. Furthermore, political discourse is likely influenced by the political critique of political text and talk used for political objectives.

In the past twenty years, one of the most rapidly developing fields of applied linguistics has been the critical theory to language, specifically political text and talk. Most CDA researchers have contributed to the field of political discourse, such as Norman Fairclough and Van Dijk. ( Wilson, 2015)

Critical analysts define political discourse as the utilization of words, sentences, grammatical relations, and discursive positioning for reasons, such as concealing or distributing responsibility in a particular manner or categorizing people or groups into different categories that fulfill specific political ends.

The speaker chooses which one to use according to his purposes, whether he wants people to empathize with the victim or hint at some sort of personal accountability on their end, which means the choice of words is «systematic » and may represent options present in the language's grammatical system. (Wilson, 2015)

At the stage of «transitivity," for example, choices can be between many related and separate processes; these processes encompass the « material, » which presents «what happened, » and the « mental » which indicates how things are comprehended or experienced and so on. In other words, transitivity contributes to view who does what to whom and the reason behind the action.

Indeed, choices can be made at different grammatical stages for particular stages, but sometimes a particular production does not ensure a particular understanding. For example, the speaker wants to stress one group over the other by saying «Police arrested the thief» or «The thief was arrested by Police,» since both have the same linguistic system and can change passive phrases into active phrases and vice versa, the comprehension of these statements may not be influenced by the structure. (Wilson, 2015)

Additionally, in sentences that lack agent, responsibility can be evaded, since there is no identifiable subject for the activities; however, in actual texts, sentences do not stand alone and the subject can be understood from earlier statements. Similarly, in critical discourse analysis, Fairclough emphasizes the significance of intertextuality and mentions that texts are interrelated to each other and do not stand alone. (John Wilson, 2015)

## VI. POLITICAL SPEECHES

Political speeches have a significant influence on public opinion and can shape the way people think about political issues. They can inspire people to support a particular candidate or cause, and they can also influence policy decisions. However, Political speeches are an important tool used by political leaders to convey their message to the public. These speeches serve as a means to communicate their policies and ideas to their constituents and inspire them to support their agenda. Political speeches are also used as a means of persuasion, to win over undecided voters, and to rally supporters to the cause. (Ecanvasser, n.d)

The structure of political speeches usually follows a set of patterns. They start with an introduction, where the speaker establishes their credibility and connects with the audience. This is followed by the main scheme of the speech, while the speaker outlines their policies and thoughts. The main body is usually divided into several sections, each focusing on a specific topic. The speech ends with a conclusion, where the speaker summarizes their key points and main ideas and leaves the audience with a call of action. ( Ecanvasser, n.d)

Furthermore, the language used in political speeches is often designed to inspire and motivate the audience. Political leaders used rhetorical devices such as repetition, alliteration and metaphors to emphasize their key points and create a memorable message. They also use emotional appeals to connect with the audience and persuade them to support their policies. ( Ecanvasser, n.d)

One of the most famous political speeches in history is the « I Have a Dream » speech delivered by Martin Luther King Jr. in 1963. This speech, delivered at the March on Washington for Jobs and Freedom, called for an end to racial discrimination and segregation in the United States. King's use of rhetorical devices and his powerful delivery helped to inspire the civil rights movement and led to significant changes in American society. ( Ecanvasser, n.d)

Another famous political speech is the « Yes We Can » speech delivered by Barack Obama in 2008. This speech, delivered after Obama won the Iowa caucus, called for hope and change in American politics. Obama's use of the phrase « Yes We Can » became a rallying cry for his supporters and helped to inspire a generation of young people to involve in politics.

Political speeches can shape the way people think about life and political issues by framing the debate. Political leaders use language and rhetoric to frame the issues in a particular way, which can influence how people perceive those issues. For example, a political leader who frames an issue as a matter of 'national security' can make people more likely to support politicians who prioritize security over other concerns. ( Ecanvasser, n.d)

In addition, another way that political speeches can influence public opinion is through their use of symbols and imagery. Politicians often use symbols and imagery to convey their message and create a sense of unity and purpose among their supporters. For example, a politician who uses the American flag in his speech can create a sense of patriotism and national pride among his supporters. ( Ecanvasser, n.d)

Writing a successful political speech can be a challenging task, but it can also be very rewarding when done effectively. Here are some tips to help the reader to write a correct political speech (Pathways to Politics, n.d)

1. *Understand Your Audience:* Before you start to write a political speech, it is important to understand who your audience is. Who are you talking to? What are their interests and values?
2. *Have a Clear Message:* Your speech should have a clear message that you want to convey to your audience by identifying the key points and avoiding ambiguity.
3. *Use Rhetorical Devices:* Rhetorical devices are powerful tools that can help you make your own speech more memorable and impactful.
4. *Be Authentic:* your audience wants to hear from someone genuine and authentic. You should speak from the heart and use personal anecdotes or experiences to illustrate your points. Moreover, avoid using language that sounds too rehearsed or scripted.
5. *Use Emotional Appeals:* People are more likely to be moved by a speech that connects with them emotionally. Use emotional appeals to tap into your audience's values and beliefs. You can use stories and metaphors to illustrate your points and create an emotional connection with your audience.

On the other hand, political speeches can influence policy decisions by putting pressure on politicians to take action. Political leaders who deliver powerful speeches can inspire their supporters to take action and demand to change their elected officials. This can lead to policy changes that reflect the concerns and priorities of the people. (Pathways to Politics, n.d)

### **1. The Use of Humor in Political Speeches**

The use of humor in political speeches can be effective if used appropriately and in moderation. It can help politicians to connect with their audience and convey their message in a more memorable way, but it should be done in a way that does not offend or alienate anyone.(Benjamins, n.d)

- ✚ *Self-Deprecating Humor*: Politicians sometimes use self-deprecating humour to show that they are aware of their flaws and can make fun of themselves. This can help to humanize them and make them seem more relatable to their audience.
- ✚ *Satire*: Politicians may use satire to criticize their opponents or draw attention to an issue in a humorous way. This can be effective, as it can make people think about the issue in a different way and encourage them to take action.
- ✚ *Irony*: Politicians may use irony to show the contrast between what they are saying and what is actually happening. This can be a powerful way to highlight a problem or issue that needs to be addressed.
- ✚ *Jokes*: Politicians may use jokes to lighten the mood or to make a point in a more entertaining way. However, it is important for politicians to be careful with their jokes, as they can easily be misinterpreted or offend some people.(Oxford Bibliographies, 2022)

## 2. Gender Differences in Political Speeches

It's important to note that these differences are not absolute and can vary depending on the individual and the context of the speech. Additionally, it's important to avoid making assumptions based solely on gender and to focus on the content and substance of the speech.

*Word Choice*: Both men and women disappear in giving political speeches, especially with regard to the vocabulary used. In public speeches, women tend to use words expressing feelings and relationships, unlike men, who rely on words expressing competition and power

*Tone*: Women are known for their low tone, which is an indication of softness and the selection of polite words, in contrast to men, who have a sharp tone and direct vocabulary, which is an indication of strength.

*Nonverbal Cues:* Women may use more nonverbal cues such as smiling and nodding to convey agreement or support, while men may use more physical gestures to convey dominance or authority.

*Topic Selection:* Women may focus on issues related to social justice and equality, while men may focus on issues related to economic growth and national security.

### **3. Emotions in Political Speeches**

Emotions are considered as means of special influence in the political field, with an influential discourses by spreading feelings such as fear, happiness, hope, anger, and gratitude in order to change beliefs and take certain actions

Some of the most commonly used emotions in political speeches include fear, anger, happiness, and empathy. Fear is often used to emphasize the dangers of a particular policy or course of action, while anger can be used to rally supporters and mobilize them into action. Happiness and hope are used to inspire positive change, while empathy can be used to connect with people on a personal level and demonstrate understanding of their concerns and needs.

