

The Image of Muslims in three Political Speeches: A Corpus Based Critical Discourse Analysis	العنوان:
مجلة كلية التربية في العلوم الإنسانية والأدبية	المصدر:
جامعة عين شمس - كلية التربية	الناشر:
شلبى، منار	المؤلف الرئيسي:
مج23, ع2	المجلد/العدد:
نعم	محكمة:
2017	التاريخ الميلادي:
70 - 135	الصفحات:
873519	رقم MD:
بحوث ومقالات	نوع المحتوى:
English	اللغة:
AraBase, HumanIndex	قواعد المعلومات:
الخطب السياسية، تحليل الخطاب النقدي، علم الذخائر، أساليب الامتناع	مواضيع:
<a href="http://search.mandumah.com/Record/873519">http://search.mandumah.com/Record/873519</a>	رابط:



---

# **The Image of Muslims in Three Political Speeches: A Corpus-based Critical Discourse Analysis**

---

**Manar Shalaby**  
Cairo University

## صوره المسلمين في ثلاث خطب سياسية : دراسية مبنية على علم الزخائر و تحليل الخطاب النقدي

د. منار شلبي

جامعة القاهرة

تهدف هذه الدراسة لبحث اساليب الإقناع واستخدام اللغة في ثلاث خطب مؤثره لها علاقة بالمسلمين و الإسلام و الإرهاب. الخطب ألقاها كل من الملك عبدالله ملك الأردن و باراك أوباما الرئيس الامريكى و دونالد ترامب المرشح الرئاسى الامريكى. الدراسة نوعية كمية تعتمد على منهج تحليل الخطاب النقدي.

\*الجانب النوعى ينتهج منهج تحليل المفردات العنصريه التى تستخدم لإظهار صورة إيجابية للنفس و سلبية للآخرين بالإضافة إلى دراسة الأساليب البلاغية المستخدمه للمتحدثين لإقناع المستمعين.

\* الجانب الكمي يستخدم أدوات علم الزخائر وخصوصا قائمة الكلمات (word lists) (و اسطر التوافق ( concordance lines) و الكلمات المحورية (keywords) . (أثبتت الدراسة احترافيه الخطباء لاختياراتهم اللفظية و الاساليب البلاغية و اختيارهم للمفردات والمعانى الضمنية المصاحبه لها بما يخدم أيديولوجية كل منهم وتوجهه السياسى وقت إلقاء الخطاب.

و اختلف الخطباء في درجه مخاطبتهم للمنطق أو المشاعر لمتلقى الخطاب. كذلك فى بعض الاساليب البلاغية مثل استخدام المقاطع الدينية لخدمة الغرض من الخطاب. الكلمات المفتاحية: الخطب السياسية-تحليل الخطاب النقدي-علم الزخائر-اساليب الامتتاع.

## The Image of Muslims in Three Political Speeches: A Corpus-based Critical Discourse Analysis

Manar Shalaby  
Cairo University

### Abstract

Persuasive strategies have always been used in political discourse to convince audience of a specific 'ideological position', which requires audience approval (Wodak, 2011). This paper aims at investigating the persuasive strategies and language use in three influential speeches related to Muslims, Islam and terrorism. The speeches were delivered by three world leaders, namely, King Abdullah Al-Hussein, President Donald Trump and President Barak Obama.

The study employed qualitative and quantitative tools of analysis. The qualitative part used Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) tools to help interpret the speeches in the light of their social-cultural background, purpose and audience, which induced the language patterns detected. The analytical framework mainly examines the following:

- Lexical choices, e.g. discriminatory words that entail 'inclusion' and 'exclusion' lexis (Halliday, 1994), and those that involve 'self-positive' and 'other negative' representations (Van Dijk, 2004).
- Rhetorical devices and persuasive strategies, e.g. categorization, hyperbole, evidentiality, victimization,

repetition, parallelisms, emotional expressions (Fairclough, 1995, Van Dijk, 2004).

The quantitative analysis made use of corpus-based tools to help reach more objective and generalizable findings, thus reduce research bias. Word List, key words and concordance lines were the main features used, which provided the quantitative support and starting point of the analytical part.

The three speakers were successful in crafting language to serve their ideological stance and social position. The results revealed that the politicians differed in how they presented themselves and the 'other', and in the degree of addressing audience's emotions and/or logical thinking. They also differed in the use of some rhetorical devices, e.g. religious quotes, code switching. However, they used similar persuasive strategies such as repetition, rhetorical questions, analogies, categorization.

*Key words:* CDA, Corpus linguistics, political speeches, persuasive strategies

## The Image of Muslims in Three Political Speeches: A Corpus-based Critical Discourse Analysis

Manar Shalaby  
Cairo University

### Introduction

The purpose of this paper is to investigate the linguistic and rhetorical devices related to the image of Muslims in three speeches by current political leaders. They employed similar and different images, each influenced by his ideological stance, the purpose of the speech and the audience. Each of the speakers employed diverse linguistic devices to persuade and position the audience into accepting his proposed ideas.

The three political speeches had far-reaching impact on the audience and the world at the time of their delivery. They were delivered around the same period of time (March, 2015-January, 2016) triggered by almost the same terrorist incidents or their outcomes that were attributed to Islamic extremist groups. The speakers tried to persuade and position their audience of their stance towards Muslims as culprits or victims of these terrorists' acts each according to the power and needs of his position and the pressing current events at that time. Each of the two American speakers presented a contrasting image of Muslims influenced by their own personal agenda at the time. The Arab speaker wanted to redefine the image of Muslims, negatively influenced by rigid and misinterpretation of Islam.

Using a CDA model and corpus linguistics tools, the ideological stance and persuasive strategies of the three politicians were examined and compared. The analytical framework of the qualitative part of the study employed CDA tools to examine the language patterns detected in the quantitative results. The model of analysis examines:

- Lexical choices (discriminatory words, labels, evaluative language, metaphor, collocates) that entail 'inclusion' (in-group) and 'exclusion' (out-group) lexis (Halliday, 1994), and those that involve 'self-positive representation' and 'other negative representation' (Van Dijk, 2004)
- Rhetorical devices and persuasive strategies, e.g. categorization, hyperbole, evidentiality, victimization, repetition, parallelisms, emotional expressions, analogy, rhetorical questions, among others (Fairclough, 1995, Van Dijk, 2004).

The analysis was initiated by the quantitative results. The three speeches were analyzed using the sketchengine open corpora to detect the most frequent words used in each speech (word list) and then the speeches were compared to authentic larger corpora and compared against each other to detect significant word use (keywordness). Concordance lines were another feature used to examine word use and collocates within context.

The paper starts with a review of related literature, following this, the research questions, methodology, background and context of the speeches, and then moving to results (quantitative followed by the qualitative findings) and then discussion and conclusion.

-

**The Image of Muslims in Three Political Speeches: A Corpus-based  
Critical Discourse Analysis**

---

## **Literature Review**

The review of related literature focuses on the CDA theoretical background and framework, and then research on political speeches and the image of Muslims and Islam in western media.

### **CDA and Theoretical Background**

CDA is a critical theory of language that considers language as a type of social practice that involves a specific context, social relations, ideologies and contested interests. Using CDA as a discipline helps identify how a text positions and persuades the audience, the ideologies and interests behind words, the marginalized parties, and consequences of this positioning. CDA also helps study and understand how power relations are manifested in the discourse (Janks, 2016). In other words, CDA helps find relations between language, power, society, ideology, culture, especially in the fields of social science and humanities (Van Dijk, 2009).

CDA research analyzes how grammar is used to exercise power and dominance in social and political discourse. Stereotyping and abuse of power embodied in the use of discriminatory language lead to social discrimination, overgeneralization and inequality (Van Dijk, 2009, Meyer, 2001). CDA also contributed to understanding and raising awareness towards how public rhetoric sometimes based on biased ideologies lead to stereotyping certain groups and individuals, e.g. Muslims.

Several models and methods of analysis were offered to implement the theoretical claims of CDA. Some of the pioneers whose work focused on analyzing relations between language,

context and society are Halliday and his multifunctional linguistic theory, Fairclough, Wodak, and van Dijk, among others.

Halliday's Systemic Functional linguistics (SFL) contributed extensively to the development of critical linguistics (Meyer, 2001). Halliday (1994) states that there is a relation between grammar and social needs of users. He offers a model of discourse analysis that helps discover linguistic power in texts. This model distinguishes three interconnected metafunctions: tenor, field and mode. The first is the interpersonal function, i.e. the relationship between participants in discourse. Field is experiential function relevant to the content matter and ideational function of language and how it structures 'experience'. Lastly, mode is relevant to text coherence, degree of interactivity and spontaneity of discourse. Halliday (1994) also introduced a theory of meaning that helps in interpreting language as options entailing 'inclusion' and 'exclusion'. This linguistic analytical framework mainly examines:

- Lexical choices (discriminatory words, labels, terms of address, evaluative language, metaphor)
- Grammatical choices (transitivity patterns, e.g. nominalization, passivization, ergative verbs; modality, pronouns)

Meyer (2001) explains that ' argumentation theory and rhetoric have been successfully combined with functional systemic linguistics' (p. 8). Several linguists acknowledged this merger and the intrinsic need to employ all aspects of context to effectively interpret the meaning of discourse.

Fairclough and Wodak also contributed a lot to the field of CDA which also stemmed from work on ideologies and power relation that go back to Michael Foucault and Pierre Bourdieu (Rahimi and Riasati, 2011). Fairclough (1995) proposed a model that draws upon the Hallidayan theory of SFL and examines the

## The Image of Muslims in Three Political Speeches: A Corpus-based Critical Discourse Analysis

---

social function of language. This framework entails a three-dimensional analysis:

1. *Text analysis* (micro-level of analysis) that focuses on syntax, metaphor and rhetorical devices
2. *Discourse practice* (meso-level) that focuses on production, distribution and consumption, i.e. the author, medium and audience
3. *Discursive events* (macro-level) focusing on the social-cultural broad context; intertextual and societal issues. In other words, this macro level examines ideologies behind discourse that imply taken-for-granted and accepted evaluations.

There are, therefore, three different dimensions of analysis; ideological, rhetorical and strategic. The first focuses on power relations and its language manifestation, the second persuasion and audience positioning devices, and the last on examining intertextuality, ideologies, the taken-for-granted and commonly accepted evaluations. Fairclough (2015) adds some rhetorical strategies to analyze the discourse of power, especially during 'periods of major social change'. For example, *parallelism* is a standard rhetorical device which goes back to classical rhetoric as well as *intertextuality* which 'recontextualize' audience into moving from one context to another.

Wodak (1996, 2001) proposed the discourse-historical approach that focused on the importance of context, and historical and social background in analyzing discourse. She also proposed the use of non-verbal signs and other semiotic devices as useful tools in CDA.

Van Leeuwen (1996) was influenced by Wodak and proposed a linguistic CDA framework that is also based on *inclusion* and *exclusion* and the exercise of power by manipulation

of discourse. Social actors in the community can be marginalized or subjectively represented via the following discourse strategies: exclusion (suppression, backgrounding), inclusion (e.g. activation vs. passivization, individualization, assimilation), and impersonalized social actors (abstraction, objectivation) (Rahimi and Riasati, 2011, p. 110).

Van Dijk(2009) also contributed to the psychological aspect of CDA and how linguistic analysis brings insights into inequalities, power abuse and dominance. They are triggered by social exercise of power or abuse of power which results into alienation, marginalization and social inequality. Van Dijk (2009, 2004) proposed an analytical framework pertinent mainly to ideologies and how they are expressed in different discourse types. This framework focuses on the analysis of meaning, argumentation and rhetoric using 26 ideological strategies. The two most generic that are implied in all the other strategies are: '*self* positive representation' and '*other* negative representation'. They are considered semantic macro-strategies with the purpose of 'face keeping' or 'impression management'. Other devices are subcategories of the above macro-strategies; they are mainly: actor description (whether positively or negatively), authority, evidentiality (using hard evidence) and number game (making use of authorities in the field or hard evidence and numbers to support claims), categorization, comparison, disclaimers, euphemism, generalization, irony, hyperbole, implications, lexicalization (use of lexis to negatively describe the 'other'), national self-glorification, polarization, presupposition, vagueness and victimization (provision of negative narratives about the 'other'). These strategies are mainly used as tools for positive 'self' presentation and negative 'other' presentation, as well as in categorizing entities as in-groups and out-groups. Members of in-groups are usually associated with positive or neutral description, whereas out-groups members are negatively described. Van Dijk also claims that inflicting power and dominance over the community is achieved by 'controlling discourse' (Rashidi and Souzandehfar, 2010).

---

## The Image of Muslims in Three Political Speeches: A Corpus-based Critical Discourse Analysis

---

The analytical and qualitative part of the current study was guided by these CDA models, especially those proposed by Halliday, 1994. Fairclough, 1995, 2015, Wodak, 2011 and Van Dijk, 2004.

### Research on Political Speeches

Political speeches are considered a type of public rhetoric that has been studied since Aristotle and Cicero. Public speeches are designed to attract the attention of the audience to gain their support and approval of what is being said (Wooffitt, 2002). Political discourse, unlike press, does not only involve words and logically presented argument but also involves multimodal discourse. It is face-to-face interaction that includes, as well, paralinguistic features, like voice quality, facial expressions, and body movements. All contribute to shape the politician's image that is an essential component in the process of persuasion.

Atkinson (1984) studied recordings of political speeches to identify the most effective rhetorical devices guided by the applause of the audience. He identified some of the powerful techniques, for example, three-part list, contrasts, combination of both and other paralinguistic features like gestures and voice pitch. He states that these devices are effective because they cue audience applause and invite collective applause from the whole audience. They are signals for applause because they 'project their own completion: as they are being built, they signal when they are going to end'. (p. 130). Thus, they are interactive tools that project a sense of unity and completeness.

Lamb (2016) adds other rhetorical devices like appealing to people's emotions, fears and pride; using logical evidence (statistics, expert opinion, research finding and anecdotes); attacking the opposite opinion; using inclusive and exclusive language (*we, us, our* vs. *them*); rhetorical questions; analogy; humor (puns, sarcasm and irony to make fun of the opposing

opinion); repetition, among others. These are found to be effective persuasive tools that help position the audience to accept a particular point of view.

