

Circumlocution in King Abdullah II's Discussion Papers

Ahmad El-Sharif (Corresponding author)

Associate Professor of Linguistics, Department of English Language and Literature,
Al-alBayt University, Jordan

E-mail: a.el-sharif@aabu.edu.jo

Aya Owais

Post-Graduate Student, Department of English Language and Literature, Al-alBayt
University, Jordan

E-mail: yaya.jordan@yahoo.com

Received: March 3, 2019 Accepted: April 9, 2019 Published: April 30, 2019

doi:10.5296/ijl.v11i2.14752 URL: <https://doi.org/10.5296/ijl.v11i2.14752>

Abstract

This article studies circumlocution in King Abdullah II's Discussion Papers in light of Critical Discourse Analysis and Corpus-based analysis. The analysis aims to investigate the role of using this strategy in identifying the ideologies embedded in the discourse of democracy and reform adopted by the Jordanian Monarch. The study relied on a small corpus of the seven Royal Discussion Papers published between December 2012 and April 2017. The study demonstrated that King Abdullah II considerably employs circumlocution in his Discussion Papers to convey his vision, ideas, and ideologies about democracy and reform in Jordan by repeating a set of keywords to accentuate his vision of the enactment of reform and democracy in Jordan. These keywords are found to reflect the King's ideologies on the basis of four key assumptions: the *Partakers*, *Reform*, *My Nation*, and *Optimism* and *Sanguinity*.

Keywords: King Abdullah II, Discussion Papers, reform, democracy, Jordan, ideology, Critical Discourse Analysis, Corpus-based approach, Circumlocution

1. Introduction

One of the constant truths about of Jordan is that its destiny is shaped by its geopolitical landscape. Jordan is an Arabic country located in the heart of Middle East. It connects most of the Asian and African Arabic countries together, and it has borders with Israel since 1948. Jordan has encompassed citizens from many origins and ethnicities; making it one of the most pluralistic societies. And in the last decades, and along the thread on its long borders with Palestine, Syria and Iraq, Jordan has been affected by the many drastic commotions that afflicted its neighbors. This effect is materialized by the challenges which face the economy where the increasing number of the refugees in Jordan from those three countries has been considered one of the reasons behind Jordan's economic challenges (Gharaybeh, 2014).

Social and economic hardships have been met by the Jordanian citizens with complaints, frustration, and mistrust, and they have resulted in increasing the gap with the successive governments. Here, King Abdullah II, the Monarch of Jordan, has endeavoured to delimitate the citizens' mistrust and misunderstanding by inviting them to effectively practice their right in decision making with partnership with the assigned governments. He has constatly called them, citizens and governmnets, to come up with right plans that may result in depleting the economical, and existential, threats which face Jordan.

Since ascending on the throne in 1999, King Abdullah II has focused on democratic development and reform in Jordan. In his discourse, he firmly asserts that he is 'the vanguard of reform' who protects the march towards democracy and reform in Jordan (EL-Sharif, 2014; EL-Sharif, 2015). To achieve his goal, he has published seven royal discussion papers between December 2012 and April 2017 to outline his vision on democracy and reform in Jordan.

The contents of these *Discussion Papaers* have raised national and public debates on the current status of Jordan, its identity, and the path towards political and economic reform. The main theme of these Papers are believed to reach a consensus that persuades and encourages the citizens of Jordan to be more active and engaged in reform process.

As a genre of political discourse, King Abdullah II's Discussion Papers are perceived as having discursive persuasive strategies to fulfill the purpose of convincing the citizens of Jordan to perform an action or adopt a set of beliefs. These strategies reflect the King's underlying ideologies on the basis of Norman Fairclough's assumptions (2013) that 'ideologies reside in texts' and that 'texts are open to diverse interpretations'. And one of these prevalent persuasive strategies is *circumlocution*; the prevalent use of several keywords in a series of speeches (or letters) which cover a period of time. Accordingly, the discourse producer can describe and elaborate what he aims in keywords, and their collocations, rather than under major themes, or headings. Here, we assume that the purpose of adopting circumlocution by politicians is to deliver plainly intended messages, as well as to deepen the understanding of these messages and enhance their persuasiveness.

2. Discourse and Discourse Analysis

Early discourse analysis, according to Fitch and Sanders (2004), focused on the linguistic structure of the text whereas the modern discourse analysis is an approach which combines linguistic and social analysis. It examines how language, both spoken and written, enacts social and cultural perspectives and identities (Gee, 2014). However, it is not just one approach, but a set of interdisciplinary approaches which can be used to explore many various social domains in many various forms (Jørgensen and Phillips, 2002). On the other hand, political discourse analysis is about texts and talks of professional politicians or political institutions, such as the discourses of presidents and prime ministers or members of parliaments and governments and leaders of political parties. However, as Teun van Dijk accentuates, politicians are not the only participants in the domain of politics, and when analyzing a political discourse, we therefore should also include the various *recipients* involved in the political communicative events, such as the public, the people, citizens, the 'masses', and other groups or categories (van Dijk, 1997: 13). van Dijk sees also that political discourse is a type of political actions most of which involve passing laws, decision making, meeting, campaigning, etc., and these actions are broadly verbal and discursive, and their main goal is *persuasion*.

Persuasion is regarded as a psychological communicative process that is used to make others adopt specific ideas, beliefs, and opinions. According to Perloff (2003, p.8), persuasion is 'a symbolic process in which communicators try to convince other people to change their attitudes or behaviors regarding an issue through the transmission of a message in an atmosphere of free choice'. Persuasion is also perceived as a process of conveying beliefs to other people to influence them (Poggi, 2005). Here, both Perloff and Poggi agree in regarding persuasion as a process which follows prescribed steps. In addition, Halmari (2005) sees persuasion as all linguistic choices, or behaviors, which attempt to change thinking or the behavior of the audiences or to strengthen their beliefs (Halmari, 2005). On the other hand, Johnstone (1989: 143) defines *persuasive strategies* as 'the range of options from which speaker selects in deciding on an appropriate tactic or a combination of tactics for persuasion in a given situation'. Speakers, or writers, employ several tactics based on the range of communicative strategies, verbal and nonverbal, in situations where persuasion is necessary (ibid). In this regard, the politicians' discursive strategies used for persuasion are essential in analyzing political discourse; they reflect and define the ideologies embedded in the politician's discourse.

Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) is a renowned approach to discourse analysis which identifies and analyzes power, dominance, inequality, and bias in political discourse, and it studies how these sources are represented in social and political contexts. CDA is 'critical' in its approach because it aims at revealing the hidden connections and causes behind the production and reception of a particular discourse; thus, it can uncover the hidden connections from people; such as the connections between language, power, and identity (Fairclough, 1989), and it aims also to uncover the role of language in building up the social identities, relationships and events (Min, 1997). To achieve such goals, CDA has been developed to a multidisciplinary theory which focuses on social problems, and especially on

the role of discourse in the production and reproduction of power abuse or domination (Dijk, 2001).