( Ecpr, n.d)

However, the use of emotions in political speeches can also be problematic if they are manipulative or insincere. Politicians may use emotional appeals to distract from the substance of their arguments or to hide their true intentions. Therefore, it is essential for politicians to use emotions in a responsible and ethical way by being authentic and transparent in their communication and by using emotions to foster empathy and understanding rather than division and conflict. .( Ecpr, n.d)



#### 4. Topics in Political Speeches

Political speeches can cover a wide range of topics, depending on the context, the speaker, and the audience. Some common topics in political speeches include:

- *Economic Policy*: This can include discussions of taxes, government spending, job creation, trade policy, and other economic issues.
- *Social Policy*: Topics in this category might include healthcare, education, housing, and social welfare programs.
- *National Security and Foreign Policy*: This can include discussions of defense spending, military intervention, diplomatic relations with other countries, and international trade agreements.
- *Civil Rights and Social Justice*: Topics in this category might include race relations, gender equality, disability rights, and other issues related to social justice.
- *Environmental Policy*: This can include discussions of climate change, pollution, natural resource management, and energy policy.
- *Immigration Policy*: This can include discussions of border security, immigration reform, and the rights of immigrants.
- *Political Reform*: Topics in this category might include campaign finance reform, voting rights, and other issues related to the functioning of democracy.
- *Healthcare Policy*: This can include discussions of healthcare access, insurance, and healthcare reform.
- *Education Policy*: This can include discussions of school funding, curriculum, and education reform.
- *Infrastructure Policy*: This can include discussions of transportation, public works, and other infrastructure-related issues.

---

### **Conclusion**

In this chapter, we have seen the impact of the political speeches on the society as an influential tool, the language used, and the combination of a successful political discourse, such the spoken and the non-spoken language ( Body language), in addition to the most chosen topic included in the political discourses and the differences between gender as politicians. This chapter is capable to help the reader in involving his own political speech correctly.

## CHAPTER THREE: METHODOLOGY AND DATA ANALYSIS

### Introduction

According to the previous two chapters, the zone of research is about political speeches and how can linguistics and its procedures helpful to extract the ideology given by politicians. In the last chapter, we focused on the Algerian politics as an area of research by starting with the historical background of the Algerian politics since its independence to simplify the context. Besides, we selected the most two attractive presidents as a case study: Mr. Abdel Madjid Tebboune and Mr. Abdelaziz Bouteflika. Moreover, both of the presidents were present with their first speech in relation with the two tricky situations that Algeria passed through ( The Black Decade) and (Al Hirak ). However, from those two influential speeches, we selected some passage in order to facilitate the work and the final findings. As stated in the previous chapters, the chosen passages were analyzed by using the framework of Van Dijk's modal ( Macro and Micro-level analysis).

### I. SCOPE OF THE STUDY (ALGERIAN POLITICAL HISTORY.)

According to the website el moradia dz Algeria has a complex political history, with various forms of government and political movements emerging over the years. In 1830, Algeria was invaded by France, and it became a French colony until 1962. During this time, Algerians were subjected to colonial rule and exploitation. However, resistance movements emerged, such as the National Liberation Front (FLN), that fought for official independence.

Furthermore, the FLN took control of the government. The early years of independence were marked by political instability, economic struggles, and a power struggle within the FLN. Besides, a famous military coup led by Houari Boumedienne overthrew the FLN government and established a socialist state.

Boumedienne's regime was characterized by authoritarianism and centralized control. However, after Boumebienne died in 1978, a series of military coups and political turmoil followed. In 1991, the Islamic Salvation Front won the first round of parliamentary elections, but the military intervened and canceled the second round, sparking a civil war that lasted for over a decade. Furthermore, In 1999, Abdelaziz Bouteflika was elected president, and he remained in power until 2019. Bouteflika's presidency was marked by economic growth but also by accusations of corruption and authoritarianism.

During his presidency, Bouteflika oversaw the end of Algeria's long civil war in the 1990s and implemented policies aimed at stabilizing the country's economy. He also pursued diplomatic initiatives, including efforts to mediate conflicts in neighboring countries such as Libya and Mali.

However, Bouteflika's presidency was also marked by allegations of corruption and authoritarianism. His administration was accused of stifling political opposition and restricting press freedom. He also faced criticism for failing to address widespread unemployment, poverty, and inequality.

In 2019, protests erupted across Algeria, calling for Bouteflika's resignation and political reform. The previous president eventually stepped down, and a new government was created. Nowadays, a new term has been noted: « The New Algeria, » created by the present president Mr. Abdel Madjid Tebboune as a semi-presidential system, a republic that is governed by a president who serves as a head of state and a prime minister who control the government. Mr. Tebboune is elected for a five-year term with no term limits. In addition, a popular parliament represents citizens. The military plays a significant role in Algerian politics and has often intervened to shape government policy. The military is seen as a powerful and influential force in the country, and many senior government officials have military backgrounds.

Official parties are allowed, but they are tightly controlled by the government, and opposition parties face significant challenges in organizing and participating in elections. Besides, the ruling National Liberation Front (FLN) has dominated Algerian politics since its independence, but other parties have emerged in recent years, including the Islamist party, the Movement of the Society of Peace (MSP), and the Secularist party, the Rally for Culture and Democracy (RCD).

Since the presidency of Tebboune, he has focused on implementing his economic and political agenda, which includes reforms to the country's state-owned enterprises, increasing foreign investment, and modernizing the economy. Tebboune has also taken steps to address corruption within the government and improve relations with neighboring countries.

Tebboune's presidency has also been overshadowed by the COVID-19 pandemic, which has had a significant impact on Algeria's economy and healthcare system. His administration has faced criticism for its handling of the pandemic.

## **II. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY**

In order to get an accurate and a well-structured research, we followed the corpora research method, which involves gathering and analyzing large amounts of language data from a range of sources, including long written texts and spoken language. We used this method by selecting passages from speeches (Corpus Linguistics ) and for the statistical procedure of counting the frequency of discursive devices that are used in both speeches.

### **1. Data Collection Tools**

Before starting the analysis, first it is needed to select the passages from both presidents' speeches, these passages represents all the discursive devices that they used in their speeches. Then, counting the frequency and percentage of each discursive device.

## A. Selected Passages from President Tebboune's Speech

These following twenty three passages are taken from the first official presidential speech delivered by Mr. Abdel Madjid Tebboune on December 19, 2019 at the Palace of Nation ( Kasr Al Oumam) in Algiers, Algeria. In which he called the nation to unite in order to build a new era of Algerian history after a pig popular uprising ( Al Hirak). The speech is taken from a website named : El Mouradia Dz. This speech is written in Modern Standard Arabic (MSA), which is the language used by the president formed in 24 pages. A transliteration is provided for non native speakers and a translated version in English for better understanding.

يتعين علينا جميعاً أن نطوي صفحات الخلاف.

yata' ayānu 'ala ynā jamī' a<sup>n</sup> aān naṭwī ṣafḥāti al khilāafi.

We all need to turn the page on our problems.

وتذهب ريحنا.

watadhhabu ryḥunā.

We lose.

ضرب أروع الأمثلة.

ḍarbu aārwā 'u al aāmhalaṭi.

Give the most incredible examples.

يا من عودتم الجزائر على ضرب أروع الأمثلة في التضحية.

yā mañ 'awādtum al jazāyira 'ala ḍarbi aārwā 'i al aāmhalaṭi fī tādhīati.

For those who gave us the most incredible examples.