Zurloni and Anolli (2013), in a qualitative-quantitative study, examined argumentative fallacies that are frequently used in political discourse. Their data were political debates on nuclear energy in Italy. They studied how speakers used fallacies in the development of their arguments in order to persuade their audience and present a coherent logical argument. They identified four types of fallacies: *Appealing to force or threat* (fear of force, it appeals to human fear and it is a fallacy because it appeals to emotions rather than the logical reason behind the argument). The second fallacy is *attacking the opponent* or being personal; here the speaker instead of justifying the soundness of his argument, attacks his opponent, e.g. for having self-interest motivations. This is viewed as 'deceptiverationalization' because it is impartial and illogical. The third type is *argument from analogy*; here the case is built on assuming that two cases are similar in all respects, thus similar consequences would occur. The last type of fallacy is *argument from consequence and slippery slope*. The speaker would assume possible unforeseen consequences occurring out of an action, therefore, to avoid these consequences this action should be abandoned. This is seen as negative reasoning of a future event that is seen as having inevitable effects. These rhetorical devices are frequently used by politicians to resolve differences to their favour and convince audience of their argument even by using argumentative fallacies.

Al-Majali (2015) studied 7 political speeches of Arab former presidents during the Arab Spring Revolution. The analyzed speeches revealed distinctive lexical features that differentiated the speeches delivered during the revolution from the speeches delivered by the ousted presidents before the revolution. She used Halliday and Hasan's (1976) analytical framework of cohesion, mainly the lexical features of repetition, synonymy, hyponymy, antonymy and collocations. She related the contextual functions of

## The Image of Muslims in Three Political Speeches: A Corpus-based Critical Discourse Analysis

---

these features with the ideological goals of the ousted leaders which mainly aimed at threatening the protestors. The analysis mainly focused on lexical features within the sentence level.

Wang (2010), in a quantitative research, compared two speeches by President Obama: his victory and inauguration speeches. The analytical framework was based on Halliday's SFL model of ideational, interpersonal and textual functions, focusing on transitivity and modality. She found that the main linguistic features in Obama's speeches are: the use of simple words, short sentences, and easy colloquial lexis. This made his language accessible to the public which helped create rapport and familiarity. As to transitivity analysis, most of the processes were material processes in both speeches, which consequently draws attention to the achievements of his government. The interpersonal function was traced in modality, frequent use of first person pronouns, simple present and future tenses, as well as religious reference which helped to transmit his ideology of building trust and confidence, thus gaining public acceptance and support.

Rashidi and Souzandehfar (2010) analyzed the debates of the Democratic and Republican parties in USA over the war in Iraq. They used van Dijk's (2004) CDA analytical framework to detect the ideological structure and persuasion devices of six speeches; three for each party. They found that each party utilized devices of lexicalization, polarization and rhetoric of positive in-group and negative out-group presentation. Each group used different strategies to justify their claims to legitimize or delegitimize the continuation of the war in Iraq. Both parties positively presented themselves and negatively presented the other's view.

Adetunji (2006) studied the use of inclusion and exclusion deixis in two speeches of the Nigerian president Olusegun Obasanjo. Using Miller's (2004) 'alignment' and 'alienation' dichotomy framework, he classified pronouns into *inclusive*: first

person pronoun 'I' singular and plural and their variants, and the *exclusive* pronouns: third person pronoun 'he'; singular and plural and their variants, besides other special and temporal deixis like 'this', 'those' and 'when', and the use of past and present tenses. He concluded that in political discourse, the Nigerian president used inclusive pronouns to seek acceptance, create rapport, and show collaboration with the audience especially when using the 'all inclusive' collective pronoun 'we'. His aim was to convince and share the load of responsibility with the audience. In contrast, he used the 'self-exclusion' pronouns of the third person singular and plural and their variants as a 'discrediting tact', and 'verbal flogging' aimed at finding fault, 'delegitimizing' and negatively presenting the other (pp. 188-189).

Krzyzanowski (2005) in a multi-method approach of CDA particularly, based on Wodak's discourse-historical framework, conducted analysis of the collective identities constructions in EU talks. The framework depended on the discursive strategies of collective and individual constructions of *self* and *other* presentation. She studied the 'mainstream voice' and the tendency to use positive evaluation of the EU, e.g., the use of the collective 'we' and 'us', positive evaluation words, e.g. 'successful' and the use of metaphor, e.g. portraying EU as a 'significant player; example for the world, successful experiment, who can teach...' (p. 151). These are used as a strategy of group construction in order to show deep involvement and collective action. The non-mainstream topics, on the other hand, were developed by the use of negative nouns and verbs e.g. 'degeneration', 'disappointing', 'danger'.

Moustafa (2015) carried out a synergy study of CDA and Corpus Linguistics on political discourse. Corpus tools were used to detect word frequencies, keywords and collocates in Obama's and Clinton's speeches during 2008 Democratic Party Primaries. In comparing the political identity of the two candidates, she found that Obama focused more on foreign policy than Clinton who focused on domestic affairs and women related issues. Obama, on the other hand, focused more on 'racial, ethnical and religious

## The Image of Muslims in Three Political Speeches: A Corpus-based Critical Discourse Analysis

---

issues"(p. 387). Examining keywords and collocates help construct Obama's and Clinton's political identity and their major concerns.

### Research on the Image of Muslims in the Western Media

Muslims have recently been the subject of controversy, suspicion and stereotyping in western media. The principles of Islam have also been viewed by some as the main enemy to The West and their modern way of life. One possible interpretation is due to associating the recent terrorist acts with Muslims, hence leading to banning, alienation and marginalization that are often based on overgeneralization, wrong assumption and misinterpretations. Much research has been conducted recently to detect this anti-Muslim campaign in the media.

Moore et al. (2008) analyzed the image of Islam in 974 articles in British press from 2000 until 2008. They reported that news stories focused more on differences between Islam/Muslims and the West. Few articles reported Muslims predicaments or problems. Muslims were stereotyped in pictures representing them only doing religious rituals.

Baker and colleagues (2016) used a corpus linguistics and critical discourse analysis approach to study how the word 'Muslim' and its alternatives 'Muslims', 'Islam' and 'Islamic' were represented in the British Press from 1998 to 2009 in a corpus of 200,000 news articles (143 million words) in both mainstream and tabloid newspapers. The quantitative analysis found that press frequently 'collectivize Muslims' looking at all Muslims as one similar group which is distinctively different from 'The West'. The researchers reflected their surprise to find that the most frequent noun in the corpus was '*terrorism*' which appeared more often than

'Islam', though the articles were chosen on the basis of their reference to Islam and its variant words. The second most frequent word was '*conflict*'. Both words appeared once in every twenty reference to '*Muslim*'. Other collocates were '*fanatic, militant, extremist*'. The word '*moderate*' appeared only once every 200 references to '*Muslim*'. '*Muslim leaders*' were often referred to negatively and mainly as beneficiary; their most common collocates were '*offended, angry, outraged, hostile, indignant*'. The category '*conflict*' was lexically rich. The qualitative analysis, looking at the context within concordance lines, found that the '*Muslim community*' and '*Muslim world*' were represented as identical members, and often indicate opposition to the west. '*Muslim women*' appeared more frequently than '*Muslim men*' and appeared mainly in relation to the 'veil debate'. The findings were interpreted by the researchers as leading to alienation, marginalization, and contributing to 'othering' process.

'Muslims' were also negatively represented in the American and Australian press. Awass (1996), in earlier research, found that Islam was associated with 'fundamentalism and terrorism' in American printed media. Islam's principles were misinterpreted and distorted in the American press and were negatively portrayed under the pretence of objectivity.

In Australian press, Dunn (2001) also found that Muslims were represented as "*fundamentalist, terrorist, sexist, militant, undemocratic, violent, suicide bombers, hijackers, orthodox, fanatic*". Muslims were presented also as intolerant to other religions and Muslimwomen were represented as "repressed hijab wearers". Dunn adds that Muslims were associated with "*war, conflict, violence, disunity and sexism*" (p. 4). He also claims that thisprejudiced stereotyping of 'us' and 'them' discourse is prevalent in Australian media. Nonetheless, he also found that there are counter opinion in the media that represented Muslims positively as "*peaceful, moderate, liberal, feminist, family oriented, anti-terrorist*"

**The Image of Muslims in Three Political Speeches: A Corpus-based  
Critical Discourse Analysis**

---

*and community oriented*" (p. 5). They were also portrayed as an integral part of the Australian cultural construction and community builders.

Al-Hejin (2012) in a corpus analysis and CDA study compared how *Muslim women* were presented in British and Arabic online news websites from 2001 to 2007. The corpus comprised 1.9 million words in 3,269 articles of BBC news and 2.2 million words in 3,111 articles in Arab News. He investigated the linguistic patterns that collocate with 'Muslim women'. The findings indicated that in the British news 'Muslim women' were more associated with 'conflict' and 'crime' than in Arab news. In the Arab news, 'Muslim women' were associated with a wider variety of topics, e.g. their achievements, and regional concerns e.g. education, business and employment. 'Islam' was also represented differently in both media especially in relation to women's rights. The 'hijab' was frequently used in both corpora but was more commonly referred to in British news and with more negative reference. The researcher interpreted the findings as leading to marginalization of the majority of Muslim women, and he offered recommendations to western journalists to avoid misrepresentations and stereotypical reference to *Muslim women*.

It is, thus, noticeable that the image of Muslims and Islam has received varied views from the media recently. The linking of several terrorist acts in several European and American states to Muslims has negatively affected the image of Muslims and Islam worldwide. However, there are also counter views that present more balanced, rational interpretations. This idea triggered the current research problem.

---

## Statement of the Problem

This study investigates the linguistic features used by three political figures to pursue their goals of persuading their audience of their view points, especially in relation to how Muslims are presented.

The theoretical and analytical framework of the study is based on CDA and corpus linguistics tools. This can help us have better understanding of how language can effectively serve the ideological and political purposes of public speakers.

## Research Questions

1. What are the rhetorical and linguistic devices employed by each speaker?
2. How are 'Muslims' represented in the three speeches? Corpus analysis of word frequencies, key words, concordances and collocates provide the quantitative evidence.
3. What are the similarities and differences in Muslims' representation in the three speeches?

## Methodology

### The Data and Context of the Speeches

The following section introduces the context and background of the three sample speeches. Examining the context of the speeches help interpret the speakers' purposes and ideological background that induced the linguistic patterns detected.

King Abdullah II of Jordan's speech was on March 10<sup>th</sup>, 2015 at the European Parliament in Strasbourg, France. It coincided with a number of terrorist incidents in Paris, Libya and Jordan that led to the rise of global Islamophobia. In this speech, he called, as a

## The Image of Muslims in Three Political Speeches: A Corpus-based Critical Discourse Analysis

leader of a Muslim country, for mutual combat against terrorism and hostility towards Muslims. Linking global terrorism with Muslims and Islam's principles led to calls for official acts to limit Muslim immigration. King Abdullah II speech focused on three main initiatives: firstly, call for joint efforts with Europe to combat terrorism and radicalism; secondly, establish the fact that ISIS is a radical terrorist group that does not follow Islam's moderate principles that call for peace and religious coexistence; thirdly, call for promotions of 'mutual respect' and 'an inclusive society'.

President Donald Trump's speech, on December 7<sup>th</sup>, 2015, was part of his presidential campaign, at Pearl Harbour Day Rally, South Carolina. It coincided with the terrorist attacks linked with Muslims in San Bernardino, USA, and the Charlie Hebdo shooting in Paris. In his speech, he proposed a blanket ban of all Muslims entering the United States. He defended his proposal by drawing attention to the growing hatred of American-Muslim citizens, who participated in a poll viewing 'violence against Americans is justified as part of global jihad'. He used alarming expressions to intensify the state of fear and danger in America due to incompetent decision makers, the inadequate measures and ineffective decisions taken by the government. He also referred to the 'foolish' role of media in profiling ISIS leaders as 'masterminds' and 'brilliant', which helped attract and recruit young kids, with 'impressionable' minds to follow ISIS. To intensify the state of danger and justify his campaign for presidency, he negatively stigmatized Muslims, whom he claimed wanted to rule USA by 'Sharia', which he described as only calling for beheading nonbelievers and committing 'unthinkable acts' against Americans, especially women.

## Dr. Manar Shalaby

---

President Barak Obama's speech was at the Islamic Society Mosque in Baltimore Maryland - January 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2016. It was Obama's first visit to a mosque during his seven-year presidency period. The purpose of his visit and speech was to reassure the American-Muslims that they were an integral part of the American community and history. He started by thanking the attendees and mentioned some American-Muslim heroes in sports, business and US army. This speech came as a consequence of increased acts of violence against Muslims and mosques in retaliation of Paris attack and San Bernardino shooting. He also wanted to condemn 'inexcusable political rhetoric'; against Muslim Americans from Republican candidates, which did not discriminate between Islam and the terrorist acts of a few. The speech was seen to 'slam Trump's anti-Muslim vitriol' (Hasan, 2016). Obama said that hatred speech leads to violence. He denounced linking terrorism to Islam rather than to a few radical Muslims; "conflating the horrific acts of terrorism with the beliefs of an entire faith". The speech was positively seen and received by the Muslim community in USA, and was considered a 'public reminder' that Muslims have been part of the first founders of America.

The three speeches were selected because of their strong impact and widespread effect not only on the present audience but also on the wider public and media coverage ensuing their delivery. Trump and Abdullah's speeches presented two opposite views of how far Islam can be linked with the latest terrorist acts. Is it an insidious trigger of terrorism or a misinterpretation or/and desire for power and control? Obama's speech was selected to represent another more official American perspective of the issue. It was delivered as a repercussion of Trump's speech to counter his views and reassure Muslim-Americans.

The speeches were downloaded from the Internet, as well as the scripts except for Trump's speech that was transcribed by the researcher.

**The Image of Muslims in Three Political Speeches: A Corpus-based  
Critical Discourse Analysis**

---

### **Analytical Framework**

The study used both quantitative and qualitative tools of analysis.

**The quantitative tools of analysis.** A corpus-based analysis was used to provide the quantitative results that aimed at reaching more objective and generalizable findings, thus, reduce research bias.