CDA considers language use as a social practice which means that the users of language use it in agreement of social and mental structure; especially for the practice of persuasion. Hence, CDA encompasses the areas of social psychology, history, ethnography, anthropology, sociology, and many other disciplines in order to reveal how language, ideology, and identity interrelate to each other in discourse. In this regard, CDA is said to consist of three dimensions of discourse conception: a *language text*, spoken or written, and *discourse practice*, text production, and interpretation, and *socio-cultural practice* (Fairclough, 1995: 97).

Furthermore, when applying CDA to analyze a discourse, Fairclough (1989) suggested that there are three stages to follow: a *description stage*, which is concerned with the formal properties of the text, and an *interpretation stage*, which is concerned with the relationship between text and interaction, and an *explanation stage*, which is concerned with the relationship between interaction and social context (Fairclough, 1989: 26). Accordingly, critical analysis has gone beyond the ‘whatness’ of the text description towards the ‘howness’ and ‘whyness’ of the text interpretation and explanation.

CDA scholars believe that, through the choice of language, interlocutors reflect their intentions, thoughts, and ideology. According to Irvine (1989: 255), *ideology* refers to the cultural system of ideas about social and linguistic relationships, together with their loading of moral and political interest. According to Dellinger, texts are selected and organized syntactic forms whose ‘content-structure’ reflect the ideological organization of a particular zone of social life (Dellinger, 1995). CDA claims that it is not possible to ‘read off’ ideologies from texts only, which involve structure and content, but it is necessary to take into account the context in which the discourse occurs (Fairclough, 2013: 57). Typically, such context can be approached by the discourse analyst by collecting information about the conditions and circumstances surrounding the production of the text. In addition, the immediate linguistic context of the discourse can be revealing by looking to the many linguistic signs which are frequently employed to represent the different discursive practices employed by the discourse producer. Hence, a society’s ideologies are the fundamental beliefs of a group and its members who live in that society (van Dijk, 2004: 7).

Van Dijk accentuates that CDA is instrumental tool in examining the relationship between language and social cognition (*See his work on power abuse and enactment in political discourse in Western societies* (van Dijk, 1997). Analyzing discourse, he elaborates, can help to reveal which social and cognitive, and most notably ideological, constructs fuel and are fuelled by it (ibid: 1-2). Gee (2014) comments on this, stating that when we study language as it is used in a particular context, it enables us to reveal more about how things can be said or done or how they can exist differently in the world. This again supports the strong relationship between discourse and context established in the previous argument. Nevertheless, one needs to be clear about what kind of analysis is involved in understanding what the outcomes of the study are.

Regarding CDA, Gee (2014) distinguishes between *descriptive* and *critical* discourse studies. In the case of the first, the analysis aims to describe a language for the sake of understanding it without attempting to act upon it. A clear example of this is when an analyst analyses the linguistic patterns produced by second language learners to understand which stage of interlanguage they are currently at, and what characterizes that stage. On the other hand, critical discourse studies, as explained earlier, go beyond the description and even the explanation stage to intervene in what the analyst perceives as unjust or discriminatory. This means that CDA cannot be conducted independently from the ideology of the culture to hand. Therefore, it is essential to point out beforehand what type of ideology is concerned. To elaborate, critical discourse analysts do not only target specific realizations of ideologies, but they are also preoccupied with uncovering the hidden beliefs encoded using various linguistic tools; such as analogies and conceptual metaphors (Wodak and Meyer, 2009).

Several scholars have applied critical discourse analysis to different genres of texts and discourses. One of these genres is political discourse; a broadly recognized genre of discourse that embarks upon the immense amount of discourse which politicians produce and enact and emancipate to communicate and legitimize their policies and ideologies.

Political discourse is deemed a fertile field to be analyzed according to CDA, and across several languages, cultures, and sociopolitical contexts. Thus, we have extensive body of research in CDA that has *critically* analyzed political speeches of several political leaders of the world; such as the successive American Presidents (namely, George W. Bush (Erjavec and Volcic, 2007), Barack Obama (Horvath, 2009; Unvar and Rahimi, 2013; Ghazani, 2016), and Donald Trump (Rachman and Yuniarti, 2017), and Muslim and Arab leaders (namely, Recep Tayyip Erdogan (Bayram, 2010), Abdel Fattah El- Sisi (Hussein 2016), and King Abdullah II (Al-Shalabi and Al-Rajehi, 2011; Al-Haq and Al-Sleibi, 2015; El-Sharif, 2014 and 2015; Rabab'ah and Rumman, 2015; Al-Dunaibat, 2016; Al-Momani, 2017)). In addition, several studies on CDA have revealed how the less-dominant group's *discourses of resistance* also employs discursive strategies which evoke polar ideologies; such as the 'negative other' and a 'positive we' (See Hakam, 2009; Mazid, 2008). Most of these researches on analyzing political discourse according to CDA has been directed by the expansion of using computer software in (linguistic) academic research. This expansion has been materialized in discourse analysis by the application of the tenets and assumptions of CDA with the techniques of *corpus linguistics*.

Corpus linguistics (CL) is a quantitative approach which is being used or applied to process large bodies of texts which are characterized to be representative. Such analysis can begin by identifying the *Key Words in Context* (KWICs), which involve the most frequent (lexical) words and their derivatives (or *lemmas*: *the canonical form, dictionary form, or citation form of a set of the keywords*) in the corpus. Then, studying the linguistic contexts where they occur and focusing on identifying their *collocations* and *colligations*. According to Firth, the term 'colligation' refers to the syntagmatic attraction between grammatical categories, e.g. part of speech or syntactic function, whereas the term 'collocation' refers to the syntagmatic attraction between lexical items (Lehecka, 2015, p. 5). The analysis and interpretation of

these syntagmatic attractions would smooth the progress of the contextual *qualitative* analysis of the texts under investigation.

The qualitative approaches of CDA depend primarily on doing a close reading for *fragments* of the text, which are related to the topic under investigation, and this might help the researchers achieve semantic and pragmatic explanation of the discourse. In using CDA, data are quantitatively calculated in terms of their distribution and frequencies, and then, the most frequent KWICs are semantically and pragmatically analyzed within the social and political contexts of the discourse. This means that using both quantitative and qualitative approaches would augment the robustness of the implications of the critical analysis of the discourse. Baker et. al., accentuates that:

‘CL processes can help quantify discursual phenomena already recognized in CDA; that is, establish their absolute and relative frequencies in the corpus, through the examination of the different linguistic means utilized to express them. Even when the CL analysis does not set out to examine existing CDA notions, it can utilize a CDA theoretical framework in the interpretation of the findings’ (Baker et. al., 2008: 285).