إن هذا النجاح الكبير هو ثمرة من ثمار الحراك الشعبي المبارك الذي بادره شعبنا المبارك.

aj̄nā hadhā al̄h̄jāhi al̄kabīri hūa th̄amaratū<sup>n</sup> min̄ th̄imāri al̄harāk al̄shā‘bī al̄mubāarak al̄adhī  
bādarahu shā‘banā al̄mubāarak.

This success is a fruit of our blessed uprising initiated by our people.

كتلك التضحيات التي قدمها أجدادنا و أبوانا في سبيل تحرير البلاد.

katilka al̄tādh̄īati al̄ātī qadamahā aaj̄dādanā wa aḅaḅawnā fi sabīli taḅrīri al̄bilādi.

As the precious sacrifices made by our fathers and grandfathers to free Algeria.

يجب أن نرفع التحية و التقدير للجيش الوطني الشعبي.

yajibu aḅn̄ narfa‘ al̄tāh̄īāta wa al̄tāq̄dyr lil̄jaysh al̄waṭanī al̄shā‘bī.

We must thank and praise our National popular Army.

و الشكر موصول بلا موارد لآسلاك الأمن جميعها.

wa lsh̄ūkra maḅṣūlu<sup>n</sup> bilā mūārabāti<sup>n</sup> liāāslāaka al̄āāmn̄i jamī‘ahā.

thank harmfully to all our security agencies

سيتم إشراك الجامعيين أنفسهم في عملية النهوض.

sayatimū aḅsh̄rāku al̄jāmi‘īyna aḅfusuhum̄ fi ‘amalīāti al̄nūhūḅi.

We will engage our youth in the uprising process.

و تقوم الدولة بإطلاق خطة عمل للشباب.

wa taqumu al̄dāwlatu biāḅl̄lāqi kḅuṭāti ‘amali<sup>n</sup> lilsh̄ābābi.

The government will release a work plan for our youth.

كاد المعلم أن يكون رسولا.

kāda al̄mu‘alīmu aḅn̄ yakwunā rasūla<sup>n</sup>.

A teacher’s status could be as high as that of a prophet.

إنما المؤمنون إخوة.

aj̄nāmā ʾalmūminūna aj̄kḥwatu<sup>n</sup>.

All Muslims need to be together as a loving family.

إننا جميعنا جزائريون.

aj̄nānā jamī‘unā jazāyirīūwna.

We are all Algerians.

إننا ملزمون جميعا.

aj̄nānā mulzamūna jamī‘a<sup>n</sup>.

We are all committed.

و سوف تحرص الجزائر على بناء علاقات صداقة و تعاون مع كل دول العالم باستثناء تلك التي لا تربطنا بها علاقات دبلوماسية.

wa sawfa taḥraṣu aljazāyir ‘ala binā’i ‘alāāqāti ṣadāqaṭi<sup>n</sup> wa ta‘āwunu ma‘a kulū dūali al‘ālamī bistithḥa’ tīlka ālātī lā taḥbuṭnā bihā ‘alāāqātu<sup>n</sup> diḥlūmāsīāṭu<sup>n</sup>.

Algeria will take into consideration creating a friendly relationship with all countries around the world except the one with whom we do not have diplomatic relations.

-الإلتزامات الأربعة و الخمسون.

aj̄āiltizamaṭ aj̄āāfba‘īta wa lkḥumusūn.

The fifty four obligations.

أوجه دعوة خالصة و صداقة إلى جميع رجال الأعمال الوطنيين.

āwajihu da‘wa khāliṣa wa ṣādiqaṭu<sup>n</sup> aj̄la jamī‘i rijāli aj̄āā māli alwaṭanīyina.

A sincere invitation to all Algerian businessmen

-سنسعى لبناء إقتصاد قوي و متنوع.



sanaš'a libinā'a aīqtīṣad qaūīy wamutanawī'a.

We will work hard to build a fruitful economy.

سوف نفتح أفقا واسعة للاقتصاد المنزلي.

saŵfa naftaḥu āfāqa<sup>n</sup>a wāsi'a<sup>n</sup> llaīqtṣad ālmañzilī.

We will create an environment to the house economy.

لن أرضى لأي جزائري أن يعيش في كوخ أو بيت قصديري.

lañ ārḥda liāyī jazāyirī<sup>n</sup> ān yu'ayīṣḥa fī kūkḥi<sup>n</sup> āāw baýt qaṣḍirī.

I will not allow an Algerian to live in an old house.

كما ألتزم أخلة الحياة السياسية.

kamā āāltazimu āākhliqa<sup>n</sup>a āḥayā<sup>n</sup>i ālsīyāsīā<sup>n</sup>i.

I will make an ethical system for the political life.

إن الدولة ستقوم أيضا بإصلاح عميق في النظام.

āīnā āldāwla<sup>n</sup>a sataqūmu āāyḍa<sup>n</sup> biājṣlāḥi 'amīqi fī ālnīzāmi.

The government will make a deep reform of the system.

#### B. Selected Passages from President Bouteflika's Speech

The following thirteen passages are taken from a speech delivered by Mr. Abdelaziz Bouteflika in April 15, 1999 in Wilaya of Batna, it is addressed to the Algerian people with the aim of convincing them to vote for him to apply the civil concord and bring the civil war to a close ( the black decade in Algeria) from an election compain. The speech is taken from a Youtube channel and has been transcribed manually. It contains 15 paragraphs on five pages, in which the president uses modern standard Arabic. However, he uses some words in ADA. Moreover, a transliteration and an English translation for the passages are provided for a better understanding for non native speakers.

يتعلموا الحجة في راس اليتامى.

yata'alāmu āḥijāma fī rās ālyatāma.

They have made you a testing ground.

الجزائر كانت ورشة تجارب.

aljazair kant warshat tajarub.

Algeria was an experiments lab.

ماتظنوش أنه كان من السهل أن يرفع الإنسان الراية الجزائرية و يوصلها إلى السما السابع و إلى سدرة المنتهى.

maṭdhunush anu kān mina alsāhl an yarfa' u alajnsān alrāya aljazāyirā wa yūsiluhā aḥla alsāmā alsāb'a w aḥla sidra' almuṭṭaha.

. Don't believe that it was easy for a man to raise the Algerian flag and take it to the confines of the seventh heaven.

أبشركم بخير سنصبح شبل الأسد.

abashirkum bikhayr sanushbilu shibla alasad

Good news, we will become a lion's cub.

لابد أن ترفعوا رؤوسكم كمحور ثابت، ما نتمش أي شعب، مانتمش ولاد أي بلد، أنتم ولاد الجزائر.

labudā aḥn taḥfa' uā rūwsakum kamiḥwari thābit, mā natumsh ayyā sha' b, mā ntumsh wlād ayyū baladīn , aḥntum awlādā aljazāyir.

You must hold your head up, You're not random, you're not the sons of any country, You're the sons of Algeria.

لكن قيمتكم تعلوا كل قيمة لأنكم أحببتكم المبادئ ماحببتمش الماديات، أحببتكم الشموخ ما حببتمش الماديات، أحببتكم عزة الجزائر ماحببتمش الماديات, و أنا أشركم من صميم الفؤاد على هذه الخصال الوطنية الرفيعة.

lakinā qīmatakum ta'ū kulū qīma liānākuṃ aḥḥābbum ḥabībū māḥḥabbumsh ḥabībū ,  
 aḥḥābbum ḥabībū māḥḥabbumsh ḥabībū , aḥḥābbum 'izāta ḥabībū māḥḥabbumsh  
 ḥabībū , w aḥḥābbum ḥabībū min ḥabībū ḥabībū 'ala ḥabībū ḥabībū ḥabībū ḥabībū .

But your value surpasses every value because you loved principles, not materialism. You loved  
 pride, not materialism. You loved the dignity of Algeria, not materialism. And I thank you from  
 the bottom of my heart for these noble national traits.

إذا قلت الجزائر لا تتفصل الكلمة و الاسم عن الحضارة.