The analysis started by tracing frequencies and collocates in the three speeches. The open corpora "Sketch Engine" was used (retrieved from <http://the.sketchengine.co.uk/open/>). It contains 400 corpora in 80 languages, the size of each goes up to 20 billion words to provide a real representation of the language. It includes several features mainly concordance, collocations and frequency lists. This is in addition to several reference corpora that allow comparison between the focus corpus (the current corpus) and a larger general corpus to highlight the key words of the focus corpus. The top key words reveal the domain of the focus corpus compared to a standard which is the reference corpus.

The quantitative results are presented first, including **word lists** (frequencies), **keywords** using a reference corpus to get a list of keywords which were statistically more frequent than they would normally appear. Then the key words were compared in the three speeches against each other. More detailed analysis was conducted by examining **concordance lines**.

**The qualitative tools of analysis.** These study the patterns and collocates established by the quantitative findings. CDA framework was used focusing mainly on:

- Lexical choices (the use of discriminatory lexis entailing 'inclusion' and 'exclusion' (Halliday, 1994, van Leeuwen, 1996, Wodak, 2001). In addition to, Van Dijk's (2004, 2009) analytical and rhetorical strategies, mainly '*self* positive representation' and '*other* negative representation'.

• Rhetorical devices (for example, repetition, three-part lists, parallelisms, rhetorical questions, analogies, religious reference)(Fairclough, 1995, 2001).

### Analysis and Discussion

#### Quantitative Analysis

The analysis of the speeches started by the quantitative data. The three speeches vary in length and number of words. Table 1 depicts duration, number of words, setting and date of the three speeches.

Table 1  
*Details of the Sample Speeches*

	Name	Words	Duration	Occasion/Place	Date
1.	King Abdullah II of Jordan Speech	1,417	15:49	European Parliament- Strasbourg	Mar. 10, 2015
2.	Donald Trump Speech	6,272	42:52	Presidential Campaign- South Carolina- USA	Dec. 7, 2015
3.	Barak Obama Speech	5,030	43:82	Baltimore Mosque- Maryland- USA	Jan. 3, 2016

The three speeches were set in close time span (within a ten-month period in 2015-2016), triggered by almost the same terrorist acts executed by Islamist extremists referred to as 'Daesh', 'ISIS' and 'ISIL' respectively by King Abdullah, President Trump and President Obama. The speeches differ, though, in their length, target audience and purpose.

The Image of Muslims in Three Political Speeches: A Corpus-based  
Critical Discourse Analysis

**Most Frequent Words (Word Lists)**

The most frequent twenty words in the three speeches are presented in Table 2. The percentages display frequency of tokens in each speech to accommodate for the different word count.

Table 2

*The Most Frequent Twenty Words in the Three Speeches*

Rank	King Abdullah 1,417		Pres. Trump 6,272		Pres. Obama 5,030	
	Word	frequency	Word	Frequency	Word	Frequency
1.	The	62(4.38%)	I	256 (4.1%)	The	193 (3.8%)
2.	And	61(4.30%)	The	229 (3.6%)	To	167 (3.3%)
3.	Of	35(2.47%)	And	132 (2.1%)	Of	142 (2.8%)
4.	Is	34(2.40%)	A	121(1.9%)	And	142 (2.8%)
5.	To	33(2.33%)	To	111 (1.8%)	That	119 (2.36%)
6.	A	29(2.05%)	It	111 (1.8%)	In	92 (1.8%)
7.	In	21(1.48%)	Of	109(1.7%)	A	86 (1.7%)
8.	Not	17 (1.2%)	You	107(1.7%)	We	67 (1.3%)
9.	Our	15(1.06%)	N	99(1.6%)	Is	65 (1.29%)
10.	That	13(0.92%)	They	99(1.6%)	Are	61 (1.2%)
11.	By	12(0.85%)	We	94 (1.5%)	Out	59 (1.17%)
12.	This	11(0.78%)	Have	86(1.4%)	I	59 (1.17%)
13.	Be	11(0.78%)	That	79(1.3%)	Muslim	58 (1.15%)
14.	With	11(0.78%)	Is	74(1.2%)	And	55 (1.1%)
15.	People	10(0.70%)	In	74(1.2%)	Have	53 (1.05%)
16.	Has	10 (0.70%)	Do	64(1.0%)	You	50 (1.0%)
17.	The	10(0.70%)	People	59(0.9%)	Who	40 (0.8%)
18.	Are	10(0.70%)	He	55(0.87%)	Be	39 (0.77%)
19.	It	10(0.70%)	They	52(0.8%)	For	39 (0.77%)
20.	An	9 (0.64%)	Was	49 (0.78%)	As	38 (0.75%)

Table 2 shows that function words are the most frequent words in the three speeches, which agrees with other corpus

research findings. Pronouns of 'self' and 'other' presentation are displayed differently by the three speakers. The least in using pronouns of 'self' and 'other' is King Abdullah, the collective possessive pronoun 'our' is the only pronoun displayed in the most frequent twenty words with 15 occurrences (1.05%). The other extreme is President Trump, the first person pronoun 'I' is the most frequent word in the speech with 256 occurrences (4.1%), 'you' was used 107 times (1.7%), 'they' 99 times (1.6%), 'we' 94 times (1.5%), 'he' 55 times (0.87%) and 'they' 52 times (0.8%). Obama used the first person plural pronoun 'we' 67 times (1.3%), 'our' 59 times (1.17%), 'I' 59 times (1.17%), and 'you' 50 times (1.0%). Personal pronouns are examined in more details below. Other frequent words are 'people' 10 occurrences (0.70%) by Abdullah, 'n't' 99 times (1.6%) by Trump and 'Muslim' 58 times (1.15%) by Obama.

A point of interest is the appearance of 'that' and 'who' in the 20<sup>th</sup> most frequent words in Trump's and Obama's speeches. 'That' is in the 13<sup>th</sup> position (79 times, 1.3%) and 5<sup>th</sup> position (119 times, 2.36%) by Trump and Obama respectively, whereas 'who' only appears in Obama's in the 17<sup>th</sup> position with 40 occurrences (0.8%). These relative pronouns are used as conjunctions in complex sentences, which reflects the tendency to use complex syntax (Savoy, 2009) by the two American presidents. They tend to use more complex sentences when addressing Americans, whereas 'that' was not found as a key word in King Abdullah speech, though a native speaker of English but he addresses multilingual diplomats in the UN parliament. Sentence complexity and length is not the focus of this paper but could be an area of interest in other research.

### Keywords

Keywordness is another feature of corpus search. Baker et al. (2008) define keyness as the statistically significant words that appear with higher frequency when compared to a general larger reference corpus or specialized corpus (p. 278). The aim of examining keyness is to detect the focus, topic or 'aboutness' of a text's content (p.278). In other words, a word is statistically compared to a similar word in a larger corpus, and the one that

## The Image of Muslims in Three Political Speeches: A Corpus-based Critical Discourse Analysis

occurs more frequently in one text is seen as key. Hence, keywords are not always the most frequent words in the corpus; a keyword is more frequent than expected in normal use. A keyword list is considered more helpful than a wordlist because it is seen as 'signposts' of significant words when compared against another corpus. It reflects topic and/or stylistic choices by the author of the corpus (Baker et al., 2008; Moustafa, 2015).

A key word list is beneficial also because it reveals less function words than wordlists (Mostafa, 2015). Word lists "have traditionally high numbers of grammatical words, e.g. pronouns, prepositions, articles and conjunctions, which are indicative of the language used in general terms rather than of the individual features characteristic of a certain corpus" (Mostafa, 2015, p. 167). Therefore, keyword lists are more commonly used to reveal the focus and main topics in the corpus under study.

The reference corpora used in the current paper are:

- **EUROPARL7, English:** It is built-in sketchengine online corpus. This general reference corpus is extracted from the European Parliament proceedings. It is a parallel corpus for machine translation and includes about fifty million English words from 1996 to the present. The reason for choosing this general corpus is to compare like with like, in other words, compare the speech of King Abdullah II in European Parliament with similar speeches in similar contexts to highlight the keywords in the current speech.
- **Brown corpus:** It is built-in sketchengineonlinecorpus. It is also called The Brown University Standard Corpus of Present-Day American English. It contains more than one million words of texts in the United States. It is used to identify the key words in the speeches of the American Presidents: Trump and Obama.

The keywords of King Abdullah's speech compared to the general corpus Europarl7, English are displayed in Table 3.

Table 3

Keywords in King Abdullah Speech

word	King Abdullah of Jordan Speech		EUROPARL7, English		Score
	frequency	frequency/mill @	frequency	frequency/mill	
Jordan	7	4284.0	423	7.0	538.0
Muslim	8	4896.0	826	13.6	335.4
faith	9	3672.0	1,632	26.9	131.8
friends	7	4284.0	2,412	39.8	105.0
de	6	3672.0	3,216	64.5	56.1
values	6	3672.0	9,861	162.2	22.5
peace	8	4896.0	14,163	233.2	20.9
My	6	3672.0	10,830	178.3	20.5
violence	5	3060.0	9,191	151.3	20.1
Our	5	3060.0	10,204	168.0	18.1
global	5	3060.0	14,046	231.2	13.2
respect	2	5508.0	27,421	451.4	12.2
forward	2	3060.0	20,450	336.7	9.1
world	8	4896.0	33,986	559.5	8.7
means	6	3672.0	31,336	515.9	7.1
people	10	6120.0	79,901	1315.4	4.6
This	11	6731.9	102,570	1688.6	4.0
against	5	3060.0	45,664	817.6	3.7
our	15	9179.9	158,757	2613.6	3.5
what	7	4284.0	87,233	1436.1	3.0
who	6	3672.0	82,349	1355.7	2.7
you	8	4896.0	129,642	2134.3	2.3
other	5	3060.0	87,030	1432.8	2.1
Europe	6	3672.0	104,951	1727.8	2.1

In King Abdullah's speech, the words *Jordan*, *Muslim*, *faith*, *friends*, *values*, *peace*, *violence*, *our*, *global*, *respect*, *Europe* are used more than normal in parliament talk. This shows that these are significant keywords in his speech.

The keywords of King Abdullah's speech were also compared to keywords in President Trump's speech (see Table 4) and President Obama's speech (see Table 5).

The keywords in King Abdullah's speech reflect his main intended message. For example, *peace*, *Jordan*, *values*, *faith*, *Europe*, *Muslim*, *global*, *friends*, *respect*, and *violence* are more frequently used by Abdullah than the two American presidents. Again they reflect a more outreaching interest in *global peace*. He seeks the help of *friends* in *Europe* to achieve *peace*. *Values*, *faith* and *Muslim* are key words that highlight his interest to redefine Muslims' true values to the world. *Jordan* is another keyword showing his role as the King of Jordan. The French function word *de* appears as another keyword used in his multi-lingual

**The Image of Muslims in Three Political Speeches: A Corpus-based  
Critical Discourse Analysis**

introduction addressing a more varied audience than the two American presidents, who mainly addressed their people. Similarly, the significant use of *friends*, *violence*, *our*, *peace* and the modal *must* show his assertive call and need to bind with Europe to combat world terrorism.

The keywords of Trump's speech are displayed in Table 6. *Trump*, *Sharia*, *Obama*, *ISIS*, *Muslims*, *Unbelievable*, *Dishonest*, *polls*, *thank*, *horrible*, *smart*, *fan* are keywords in the speech. These keywords reflect the main focus and purpose of his speech. For example, *Trump* appears significantly more than its normal use, which reflects his desire to promote his image as a candidate for presidency. *Sharia*, *ISIS* and *Muslims* are key topics in the speech (collocates of these terms are presented in more details below).

Table 4  
*Keywords Abdullah vs. Trump  
Obama*

Table 5  
*Keywords Abdullah vs.  
Obama*

word	King Abdullah of Jordan		Donald Trump Ban Speech		Score
	frequency	frequency/nll (%)	frequency	frequency/nll (%)	
peace	1	484.0	0	0.0	487.0
Jordan	7	424.0	0	0.0	425.0
values	6	367.0	0	0.0	367.0
most	6	367.0	0	0.0	367.0
means	6	367.0	0	0.0	367.0
faith	6	367.0	0	0.0	367.0
de	6	367.0	0	0.0	367.0
Europe	6	367.0	0	0.0	367.0
forward	5	306.0	0	0.0	306.0
Our	5	306.0	0	0.0	306.0
Muslim	8	484.0	1	118.1	35.2
My	6	367.0	1	118.1	26.4
their	5	306.0	2	215.5	11.1
global	5	306.0	2	215.5	11.1
friends	7	424.0	2	414.8	10.1

word	King Abdullah of Jordan		Obama Baltimore		Score
	frequency	frequency/nll (%)	frequency	frequency/nll (%)	
Jordan	7	424.0	0	0.0	425.0
de	6	367.0	0	0.0	367.0
My	6	367.0	0	0.0	367.0
Europe	6	367.0	0	0.0	367.0
global	5	306.0	1	170.4	17.1
friends	7	424.0	1	140.8	12.9
means	6	367.0	1	140.8	10.7
This	11	671.9	1	85.9	7.9
respect	5	306.0	1	85.9	6.5
Our	5	306.0	1	51.2	6.0
values	6	367.0	1	61.5	5.4
The	10	612.0	1	119.7	5.1
violence	5	306.0	1	61.5	4.5
what	7	424.0	1	102.3	4.1
peace	8	484.0	1	119.7	4.1

*Unbelievable*, *dishonest*, *polls*, *thank*, *horrible*, *smart*, *fan* are linked to his campaign to discredit the 'other', justify his quest for reform and to thank his supporters. The appearance of informal

## Dr. Manar Shalaby

words like *wanna*, *gonna* and *gotta* reflects Trump's informal style which is often used in electoral speeches to create rapport and friendliness with the audience.

To get a more relevant indicator of significant word use, Trump's speech was compared to the two other speeches; to Obama's in Table 7 and to Abdullah's in Table 8. Informal keywords appear significantly more in Trump's speech than in the other two speeches. For example, *gonna*, *wanna*, *guy* and the evaluative personal adjectives *smart*, *nice* render the speech a more personal, informal style. Similarly, the keywords *percent*, *polls* and *press* are keywords commonly used in elections and propaganda speeches.