This means that CL is a sensible approach that cooperates with CDA directly or indirectly; CL can help CDA directly in quantifying any discursive notion which is already recognized by CDA. For example, in analyzing a given political discourse produced by a political leader, the analysis would start by looking into the purposes behind the production of the discourse in order to clarify its main goals and themes. In view of that, CL approaches can directly create a concordance of the key words of the corpus of the politician’s discourse. These keywords can be reorganized under a set of key themes and headings which are connected with semantic and pragmatic relationships. Here, CL can help CDA indirectly, interpreting the findings of the corpus-based findings; especially frequencies of keywords, their distribution across the corpus, and their collocations. As a result, a set of assumptions and implications can be recognized on basis of the society where this discourse is produced, enacted, and emancipated.

In one of their seminal studies, Baker et. al. (2008) discussed issues related to critical discourse analysis once it is associated with corpus linguistics. The study was based on the analysis of a 140-million-word corpus of British news articles about refugees, asylum seekers, immigrants and migrants (collectively RASIM). It discussed how processes such as collocation and concordance analysis were able to identify common categories of representation of RASIM as well as directing analysts to representative texts in order to carry out qualitative analysis. Other studies found also that CL can also examine frequencies, or, at least, provide strong indicators of the frequency, of specific phenomena recognized in CDA (e.g., topoi, topics, metaphors), by examining lexical patterns, and it can add a quantitative dimension to CDA. Therefore, CDA can benefit from incorporating more objective, quantitative CL approaches, as quantification can reveal the degree of generality of, or confidence in, the study findings and conclusions; thus guarding against over- or under-interpretation. In this, corpus linguistics has been used by several researchers as a tool to investigate the hidden meanings and ideologies in different genres of discourse; such as the

discourse of climate change (Grundmann and Krishnamurthy, 2010), restaurant reviews in several newspaper articles (Hou, 2012), and the discourse of civil wars (Haider, 2016).

Subsequently, several studies have been conducted in order to come up with a comprehensive understanding of how corpus analysis and critical discourse analysis may contribute thoroughly in understanding someone ideology of speech and how s/he manages to convince the audience of his opinion. Furthermore, it is clear that most of the studies had taken many famous leaders as a subject for these researches, and those were precisely chosen for their ability in directing the audience ears to their speeches and gain their attention and trust. Eventually, the rational of this literature review has been constructive in designing a fitting methodology to answer the questions of this study after analyzing King Abdullah II's Discussion Papers.

5. The Current Study

The current study aims to examine the use of circumlocution as a discursive persuasive strategy in the King Abdullah II's Discussion Papers in revealing the underlying ideologies of the Jordanian Monarch.

To achieve the objectives of the study, the researchers compiled a corpus of all King Abdullah II's seven Discussion Papers published between 29th of December 2012 and 15th of April 2017. The texts of this corpus were extracted from King Abdullah II's official website, and the analysis was based on the official English translation of the original Arabic text. The corpus was compiled in seven document files; each contains one discussion paper and stored in rich text format (*.rtf). The details of the corpus are illustrated in the following table:

Table No.1: The corpus of King Abdullah II's Discussion Papers.

Paper No.	English Title	Date of Publication	Number of Words in the English Version
1.	<i>Our Journey to Forge Our Path Towards Democracy</i>	29th, December 2012	1980
2.	<i>Making Our Democratic System Work for All Jordanians</i>	16th, January 2013	1324
3.	<i>Each Playing Our Part in a New Democracy</i>	20th, March 2013	3895
4.	<i>Towards Democratic Empowerment and Active Citizenship</i>	20th, June 2013	1810
5.	<i>Goals, Achievements and Conventions: Pillars for Deepening Our Democratic Transition</i>	13th, October 2014	2976
6.	<i>Rule of Law and Civil State</i>	16th, October 2016	3005
7.	<i>Developing Human Resources and Education Imperative for Jordan's Progress</i>	15th, April 2017	1096
	Total		16086

The (quantitative) corpus-based analysis was carried out using Wordsmith Tools version 6.0.0.252. The analysis was basically based on identifying the *Keywords In Context* (KWICs), and identifying the instances in which each keyword (and its lemmas) occur. Then, Wordsmith Tools generated a word-list and their frequencies. The first 14 (occurred more than 30 times) lexical words (and their lemmas) were recognized as the keywords in the corpus. With the help of the *concordance* function of Wordsmith Tools, we extracted all the linguistic contexts where each one of these keywords in the Corpus. In addition, the most frequent collocations and colligations of these keywords were identified in order to proceed for the stage of *description*, *interpretation* and *explanation* according to CDA (See Fairclough, 1989: 26). This last stage was principally based on interpreting the semantic and pragmatic connotations of the keywords and their lemmas. The explanation, in turn, was based on the qualitative analysis which aimed to identify the ideologies behind the each set of - semantically and pragmatically - related keywords.

3. Data Finding and Analysis

Analysis was primarily based on Fairclough's (1989) three stages of CDA: *description stage*, *interpretation stage*, and *explanation stage*; so, it went beyond the 'whatness' of the text description towards the 'how' and 'whyness' of the text interpretation and explanation. Accordingly, the data analysis using WordSmith Tools identified the KWICs and their frequencies and contexts.

It is found that the total word count of the corpus of King Abdullah II's Discussion Papers is 16086 words (the English version); while the number of the sentences is 641 sentences. The identified word-list of the most 14 (occurred more than 30 times) frequent lexical words in the corpus demonstrates that the themes of the Discussion Papers are blatantly related to *politics* register as the most frequent words are related to the semantic domain of politics; and Table no.2 below illustrates the distribution of these keywords:

Table No. 2: KWICs frequencies in the corpus.