Idḥa qult ḥabībū lā taḥḥabībū ḥabībū wa ḥabībū 'ani ḥabībū .

When I say Algeria, I mean the country and the civilization.

لا بد من الخروج من هذه المحنة.

lā budā mina ḥabībū min ḥabībū ḥabībū .

We must get out of this ordeal.

بسبب المشاكل الأمنية و صبحت في ظروف أنه ما بقاش يهملها تعطي رأي لا في فلسطين ولا في العراق ولا في ليبيا ولا في  
 رواندا.

bisababi ḥabībū ḥabībū w ḥabībū fī dhuruf ḥabībū mā ḥabībū ḥabībū tu 'ī rāy lā fī filaḥḥān  
 walā fī ḥabībū irāq walā fī lībyā wa

lā fī rūāndā.

Due to the security problems and the circumstances that have become so dire, its concern is no  
 longer to give its opinion regarding Palestine, Iraq, Libya, or Rwanda.

يسافر الجزائري من تبسة لمغنية من دون أن يخاف من أي جزائري آخر.

yusāfir aljazāyiri miñ tbessa li meghnīya miñ dūn aāñ yakḥāf min ay jazāyiri ākhar.

An Algerian can travel from Tebessa to Meghnia without being afraid of any other Algerian.

كثير من الإخوان هنا والأصدقاء هنا نعرفهم، دخلت بيوتهم ووجدت عندهم صورة الرئيس هواري بومدين.

kathīru<sup>n</sup> mina alajikhwāni hunā wālāāḥḍiqā'a hunā na'rafhuḥḥ dakḥalī buyūtaḥuḥ wawajadī  
'indahuḥ ṣūraḥa alrāyisi hawāārī.

I went to many friends and brothers' houses. When I walked inside, I found The president Boumediene's picture.

أعتقد أنه ما بقى في الضمير إلا العهد نتاع الرئيس بومدين لي يعتبر عهد ذهبي.

Aataqid aānāhu mā baqā fī alḍāmīr aīlā al'ahḍ ntā'a alrāyis bumadyan lī yua'tabar 'ahḍ dḥahabī.

I believe that there is nothing left in our conscience except for the era of President Boumediene, which is considered a golden era."

إستقللنا مات عليه أكثر من عشور نتاع سكاننا و أنتم تعلمون ذلك.

aiṣṭqlalḥa māta 'alayḥi aākḥthara miñ 'ushūri ntā'a sukāānanā wa aāntuḥḥ ta'lamūna dḥalika.

More than the tenth of our people died to get our independence and you're aware of that.

## 2. Procedures

The collected data are studied through Van Dijk's modal which analyze speeches through two levels, at the micro-level we identify the discursive devices used by both participants to defend their ideological stance. Besides, by following the framework, at the macro-level we identify positive self-representation and negative other representation and make a comparison between their usage by both participants and at the micro-level analysis we count the frequency and percentage of the discursive devices used by both participants in their speeches.

### 3. Data Analysis

This stage represents CDA and the analysis of the two speeches, following the framework of Van Dijk, the analysis will be at two levels ; the micro-level analysis which is about the frequency of discursive devices used by the participants, and the macro-level analysis which is a comparison between the usage of positive-self representation and negative-other representation.

#### A. CDA of President Abdelmadjid Tebboune's Speech

This section represents the passages of President Abdelmadjid Tebboune which are going to be analyzed through two levels: micro-level and macro-level analysis.

##### 1) Micro-Level Analysis

As it is mentioned in the previous chapter, according to Van Dijk this level represents the 25 aspects used by Mr. Tebboune :

- **Metaphor**

This aspect shows that Mr. Tebboune used metaphors three times :

(page 07 p 01) يتعين علينا جميعا أن نطوي صفحات الخلاف

(page 08 p 01 ) وتذهب ريحنا

(page 10 p 01 ) ضرب أروع الأمثلة

- **National Self-Glorification**

According to the followed framework, this device is for the speaker who focuses on his country and glorifies it. According the first speech, Tebboune mentioned three passages :

(Page 10 p 03) -يا من عودتم الجزائر على ضرب أروع الأمثلة في التضحية

( Page 06 p 01) -إن هذا النجاح الكبير هو ثمرة من ثمار الحراك الشعبي المبارك الذي بادره شعبنا المبارك

( Page 08 p 02 ) -كتلك التضحيات التي قدمها أجدادنا و أبائنا في سبيل تحرير البلاد

- **Authority**

The authority level shows the passages that focus on clarifying authority as the national organisations or poeple who are above the governement :

( Page 07 p 02 ) -يجب أن نرفع التحية و التقدير للجيش الوطني الشعبي

(Page 07 p 02) -و الشكر موصول بلا موارد لأسلاك الأمن جميعها

- **Populism**

At this level, the speaker mentioned the populism strategies twice by the proposal of the youth's labour :

( Page 17 p 03) -سيتم إشراك الجامعيين أنفسهم في عملية النهوض

(Page 16 p 02) -و تقوم الدولة بإطلاق خطة عمل للشباب

- **Illustration/ Evidentiality**

Mr.Tebboune quoted two examples from the religious background as :

(Page17 p 01) -كاد المعلم أن يكون رسولا

( Page 21 p 04) -إنما المؤمنون إخوة

- **Polatization**

It is about about mentioning the ingroup (us) / outgroup (them) :

( Page 08 p 02) -إننا جميعنا جزائريون

( Page 08 p 03) -إننا ملزمون جميعا

- **Implication**

The speaker used the hidden language ( Pragmatics) in his utterance to implicate the non-said meaning :

-و سوف تحرص الجزائر على بناء علاقات صداقة و تعاون مع كل دول العالم بإستثناء تلك التي لا تربطنا بها علاقات

دبلوماسية ( Page 19 p 03)

- **Number Game**

This aspect represents the numbers mentioned in the speech, and we found once :

-الإلتزامات ال54 ( Page 11 p 01)

- **Burden**

The speaker shows a part of sorrow by mentioning the Algerian martyrs :

-كتلك التضحيات التي قدمها أجدادنا و أبائنا في سبيل تحرير البلاد ( Page 08 p 02)

According to the selected passages and the Micro-analysis Level by Van Dijk , the following Table represnts the findings and results of the research showing the discursive devices .

**Table 3.1: Discursive Devices Used by President Abdelmadjid Tebboune.**

| Discusive devices                  | Frequency | Percentage |
|------------------------------------|-----------|------------|
| <b>Metaphor</b>                    | 3         | 15.7%      |
| <b>National self-glorification</b> | 3         | 15.7%      |
| <b>Authority</b>                   | 2         | 10.5%      |
| <b>Implication</b>                 | 1         | 5.2%       |
| <b>Polarization</b>                | 2         | 10.5%      |

|                          |   |       |
|--------------------------|---|-------|
| <b>Illustration</b>      | 2 | 10.5% |
| <b>Evidentiality</b>     | 2 | 10.5% |
| <b>Populism</b>          | 2 | 10.5% |
| <b>Number Game</b>       | 1 | 5.2%  |
| <b>Burden (topos)</b>    | 1 | 5.2%  |
| <b>Generalization</b>    | 0 | 0%    |
| <b>Comparaison</b>       | 0 | 0%    |
| <b>Categorization</b>    | 0 | 0%    |
| <b>Victimization</b>     | 0 | 0%    |
| <b>Disclaimers</b>       | 0 | 0%    |
| <b>Irony</b>             | 0 | 0%    |
| <b>Hyperbole</b>         | 0 | 0%    |
| <b>Consensus</b>         | 0 | 0%    |
| <b>Counterfactuals</b>   | 0 | 0%    |
| <b>Euphemism</b>         | 0 | 0%    |
| <b>Vagueness</b>         | 0 | 0%    |
| <b>Actor Description</b> | 0 | 0%    |
| <b>Norm Expression</b>   | 0 | 0%    |



|                       |   |    |
|-----------------------|---|----|
| <b>Pressuposition</b> | 0 | 0% |
| <b>Lexicalization</b> | 0 | 0% |

According to table 3.1 these are all the discursive devices used in the presidential speech presented by the President Abdelmadjid tebboune: Metaphor three times with a percentage of (15.7%), national-self glorification three times with a percentage of ( 15.7%), authority twice with a percentage of (10.5%), implication once with a percentage of (5.2%), polarization twice with a percentage of (10.5%), illustration twice with a percentage of (10.5%), evidentiality twice with a percentage of (10.5%), populism twice with a percentage of (10.5%), number game once with a percentage of (5.2%), and burden once with a percentage of (5.2%). In addition, it shows the absence of all the following devices: irony, hyperbole, victimization, vagueness, euphemism, consensus, counterfactuals, disclaimers, comparaisn, categorization, generalization, actor description, norm expression, pressuposition, and lexicalization.