Table 6

### *Keywords in President Trump's Speech*

word	Donald Trump speech		Brown		Score
	Freq	Freq/mill	Freq	Freq/mill	
Trump	8	1102.4	0	0.0	1102.4
Sharia	2	964.6	0	0.0	965.6
Obama	7	964.6	0	0.0	965.6
ok	6	826.8	0	0.0	827.8
bring	6	826.8	0	0.0	827.8
alright	5	689.0	0	0.0	690.0
ISIS	5	689.0	0	0.0	690.0
wanna	12	2342.6	2	2.6	659.8
Muslims	6	826.8	2	1.7	306.5
unbelievable	2	964.6	4	3.4	219.3
gonna	23	3169.4	16	13.6	217.0
dishonest	3	689.0	3	2.6	194.3
polls	10	1378.0	2	7.7	159.3
gotta	6	826.8	2	4.3	157.6
media	8	1102.4	13	11.1	91.5
poll	3	689.0	2	7.7	79.7
Thank	2	964.6	13	12.8	70.2
horrible	6	826.8	13	12.8	60.2
thank	8	1102.4	21	17.9	58.5
smart	8	1102.4	21	17.9	58.5
fan	6	826.8	18	15.3	50.8

The keywords in Obama's speech are shown in Table 9. The words that are used more than they would normally do are mainly relevant to two main topics: the American-Muslim community (his audience) and terrorism. The first set of words refer to Obama's first topic, for example, *Muslim(s)*, *Koran*, *Islam*, *mosque*, *faiths*, *hijab*, *God's*, and *Muhammad*. The second set of words are: *extremist*, *Bernardino*, *terrorists*, *vandalized*, *terrorism*, *targeted*, *ISIL*. These keywords highlight Obama's second purpose of his

**The Image of Muslims in Three Political Speeches: A Corpus-based  
Critical Discourse Analysis**

speech, which is to reassure the American-Muslim community, and condemn attempts to terrorize them due to misconceptions in linking terrorism with Islam.

Keyword search detected significant word use in Obama's speech in comparison to the speeches of Trump in Table 10 and Abdullah in Table 11.

**Table 7**  
*Keywords Trump vs. Obama vs. Abdullah*

word	Donald Trump last speech		Obama last time		Score
	frequency	frequency/all	frequency	frequency/all	
gotta	22	2179.9	0	0.0	2180.1
percent	20	2026.8	0	0.0	2027.8
wanna	17	2290.1	0	0.0	2291.1
file	15	2073.8	0	0.0	2074.8
really	15	1717.1	0	0.0	1718.1
go	15	1777.1	0	0.0	1778.1
west	15	1523.8	0	0.0	1524.8
day	15	1519.8	0	0.0	1520.8
same	15	1382.4	0	0.0	1383.4
polls	15	1382.4	0	0.0	1383.4
press	5	1241.1	0	0.0	1242.1
smart	5	1126.0	0	0.0	1127.0
rice	5	1126.0	0	0.0	1127.0
file	5	1126.0	0	0.0	1127.0
done	5	1126.0	0	0.0	1127.0

**Table 8**  
*Keywords Trump*

word	Donald Trump last speech		King Abdullah of Jordan		Score
	frequency	frequency/all	frequency	frequency/all	
be	51	7082.0	0	0.0	7083.0
was	49	6793.5	0	0.0	6794.5
know	45	5945.0	0	0.0	5946.0
did	39	4972.0	0	0.0	4973.0
to	35	4464.0	0	0.0	4465.0
had	34	3918.1	0	0.0	3919.1
at	21	2181.0	0	0.0	2182.0
gotta	21	2179.9	0	0.0	2180.9
so	21	2041.0	0	0.0	2042.0
get	21	2031.0	0	0.0	2032.0
would	21	2001.4	0	0.0	2002.4
get	21	2001.4	0	0.0	2002.4
go	11	1613.0	0	0.0	1614.0
wanna	11	2203.1	0	0.0	2204.1
never	11	2193.1	0	0.0	2194.1

The words *American(s)*, *America*, *faiths* tend to occur more frequently in Obama's speech when compared to King Abdullah's speech. Obama referred to Islam, Muslims and American community significantly more than Trump did who mainly focused on himself and election related words. The keywords in Obama's speech in comparison to Trump are: *American*, *faith(s)*, *Islam*, *community(ies)*, *religious*, *mosque*, *Christians*, *terrorism*.

Table 9  
Keywords in President Obama's Speech

word	Obama Baltimore		Brown		Score
	frequency	frequency/mill @	frequency	frequency/mill	
Muslim	58	9882.4	3	2.6	2782.7
Muslims	23	3918.9	2	1.7	1451.2
terrorism	7	1192.7	0	0.0	1192.7
targeted	7	1192.7	0	0.0	1192.7
Sabah	5	851.9	0	0.0	852.9
world's	4	681.5	0	0.0	682.5
Koran	4	681.5	0	0.0	682.5
Islam	17	2896.6	4	3.4	658.2
mosque	2	340.8	2	1.7	568.1
faiths	11	1874.3	3	2.6	928.0
hijab	3	511.2	0	0.0	512.2
extremist	3	511.2	0	0.0	512.2
Scouts	3	511.2	0	0.0	512.2
God's	3	511.2	0	0.0	512.2
Bernardino	3	511.2	0	0.0	512.2
terrorists	4	681.5	1	0.9	368.8
Muhammad	4	681.5	1	0.9	368.8
vandalized	2	340.8	0	0.0	341.8
terrorist	2	340.8	0	0.0	341.8
resilient	2	340.8	0	0.0	341.8
ISIL	2	340.8	0	0.0	341.8
Groups	2	340.8	0	0.0	341.8

Table 10  
Keywords Obama vs. Trump

word	Obama Baltimore		King Abdullah of Jordan		Score
	frequency	frequency/mill @	frequency	frequency/mill	
Americans	37	6364.3	0	0.0	6365.3
American	23	3918.9	0	0.0	3919.9
just	16	3067.0	0	0.0	3068.0
when	17	2896.6	0	0.0	2897.6
at	16	2726.2	0	0.0	2727.2
so	15	2555.8	0	0.0	2556.8
was	14	2385.4	0	0.0	2386.4
America	14	2385.4	0	0.0	2386.4
many	13	2215.0	0	0.0	2216.0
So	13	2215.0	0	0.0	2216.0
often	11	1874.3	0	0.0	1875.3
her	11	1874.3	0	0.0	1875.3
faith	11	1874.3	0	0.0	1875.3
leaders	10	1703.9	0	0.0	1704.9
You	10	1703.9	0	0.0	1704.9

Table 11  
Keywords

Obama vs. Abdullah

word	Obama Baltimore		Donald Trump Bar Speech		Score
	frequency	frequency/mill @	frequency	frequency/mill	
American	23	3918.9	0	0.0	3919.9
faith	11	1874.3	0	0.0	1875.3
Islam	17	2896.6	0	0.0	2897.6
community	16	2726.2	0	0.0	2727.2
communities	15	2555.8	0	0.0	2556.8
often	11	1874.3	0	0.0	1875.3
faiths	11	1874.3	0	0.0	1875.3
religious	9	1533.5	0	0.0	1534.5
mosque	9	1533.5	0	0.0	1534.5
children	9	1533.5	0	0.0	1534.5
speak	8	1363.1	0	0.0	1364.1
Christians	8	1363.1	0	0.0	1364.1
voices	7	1192.7	0	0.0	1193.7
terrorism	7	1192.7	0	0.0	1193.7
targeted	7	1192.7	0	0.0	1193.7

## The Image of Muslims in Three Political Speeches: A Corpus-based Critical Discourse Analysis

---

The keyword search of the three speeches highlighted the words that were used more than they would normally do in real speech. These keywords reflect the ideological stance of the speaker and contextual background of each speech.

### Qualitative Analysis

This part of the study looks more closely at the use of lexis and other rhetorical devices employed by the speakers to persuade their audience and present an effective argument. The analysis is guided by the CDA models, mainly: lexical choices and the use of discriminatory lexis entailing 'inclusion' and 'exclusion'; 'self positive representation' and 'other negative representation' (Halliday, 1994, Fairclough, 1995, Wodak, 2001, Van Dijk, 2004 & 2009).

### Positive-Self Representation and Negative-Other Representation Inclusive and Exclusive Language in Trump's Speech

This type of persuasive strategy is known as the construction of 'us' and 'them' (Wodak, 2001 & 2011). The positive self presentation is materialized through the use of positive evaluative words, first person pronoun in the singular, plural and their variants, and use of positive metaphors. This is also referred to by Miller 2004 as 'alignment and alienation' framework.

In Trump's speech, *I, you, we, they* were some of the most frequent words used in the speech. As to keywords, *Trump* (256 times/ 4.1%) was found to be the first keyword in the speech. Concordance lines of the most frequent words and keywords are analyzed in details to highlight collocates. 'I' was the most frequent word in Trump's speech. Talking about himself and how he presents himself is the focus of the coming section.

Figure 1  
Concordance lines of 'I' in Trump's Speech

Query: I 256 (35,247.14 per million) ⓘ

First | Previous Page 6 of 13 Go Next | Last

file3730648 join ISIS .and we have our anchors. I think I got them mostly stop, you know, I said  
 file3730648 think I got them mostly stop, you know, I said I don't hear it too much. But they  
 file3730648 I got them mostly stop, you know, I said I don't hear it too much. But they say the  
 file3730648 masterminds. Ahh he's brilliant. He's brilliant. I don't even think he's got a high IQ. I  
 file3730648 . I don't even think he's got a high IQ. I call him in Paris, I called him in Paris  
 file3730648 he's got a high IQ. I call him in Paris, I called him in Paris the guy with the dirty  
 file3730648 them back. Oh come back, where were you? I was fighting for ISIS. Oh welcome back  
 file3730648 .probably a guy who couldn't get women . I don't know what was the hell his problem  
 file3730648 And quickly. Don't worry about profiling. I promise I will defend you from profiling  
 file3730648 . Don't worry about profiling. I promise I will defend you from profiling. I promise  
 file3730648 promise I will defend you from profiling. I promise. (25:47) So when I started this  
 file3730648 from profiling. I promise. (25:47) So when I started this whole quest , who knew it's  
 file3730648 's been an amazing thing. No matter where I go I have to mend this crap packed crowds  
 constitution and our constitutional rights and I don't want that I want ISIS to surrender  
 constitutional rights and I don't want that I want ISIS to surrender .ok. I want ISIS  
 want that I want ISIS to surrender .ok. I want ISIS to surrender. Very simple. It  
 Very simple. It's very simple. So here what I am. In a little bit of controversial ...

Trump focused on presenting a positive image of himself, mainly as a committed independent powerful leader, e.g. 'I promise', 'I got them mostly stop', 'I want to be the people's president', 'I don't work for any of the lobbyists', 'I don't want for any of these people that are leading our country in the wrong direction'. He also presented himself as an intelligent shrewd person who is able to judge and evaluate people, e.g. 'I don't think he's got a high IQ'.

Trump frequently used banners, and glorified himself. He even compared (analogies) his presidential campaign to a 'quest', which is associated with a medieval romantic idea of a knight starting a heroic journey and 'searching for the Holy Grail' (more details on this point is presented later).

He also appealed to people's emotions and fears by showing his strong commitment to the elimination of ISIS 'I want ISIS to surrender', which he repeated more than once (more details on repetition is presented later).

## The Image of Muslims in Three Political Speeches: A Corpus-based Critical Discourse Analysis

The collective inclusive 'we' was also one of the most frequent words used in Trump's speech. It was used to convince the audience of the shared responsibility to create a common goal, e.g. 'we are all in this together folks', 'we wanna have a strong country', 'we're talking about making America greater', 'we have to be strong', 'we have to be vigilant', 'we are in the same basket', 'we would be all in the same boat' (see Figure 2).

Figure 2

### Concordance Lines of 'We' in Trump's Speech

File	Text
file3611299	have a system now they'll have four people we're interrupted four times one night a couple
file3611299	days one night a couple of weeks ago and we have four people one person at a time and
file3611299	republicans wouldn't be good for all of us as we can get together and really make our country
file3611299	really think that I can convince her that we're all in this together folks. We wanna
file3611299	We wanna have a strong country, Right we wanna have. Pastor stand up. What a good
file3611299	the other side. But really believe that if we're talking about making America (greater
file3611299	making America (greater) We have to be strong we have to be vigilant and if we're not vigilant
file3611299	be strong we have to be vigilant and if we're not vigilant. That was the same person
file3611299	the same person you can do very nice but we're gotta get her out. Honestly it's inappropriate
file3611299	happens. But you would think that everybody, we are in the same basket, that every everybody
file3611299	the security. One person one person and we've wasted 5 minutes. Get him out. Thank
file3611299	out. Thank you So you would think that if we could get together and we would be all
file3611299	think that if we could get together and we would be all in the same boat. Now Last
file3611299	all in the same boat. Now Last night all we saw and we witnessed something I felt was

The second person pronoun 'you' was also used frequently in the speech to create rapport and show involvement and collectivism. He used 'polarization' as a device to show that he and the audience are all together in good and bad. He stressed that they all shared a great history and had great leaders in order to appeal to the audience's sense of dignity and belonging, e.g. 'can you imagine what our great leaders of the past..'. He directly addressed the audience with a series of rhetorical questions to alarm and appeal to their fear, e.g. 'You know what sharia is?', 'to kill anyone in front of them including you folks I am afraid to tell you' (see Figure 3).