Number	KWICs (and their lemmas)	Frequency	DP 1	DP 2	DP 3	DP 4	DP 5	DP 6	DP 7
1	<i>politics</i>	140	5	8	50	31	35	10	1
2	<i>parliament</i>	135	5	30	64	6	28	2	0
3	<i>government</i>	125	0	23	51	4	41	5	1
4	<i>citizen</i>	108	16	8	25	20	13	25	1
5	<i>Jordan</i>	107	16	5	31	18	17	7	13
6	<i>democracy</i>	105	26	12	21	19	22	5	0
7	<i>nation</i>	97	14	9	27	7	23	14	3
8	<i>law</i>	65	0	2	2	0	14	47	0
9	<i>system</i>	60	3	15	13	1	19	5	4
10	<i>role</i>	53	0	4	27	3	14	4	1
11	<i>country</i>	46	10	5	8	7	0	14	2
12	<i>parties</i>	45	1	7	26	3	8	0	0
13	<i>future</i>	39	7	1	9	3	5	5	9
14	<i>new</i>	36	4	5	8	4	13	2	0
	Total KWICs count	1161							
	Total words count in	16086							

It can be perceived from the Table no. 2 above that the KWICs in the corpus makes about 7% of the size of the entire corpus. In other words, these keywords are mentioned 70 times every thousand words in the discourse of King Abdullah II's Discussion Papers. This perceived frequency accentuates the importance of these keywords and their repetition is meant to reflect aspects of the King's visions and ideologies through circumlocution; or the intentional use of several keywords to describe what could be said with fewer ones. This discursive strategy, as corpus analysis may suggest, aims to emphasize some planned messages which are produced by the King where his intention that these messages are enacted and emancipated by a targeted audience.

Here, instances of *circumlocution* and their frequencies and contexts were identified and elaborated to make interpretations of their usage. By the meticulous inspection of the contexts of these KWICs (and their lemmas) in the corpus, it is found that they can be classified under four ideological assumptions that 'reside in texts' (as Fairclough argues (Fairclough, 2013)). These ideological assumptions were recognized as:

1. targeting the *partakers* (by the frequent use of the keywords 'parliament', 'government', 'citizen', and 'parties' (and their lemmas).
2. targeting the *nation* (by the frequent use of the keywords 'Jordan', 'nation', and 'country' (and their lemmas).
3. targeting the *reform* (by the frequent use of the keywords 'politics', 'democracy', 'law' and 'system' (and their lemmas).
4. targeting the *Optimism and sanguinity* (by the frequent use of the keywords 'future' and 'new' (and their lemmas).

3.1 The Partakers

The analysis shows that lexes and lemmas related to the addressees occupy about 35% of the total number of the most frequent KWICs in the corpus. These addressees are recognized as the partakers of the Discussion Papers, and they come into four categories. These partakers are the target of the King to whom he passes his visions and ideologies (especially those on reform and democracy in Jordan). Remarkably, the weight of these partakers varies considerably; some were targeted more than the other categories by the King; and this is plainly in Table No. 3 below:

Table No. 3: The distribution of the *Partakers* KWICs and their lemmas in the corpus

Order	KWICs	Lemmas	Freq.	DP 1	DP 2	DP 3	DP 4	DP 5	DP 6	DP 7
2	<i>parliament</i>	<i>parliamentary, parliaments, parliamentarians</i>	135	5	30	64	6	28	2	0
3	<i>government</i>	<i>governments, governments</i>	125	0	23	51	4	41	5	1
4	<i>citizen</i>	<i>citizen, citizens</i>	108	16	8	25	20	13	25	1
12	<i>parties</i>	<i>parties</i>	45	1	7	26	3	8	0	0
	<i>Partakers KWICs count</i>	413 (35.5%)								
	<i>Total KWICs count</i>	1161								

The table reveals that the *parliament* is the most targeted partaker in the discussion papers. To elaborate, the keyword ‘parliament’ and its lemmas; ‘parliamentary’, ‘parliaments’ and ‘parliamentarians’ appear 135 times; a number that reflects the King’s profound belief in the role of the parliament in promoting his visions. In addition, the corpus analysis of the colligations of ‘parliament’ reveals that its most frequent grammatical pattern is that where it is preceded by an attributive adjective (adjective + ‘parliament’) which refer to the newly elected parliament. Such uses, especially with attributive *optimistic* adjectives such as ‘new’ and ‘next’ indicates the King’s faith and hope in the democratically elected institutions. However, the most predominant use of the keyword ‘parliament’ in the corpus is as the head noun of a prepositional phrase to mark his understanding and perception of the real nature of the parliament; for example:

1. ‘In various international parliamentary government practices, the Prime Minister-designate and Cabinet team may emanate from Parliament or not, or the Cabinet may be a mix of MPs and technocrats’ (3rd Discussion Paper, 2013).
2. ‘Members of Parliament have the responsibility of serving as honest public servants, who balance local and national interests and match the need for collaboration with government to the need to serve the role of constructive opposition’ (5th Discussion Paper, 2014).

On the other hand, the lemma ‘parliamentary’ appears 83 times in the corpus to create a colligation of compound nouns. The head of these compounds are abstract, rather than concrete, materializations of political domains. Thus, we have it in *parliamentary government* (x 36), *parliamentary blocs* (x 11), *parliamentary system* (x 6), *parliamentary cycles* (x 4), *parliamentary elections* (x 4), and *parliamentary majority* (x 4). Though non of these materialisations significantly exists in the Jordanian case, the frequent reference to ‘parliamentary government’, for instance, is of great significance in the discourse of King Abdullah II; especially in reflecting the King’s vision of encouraging Jordanians to effectively participate in decisions making. This effective participation allows Jordanians to

indirectly choose, but not necessarily *elect*, members of the parliament and the government; especially with the partaking of political *blocs* and parties; he says:

3. 'If no clear majority emerges initially, then the designation will be based upon consultation with all parliamentary blocs' (2nd Discussion Paper, 2013).

Meanwhile, the government is the second most frequent political partaker mentioned in six of the seven discussion papers. For instance, the mentioning of 'government' and its lemmas tends to increase in the following discussion papers as a reflection of the King's reliance on the government and the parliament to enact his visions of reform. To elaborate, the lemma 'government' appears 103 times, and that its most frequent collocation is 'parliamentary government', which appears 36 times. The collocation 'parliamentary government' refers to the system of government that has the real executive power, and this power is vested in a cabinet composed of members of the parliament, the legislatures. These legislatures, then, are individually and collectively responsible before the citizens and the King of their legislation and exercise of power. The King accentuates:

4. 'I have no doubt that we will continue to refine this process as we learn from our experience and as our new system matures, but I look forward to this immediate next step towards full parliamentary government' (2nd Discussion Paper, 2013).
5. '*Building on these foundations of an effective parliamentary government system, we will move towards the point in which a majority coalition of parties in Parliament forms the government*' (3rd Discussion Paper, 2013).

In contrast, the executive powers of the government, as a separate body from the parliament, are highlighted by the King in his frequent reference to the 'governments'. The lemma 'governments' was used 20 times to refer mostly to the responsibilities of the government in building up strategies and actions; for instance, the King says:

6. 'Moreover, governments must devise long-term government strategies and action plans, based on effective public consultations, transparency, and accountability in announcing budgets and managing national projects' (5th Discussion Paper, 2014).