## 2) Macro-Level Analysis

At this level, our analysis is about the given image of the speaker ( a politician) and the manner in which he uses words to create a positive view about himself, known as the Positive self-representation.

- **Positive Self-Representation**

According to the speech, the politician used the positive self-representation strategy to convince the hearers about their right choice by giving several positive plans as an illustration :

(Page 12p 02)

-سنسعى لبناء اقتصاد قوي و متنوع

(Page 12 p 04)

-وتقوم الدولة بإطلاق خطة عمل للشباب

(Page 13 p 04) -سوف نفتح أفقا واسعة للاقتصاد المنزلي

(Page 15 p 02) -لن أرضى لأي جزائري أن يعيش في كوخ أو بيت قصديري

( Page 11 p 04) -كما ألتزم أخلقة الحياة السياسية

( Page 13 p 04) -إن الدولة ستقوم أيضا بإصلاح عميق في النظام

In this speech, we notice that the speaker avoids the use of negative-other representation strategy.

#### B. CDA of President Abdelaziz Bouteflika's Speech

The following stage is about the analysis of the selected passages in President Abdelaziz Bouteflika's speech according to a micro-level analysis and macro-level analysis.

##### 1) Micro-Level Analysis

This level represents the frequencies and analysis of discursive devices used by President Abdelaziz Bouteflika in his speech to persuade the audience with his ideas, as well as explanation of every discursive device.

**Table 3.2: Discursive Devices Used by President Abdelaziz Bouteflika.**

| Discursive devices                 | Frequency | Percentage     |
|------------------------------------|-----------|----------------|
| <b>Lexicalization</b>              | <b>14</b> | <b>51.85 %</b> |
| <b>Metaphor</b>                    | <b>4</b>  | <b>14.81 %</b> |
| <b>National self-glorification</b> | <b>3</b>  | <b>11.11 %</b> |
| <b>Implication</b>                 | <b>3</b>  | <b>11.11 %</b> |
| <b>Vagueness</b>                   | <b>1</b>  | <b>3.70 %</b>  |

|                       |           |               |
|-----------------------|-----------|---------------|
| <b>Burden (topos)</b> | <b>1</b>  | <b>3.70 %</b> |
| <b>Authority</b>      | <b>1</b>  | <b>3.70 %</b> |
| <b>Total number</b>   | <b>27</b> |               |

According to table 3.2 the following devices are all the discursive devices that President Abdelaziz Bouteflika used in his speech to defend his ideological stance, which is ending the civil war. It shows that he uses these devices 27 times, including lexicalization (14) times, which he used more than the other devices, with a percentage of (51.85%), followed by metaphor four times with a percentage of (14.81%), national self-glorification three times with a percentage of (11.11%) implication three times with a percentage of (11.11%), then vagueness once, burden (topos) once, and Authority once with a percentage of (3.70%) for each, respectively. Regarding the other devices such as actor description, comparison, counterfactuals, disclaimers, euphemism, evidentiality, illustration, generalization, hyperbole, irony, norm expression, polarization, populism, presupposition, and victimization, they are not applied in the speech.

- **Lexicalization**

President Abdelaziz Bouteflika employs lexicalization (14) times with a percentage of (51.85%) to describe others ( Terrorists) negatively by applying negative lexicalization such as الجهل, الحقرة, الرداءة, انحطاط, العدو, إعوجت, العشوانية, عدو, إنحطاط, الرداءة, الحقرة, الجهل. He also applied positive lexicalization to describe in-groups positively like; تعاطف, الحضارة, الخصال الوطنية الرفيعة, الوفاء, عزة, الشموخ, المبادئ

- **Metaphor**

President Abdelaziz Bouteflika uses metaphor to persuade people with his ideas and views; he employs it four times with a percentage of (14.81%). the following sentences are examples of metaphor :

(from minute 06 :16 to 06 :22) يتعلمو الحجابة في راس اليتامى

( 08 :16 to 08 :18 ) الجزائر كانت ورشة تجارب

In these utterances, Abdelaziz Bouteflika refers to all the presidents that came before him but did not benefit Algeria in any way other than trying new things and making decisions without thinking about the consequences of their actions. He does this by referring to Algerian people as *يتامى* to show that they accept any decision because they have no one to defend them or speak on their behalf.

ماتظنوش أنه كان من السهل أن يرفع الإنسان الراية الجزائرية و يوصلها إلى السما السابع و إلى سدرة المنتهى

(22 :51 to 22 :59)

In this sentence, he describes the misery the Algerian people experienced and how hard it was to get the independence of Algeria by mentioning delivering the flag to « سدرة المنتهى » and « السماء السابع » which is impossible.

(23 :43 to 23 :47) أبشركم بخير سنصبح شبل الأسد

With this utterance, the President reassures the Algerian people that they will come out of this crisis together and end the civil war.

- **National Self-Glorification**

President Bouteflika uses this device three times with a percentage of (11.11%) to praise Algeria and the Algerian people in these following sentences

لابد أن ترفعوا رؤوسكم كمحور ثابت، ما نتمش أي شعب، ماتتمش ولاد أي بلد، أنتم ولاد الجزائر.

( from 19 :08 to 19 :23)

لكن قيمتكم تعلوا كل قيمة لأنكم أحببتكم المبادئ أحببتكم الشموخ ما حبيتكم الماديات، أحببتكم عزة الجزائر ما حبيتكم الماديات، و أنا أشكركم من صميم الفؤاد على هذه الخصال الوطنية الرفيعة. (04 :22 to 04 :52)

إذا قلت الجزائر لا تفصل الكلمة و الاسم عن الحضارة. ( 11 :30 to 11 :40 )

- **Implication**

The president Abdelaziz Bouteflika, uses this device three times with a percentage of (11.11%) in the following sentences :

لا بد من الخروج من هذه المحنة. (16 :53 to 16 :55)

بسبب المشاكل الأمنية و صبحت في ظروف أنه ما بقاش يهملها تعطي رأي لا في فلسطين ولا في العراق ولا في ليبيا ولا في رواندا. (20 :23 to 20 : 36)

يسافر الجزائري من تبسة لمغنية من دون أن يخاف من أي جزائري آخر (12 :36 to 12 :42)

In these sentences, he uses implication to mention the terrorists and the civil war implicitly because his purpose was to convince the Algerian people to unite all together in order to finish the civil war. So he mentions words like «المحنة» «المشاكل الأمنية» and «الظروف» so the crowd can understand what he is referring to.

- **Vagueness**

President Bouteflika employs this device once with a percentage of (3.70%) in his speech; the following utterance is an example of vagueness :

كثير من الإخوان هنا والأصدقاء هنا نعرفهم، دخلت بيوتهم ووجدت عندهم صورة الرئيس هواري بومدين.