Figure 3  
Concordance Lines of 'You' in Trump's Speech

Query you 121 (16,559.78 per million) ⓘ

First | Previous Page 2 of 7 Go Next | Last

file3730648	stupid country so many different ways. <u>Can you imagine</u> what our great leaders of the past
file3730648	but we didn't want to racially profile. <u>Ok you're ok you're innocent.</u> Or how about where
file3730648	n't want to racially profile. <u>Ok you're ok you're innocent.</u> Or how about where the families
file3730648	attack at least at least if they were. (thank you D at my side). But while it was an attack
file3730648	want to be governed according to Sharia. <u>You know what Sharia is?</u> So I wrote this at
file3730648	my face. I say <u>fan the crowd just to show you all the people over there.</u> It's a record
file3730648	. They never fan it. And yet I <u>guarantee you</u> that young woman that just got taken out
file3730648	question questions and then I went around it. <u>You know everybody knew it was false.</u> Amazingly
file3730648	can call the election tomorrow. <u>Wouldn't you love that.</u> How they're coming at coming
file3730648	us, they're coming at all of us. Because you know we have a noisy majority they used
file3730648	trying to get him back) he left he deserted <u>You know in the old days when we were a strong</u>
file3730648	heard they don't do anything to him, <u>can you believe it?</u> He's gonna get away with nothing
file3730648	<u>to kill anyone in front of them including you folks I hate to tell you.</u> So we get Bergdahl
file3730648	them including you folks I hate to tell you . So we get Bergdahl and they get five of
file3730648	will they have the right to self-respect <u>you're doing nuclear weapons over there.</u> We
file3730648	them oh no we're not doing nuclear weapons. <u>You know the Persians are great negotiators</u>
file3730648	thought of him like a diviner because I said <u>you know what I don't think he's going to be</u>
file3730648	president. I backed McCain he lost by the way. <u>You know I don't blame McCain for losing because</u>
file3730648	these people we going crazy. <u>Shall I read you the statement?</u> Donald J. Trump is calling
file3730648	statement? Donald J. Trump is calling for - <u>you gotta listen to this because it's pretty</u>

The collocates (lexical items that keep the company of the keywords) and accompanying phrases that come with 'I', 'we' and 'you' are positive and show solidarity and the need to be together to face all future threats. Words like 'together... we make our country', 'we are in this together folks', 'we wanna have a strong country', 'we're talking about making America greater', 'we have to be strong'. All these words establish a bond and collectivism between Trump and the audience.

### 'Other' negative representation in Trump's speech

Trump, on the other hand, used stigmatizing lexis in describing the 'other' who are mainly the government, his opponents, the media, and ISIS/Muslims. '**Undermining the other**' is the main device used by Trump. The pronoun 'they' is the tenth most frequent word in Trump's speech (frequency 99: 1.6%). The collocates associated with 'they' are mainly negative, e.g. 'crap happening to us....they did not want to report that', 'they are dishonest', 'nobody says it was a lie', 'they do not want to show this

## The Image of Muslims in Three Political Speeches: A Corpus-based Critical Discourse Analysis

crowd'. Hence, the 'other', as indicated by the pronoun 'they', was constantly associated with negative adjectives and phrases.

Trump employed several rhetorical strategies to present his argument, as revealed in pronouns use, mainly glorifying self, polarization by the frequent use of collective pronouns to create a bond and show solidarity with the audience. In contrast, the 'other' (including Muslims) are always associated with negative collocates. The token 'Muslim' and its collocates are analyzed in another section below.

Figure 4

### Concordance Lines of 'They' in Trump's Speech

Query	They	52 (7,165.50 per million)
file3611299	should be taken out, same person, one person. They let her out, they give her a second chance	
file3611299	with the kind of crap happening with us. They did not want to report that because they	
file3611299	people. But they know we have a problem. They know we have a real problem. There's something	
file3611299	. These people back there did the worst. They are so dishonest. No no they are so dishonest	
file3611299	dishonest. No no they are so dishonest. They are so dishonest. And I had one from NBC	
file3611299	and actually another one I think from CBS. They actually in Columbus Ohio had a tremendous	
file3611299	in Columbus Ohio had a tremendous crowd. They had ten-thousand people. It was a love	
file3611299	after ten minutes. Now the press was there. They saw it. Nobody says it was a lie. It was	
file3611299	thing to do. Here we get the biggest crowd. They donna want to show this crowd. Tonight	
file3611299	all these people outside trying to get in. They don't do that. They have the cameras right	
file3611299	outside trying to get in. They don't do that. They have the cameras right to my face, I say	
file3611299	history of this ship. But they don't show. They don't show it. No no. and I say fan it.	

### Inclusive and Exclusive Language in King Abdullah's Speech

King Abdullah's speech was directed to the European Union and to the world. He tackled several topics in his speech, mainly urging the EU and the world to fight terrorism and extremism with Muslims, and clarifying that these terrorist acts were directed mainly towards Muslims, and oppose Islam's main values and principles that call for peace and co-existence. He also highlighted the dangers of "Islamophobia" that is increasing everyday worldwide and leads to stereotyping and alienation of innocent

Muslims. He stressed, as well, that the whole world needs to unite and join forces to face violence. He also called for mutual respect. In this speech, King Abdullah used several rhetorical devices to persuade the audience. Some of these are:

He presented himself as a thankful head of state, who was 'outraged' by the terrorist acts and called for world collaboration to fight terrorism. He also presented himself as a true Muslim who valued peace, mercy, and tolerance and as a husband and father who taught his children the principles of Islam that he learnt as a child.

Notably, the first person singular pronouns did not show in the most frequent 20 words or in the keyword lists. This is possibly due to the frequent use of collective pronouns to associate himself more with other Muslims and Arabs. Examples of first person pronoun used are, 'I appreciate your invitation', 'Rania and I joined millions of people in France', 'I and countless other Muslims', 'these are the values I teach my children', 'my people', 'my small country', 'my children', and 'my friends' (which is repeated 5 times (0.35%) in the speech) (see Figures 5 and 6). King Abdullah did not glorify himself as Trump did but he mentioned himself less frequently as a thankful true Muslim who is outraged by terrorism directed towards both Muslims and the world.

Figure 5

*Concordance Lines of 'I' in Abdullah's Speech*

Query 1 8 (4,895.96 per million) 3

file3730735 of friendship with this great institution. I appreciate your invitation to speak here  
file3730735 friends are with you. In January, Rania and I joined millions of people in France, who  
file3730735 clarify what it really means to be a Muslim. I and countless other Muslims, have been  
file3730735 the All-Merciful. All my life, every day, I have heard and used the greeting, Assalamu  
file3730735 means to be a Muslim. These are the values I teach my children and they will hand on  
file3730735 they will hand on to theirs. My friends, I am outraged and grieved by the recent attacks  
file3730735 they want and deserve. Again and again, I hear the question: why doesn't the world  
file3730735 the world's third-largest refugee host and I thank all of you who are helping us to

## The Image of Muslims in Three Political Speeches: A Corpus-based Critical Discourse Analysis

Figure 6

### Concordance Lines of 'My' in Abdullah's Speech

Query my 9 (5,507.96 per million) ③

file3730735 réconciliation et de l'unité de l'Europe. My friends: People thrive where there is mutual  
file3730735 united, against violence and intimidation. My friends, There are those living in Europe  
file3730735 the Compassionate, the All-Merciful. All my life, every day, I have heard and used  
file3730735 be a Muslim. These are the values I teach my children and they will hand on to theirs  
file3730735 children and they will hand on to theirs. My friends, I am outraged and grieved by the  
file3730735 will not allow them to hijack our faith. My friends, The second area key to global  
file3730735 hosting the entire population of Belgium. My small country is now the world's third-largest  
file3730735 us to uphold this global responsibility. My friends, Your support sends a message,  
file3730735 Your support sends a message, not only to my people, but all those who seek to move

Abdullah used the first person plural possessive pronoun 'our' 20 times (1.4%). It is the 8<sup>th</sup> most frequent word used in the speech and also appeared as a significant keyword when compared to the reference corpus and the corpora of Trump and Obama's speeches (See Tables 3, 4 and 5). He used 'our' as a collaborative term to show affiliation and solidarity with Muslims and non-Muslims, e.g. 'Our faith, like yours, commands mercy, peace and tolerance. It upholds, as yours does, the equal human dignity of every person – men and women, neighbours and strangers. He also wanted to emphasize collectivism and the mutual collaborative efforts needed from the Arab countries and Europe to unit and fight terrorism. For example, he said 'our victory now depends on our unity', 'our world', 'our fight', 'our people', 'our unity', 'our regions', 'our strong partnership', 'our moral obligations' (See Figure 7).

Figure 7

Concordance Lines of 'Our' in Abdullah's Speech

Query Our: 20 (12,239.90 per million) ⓘ

file3730735	these challenges have special importance. <u>Our world faces an assault by terrorists, with</u>
file3730735	<u>been swift, serious and determined. And our fight will continue. We and other Arab</u>
file3730735	<u>other Arab and Muslim states defend not only our people but our faith. This is a fight that</u>
file3730735	<u>Muslim states defend not only our people but our faith. This is a fight that has to be carried</u>
file3730735	<u>disrespect Islam's values and humanity's values. Our victory now depends on our unity. Europe's</u>
file3730735	<u>humanity's values. Our victory now depends on our unity. Europe's role is vital. Only by</u>
file3730735	<u>Europe's role is vital. Only by cooperation can our regions shut down the sources of terrorist</u>
file3730735	<u>their purposes. It is also essential that our regions renew the source of our great strength</u>
file3730735	<u>essential that our regions renew the source of our great strength: the mutual respect that</u>
file3730735	<u>countless other Muslims, have been taught from our earliest years that our religion demanded</u>
file3730735	<u>been taught from our earliest years that our religion demanded respect and caring for</u>
file3730735	<u>Arab Christians are an integral part of our region's past, present and future. Jordan</u>
file3730735	<u>society, friends and partners in building our country. The world's Muslims have a critical</u>
file3730735	<u>a critical role in global understanding. Our faith, like yours, commands mercy, peace</u>
file3730735	<u>target. We will not allow them to hijack our faith. My friends, The second area key</u>
file3730735	<u>forward towards Palestinian-Israeli peace? Our countries, united, must provide the momentum</u>
file3730735	<u>partnerships such as yours. Jordan values our strong partnership with the European Union</u>
file3730735	<u>partnership. Jordan also takes seriously our moral obligations to others. Despite scarce</u>
file3730735	<u>peace and moderation: Europe is with you. Our regions, our people, can find no better</u>
file3730735	<u>moderation: Europe is with you. Our regions, our people, can find no better partners and</u>

'Other' Representation in King Abdullah's Speech

Abdullah used several phrases to refer to the 'other'. He used 'my friends' 5 times (0.35%) to address the EU members/his audience, and Europe. He also used 'Other(s)' 8 times (0.56%) to refer to the Arab countries, Muslim states, non-Muslims, battered states, and Europe (See Figure 8). He drew the world's attention to the Arab's moral obligation to fight terrorism, e.g. "we and *other* Arab and Muslim states defend not only our people but our faith. This is a fight that has to be carried out by Muslim nations first and foremost. A fight within Islam." He highlighted that this fight is with radical extremist beliefs that mainly target moderate Muslims who are excluded and attacked by terrorist radical groups like Daesh. 'Others' also referred to the refugees who came to Jordan for asylum and he looked at this as 'our moral obligations to others'. 'Other' also referred to Europe and the audience, e.g. 'Our regions, our people, can find no better partners and neighbours than each *other*. History, geography and future bind us. Let no one separate

## The Image of Muslims in Three Political Speeches: A Corpus-based Critical Discourse Analysis

us; because together, we can create pillars of mutual respect that will support the common good for generations to come'. He sent a call for other neighbouring states that share history, land and future to unite and support their mutual quest to create a better world for the future generations.

Figure 8

*Concordance Lines of 'Other(s)' in Abdullah's Speech*

Query other 8 (4,895.96 per million) 

file3730735	determined. And our fight will continue. We and other Arab and Muslim states defend not only
file3730735	of all societies. <u>Attacking and excluding others , insulting other peoples and their faith</u>
file3730735	<u>Attacking and excluding others, insulting other peoples and their faith and convictions</u>
file3730735	really means to be a Muslim. I and countless other Muslims, have been taught from our earliest
file3730735	religion demanded respect and caring for others . The Prophet Mohammad, peace and blessings
file3730735	<u>greeting, Assalamu aleikum - a wish for the other to be blessed with peace. This is what</u>
file3730735	takes seriously our <u>moral obligations to others .</u> Despite scarce resources, the people of
file3730735	<u>better partners and neighbours than each other .</u> History, geography and future bind us.

Abdullah, unlike Trump, talked about the 'other' with respect as partners in a mutual cause. *Negative reference* was not directed to a specific entity, for example, when referring to terrorism, Abdullah used the general abstract terms, e.g. 'terror', 'violence', 'extremists', 'extremism' or identified a specific entity, i.e. 'Daesh' rather than a collective all-inclusive term, like, *Muslims* or *Islam*, e.g. 'the savage murder by Daesh of Jordan's hero pilot outraged all Jordanians' (see Figure 9). Words as 'terror', 'violence', 'extremists', 'extremism' do not collocate with specific entities but were used as general sources of danger to the whole world, Muslims included. The purpose is to emphasize that Islam or Muslims are not the source of these 'global' violent acts.

Examples are: 'conflict will breed further hate, *violence* and *terror* across the world', 'in France...marched against *violence* and intimidation', 'hate, *violence* and *terror* across the world', 'refugees fleeing regional *violence*', 'the danger of *extremism* must be seen for

what it is: global', 'These *terrorists* have made the world's Muslims their greatest target... We will not allow them to hijack our faith'.

Figure 9

*Concordance Lines of 'violence' in Abdullah's Speech*

Query violence 5 (3,059.98 per million) 

file3730735 in France, who marched, united, against violence and intimidation. My friends, There are  
file3730735 , must be inspired by values that reject violence , create peace and build inclusive society  
file3730735 by political means - not by force, not by violence . And it has given the extremists a powerful  
file3730735 going conflict will breed further hate, violence and terror across the world. How can we  
file3730735 their arms to refugees fleeing regional violence . As the president has mentioned earlier

### **Inclusive and exclusive language in President Obama's Speech**

'We', 'our' and 'I' appear in the twentieth most frequent word list of Obama's speech(see Table 9). This highlights Obama's desire to use collective pronouns to bond with his audience (members of the Muslim Community in the Baltimore Mosque- Maryland).

The frequent use of 'we' (103 times: 2.04%) and 'our' (62 times: 1.2%) reveals Obama's desire to associate with the Muslim community in America whom he wanted to assure of being an integral part of the American society. Here Obama uses 'inclusive' speech to encourage and express appreciation to Muslim Americans after the rise of Islamophobia in USA which led to committing acts of violence against Muslim individuals and mosques. Hence, Obama used the inclusive pronoun 'we' (8<sup>th</sup> most frequent word) to represent himself, to quote words of Muslim Americans and most importantly as a collective pronoun referring to the whole American community as one inseparable unit (see Figure 10).