These long-term government strategies and action plans are meant to target the third category of partakers: the *citizens* of Jordan.

The keyword 'citizen' and its lemmas 'citizen' and 'citizenship' appear 108 times. This shows that King Abdullah II constantly believes in including *every* Jordanian citizen in the process of reform and development through active participation in decision-making and abiding to law; the King writes:

7. 'Each citizen must share a part of the burden of deciding on the future we want to build for our children' (4th Discussion Paper, 2013).
8. 'And I ask every citizen to show respect for our beloved country by respecting its laws, express love to our country by extolling its laws, show loyalty to our country by never

acting above the law, and to pledge that respect for rule of law will be the essence of our individual and collective actions' (6th Discussion Paper, 2016).

Here, we notice here that the usage of inclusive quantifiers, such as 'every' and 'each' before the lemma 'citizen', indicates the King's emphasis on the equality of between Jordanians in participating in decision making. Accordingly, the Discussion Papers address all Jordanians, and they aim to invite all citizens to actively participate in the process of reform and decision-making. This idea is also manifested in using the quantifier 'all' 10 times before the lemma 'citizens'; for example:

9. 'The responsibility assumed by those elected to the new Parliament on behalf of all citizens is enormous' (1st Discussion Paper, 2012).
10. 'A civil state is one that is governed by a constitution and laws that apply to all citizens without exception' (6th Discussion Paper, 2016).

Hence, the use of the lemmas 'citizen' and 'citizens' - after *inclusive* quantifiers - conveys the King's ideology of what constitutes sound citizenship. This inclusive ideology does not marginalize any constituents of the Jordanian spectra, and it addresses the citizens as individuals and groups; especially political groups, or in other words, *parties*.

The keyword 'parties' appears 45 times in the corpus, and its most frequent collocation in this concordance is 'political parties' which appears 30 times. King Abdullah II encourages Jordanians to establish and enroll in active political parties in order to reinforce the democratic in Jordan and enhance the opportunities to participate in decision-making as other nations do; he writes:

11. 'We can also learn from other nations' experiences in accelerating political parties 'growth' (3rd Discussion Paper, 2013).

Democratic countries allow for political parties to be established in order to activate the role of the ordinary man in expressing his views on decision-making process. Thus, parties must significantly operate in the reform process in Jordan.

Consequently, we see that King Abdullah II's ideology and vision on reform and democracy accentuates the roles of all constituents of Jordanian society. He believes that democracy and reform is the task of the parliament first, and the government is just the tool to enact this vision. On the other hand, he invites all Jordanian citizens to effectively participate with the parliament and the government in the course of democracy and reform by accepting plurality and differences in opinions that are materialized through political parties.

3.2 My Nation

Jordan is a focal point in King Abdullah II's discourse on reform and democracy, and it appears in more than 20% of the KWICs and in all the seven Discussion Papers. In most instances, the King explicitly mentions 'Jordan'; however, he recurrently refers to it by the substitutive key nouns 'nation' and 'country'. This distribution can be patently perceived

when reading the corpus thoroughly where ‘Jordan’ and ‘nation’ and their lemmas are almost exactly mentioned, and Table No. 4 below illustrates:

Table No. 4: The distribution of the *My Nation* KWICs and their lemmas in the corpus

Order	KWICs	Lemmas	Freq.	DP 1	DP 2	DP 3	DP 4	DP 5	DP 6	DP 7
5	<i>Jordan</i>	<i>Jordan, Jordanians</i>	107	16	5	31	18	17	7	13
7	<i>nation</i>	<i>nations, national, nationally, nationalism, nationalist, nationwide</i>	97	14	9	27	7	23	14	3
11	<i>country</i>	<i>country, countries</i>	46	10	5	8	7	0	14	2
	<i>My Nation KWICs count</i>	250 (21.5%)								
	Total KWICs count	1161								

As the table above shows, the keyword ‘Jordan’ and its lemmas (‘Jordanian’ and ‘Jordanians’) are mentioned 107 times in the corpus. Although the lemma ‘Jordanians’ (appears 43 times) can be said to refer to the *partakers* mentioned in the previous section, the absolute majority of the contexts in which this lemma occur emphasizes the King’s assertion of the incorporation of the identity of the Jordanians as a material representation for Jordan as a nation. In this regard, this frequent mentioning accentuates that the Discussion Papers are about Jordan even when they are addressed to Jordanians; the two are on the top priorities of the King; for example:

12. ‘Let us also remember that the goal for Jordan’s home-grown reform is clear: Empowering people to take the widest role in decision-making through their elected representatives’ (5th Discussion Paper, 2014).

In addition, the most recurrent colligation associated with ‘Jordanians’ is the noun phrase ‘all Jordanians’ which appears 23 times:

13. ‘Now is the time we must each take responsibility for creating the future we want for all Jordanians by making democracy a way of life’ (1st Discussion Paper, 2012).
14. ‘All Jordanians should take heart from the multiplicity of tools to make their voices heard – from exercising their duty to vote in parliamentary and municipal elections, (3rd Discussion Paper, 2013).

This frequent reference to ‘all Jordanians’ indicates that King Abdullah II addresses his seven Discussion Papers primarily to all citizens of Jordan regardless of their origins, social status, or religious and political beliefs. This plurality of ‘Jordanians’ what makes ‘Jordan’ *unique* in its formation. In this regard, ‘Jordan’ and “all Jordanians” constitute what the King believes as the bases of the Jordanian *nation*.

The keyword ‘nation’ and its lemmas, ‘nations’, ‘national’, ‘nationally’, ‘nationalism’, ‘nationalist’ and ‘nationwide’, were used 97 times. The recurrence of the lemma ‘nation’ and its lemmas in the seven Discussion Papers accentuates the message behind the papers. King Abdullah II constantly refers to ‘nation’ as a unifying term to assemble together the intrinsic divisions of society. For instance:

15. ‘My goal and responsibility within this national course isto encourage debate about our progress as a nation in democratic development’ (1st Discussion Paper, 2012).
16. ‘This decisive issue lies at the core of our nation’s future, and a healthy discussion is a sign of awareness that I fully support, and I look forward to seeing it culminate into tangible reforms and outcomes’ (7th Discussion Paper, 2017).

Furthermore, the lemma ‘national’ is the adjective of ‘nation’ which means attribution or relating to a nation, and in our context, it relates to Jordan. This lemma appears 68 times in the corpus making the collocations: *national political parties* (*x* 5), *national security* (*x* 5), and *National Integrity System* (*x* 4). These collocations reflect the King’s beliefs in the capability of Jordan to create and consolidate its own national institutions which will make reform achievable.