( 02 : 57 to 03 :05)

- **Authority**

In this speech, President Abdelaziz Bouteflika employs authority once with a percentage of (3.70%) in :

أعتقد أنه ما بقي في الضمير إلا العهد نتاع الرئيس بومدين لي يعتبر عهد ذهبي. (08 :23 to 08 :35)

In this utterance, President Bouteflika mentions the golden era of President Boumediene to remind the Algerian people about the glory and strength of Algeria in the era of Boumediene and how it was before the civil war.

- **Burden**

President Bouteflika utilizes burden once with a percentage of (3.70%) in the following sentence:

إستقلاننا مات عليه أكثر من عشور نتاع سكاننا و أنتم تعلمون ذلك. (22 :36 to 22 :41)

Here, President Bouteflika mentions the human loss during the liberation revolution to gain Algerians' empathy and to persuade them to end the civil war,

- 2) Macro-Level analysis

The macro-level analysis presents the utilization of positive self-representation and negative other representation by President Abdelaziz Bouteflika. However, we notice that there is a slight dissimilarity in their usage.

- **Positive Self-Representation**

Through reading the speech of President Abdelaziz Bouteflika, delivered in 1999, it can be seen that Bouteflika frequently employs the positive self-representation technique; he emphasizes the positive aspects of Algeria and the Algerian people; he uses this strategy through discursive devices, specifically, through National self-glorification, as follows :

لابد أن ترفعوا رؤوسكم كمحور ثابت، ما نتمش أي شعب، مانتمش ولاد أي بلد، أنتم ولاد الجزائر.

(19 :08 to 19 :23)

إذا قلت الجزائر لا تنفصل الكلمة و الاسم عن الحضارة (11 :30 to 11 :40)

لكن قيمتكم تعلوا كل قيمة لأنكم أحببتكم المبادئ ما أحببتكم الماديات، أحببتكم الشموخ ما حببتمش الماديات، أحببتكم عزة الجزائر ماحببتمش الماديات، و أنا أشكركم من صميم الفؤاد على هذه الخصال الوطنية الرفيعة. (04 :22 to 04 :52)

In these sentences, the president describes the Algerian people positively as well as praises the country and the people of Algeria by using positive lexicalization in words such as الحضارة, الوفاء, مبادئ, and الخصال الوطنية الرفيعة. Besides. he also utilizes the negative other-representation, but not as much as this strategy.

#### • Negative Other-Representation

In the speech of President Abdelaziz Bouteflika, it is noted that he did not use this strategy so often. In addition, he employs it implicitly in his speech through the discursive device « implication » since « others » are Algerian terrorists, and one of the purposes of his speech is to convince Algerians of the concept of civil concord. This technique appears in :

يسافر الجزائري من تبسة لمغنية من دون أن يخاف من أي جزائري آخر (12 :36 to 12 :42)

لا بد من الخروج من هذه المحنة (16 :53 to 16 :55)

بسبب المشاكل الامنية و صبحت في ظروف أنه ما بقاش يهملها تعطي رأي لا في فلسطين ولا في العراق ولا في ليبيا ولا في رواندا. (20 :23 to 20 : 36)

In these phrases, Abdelaziz Bouteflika talked about « others » who are terrorists implicitly. In the first sentence, he refers to terrorists as « جزائري آخر », and in the second sentence, he mentions the word « المحنة ». He also said « المشاكل الأمنية » and « ظروف » to make the Algerian people understand that he is talking about the Algerian Civil War, or as it is known, the black decade.

#### 4. Discussion of Findings

After selecting the speeches of President Abdelaziz Bouteflika delivered on April 15, 1999, and the speech of President Abdelmadjid Tebboune delivered on December 19, 2019, we

analyzed the speeches using Van Dijk's Framework of CDA. We started the analysis at the micro-level, where we extracted the discursive devices used by both presidents in their speeches to convince the audience with their ideas and defend their ideological stance. We concluded that President Abdelaziz Bouteflika used seven devices out of 25, which are metaphor, vagueness, national-self glorification, authority, burden, lexicalization, and implication.

Furthermore, Abdelmadjid Tebboune used 10 devices out of 25, which are metaphor, national-self glorification, authority, implication, polarization, illustration, evidentiality, populism, number game, and burden. Then we moved to the macro-level analysis, where we utilized a comparison between positive-self representation and negative other representation, and we concluded that President Abdelaziz Bouteflika used positive self representation explicitly in his speech and used it more than the negative other representation, which he applied implicitly, whereas President Abdelmadjid Tebboune avoided using negative other representation completely. The reason that the two presidents did not apply negative other representation or did not apply it explicitly is that in both periods that the presidents delivered their speeches, the "other" was one of them, one of the Algerians. Finally, we conclude that critical discourse analysis can extract discursive devices and ideologies from political speeches.

### **Conclusion**

This research ends with the third chapter, which focuses on the case study by giving a short overview of politics in Algeria. Moreover, it includes analysis of the speeches of President Abdelaziz Bouteflika and Abdelmadjid Tebboune which, they delivered during dark periods known as “ the black decade 1991-2002” and “ the popular protests in 2019 utilizing Van Dijk’s CDA modal. Furthermore, according to the collected data, the two Presidents used discursive devices in their speeches to defend their ideological stances which shows that CDA can reveal discursive devices and uncover political ideologies and their influence on public opinion, policies, and social practices.



## GENERAL CONCLUSION

This study aims at revealing discursive devices and implicit ideologies in political speeches, we analyzed the speeches of President Abdelaziz Bouteflika that he delivered on April 15, 1999, and president Abdelmadjid Tebboune that he delivered on December 19, 2019, which are regarded as two of the most influential speeches since they were delivered in two critical periods that Algeria has gone through, from a CDA perspective.

We came to the conclusion that the two Presidents relied on using the discursive devices in order to create communication with the audience and thus influence and convince them with their ideological stances. President Abdelaziz Bouteflika wanted to convince them to end the civil war and start a new life all together, and President Abdelmadjid Tebboune wanted to convince them with a new beginning to Rebuild Algeria again. And they both did.

The Framework that we adopted to arrive at these results is Van Dijk's framework, which consists of analysis on two levels : the micro-level analysis, in which we counted the use of discursive devices and we explained each one they used, and the macro-level analysis, in which we compared the two strategies of positive self-representation and negative other representation and their usage by both Presidents. Moreover, the results of this investigation also show us the power of language in influencing people's thoughts and opinions, which makes the politicians able to give a powerful impact on their citizens and the political environment. Further, our recommendations to the next researchers to try other CDA frameworks in analyzing speeches like Fairclough's model , also to work on more comparative studies on Algerian political speeches.

Finally, after a long period of research, and a hard practical process we faced some obstacles such as interpreting the discursive devices, especially those used by President Abdelaziz Bouteflika since we did not live in the period of the black decade, and applying the

model of Van Dijk that we faced a problem in understanding what we should analyze in the micro and macro levels. Moreover, we estimate that critical discourse analysis has a powerful effect as a followed process that can reveal discursive devices and ideologies in political discourse, CDA can reveal them by using theories like Van Dijk's theory, also the ability of the audience to understand and decode implicit thoughts and the special language that the politicians use is very crucial.