## The Image of Muslims in Three Political Speeches: A Corpus-based Critical Discourse Analysis

Figure 10  
Concordance Lines of 'We' in Obama's Speech

Query we 103 (16,769.78 per million) ⓘ

Page 1 of 4  [Next](#) | [Last](#)

file3730667	your members said, "just look at the way we live...we are true Americans." So the first
file3730667	members said, "just look at the way we live... we are true Americans." So the first thing
file3730667	strong and united as one American family. We are grateful for that. (Applause.) Now,
file3730667	an entire faith. And of course, recently, we've heard inexcusable political rhetoric
file3730667	-- just like Sabah -- have been targeted. We've seen children bullied. We've seen mosques
file3730667	been targeted. We've seen children bullied. We've seen mosques vandalized. Sikh Americans
file3730667	about how their children were asking, are we going to be forced out of the country,
file3730667	to be forced out of the country, or, are we going to be rounded up? Why do people treat
file3730667	being a teenager already -- that's not who we are. We're one American family. And when
file3730667	teenager already -- that's not who we are. We're one American family. And when any part
file3730667	challenge to our values -- and that means we have much work to do. We've got to tackle
file3730667	and that means we have much work to do. We've got to tackle this head on. We have
file3730667	to do. We've got to tackle this head on. We have to be honest and clear about it. And
file3730667	have to be honest and clear about it. And we have to speak out. This is a moment when
file3730667	out. This is a moment when, as Americans, we have to truly listen to each other and
file3730667	for many when he wrote to me and said, " We just want to live in peace." Here's another
file3730667	entrepreneurs who are creating new technologies that we use all the time. They're the sports heroes
file3730667	all the time. They're the sports heroes we cheer for -- like Muhammad Ali and Kareem
file3730667	and patriotic Americans you'll ever meet. We're honored to have some of our proud Muslim
file3730667	here today. Please stand if you're here, so we can thank you for your service. (Applause

'Our' is the 11<sup>th</sup> most frequent word in the speech (59 occurrence- 1.17%). It is likewise used to emphasize collectivism and inclusiveness. 'Our' is used to refer to the shared country, families, nation, constitution, etc. He presented exemplary records of distinguished Muslims and how they served the American community (see Figure 11).

Figure 11

Concordance Lines of 'Our' in Obama's Speech

Query our 62 [10,094.43 per million] ⓘ

Page 1 of 4 Go Next | Last

file3730667 (Applause.) This mosque, like so many in our country, is an all-American story. You've  
 file3730667 I know that in Muslim communities across our country, this is a time of concern and,  
 file3730667 against Muslim Americans that has no place in our country. No surprise, then, that threats  
 file3730667 one American family. And when any part of our family starts to feel separate or second-class  
 file3730667 targeted, it tears at the very fabric of our nation. (Applause.) It's a challenge to  
 file3730667 nation. (Applause.) It's a challenge to our values -- and that means we have much work  
 file3730667 communicated on a regular basis through our media. So let's start with this fact: For  
 file3730667 when enshrining the freedom of religion in our Constitution and our Bill of Rights, our  
 file3730667 freedom of religion in our Constitution and our Bill of Rights, our Founders meant what  
 file3730667 our Constitution and our Bill of Rights, our Founders meant what they said when they  
 file3730667 Generations of Muslim Americans helped to build our nation. They were part of the flow of immigrants  
 file3730667 pertinent fact, Muslim Americans enrich our lives today in every way. They're our neighbors  
 file3730667 enrich our lives today in every way. They're our neighbors, the teachers who inspire our  
 file3730667 our neighbors, the teachers who inspire our children, the doctors who trust us with  
 file3730667 children, the doctors who trust us with our health -- future doctors like Sabah. They  
 file3730667 ) Muslim Americans keep us safe. They're our police and our firefighters. They're in  
 file3730667 Americans keep us safe. They're our police and our firefighters. They're in homeland security  
 file3730667 firefighters. They're in homeland security, in our intelligence community. They serve honorably  
 file3730667 intelligence community. They serve honorably in our armed forces -- meaning they fight and

The first person pronoun 'I' is the 12<sup>th</sup> most frequent word in Obama's speech (f.59: 1.17%). Obama expressed his thoughts, desires and feelings by a series of mental processes, e.g. 'suspect', 'want', 'hear', 'know', 'believe' to show empathy with Muslim American predicaments. He wanted also to establish himself as a Christian but who shared beliefs with Muslims, for example, "Whoever wants to enter paradise, the Prophet Muhammad taught, 'let him treat people the way he would love to be treated'. For Christians like myself, I'm assuming that sounds familiar. The world's 1.6 billion Muslims are as diverse as humanity itself. They are Arabs and Africans. They're from Latin America to Southeast Asia; Brazilians, Nigerians..." (see Figure 12).

Obama used 'consensus' (Van Dijk, 2004) to stress agreement and shared principles between Islam and Christianity. In spite of the 'polarization' speech in focusing on Us-Them talk, yet he stressed agreement and common shared principles, which

## The Image of Muslims in Three Political Speeches: A Corpus-based Critical Discourse Analysis

confirms that America is a pluralistic society. He also used 'polarization' to show differences, diversity and extensiveness of Muslims across the world and to justify how unwise it is to treat them as one homogeneous group.

The second person pronoun 'you' is the 16<sup>th</sup> most frequent word (f. 50- 1.0%). He addressed the present audience as representative of the American Muslim community. He thanked them for their services and devotion to the whole community and revealed compassion for and rejection of violence and stereotyping against them(see Figure 13).

Figure 12  
*Concordance Lines of 'T' in Obama's Speech*

Query 1: 59 (9,605.99 per million) ⓘ

Page 1 of 3 Go Next Last

file3730667	You're going to be a fantastic doctor. And I suspect, Sabah, your parents are here because
file3730667	, thank you for welcoming me here today. I want to thank Muslim Americans leaders
file3730667	traveled even from out of state to be here. I want to recognize Congressman John Sarbanes
file3730667	football and basketball – boys and girls – I hear they're pretty good. (Laughter.) Cub
file3730667	are true Americans." So the first thing I want to say is two words that Muslim Americans
file3730667	Now, this brings me to the other reason I wanted to come here today. I know that
file3730667	other reason I wanted to come here today. I know that in Muslim communities across
file3730667	be Muslims have been targeted, as well, I just had a chance to meet with some extraordinary
file3730667	justice and the environment and education. I should point out they were all much younger
file3730667	And that's an anxiety echoed in letters I get from Muslim Americans around the country
file3730667	from Muslim Americans around the country. I've had people write to me and say, I feel
file3730667	country. I've had people write to me and say, I feel like I'm a second-class citizen. I
file3730667	people write to me and say, I feel like I'm a second-class citizen. I've had mothers
file3730667	I feel like I'm a second-class citizen. I've had mothers write and say, "my heart
file3730667	girl from Ohio, 13 years old, told me, "I'm scared." A girl from Texas signed her
file3730667	each other and learn from each other. And I believe it has to begin with a common understanding
file3730667	common understanding of some basic facts. And I express these facts, although they'd be
file3730667	(Applause.) For Christians like myself, I'm assuming that sounds familiar. (Laughter
file3730667	was designed to protect all faiths -- and I'm quoting Thomas Jefferson now -- "the
file3730667	Washington, D.C., President Eisenhower said, "I should like to assure you, my Islamic friends

Figure 13

Concordance Lines of 'You' in Obama's Speech

Query you 60 (10,223.21 per million) 

Page 1 of 3

file361645... Well, good afternoon. And, Sabah, thank you for the wonderful introduction and for  
file361645... your education, and your service to others. You're an inspiration. You're going to be a  
file361645... service to others. You're an inspiration. You're going to be a fantastic doctor. And  
file361645... parents are here because they wanted to see you so -- where are Sabah's parents? There  
file361645... you so -- where are Sabah's parents? There you go. Good job, Mom. She did great, didn't  
file361645... the Islamic Society of Baltimore, thank you for welcoming me here today. I want to  
file361645... in our country, is an all-American story. You've been part of this city for nearly half  
file361645... of this city for nearly half a century. You serve thousands of families -- some who  
file361645... Allegiance here. With interfaith dialogue, you build bridges of understanding with other  
file361645... justice and urban development. As voters, you come here to meet candidates. As one of  
file361645... hear often enough -- and that is, thank you. Thank you for serving your community.  
file361645... enough -- and that is, thank you. Thank you for serving your community. Thank you for  
file361645... Thank you for serving your community. Thank you for lifting up the lives of your neighbors  
file361645... a time of some fear. Like all Americans, you're worried about the threat of terrorism  
file361645... But on top of that, as Muslim Americans, you also have another concern -- and that is

The 'other' representation in President Obama's speech

The third person plural pronoun 'they' appeared 39 times (0.77%) in Obama's speech. 'They' is used to represent, in most of the examples, Muslim Americans. All modifiers associated with Muslim Americans are positive, e.g. 'pretty good', 'proud of their work', 'extraordinary work', 'diverse' (used positively to show that they should not be punished by the deeds of a minority), 'build our nation', 'first founders of America', 'enrich our lives', 'neighbours', 'teachers who inspire, doctors, scientists who win Nobel Prizes, etc'. 'They' is also used to represent Americans who do not know Muslim people and who hear about Muslims and Islam from the news. This makes them prejudiced against the Muslim community and do not recognize the diversity within Muslims and treat them all as extremists (see Figure 14).

## The Image of Muslims in Three Political Speeches: A Corpus-based Critical Discourse Analysis

Figure 14  
Concordance Line of 'They' in Obama's Speech

Query they 39 (6,349.72 per million) 

Page 1 of 2

file3730667	suspect, Sabah, <u>your parents are here because they wanted to see you so</u> – where are Sabah's
file3730667	and basketball – <u>boys and girls</u> – I hear <u>they're pretty good</u> . (laughter.) Cub Scouts,
file3730667	necessarily know – or at least don't know that they know – a Muslim personally. And as a result
file3730667	community but in the American community. And they're proud of their work in business and
file3730667	environment and education. I should point out they were all much younger than me – (laughter
file3730667	hearing about the extraordinary work that they're doing. But you also could not help but
file3730667	anxieties. Some of them are parents, and they talked about how their children were asking
file3730667	children just like mine. And the notion that they would be filled with doubt and questioning
file3730667	this great country of ours at a time when they've got enough to worry about – it's hard
file3730667	facts. And I express these facts, although they'd be obvious to many of the people in this
file3730667	Muslims are as diverse as humanity itself. <u>They are Arabs and Africans</u> . They're from Latin
file3730667	humanity itself. They are Arabs and Africans. <u>They're from Latin America to Southeast Asia</u>
file3730667	Brazilians, Nigerians, Bangladeshis, Indonesians. <u>They are white and brown and black</u> . There's
file3730667	Bill of Rights, our Founders meant what they said when they said it applied to all religions
file3730667	, our Founders meant what they said when they said it applied to all religions. Back
file3730667	Muslim Americans helped to build our nation. They were part of the flow of immigrants who
file3730667	immigrants who became farmers and merchants. They built America's first mosque, surprisingly
file3730667	Americans enrich our lives today in every way. They're our neighbors, the teachers who inspire
file3730667	our health – future doctors like Sabah. They're scientists who win Nobel Prizes, young
file3730667	new technologies that we use all the time. They're the sports heroes we cheer for –

Negative representation and exclusive lexis were mainly attributed to general abstract nouns and adjectives, e.g. *terror*, *terrorism*, *extremism* (*extremist*) or to specific groups e.g. *Al-Qaeda* and *ISIL*, the media, and some political speech. For example: 'We've seen it before, across faiths. But right now, there is an organized extremist element that draws selectively from Islamic texts, twists them in an attempt to justify their killing and their *terror*'.

Collocates with 'terrorism' and 'terror' are *threat*, *horrific act*, *protect our country from*, *to fight*, *repeatedly and consistently condemning*, *prohibits* (See Figure 15). Obama used collocates that do not link 'law-abiding Muslim citizens' with terrorism.

He also condemned the media, 'distorted media', and political discourse, 'inexcusable political rhetoric', for their negative portrayal of Muslims that emitted 'distorted impressions', which

consequently increased harassment towards Muslim Americans, for example:

"... many only hear about Muslims and Islam from the news after an act of *terrorism*, or in *distorted media portrayals* in TV or film, all of which gives this hugely *distorted impression*. And since 9/11, but more recently, since the attacks in Paris and San Bernardino, you've seen too often people *conflating the horrific acts of terrorism* with the beliefs of an entire faith. And of course, recently, we've heard *inexcusable political rhetoric* against Muslim Americans that has no place in our country. No surprise, then, that threats and harassment of Muslim Americans have surged".

When Obama referred to terrorism, he used specific reference to terrorist groups, e.g. 'Groups like al Qaeda and ISIL'. He called them 'extremists' and 'desperate for legitimacy'.

Figure 15

*Concordance Lines of 'Terrorism', 'ISIL' and 'Violent' in Obama's speech*

Query: "terrorism: 7 (1,139.69 per million) 3

file3730667 Americans, you're worried about the threat of terrorism . But on top of that, as Muslim Americans  
file3730667 and Islam from the news after an act of terrorism , or in distorted media portrayals in TV  
file3730667 often people conflating the horrific acts of terrorism with the beliefs of an entire faith. And  
file3730667 next point: As we protect our country from terrorism , we should not reinforce the ideas and  
file3730667 Applause.) So the best way for us to fight terrorism is to deny these organizations legitimacy  
file3730667 and repeatedly and consistently condemning terrorism . And around the globe, Muslims who've dared  
file3730667 Muslim clerics who teach that Islam prohibits terrorism , for the Koran says whoever kills an innocent

This is the truth. Groups like al Qaeda and ISIL , they're not the first extremists in history  
some moral clarity. (Applause.) Groups like ISIL are desperate for legitimacy. They try

community so often is targeted or blamed for the violent acts of the very few. The Muslim American

### Muslims' and Islam's Representation in the Three Speeches

Muslims were represented differently in the three speeches. In Trump's speech, the keyword 'Muslim(s)' appeared only 3 times in the speech and 'Islam' did not appear at all (see Figure 16). There are other words associated with Muslims in Trump's speech and these are: 'jihad', 'sharia', 'guns', 'masterminds' and 'ISIS'.