The keyword ‘country’ and its lemma ‘countries’ appear 46 times in the corpus. The lemma ‘country’ exclusively refers to the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan in the corpus, and this puts emphasis on the national schema of the Discussion Papers since they refer to Jordan as a political system that involves constitutional authorities and institutions. Here, the lemma ‘country’ appears 39 times in the corpus with its most frequent colligations is ‘our country’ which appears 13 times; for instance:

17. ‘And I ask every citizen to show respect for our beloved country by respecting its laws, express love to our country by extolling its laws, show loyalty to our country by never acting above the law, and to pledge that respect for rule of law will be the essence of our individual and collective actions’ (6th Discussion Paper, 2016).

On the other hand, the analysis shows that the lemma ‘countries’ (appears 7 times only) is mostly referring to examples of other countries in their well-established system of democracy as a role model to follow; for example:

18. ‘As countries have developed their democratic systems, a variety of models have emerged for the implementation of this democratic principle’ (2nd Discussion Paper, 2013).

In view of that, we distinguish how in the language of the Discussion Papers, Jordan occupies an important role in the King’s vision about reform and democracy. Herein, reform and

democracy originate from national agendas rather than international interference and dominion. This stance is mostly manifested in the King's inclusive and unifying ideology that does not marginalize any sector of society nor plays on highlighting *any* existing divisions of society which could mostly be based on religious and political beliefs.

3.3 Reform

The reader of the Discussion Papers can easily concede that their main goal is to state the King's vision about reform and democracy in Jordan. This argument is supported by the frequent use of key words related to the domains of political reform, and these keywords and lemmas make about 32% of the keywords in the corpus. Table No. 5 illustrates:

Table No. 6. The distribution of the *Reform* KWICs and their lemmas in the corpus

Order	KWICs	Lemmas	Freq.	DP	DP	DP	DP	DP	DP	DP
				1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1	<i>politics</i>	<i>political, policy, policies, politicians, politicking'</i>	140	5	8	50	31	35	10	1
6	<i>democracy</i>	<i>democracy, democratic, democratization, democracies</i>	105	26	12	21	19	22	5	0
8	<i>law</i>	<i>law, laws</i>	65	0	2	2	0	14	47	0
9	<i>system</i>	<i>system, systems</i>	60	3	15	13	1	19	5	4
	<i>Reform KWICs count</i>	370 (32%)								
	<i>Total KWICs count</i>	1161								

The keyword 'politics' and its lemmas, 'political', 'policy', 'policies', 'politicians', and 'politicking' appear 140 times in the corpus. This significant frequency accentuates the genre of the King's Discussion Papers as belonging to the political register. For instance, the frequencies of using the keyword 'politics' and its lemmas illustrate the significance of political life and its enactment accountable *partakers* such as the government, the parliament, and citizens. The lemma 'politics', which appears 7 times in the corpus, accentuates the King's ambition of resourceful political life in Jordan; for example:

19. 'To balance the need for collaboration with the need for constructive opposition. Striking this balance is the art of effective politics' (3rd Discussion Paper, 2013).
20. 'Politics is also not just about national issues debated under the dome of our Parliament. It is as much about local community issues impacting the daily life of every citizen' (4th Discussion Paper, 2013).

Accordingly, King Abdullah II uses the abstract noun 'politics' to elucidate the nature of effective politics; nevertheless, the King uses the adjective 'political' more frequently (x 111) to make various references to *what* constitute politics in Jordan; thus, we have reference to *political parties* (x 30), *political life* (x 13), *political system* (x 11), *political development* (x 8), and *political reform* (x 7). In view of that, the most frequent reference to what constitutes 'politics' is 'political parties' which appears 30 times in the corpus. Remarkably, the phrase 'political party' consistently collocates with words (mostly transitive *verbs*) of positive connotation such as *participate*, *accelerate*, *encourage*, and *develop* to reflect the King's vision that is based on democracy and pluralism; for example:

21. 'That is why it is so important that every Jordanian honor's this duty by actively participating in civic and political life on a daily basis' (2nd Discussion Paper, 2013).
22. 'We can also learn from other nations' experiences in accelerating political parties growth' (3rd Discussion Paper, 2013).

On the other hand, the lemma 'policy', which appears 14 times in the corpus, is intrinsically related to the keyword 'politics', and it refers to a high-level of overall *plans* which embrace the general goals and acceptable procedures especially of a governmental body. Thus, these 'policies' are the materializations of the King's visions and goals and it is responsibility of the government to implement them; the King says:

23. 'The mechanism for formulating the PM-designate and his Cabinet's four-year policy plan as part of the basis to receive the House of Representatives' vote of confidence' (5th Discussion Paper, 2014).

On the other hand, the keyword 'democracy' and its lemmas 'democratic', 'democratization' and 'democracies' appear 105 times in the corpus. The persistent mentioning of these keywords reflects the King's vision of democracy as a long journey towards a situation where every Jordanian citizen has the willing to express his opinion, and that each citizen effectively joins this democratic journey; the King writes:

24. 'Today, I dedicate this paper to share my vision for the principles and values needed to help us progress in our democratization journey, under our constitutional monarchy' (1st Discussion Paper, 2012).

In this regard, we see that the keyword 'democracy' appears 44 times in the corpus mostly with a particular reference to a 'unique' form of Jordanian democracy'; for example:

25. 'As I have said before, the path towards deepening our democracy lies in moving toward parliamentary government the majority coalition in Parliament forms the Government' (2nd Discussion Paper, 2012).
26. 'In the first four papers, I outlined our vision for reform with an end-goal of building a vibrant Jordanian democracy founded on three pillars: a gradual deepening of parliamentary government, under the umbrella of our Constitutional Monarchy, underpinned by active public participation or what I called 'active citizenship' (5th Discussion Paper, 2014).

Accordingly, King Abdullah II calls for adopting a version of democracy that stems from the intrinsic qualities of Jordan. He accentuates also that the right way to democracy must pass by a parliament elected by the free, and responsible, well of Jordanian citizens. And in order to elaborate on the nature of democracy and its procedures and outcomes, the King uses the attributive adjective 'democratic' (it appears 50 times) to refer to different aspects of the journey towards democracy and political reform; such as: *democratic system(s)* (x 7), *democratic culture* (x 4), *democratic development* (x 4), *democratic model* (x 4), *democratic practice/s* (x 4), *democratic transformation* (x 3), *democratic transition* (x 3), and *democratic values* (x 3). For example, the phrase 'democratic culture' was used 4 times by the King:

27. 'But one of the key requirements for democratization efforts is enhancing the role of civil society in monitoring and elevating the political performance of all institutions, by enrooting a democratic culture across society' (4th Discussion Paper, 2012)

In addition, the keyword 'law' and its plural form 'laws' appear 105 times in the corpus. Mentioning 'law' and 'laws', the King accentuates the assets of safety and security in Jordan as laws are primarily enacted to assure the safety of the individual and his property. To implement democracy, King Abdullah II emphasizes that laws guarantee the citizens' safety through their journey in reform and democracy. So, the lemma 'law' appears 43 times in the corpus with its most frequent collocation is 'rule of law' which appears 32 times; for example:

28. 'Respecting rule of law is the one true expression of love for our country' (6th Discussion Paper, 2016).
29. 'These values include moderation, tolerance, openness, pluralism, inclusiveness, respect and concern for others, respecting the rule of law and protecting the inalienable rights of every citizen' (3rd Discussion Paper, 2013).