## References

- Beard, A. (2000). *The language of politics*. Routledge.
- Body Language for Political Leaders: The Importance of Body Language for Political Leaders*.  
(2021, November 11). Political Marketing Strategy Consultant.  
<https://politicalmarketer.com/body-language-for-political-leaders/>
- Chilton, P. A. (2004). *Analysing Political discourse: Theory and Practice*. Routledge.
- Cambridge Dictionary. (2019). *DISCOURSE* | meaning in the Cambridge English Dictionary.  
Cambridge.org. <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/discourse>
- Fairclough, N. (2003). *Analysing discourse : textual analysis for social research*. Routledge.
- Fairclough, N. (2010). *CRITICAL DISCOURSE ANALYSIS : the critical study of language*.  
(2nd ed.). Routledge. (Original work published 1995)
- Fairclough, N., & Isabela Fairclough. (2012). *Political discourse analysis*. Routledge.
- Flowerdew, J. (2013). *Discourse in english language education*. Routledge, , Cop.
- Gender and Communication Differences (& Stereotypes). (2021, February 1).  
Www.youtube.com. <https://youtu.be/QBHnZHDOWfY>
- Holmes, J. (1739). *The Art of Rhetoric Made Easy*.
- Home - Ethos, Pathos, and Logos, the Modes of Persuasion – Explanation and Examples*.  
(2005). Pathosethoslogos.com. <https://pathosethoslogos.com/>
- Human Rights Watch. (2021, November 19). *Algeria: Events of 2021*. Human Rights Watch.  
<https://www.hrw.org/world-report/2022/country-chapters/algeria>
- Johnstone, B. (2018). *Discourse analysis* (2nd ed.). John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- J Maxwell Atkinson. (1984). *Our masters' voices : the language and body language of politics*. Methuen.
- Jackson, H., & Stockwell, P. (2011). *An introduction to the nature and functions of language*  
(2nd ed.). London Continuum C.

- Jørgensen, M., & Phillips, L. (2002). *Discourse analysis as theory and method*. Sage.
- Knyazyan, A., & Hakobyan, V. (2018). Language and Gender in Political Discourse. *Armenian Folia Anglistika*, 14(1-2 (18)), 62–70. <https://doi.org/10.46991/afa/2018.14.1-2.062>
- Khitabu rais Ijumhuriya Abdelaziz Boutefkikalil wiam Imadani bibatna 1999. (2017, October 2). Www.youtube.com. [https://youtu.be/eZjSD\\_2XhAY](https://youtu.be/eZjSD_2XhAY)
- Khitabu tansib (n.d.). Www.el-Mouradia.dz. Retrieved June 8, 2023, from <https://www.el-mouradia.dz/ar/president/inauguration-speech>
- Lingwist, T. (2020a, August 22). *Fairclough's Framework Of Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) - The Lingwist*. The Lingwist. <https://thelingwist.net/faircloughs-framework-of-critical-discourse-analysis-cda/>
- Lingwist, T. (2020b, August 25). *Van Dijk's Framework Of Critical Discourse Analysis - The Lingwist*. The Lingwist . <https://thelingwist.net/van-dijks-framework-of-critical-discourse-analysis/>
- Mills, S. (2004). *Discourse*. Routledge.
- Nikos-Rose, K. (2020, January 7). *Is there (still) a gender gap in politics?* University of California. <https://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/news/there-still-gender-gap-politics>
- Politics in Algeria. (n.d.). Algeria.com. Retrieved June 8, 2023, from <https://www.algeria.com/culture/political-parties/>
- Political Humor and Its Effects. (2023, August 23). Obo. <https://www.oxfordbibliographies.com/abstract/document/obo-9780199756223/obo-9780199756223-0350.xml>
- Ruth Wodak. (n.d.). Www.lancaster.ac.uk. Retrieved July 2, 2023, from <https://www.lancaster.ac.uk/linguistics/about/people/ruth-wodak>
- Racoma, B. (2018, March 27). *Asian Body Language: Mind Your Hands*. Day Translations Blog. <https://www.google.co.kr/amp/s/www.daytranslations.com/blog/asian-body->

language/amp/

Reisigl, M., & Wodak, R. (2017). *The Discourse-Historical Approach (DHA)*. ResearchGate; unknown. [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/251636976\\_The\\_Discourse-](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/251636976_The_Discourse-Historical_Approach_DHA)

[Historical\\_Approach\\_DHA](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/251636976_The_Discourse-Historical_Approach_DHA)

rhetoric | Origin and meaning of rhetoric by Online Etymology Dictionary. (n.d.).

[Www.etymonline.com. https://www.etymonline.com/word/rhetoric](https://www.etymonline.com/word/rhetoric)

Rhetoric is the art of discourse - Mskelly-pace. (2018). Studylib.net.

<https://studylib.net/doc/7499391/rhetoric-is-the-art-of-discourse---mskelly-pace>

Ruth Wodak. (2023, January 12). Wikipedia. [https://en.m.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ruth\\_Wodak](https://en.m.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ruth_Wodak)

Tannen, D. (2012). Discourse Analysis—What Speakers Do in Conversation | Linguistic Society of America. [Linguisticsociety.org](https://www.linguisticsociety.org).

<https://www.linguisticsociety.org/resource/discourse-analysis-what-speakers-do-conversation>

Tsakona, V. (n.d.). Studies in Political Humour. In *benjamins.com*. John Benjamins Publishing Company. Retrieved February 13, 2023, from <https://benjamins.com/catalog/dapsac.46>

Tannen, D., Heidi Ehernberger Hamilton, Schiffrin, D., & Carolyn Temple Adger. (2015). *The handbook of discourse analysis* (2nd ed., Vols. 1 & 2). Wiley Blackwell.

Van Dijk, T. A. (1998). *Ideology : a multidisciplinary approach*. Sage Publications.

Van Dijk, T. A. (2011). *Discourse Studies*. SAGE.

van Dijk, T. A. (1997). What is Political Discourse Analysis? *Political Linguistics*, 11(1), 11–52. <https://doi.org/10.1075/bjl.11.03dij>

Van Dijk, T. A. (2006). *Politics, Ideology, and Discourse* . [Discourses.org](https://discourses.org).

<https://discourses.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/07/Teun-A.-van-Dijk-2006-Politics-ideology-discourse.pdf>

Van Dijk, T. (2011). *Discourse Studies : a Multidisciplinary Introduction* (2nd ed., pp. 367,

373). Sage Publications Ltd.

What is Rhetoric ? Definition, Examples, and Importance. (n.d.). Master Class.

<https://www.masterclass.com/articles/writing-101-what-is-rhetoric-learn-about-rhetorical-devices-in-writing-and-3-modes-of-persuasion-in-rhetoric>

Wodak, R. (2004). Critical discourse analysis. *Qualitative research practice*, 185-204.

Wodak, R., & Meyer, M. (2001). *Methods of critical discourse analysis*. Sage.

## Appendices

### Appendix 01: Speech of Abdelaziz Bouteflika Delivered on April, 15, 1999.

غابت، لكن ما غابتش في بيوتكم، و كثير من الأخوان هنا و الأصدقاء هنا أعرفهم، دخلت بيوتهم و وجدت عندهم صورة الرئيس بومدين، أنتم عربون الوفاء.

أنا أتذكر و كنت في تلك السلطة حينذاك، لا أعتقد أن الرئيس بومدين عمل لكم شيء خاص و لكن أحببتم فيه حب الوطن، أحببتم فيه حب الشعب، أحببتم فيه النخوة و الغيرة على الجزائر، أحببتم فيه الإخلاص، أحببتم فيه التعاطف مع اليتيم و المحروم، أحببتم فيه تعاطفه مع الأرملة، أحببتم فيه محبته للقليل، اما من الناحية المادية النظام نتاع الرئيس بومدين ما عمل شيء هنا، و أنا كنت في هذاك النظام، لكن قيمتكم تعلوا على كل قيمة لأنكم أحببتم المبادئ، ما حبيتوش الماديات، أحببتم الشموخ، ما أحببتمش الماديات، أحببتم عزة الجزائر، ما أحببتمش الماديات، و أنا أشكركم من صميم الفؤاد على هذه الخصال الوطنية الرفيعة و على هذا الشموخ و على هذا الوفاء، وباسم صديقي و أخي هواري بومدين من قبره أشكركم شكرا جزيلا على تشبثكم بثورة التحرير و من جاؤوا لبناء الدولة الجزائرية الحرة المستقلة.