## The Image of Muslims in Three Political Speeches: A Corpus-based Critical Discourse Analysis

Figure 16

### Concordance Lines of 'Muslims' in Trump's Speech

- . Twenty-five percent! Fifty-one percent is the Muslims living in this country. By the way I have
- . towards Americans by large segments of the Muslim population. Most recently a poll from center

Trump used 'Muslim(s)' to refer to the Muslim population as a whole in the USA, who took part in nationwide polls revealing, as he claimed, their 'hatred towards Americans' and their consent to use 'violence against Americans'. Trump supported his argument by statistics to justify his 'victimization' hate stories against the 'other' based on 'suspicious online polls' to implicate the Muslim community in America (BIT, 2015). He used *exclusive lexis* to separate between Americans and Muslim-Americans. He referred to *Muslims* as 'Muslim population', 'people', 'I have friends in the Muslims' rather than *citizens* or *Muslim Americans*, for example:

'We have no choice... According to Pew Research among other words there is a great hatred towards Americans by large segments of the Muslim population. Most recently a poll from center for security policy released data showing 25% of those polls agreed that violence against Americans, those people are here by the way... This is people living in this country, twenty-five percent of those polls agreed violence against Americans is justified. Is Muslims. Twenty-five percent! Fifty-one percent is the *Muslims* living in this country. By the way I have friends in the Muslims and they're great people. But they know we have a problem... There's something wrong'.

This exclusive lexis leads to *alienation* rather than *alignment* (Miller, 2004). Consequently, Trump's use of in-group and out-group lexis leads to incrimination of all Muslims which justified describing his speech as 'a hate speech' and which triggered violent acts against the Muslim community in America.

## Dr. Manar Shalaby

He also used presupposition and overgeneralization to misinterpret the real meaning of 'Jihad' and 'Sharia'(Sharia appeared as the second most significant keyword in Trump's speech: Table 6). He spread scare stories to draw on people's fear and emotions. The collocate words and phrases used with 'Jihad' are, 'global', 'they wanna change your religion', 'horrendous attacks of people that believe only in Jihad', 'these people only believe in Jihad. They don't want our system'. He also used hyperbole to scare people by describing 'Sharia' as, 'Sharia authorizes such atrocities as murder against nonbelievers who won't convert beheading and more unthinkable acts that pose great harm to Americans- especially women...tough stuff'. He used Repetition as a rhetorical device to create resonance and emphasis by repeating 'you know what Sharia is' more than three times. He also added negative evaluation, e.g. 'that's terrible' and 'tough stuff' to intensify the sense of danger (See Figures 17 and 18).

Figure 17

### Concordance Lines of 'Sharia' in Trump's Speech

Query: 'Sharia' 7 (964.59 per million)

file3611299 groups want to be governed according to Sharia . You know what Sharia is? So I wrote this  
file3611299 governed according to Sharia. You know what Sharia is? So I wrote this at the mainstream media  
file3611299 the choice to being governed according to Sharia .. [pause] you know what Sharia is! [Booing]  
file3611299 according to Sharia .. [pause] you know what Sharia is! [Booing] 51% you know what Sharia is  
file3611299 what Sharia is! [Booing] 51% you know what Sharia is! Sharia authorizes, you know this, I  
file3611299 is! [Booing] 51% you know what Sharia is! Sharia authorizes, you know this, I mean, that  
file3611299 you know this, I mean, that's terrible- Sharia authorizes such atrocities as murder against

Figure 18

### Concordance Lines of 'Jihad' in Trump's Speech

Query: Jihad 4 (551.19 per million)

file3611299 as part think of that as part of global jihad [pause][booing]. They wanna change your  
file3611299 not gonna happen. As part of the global jihad and 51% of those polls agreed that Muslims  
file3611299 horrendous attacks by people that believe only in Jihad. (addressing the audience) these people  
file3611299 the audience) these people only believe in Jihad . They don't want our system. They don't

Trump conflated all Muslims to one group which he also associated with 'ISIS', 'guns', and 'masterminds' to implicate them in acts of terrorism. Collocates with Muslims are, 'slaughtered', 'carnage', 'bad guys'. He also criticized the media for describing them as 'masterminds' which glorified their deeds to young

## The Image of Muslims in Three Political Speeches: A Corpus-based Critical Discourse Analysis

Americans who were tempted to join ISIS (see Figures 19, 20, and 21).

Figure 19

### Concordance Lines of 'Guns' in Trump's Speech

Query \*gun 7 (967.79 per million) ③

file3619766 were slaughtered absolutely slaughtered had guns . you wouldn't have had the carnage that  
file3619766 would not had that carnage. If they had guns , you wouldn't have the carnage. So important  
file3619766 these weak leaders diminish it. If they had guns in Paris, if five people in that room,  
file3619766 Paris and France has probably the toughest gun laws anywhere in the world. and it was  
file3619766 same thing a few days ago in California. No guns . We didn't have guns. The bad guys had  
file3619766 ago in California. No guns. We didn't have guns . The bad guys had the guns. And these young  
file3619766 We didn't have guns. The bad guys had the guns . And these young people and I tell the

Figure 20

### Concordance Lines of 'Guns' in Trump's Speech

Query mastermind 4 (553.02 per million) ③

file3619766 tell the press you got to stop calling them masterminds . These are these are dirty rotten scums  
file3619766 watching the internet and they wanna be masterminds and you wonder why do we lose all these  
file3619766 hear it too much. But they say the young masterminds . Ahh he's brilliant. He's brilliant, I  
file3619766 smart guy, he's a dummy but people there mastermind ... bing bing bing shooting everybody you

Figure 21

### Concordance Lines of 'ISIS' in Trump's Speech

Query isis 5 (691.28 per million) ③

file3619766 constitutional rights and I don't want that I want ISIS to surrender .ok. I want ISIS to surrender  
file3619766 that I want ISIS to surrender .ok. I want ISIS to surrender. Very simple. It's very simple  
file3619766 They go over there and they want to join ISIS .and we have our anchors. I think I got  
file3619766 back, where were you? I was fighting for ISIS . Oh welcome back enjoy yourself. When they  
file3619766 leave our country and they go to fight for ISIS or any of the other groups, they never

'Mosques' is another word that is associated with Muslims in Trump's speech. He again used *hyperbole* as an ideological strategy (Van Dijk 2004) by assuming that, instead of referring to them as places of worship, mosques were referred to as dangerous places that agitate anger which leads to violence. He says, "We have to be tough, we have to be smart. We have to be vigilant .Yes, we have to look at mosques and we have to respect mosques. But

yes we have to look at *mosques*. We have no choice. We have to see what's happening. Because something is happening in there. Man! There is anger... And we have to know about it".

In King Abdullah and President Obama's speeches, a completely different image of Muslims and Islam is presented. 'Muslim(s)' appeared as a keyword in both Abdullah's and Obama's speeches when compared to Trump's speech (see Tables 4 and 10). This shows that it was significantly used more by them than by Trump. Collocates are mainly inclusive in-group lexis with Abdullah using collective lexis and pronouns to associate himself with Muslim, Islam and other Arab States. Common collocates are: 'we', 'other Arab and Muslim states', 'defend', 'nations', 'ordered not to kill', 'values'. When referring to 'Islam', Abdullah also used inclusive lexis, e.g. 'a fight within Islam', 'a war against terrorists who disrespect Islam's values', 'is an offense against humanity as well as Islam' and 'those outlaws of Islam' (See Figure 22).

Figure 22

*Concordance Lines of "Muslim" in Abdullah's Speech*

Query Muslim 11 (6,731.95 per million) 3

file361504... fight will continue. We and other Arab and Muslim states defend not only our people but our  
file361504... is a fight that has to be carried out by Muslim nations first and foremost. A fight within  
file361504... to clarify what it really means to be a Muslim . I and countless other Muslims, have been  
file361504... means to be a Muslim. I and countless other Muslims , have been taught from our earliest years  
file361504... yourself." This is what it means to be a Muslim . Among the very names of God, we hear:  
file361504... with peace. This is what it means to be a Muslim . More than a thousand years ago before  
file361504... years ago before the Geneva Conventions, Muslim soldiers were ordered not to kill a child  
file361504... synagogue. This is what it means to be a Muslim . These are the values I teach my children  
file361504... 's past, present and future. Jordan is a Muslim country, with a deeply-rooted Christian  
file361504... partners in building our country. The world's Muslims have a critical role in global understanding  
file361504... by the ocean of believers - 1.6 billion Muslims worldwide. In fact, these terrorists have

The Image of Muslims in Three Political Speeches: A Corpus-based  
Critical Discourse Analysis

Figure 23

*Concordance Lines of 'Islam' in Abdullah's Speech*

Query islam 5 (3,059.98 per million) ⓘ

file361504... nations first and foremost. A fight within Islam . At the same time, the danger of extremism  
file361504... a war against terrorists who disrespect Islam's values and humanity's values. Our victory  
file361504... destroy a church. These are the same values of Islam we were taught in school as children: not  
file361504... is an offense against humanity as well as Islam . Arab Christians are an integral part of  
file361504... neighbours and strangers. Those outlaws of Islam who deny these truths are vastly outnumbered

In Obama's speech other related keywords also appeared significant, e.g. *Koran, Islam, mosque, faiths, hijab, God's, Muhammad, faith, religious*(See Tables 9 and 10).

Besides the collective pronouns, Obama referred to Muslims as, "Muslim" (68 times: 1.35%), "Muslim Americans" (22 times: 0.43%), "Muslim communities" (9 times: 0.1%) and "Muslim American communities" (4 times: .079%). The most common collocates with these tokens are:*leaders, proud, threat of terrorism, concern, the violent acts of the very few, inexcusable political rhetoric against Muslim Americans that has no place in our country, threats and harassment, targeted, extraordinary, anxiety, a large African American Muslim community, the slaves brought from Africa were Muslim, enrich our lives, worked on Henry Ford's assembly, designed the skyscrapers of Chicago* (see Figures 24 and 25).

Figure 24

Concordance Lines of 'Muslim(s)' in Obama's Speech

Query Muslim: 88 (11,071.31 per million) ③

Page 1 of 4 [Go] Next | Last

file3730667 welcoming me here today, I want to thank Muslim American leaders from across this city  
 file3730667 other great leaders in Congress -- and proud Muslim Americans -- Congressman Keith Ellison  
 file3730667 first thing I want to say is two words that Muslim Americans don't hear often enough -- and  
 file3730667 wanted to come here today, I know that in Muslim communities across our country, this is  
 file3730667 threat of terrorism. But on top of that, as Muslim Americans, you also have another concern  
 file3730667 for the silent acts of the very few. The Muslim American community remains collectively silent  
 file3730667 at least don't know that they know -- a Muslim terrorist. And as a result, many only  
 file3730667 heard inescapable political rhetoric against Muslim Americans that has no place in our country  
 file3730667 surprise, them, that threats and harassment of Muslim Americans have surged. Here at this mosque  
 file3730667 Americans and others who are perceived to be Muslims have been targeted, as well. I just had  
 file3730667 a chance to meet with some extraordinary Muslim Americans from across the country who are  
 file3730667 doing extraordinary work not just in the Muslim community but in the American community  
 file3730667 an analogy echoed in letters I get from Muslim Americans around the country. I've had  
 file3730667 black. There's a large African American Muslim community. That diversity is represented  
 file3730667 today. A 14-year-old boy in Texas who's Muslim spoke for many when he wrote to me and  
 file3730667 the slaves brought here from Africa were Muslim. And even in their bondage, some kept their  
 file3730667 this is not a new thing. Generations of Muslim Americans helped to build our nation. They  
 file3730667 in New York City was built in the 1850s. Muslim Americans worked on Henry Ford's assembly  
 file3730667 Ford's assembly line, cranking out cars. A Muslim American designed the skyscrapers of Chicago  
 file3730667 (Applause.) And perhaps the most pertinent fact, Muslim Americans enrich our lives today in every

Figure 25

Concordance Lines of 'Islam' in Obama's Speech

Query Islam: 18 (2,930.64 per million) ③

file3730667 result, many only hear about Muslims and Islam from the news after an act of terrorism  
 file3730667 thousand years, people have been drawn to Islam's message of peace. And the very word itself  
 file3730667 message of peace. And the very word itself, Islam, comes from salam -- peace. The standard  
 file3730667 peace be upon you. And like so many faiths, Islam is rooted in a commitment to compassion  
 file3730667 to live in peace." Here's another fact: Islam has always been part of America. Starting  
 file3730667 majority -- of the world's Muslims embrace Islam as a source of peace, it is undeniable  
 file3730667 propagate a perverted interpretation of Islam. This is the truth. Groups like al Qaeda  
 file3730667 that America and the West are at war with Islam. And this warped thinking that has found  
 file3730667 leaders and holy warriors who speak for Islam. I refuse to give them legitimacy. We must  
 file3730667 legitimacy. (Applause.) They're not defending Islam. They're not defending Muslims. The vast  
 file3730667, the notion that America is at war with Islam ignores the fact that the world's religions  
 file3730667 United States of America, we do not suppress Islam; we celebrate and lift up the success of  
 file3730667 terrorist propaganda. And we can't suggest that Islam itself is at the root of the problem. That  
 file3730667 show that it is possible to be faithful to Islam and to be part of a pluralistic society  
 file3730667 clash of civilizations between the West and Islam. This is a struggle between the peace-loving  
 file3730667 voices of Muslim clerics who teach that Islam prohibits terrorism, for the Koran says  
 file3730667 scholars, some of whom join us today, who know Islam has a tradition of respect for other faiths  
 file3730667 know it's possible. Across the history of Islam, different sects traditionally have lived

Most of the collocates of Muslim-related lexis were positive, reassuring, and emphasized the Muslims' role in building and

## The Image of Muslims in Three Political Speeches: A Corpus-based Critical Discourse Analysis

enriching America. Obama also distinguished between the Muslim Americans and the acts of terrorism of the 'very few'. He acknowledged the harassment and threats that some Muslims and mosques were subjected to as well as accusations from some politicians which he described as 'inexcusable' and 'has no place in our country'.