The high frequency of this collocation reflects King Abdullah II's belief that reform and democracy in Jordan is reached by applying the 'rule of law'.

Furthermore, the keyword 'system' and its plural 'systems' appear 60 times in the corpus in the sense of the *technique* that has input, processing, output, and feedback that can keep the quality of any operation maintained at a controllable limit. Both 'system' and 'systems' are used to explain how the process of reform and democratization could be achieved, with efforts and dedication. Here, the keyword 'system' appears 53 times to elaborate the

categories of systems which the King means. So, we see collocation such as *political system* (x 11), *democratic system* (x 7), *parliamentary system* (x 6), *education/al system* (x 4), and *parliamentary government system* (x 3); for example:

30. ‘Creating the right combination of tolerant debate, respectful competition, and informed choice-making is the key foundation of a democratic system, and is essential to moving our country forward into a brighter future all Jordanians deserve’ (1st Discussion Paper, 2012).
31. ‘The challenge ahead, for all elements of our political system and all Jordanians, is to deepen this culture’ (3rd Discussion Paper, 2013)
32. ‘The Monarchy’s role in the formation of governments will continue to evolve in tandem with our maturing parliamentary system’ (3rd Discussion Paper, 2013).

All these collocations are related to the most essential systems in building the nation, and King Abdullah II points to how these systems can outline the path towards reform.

3.4 Optimism and Sanguinity

Despite his reality in describing a *satus quo* of Jordan and his zeal to change, King Abdullah II’s Discussion Papers are loaded with optimism and sanguinity. This attitude is mostly conveyed through his keenness to a better *future* for Jordan and his beliefs in *new* democratic institutions. This is manifested in the distribution of the two keywords ‘future’ and ‘new’ in the corpus as the Table No. 6 illustrates:

Table No. 6: The distribution of the *Optimism and Sanguinity* KWICs and their lemmas in the corpus

Order	KWICs	Lemmas	Freq.	DP 1	DP 2	DP 3	DP 4	DP 5	DP 6	DP 7
13	<i>future</i>	<i>future</i>	39	7	1	9	3	5	5	9
14	<i>new</i>	<i>new</i>	36	4	5	8	4	13	2	0
	<i>Optimism and Sanguinity</i> KWICs count	75 (6%)								
	Total KWICs count	1161								

The keyword ‘future’ appears 39 times, and at least once, in all the Discussion Papers. King Abdullah II has constantly referred to ‘future’ to set a landmark to his stable optimistic vision about Jordan. Here, the keyword ‘future’ is used with positive connotation along with words such as ‘better’, ‘brighter’, ‘promising’, and ‘prosperous’; for example:

33. 'Creating the right combination of tolerant debate, respectful competition, and informed choice-making is the key foundation of a democratic system, and is essential to moving our country forward into a brighter future all Jordanians deserve' (1st Discussion Paper, 2012).
34. 'But not one of my dreams for our nation can be realised in the absence of rule of law. I see it as the foundation that grounds us, the pillar that holds us and the bridge that can carry us to a better future' (6th Discussion Paper, 2016).

In addition, the keyword 'new' appears 36 times in the corpus and most the Discussion Papers (except the last one), which indicates the King's everlasting optimistic belief of the significance of new events and institutions. For instance, the corpus shows that the keyword 'new' appears after positive keywords which suggest initiatives and achievements such as: 'building', 'establishing' and 'generating'. Though, the most frequent collocations of the word 'new' are 'new democratic institutions' and 'new parliament'; for example:

35. 'By exercising the practices of good democratic citizenship outlined above, Jordanians are all encouraged to seize the rights granted to them under the Constitution to fully exercise their responsibility to elect a competent new Parliament in the best interest of the nation's future' (1st Discussion Paper, 2012).
36. 'A revised Constitution has been endorsed, thereby strengthening the separation of powers through additional checks and balances, enhancing freedoms and generating new democratic institutions' (5th Discussion Paper, 2014).

The King's invariable position towards the 'new democratic institutions' highlights his optimistic belief in the role of these institutions in enacting reform and democratic practices in Jordan in the near future.

4. Conclusions

This study investigated the ideologies adopted by King Abdullah II, through the usage of circumlocution in his seven Discussion Papers. In these papers, King Abdullah II has used circumlocution as persuasive strategy by repeating the basic concepts and ideas, such as *system*, *democracy* and the *rule of law*, to show how important they are in the reform process in Jordan. In addition, he aims to include the recipients, Jordanians, in the reform process by the noticeable reference to *citizens* and *country*.

Based on the previous analysis and findings, we see that circumlocution is instrumental in revealing the ideologies adopted by King Abdullah II. In his seven Discussion Papers, the King employed a set of keywords which reflect his most persistent concerns. On the one hand, the constant reference to *reform* indicates the King's firm belief in reform and democracy materialized by parliamentary governments, and it emphasizes the citizens' role in effective participating in decision making with other *partakers* such as the government and the parliament and political parties. Accordingly, all constituents of the Jordanian society are invited to effective democratic practices by participating in political parties and in parliamentary elections and under the umbrella of the system and role of the law.

Furthermore, the frequent usage of the identified keywords (lexemes which appear more than 30 times in the corpus) and their lemmas in the texts reflects the King's firm resolution and stance. The King focuses on a set of measurable and tangible landmarks on the path towards building a strong state; hence we have abundant reference to *democracy*, *reform*, *parliamentary governments* and *parties* which put into words his ideologies in pluralism and democracy to his Jordanian audience. These ideologies are based on his beliefs on democracy, cooperation between the institutions, and political reform. Then, the King clarified the nature of true democracy starting from active citizenship to the application of the parliamentary government which is the basis of democratic transformation in Jordan political regime. Subsequently, the King encourages the Jordanians citizens to practice the sound form of democracy, and go forward to the process of reform as the main goal of reform. In tandem, the ideology of reform is manifested when King Abdullah II insisted on the application of the rule of law in all state institutions through encouraging all Jordanians, citizens and governments and political parties, in upholding the rule of law and safeguarding the principles of integrity, transparency, justice, and equality.