قال المتحدث قبلي أنه " بعد زمن العز عرفنا زمن الذل، عرفنا زمن الداء و الرداءة، عرفنا زمن الجهل، عرفنا زمن الحقرة، عرفنا زمن الجهل، عرفنا زمن الجهل لي يحكم شعبا عظيما كشعب الجزائر، عرفنا زمن الذين جاؤوا يتعلموا الحجامة في رأس اليتامي و كنتم من الصابرين .

ما نقدرش نكون راضي عليكم، ما نقدرش نكون راضي عليكم على الإطلاق، لأن ما كان وقت فيه ظلم، ما كان في وقت فيه حاجة اعوجت إلا و قومتها بثوراتكم و قومتها بتمردكم المشهور لكن سكتتم! ما كان سكوتكم جينا ما كان سكوتكم خوفا من أحد و لكن كنتم من الصابرين، تعرفون كيف تعايشون الطبيعة القاسية و تفتاتون من الحجارة و أنتم من اهل الصحراء، كجميع اهل الصحراء في حاجة إلى الكهرباء و الماء.

For the whole speech click on the following link : [Www.youtube.com](http://Www.youtube.com).

[https://youtu.be/eZjSD\\_2XhAY](https://youtu.be/eZjSD_2XhAY)

### Appendix 02 : Speech of Abdelmadjid Tebboune Delivered on December, 19, 2019.

بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم والصلاة والسلام على أشرف المرسلين و على آله وصحبه إلى يوم الدين  
السيد رئيس الدولة،

السيد رئيس مجلس الأمة بالنيابة،

السيد رئيس المجلس الشعبي الوطني،

السيد رئيس المجلس الدستوري،

السيد الوزير الأول،

السيد الفريق نائب وزير الدفاع الوطني،

رئيس أركان الجيش الوطني الشعبي،

أصحاب المعالي والسعادة،

سيداتي سادتي،

أيها الشعب الجزائري الأبى العظيم، أيها المواطنين أيها المواطنين

يا أبناء و أحفاد الشهداء والمجاهدين، والوطنيين الأحرار،

يسعدني أن أخاطبكم، اليوم، بصفتي رئيسا للجمهورية الجزائرية الديمقراطية الشعبية. أخاطبكم أنتم الذين صنعتم

التاريخ من جديد، بإقبالكم الملحوظ على صناعة مستقبل الجزائر بقراركم السيد، يوم 12 ديسمبر 2019، لقد صنعتم

نجاحا باهرا بتأييتكم نداء الواجب الوطني المقدس، وأعدتم الجزائر إلى سكة الشرعية الدستورية والشرعية

الشعبية، التي لم يطعن فيها أحد.

إن هذا النجاح الكبير، هو ثمرة من ثمار الحراك الشعبي المبارك، الذي بادر به شعبنا الكريم، عندما استشعر

بسريرته وضميره أنه لا بد من وثبة وطنية لوقف انهيار الدولة ومؤسساتها.

For the whole speech click on the following link : <https://www.el-mouradia.dz/ar/president/inauguration-speech>



## ملخص

تهدف هذه الدراسة العلمية إلى استخراج الأجهزة الخطابية التي استخدمها عبد العزيز بوتفليقة خلال خطابه في 15 أبريل 1999، و تلك المستخدمة من قبل عبد المجيد تبون خلال خطابه في 19 ديسمبر 2019، تسعى هذه الدراسة أيضا إلى كشف الإيديولوجيات المبطنة في خطاباتها. السؤال الرئيسي الذي يطرح في هذا البحث هو كيف يمكن للتحليل النقدي للخطاب كشف الأجهزة الخطابية و الإيديولوجيات في الخطابات السياسية. للإجابة على سؤال البحث و متطلبات التحقيق سوف تجري بحث النصوص باستعمال ( لغويات النصوص). بالإضافة إلى استخدام نموذج فان دايك للتحليل النقدي للخطاب كإطار عمل . وبالتالي فإن تحليل الخطابين وفقا لهذا الإطار يتطلب تحليل على المستوى الجزئي وعلى المستوى الكلي. في المستوى الجزئي نحسب تكرار و نسبة الأجهزة الخطابية التي استخدمها كل من المشاركين، و في المستوى الكلي نقارن بين استخدام إستراتيجيات تمثيل الذات الإيجابي وتمثيل الآخر السلبي في كلا الخطابين. هذا النهج يسمح للتحليل النقدي للخطاب بالكشف عن الأجهزة الخطابية و الإيديولوجيات الحاضرة في الخطابات السياسية. تظهر النتائج ان الرئيس بوتفليقة استخدم سبعة اجهزة من اصل 25 و استخدم تمثيل الذات الإيجابي بشكل مباشر بينما استخدم تمثيل الآخر السلبي بشكل مبطن في خطابه. بينما استخدم الرئيس تبون 10 اجهزة من اصل 25 و استخدم فقط تمثيل الذات الإيجابي.

## Abstract

This research study aims to uncover the discursive devices utilized by President Abdelaziz Bouteflika during his speech on April 15, 1999, and those used by President Abdelmadjid Tebboune during his speech on December 19, 2019. The study also seeks to reveal the implicit ideologies conveyed in their speeches. The main question raised in this research is how CDA can uncover discursive devices and ideologies in political speeches. To address our research question and meet the requirements of our investigation, we will conduct corpus research using corpus linguistics. Additionally, we will utilize Van Dijk's model of Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) as a framework. Consequently, analyzing the speeches using this framework requires both a micro-level and macro-level analysis. At the micro-level, we count the frequency and percentage of discursive devices used by both presidents. At the macro-level, we compare the usage of positive self-representation and negative other-representation strategies in both Presidents' speeches. This approach allows CDA to reveal discursive devices and ideologies present in political speeches. The findings show that the president Bouteflika used seven devices out of 25 and used positive-self representation explicitly whilst he used negative-other representation implicitly in his speech. Whereas, the president Tebboune used 10 devices out of 25 and he only employs positive-self representation.

## Résumé

Cette étude de recherche vise à montrer les dispositifs discursifs utilisés par le président Abdelaziz Bouteflika durant son discours du 15 avril 1999, ainsi que ceux utilisés par le président Abdelmadjid Tebboune durant son discours du 19 décembre 2019. L'étude vise aussi à révéler les idéologies implicites transmises dans leurs discours. La question principale posée dans cette recherche est comment l'analyse critique du discours (ACD) peut montrer les dispositifs discursifs et les idéologies dans les discours politiques. Pour répondre à notre question de recherche et aux exigences de notre enquête, nous mènerons une recherche de corpus en utilisant la linguistique de corpus. En outre, nous utiliserons le modèle de l'Analyse Critique de Discours (l'ACD) de Van Dijk comme cadre. Par conséquent, l'analyse des discours en utilisant ce cadre nécessite à la fois une analyse de micro-niveau et de macro-niveau. Au niveau micro, nous comptons la fréquence et le pourcentage des dispositifs discursifs utilisés par les deux présidents. Au niveau macro, nous comparons entre l'utilisation du stratégies de la représentation positive de soi et la représentation négative de l'autre dans les discours des deux présidents. Cette approche permet à l'ACD de révéler les dispositifs discursifs et les idéologies présents dans les discours politiques. Les résultats montrent que le président Bouteflika a utilisé sept dispositifs sur 25 et a utilisé explicitement la représentation positive de soi, tandis qu'il a utilisé implicitement la représentation négative de l'autre. En revanche, le président Tebboune a utilisé 10 dispositifs sur 25 et il n'a employé que la représentation positive de soi.