References

- Al-Dunaibat, M. T. A. (2016). *Translating Political Discourse King Abdullah II Ibn Al Hussein's Papers*. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation. American University of Sharjah.
- Al-Haq, F. A. A., & Al-Sleibi, N. M. (2015). A Critical Discourse Analysis of Three Speeches of King Abdullah II. *US-China Foreign Language*, 13(5), 317-332.
- Al-Momani, H. A. (2017). Political Discourse of Jordan: A Critical Discourse Analysis. *International Journal of English Linguistics*, 7(2), 90.
- Al-Shalabi, J., & Al-Rajehi, M. B. (2011). The Amman Message: Arab Diplomacy In The Dialogue Of Civilizations. *Journal of US-China Public Administration*, 1375.
- Baker, P., Gabrielatos, C., Khosravinik, M., Krzyżanowski, M., McEnery, T., & Wodak, R. (2008). A Useful Methodological Synergy? Combining Critical Discourse Analysis And Corpus Linguistics To Examine Discourses Of Refugees And Asylum Seekers In The UK Press. *Discourse and Society*, 19(3), 273-306.
- Bayram, F. (2010). Ideology And Political Discourse: A Critical Discourse Analysis Of Erdogan's Political Speech. *Annual Review of Education, Communication and Language Sciences*, 7, 23-40.
- Dellinger, B. (1995). *Critical Discourse Analysis*. Retrieved from <https://umsl.edu/~wilmarthp/mrpc-web-resources/Critical-Discourse-Analysis.doc>
- El-Sharif, A. (2014). Constructing the Hashemite Self-Identity in King Abdullah II's Discourse. *International Journal of Linguistics*, 6(1).
- El-Sharif, A. (2015). A MARCH TOWARDS REFORM: the Metaphorical Conceptualisation of 'reform' in King Abdullah II's Language. *Miscelánea: A Journal of English and American Studies*. Spain. Vol. 51.
- Erjavec, K., & Volčič, Z. (2007). 'War On Terrorism' As A Discursive Battleground: Serbian

- Recontextualization Of GW Bush's Discourse. *Discourse and Society*, 18(2), 123-137.
- Fairclough, N. (1989). *Language and Power*, London: Longman.
- Fairclough, N. (1995). *Critical Discourse Analysis: A Critical Study of Language*. New York: Longman.
- Fitch, K. L., & Sanders, R. E. (2004). *Handbook of Language and Social Interaction*. Psychology Press.
- Gee, J. P. (2014). *An Introduction to Discourse Analysis: Theory and Method*. Routledge.
- Gharaybeh, K. (2014). General Socio-Demographic Characteristics of The Jordanian Society: A Study in Social Geography. *Research on Humanities and Social Sciences*, 4(1), 1-10.
- Ghazani, A. Z. (2016). Study of Persuasive Strategies in Selected American Presidential Speeches. *International Journal of Humanities and Cultural Studies*, 3(2), 631-647.
- Grundmann, R., & Krishnamurthy, R. (2010). The Discourse of Climate Change: A Corpus-Based Approach. *Critical Approaches to Discourse Analysis Across Disciplines*, 4(2), 125-146.
- Haider, A. S. (2016). A Corpus-Assisted Critical Discourse Analysis of The Arab Uprisings: Evidence From The Libyan Case. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation. University of Canterbury. New Zealand.
- Hakam, J. (2009). The Cartoons Controversy': A Critical Discourse Analysis of English-Language Arab Newspaper Discourse. *Discourse and Society*, 20(1), 33-57.
- Halmari, H., & Virtanen, T. (2005). *Persuasion Across Genres: A Linguistic Approach*. London: John Benjamins Publishing.
- Horváth, J. (2009). Critical Discourse Analysis of Obama's Political Discourse. In *Proceedings of Language, Literature And Culture In A Changing Transatlantic World, International Conference*, University of Presov, pp. 45-56.
- Hou, H. I. (2012). A Corpus Approach to Discourse Analysis Of Newspaper Restaurant Reviews: A Preliminary Analysis. *Studies in Literature and Language*, 5(3), 95.
- Hussein, I. (2016). Critical Discourse Analysis of the Political Speech of the Egyptian President, Abdel Fattah El-Sisi, at the New Suez Canal Inauguration Ceremony. *International Journal of Language and Literature*, 4(1), 85-106.
- Irvine, J. T. (1989). When Talk Isn't Cheap: Language And Political Economy. *American Ethnologist*, 16(2), 248-267.
- Johnstone, B. (1989). *Linguistic Strategies and Cultural Styles for Persuasive Discourse*. Beverly Hills, CA. *Language, Communication, and Culture: Current Directions Vol. XIII*. Retrieved from http://works.bepress.com/barbara_johnstone/50/
- Jørgensen, M. W., & Phillips, L. J. (2002). *Discourse analysis as theory and method*. Sage.
- Mazid, B. E. M. (2008). Cowboy and Misanthrope: A Critical (Discourse) Analysis of Bush And Bin Laden Cartoons. *Discourse and Communication*, 2(4), 433-457.

Perloff, R. M. (2003). *The Dynamics of Persuasion: Communication and Attitude In The 21st Century*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Poggi, I. (2005). The Goals of Persuasion. *Pragmatics and Cognition*, 13(2), 297-335.

Rabab'ah, G., & Rumman, R. A. (2015). Hedging in Political Discourse: Evidence from the Speeches of King Abdullah II of Jordan. *Prague Journal of English Studies*, 4(1), 157-185.

Rachman, A., & Yunianti, S. (2017). Critical Discourse Analysis in Donald Trump Presidential Campaign to Win American's Heart. *TELL*, 5(2), 8-17.

Unvar, S., & Rahimi, A. (2013). A Critical Discourse Analysis of Discursive Structures In A Political Text. *International Journal of Science and Advanced Technology*, 3(3), 12-20.

Van Dijk, T. (1993). Principles of Critical Discourse Analysis. *Discourse and Society*, 4(2), 249-283.

Van Dijk, T. (1997). What Is Political Discourse Analysis. *Belgian Journal of Linguistics*, 11(1), 11-52.

Van Dijk, T. (2001). Multidisciplinary CDA: A Plea for Diversity. *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*, 1, 95-120.

Van Dijk, T. A. (2004). *Ideology and Discourse: A Multidisciplinary Introduction*. Pompeu Fabra University, Barcelona.

Wodak, R., & Meyer, M. (Eds.). (2009). *Methods for Critical Discourse Analysis*. Sage.

Copyrights

Copyright for this article is retained by the author(s), with first publication rights granted to the journal.

This is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>)