### Other Rhetorical Devices

Rhetorical tools are effective persuasive and positioning devices that are employed extensively in the discourse of power (Fairclough, 1995, 2001). They shed light on the ideological strategies in political speeches. Some of the most common rhetorical devices used in the current corpus are the following:

#### 1. Repetition/ parallel structure

Repetition is often used as an effective rhetorical device in speeches for creating an appealing rhythmic resonance. It also works as a reminder of great speeches of great leaders, like Martin Luther King (I have a dream), hence, it often stimulates word associations and underlying meaning. Repetition emphasizes what is said, confirms facts and ideas, as well as creates cohesion

The three speakers under study used repetition extensively.

For example, Donald Trump said: 'We have to be tough, we have to be smart. We have to be vigilant', 'We have no idea who's coming into our country. We have no idea if they love us or they hate us, we have no idea if they wanna bomb us, we have no idea what's going on'.

King Abdullah said: 'Muslim soldiers were ordered not to kill a child, a woman or an old person, not to destroy a tree, not to harm a priest, not to destroy a church.', 'that conflict must be solved by political means- not by force, not by violence. He also repeated '*my friends*' five times in the speech as well as the repetition of '*this is what it means to be a Muslim*' three times in the

speech in a fashion similar to Martin Luther King's 'I have a dream' (see Figure 26)

Figure 26

*Concordance Lines of 'This is what it means to be a Muslim':  
Repetition in Abdullah's Speech*

Query this, is, what, it, means, to, be, a, Muslim 3 (1,835.99 per million) 0

file3730735 your neighbour what you love for yourself." This is what it means to be a Muslim . Among the very names of God, we hear:

file3730735 for the other to be blessed with peace. This is what it means to be a Muslim . More than a thousand years ago before

file3730735 a mosque, not a church, not a synagogue. This is what it means to be a Muslim . These are the values I teach my children

Obama also employed repetition and parallel structures as a rhetorical device, e.g. '...thank you for the wonderful introduction and for your example, your devotion to your faith and your education, and your service to others. You're an inspiration. You're going to be fantastic doctor.'he also said, 'In our lives, we all have many identities. We are sons and daughters, and brothers and sisters. We're classmates; Cub Scout troop members. We're followers of our faith. We're citizens of our country.'

## 2. Three word list

This device is also called "rule of three", "three-part list" or "power of three". It is brief and rhythmic. It compresses information and helps audience remember information, since it creates a pattern and is seen as catchy and funny. It is a tradition that originated in oral storytelling (Atkinson, 1984).

For example, Abdullah II said, 'Jordan's response has been swift, serious and determined.' 'not to destroy or desecrate a place where God is worshipped, not a mosque, not a church, not a synagogue.' 'our faith, like yours, commands mercy, peace and tolerance.' 'this ongoing conflict will breed further hate, violence and terror across the world.

Obama also used three-part list, e.g. 'And the question then is, how do we move forward together? How do we keep our country

## The Image of Muslims in Three Political Speeches: A Corpus-based Critical Discourse Analysis

strong and united? How do we defend ourselves against organizations that are bent on killing innocents?',"Think of your own church, or synagogue, or temple, and a mosque like this will be very familiar'.

Trump said, '...remember that low debt, great cash flow and the greatest assets.'

### 3. Analogies:

Using analogies is another effective rhetorical device used by Trump and Abdullah. The first said: they go back with the World Trade Center. The worst, worse than *Pearl Harbor* because with the World Trade Center they were killing innocent civilians at least while it was a dirty rotten sneak attack at least if they were...But while it was an attack at least it was military but this was an attack on the World Trade Center.

Here Trump compared the terrorist attack on the World Trade Center to the attack on Pearl Harbor during the WW2 that led US entering the war.

Abdullah also reminded Europe of similar situation of the Nazi attacks, saying "remember the ravages that struck the continent in the late 1930s and the World War that followed because of an aggressive, expansionist ideology based on hate and disregard for the very essence of humanity'.

He reminds the world that, 'Europe's war became the World's War', hence, he extends the analogy to the present time leading to the purpose of his speech which is unity and mutual combat of terrorism.

### 4. Religious quotes and God references

Reference to God words and religion is considered a powerful tool of persuasion(Lee, 2014). King Abdullah frequently

referred to quotes from Quran and Prophet Mohammed's words. He started with Arabic words "*Bismillahir-Rahman ar-Rahim*" and referred to the Islamic greeting calling for peace '*Assalamualeikum*'. The use of Arabic words shows from the beginning his desire to reveal his affiliation and solidarity with Muslims and other Muslim states. He also quoted Prophet Muhammed's words, "*None of you has faith until you love for your neighbour what you love for yourself*".

Obama also inserted religious quotations to emphasize a central unity of faith and beliefs, for example, 'we are all God's children', 'we're all born equal'. He drew attention to similarity between religions, e.g. beliefs of 'Abraham, Moses, Jesus, and Muhammad'. He ends by Islam's greetings "May God's peace be upon you" followed by "May God bless the United States of America" to reassure the audience.

## 5. Rhetorical questions

Rhetorical questions are an impressive persuasive device that is frequently used in speeches. They are a type of pseudo-interactivity strategy through which speakers directly address the audience without expecting an answer, in order to create rapport and show familiarity. They are also used to create an effect, emphasize a point or draw the audience attention.

Trump in his seemingly impromptu interactive speech often used rhetorical questions; for example, '*You know what Sharia is?*', '*Can you believe it?*', '*Can I read you the statement?*', '*Can you imagine what our great leaders of the past would have said with the kind of crap happening with us?*' The purpose is to involve and alarm the audience at the same time, and to raise a sense of danger and a need for change.

Obama also frequently used rhetorical questions, for example:

*'And the question then is, how do we move forward together? How do we keep our country strong and united? How do*

**The Image of Muslims in Three Political Speeches: A Corpus-based  
Critical Discourse Analysis**

---

*we defend ourselves against organizations that are bent on killing innocents?'*

Abdullah also used rhetorical questions, e.g. *'how can we fight the ideological battle, if we do not chart the way forward towards Palestinian-Israeli peace?'*

He posed the question to the audience and the world as a way for future joint responsibility against terrorism to resolve "ongoing conflict ...(that) breeds further hate, violence and terror across the world".

#### **6. Making fun of opponent**

Trump often used an alarmist and sarcastic tone, and he also adopted others' voices in order to discredit and undermine his opponents. For example, he criticized the current government for allowing former American ISIS members to come back to America. He said, 'do something with the internet because they are recruiting by the thousands. They are leaving our country and then when they come back, we take them back. Oh come back, where were you? I was fighting for ISIS. Oh welcome back enjoy yourself.

When criticizing the condition of the nuclear Iran deal, he sarcastically says, 'this is called amateur night, you know the Persians are great negotiators... Carrie is a horrible negotiator and Obama is a horrible negotiator... These people are horrible.'

#### **7. Code switching**

Code switching is used by King Abdullah as a rhetorical device to positively present self, appeal to the audience and claim affiliation and solidarity. King Abdullah code switches from English to Arabic and to French. He switched to Arabic to start his speech by the Islamic quote, 'Bismillahir-Rahman ar-Haim' (in the name of God the most merciful and most companionate). He then switches to French to greet people of Strasbourg- France for their hospitality and representation of unity and reconciliation. Then he resumes his speech in English. Code switching in political

discourse is seen as a sign of 'inclusion or separation'. Wei (2003) found that code switching in campaigning discourse in Taiwanese helps the speaker to use ambiguous language thus evade responsibility and obligation. Another reason is to show pride and elevate the status of a language. King Abdullah wanted from the beginning to show affiliation with Islam and the true values of peace and mercifulness. He also resorted to French to show his cultural diversity and gain social approval.

There are other rhetorical tools used by the three speakers, e.g. using statistics and hard evidence (Evidentiality), among others.

### **Findings and Conclusion**

This study is a quantitative - qualitative synergy of CDA and corpus linguistics that aimed at analyzing the linguistic representation and persuasive strategies used in three political speeches that focus on Muslims and Islam. The data of analysis comprised three influential speeches by three world leaders. Each of the speakers was affected by his ideological stance and purpose of delivering the speech which, in turn, induced the language choices and rhetorical devices used.

The qualitative tools of analysis were based on several analytical frameworks, mainly: van Dijk's (2004) 28 ideological strategies and 'self-positive representation' and 'other negative representation' which entail using in-group and out-group lexis. There are other sub-strategies such as: categorization, consensus, evidentiality, hyperbole, irony, lexicalization, polarization, victimization, among others. These stem from other CDA analytical frameworks, e.g. by Halliday's (1994) (lexical choices that subsume the use of 'inclusive' and 'exclusive' lexis), Fairclough (1995, 2015) (rhetorical strategies) and Wodak (2001) (self-other presentation and use of inclusive and exclusive lexis).

The study started by the quantitative analysis that employed tools of corpus linguistics using sketch engine corpus manager and analysis software. The main features used were word frequency lists, keyword extraction and concordance search. The results extracted from these tools were the main data and basis for the

## The Image of Muslims in Three Political Speeches: A Corpus-based Critical Discourse Analysis

---

qualitative analysis. Hence, the quantitative investigations enabled more objective and effective qualitative analysis.

The speeches of the three leaders were successful in crafting language to suit their purposes. The three speeches are considered effective tools for transmitting the ideology and purpose of the speakers. Thus, audience in the three speeches revealed enthusiasm and rapport with the speakers which were revealed in the applause and other verbal reactions.

All speakers used language to present themselves positively and varied in the degree of presenting the 'other'. Trump was more daring to discredit and attack 'the other', especially the 'Muslim other', since his speech was part of his electoral campaign, so it was seen logical then to discredit his opponents to justify the need for his election. He also intensified the fear in audience and raised an alarmist environment as another tool for justifying his election.

King Abdullah and President Obama were more composed and rational in developing their argument. They also presented themselves positively to the audience. They both attacked terrorism without directing their attack to a specific creed.

Several rhetorical devices were unanimously shared by the three speakers to help present their cases and persuade and convince the audience of their position. For instance, they used, in varying degrees: Repetition, three-part list, analogies, rhetorical questions, religious quotes and God references, discrediting the other's argument, code switching, among others.

Trump, in his presidential campaign, wanted mainly to discredit the present government as well as disperse a feeling of danger springing from the recent terrorist acts and the inadequacy of the present government to deal with them. That is why most of the lexical items especially those associated with Muslims and Islam were negative, discriminating and biased. He appealed to the people's fear, thus addressing their emotions rather than logical

thinking and common sense. He also presented all Muslims collectively as one homogeneous group and interpreted the motive behind terrorist acts as basic and fundamental in Islam's principles. He used Islamic terms as 'Sharia' and 'Jihad' negatively as the basis of hate and reason for all the terrorist acts towards the non-Muslims. All this was leading to his final declaration of a complete ban of all Muslims coming into the United States of America. Trump presented himself positively (glorified self) as a decisive competent person who wanted to take drastic actions to protect America at the expense of the whole 'minority' and colored communities in the USA. He presented the 'other' as *incompetent, stupid, dishonest, weak, etc.*

He also used several rhetorical devices to support his argument, e.g. victimization, overgeneralization, hyperbole, repetition, analogies, evidentiality (hard evidence and statistics), rhetorical questions and ridiculing and making fun of the opponent.

Both King Abdullah and President Obama had different purposes for delivering their speeches from Trump. They wanted to condemn terrorism, but they also wanted to stress the collective responsibility of the parties involved in facing terrorism as a joint responsibility of all parties involved. For King Abdullah, it is the responsibility of the Arab world as well as Europe. For Obama, it is the responsibility of the whole nation with all its different sects, Muslim-Americans included. They also shared their desire to present a positive image of Muslims evidenced in the collocates used. They emphasized the fact that terrorists do not represent the whole Muslim community or reflect the principles of Islam. They are radical thinkers who seek power and use religion as a cover for their desire for power and domination, thus intentionally misinterpret Islam's principles.

Abdullah and Obama used different techniques in presenting self and the other. King Abdullah was keen to represent himself as a symbol of a true Muslim who embodies the moderate principles of Islam which he practices as a King, an Arab, husband and father. The 'other' to Abdullah was Europe which he presented as a

## The Image of Muslims in Three Political Speeches: A Corpus-based Critical Discourse Analysis

---

partner in combating global terrorism. When referring to terrorism he used general abstract nouns, and he also referred to specific terrorist groups as 'Daeish'. He was keen to use polarization and collective lexis to emphasize solidarity with the audience, Europe and the world. His main rhetorical tools were analogy, repetition and code switching.

Obama's speech aimed at addressing the Muslim-American audience and community at large, and give them compassion and reassurance that they were an integral part of *America*, which appeared as the first keyword in his speech in comparison to the speeches of Trump and Abdullah. The speech counters Trump's attacks at Muslims and is described as a 'timely thought-provoking' speech. The main keywords in the speech were mainly related to Muslims and America. The main devices Obama used were showing respect to Muslims who were not presented as the 'other', but as an integral part of the American community. He also used consensus, polarization, religious quotes from Koran, drew attention to their shared historical background, emphasized collective usages of language, and emphasized joint responsibility to face the danger of nation extremism.

## References

Adetunji, A. (2006). Inclusion and Exclusion in Political Discourse: Deixis in Olusegun Obasanjo's Speeches. *Journal of Language and Linguistics*, 5 (2), 177-191.

Al-Hejin, B. (2012). *Covering Muslim women: A corpus-based critical discourse analysis of the BBC and Arab News* (Doctoral dissertation, Lancaster University). Retrieved from <http://ethos.bl.uk/OrderDetails.do?uin=uk.bl.ethos.627632>

Al-Majali, W. (2015). Discourse Analysis of the Political Speeches of the Ousted Arab Presidents during the Arab Spring Revolution using Halliday and Hasan's Framework of Cohesion. *Journal of Literature, Languages and Linguistics*, 10, 35-48.

Atkinson, J. M. (1984) *Our Masters' Voices: The Language and Body Language of Politics*. London: Methuen.

Awass, O. (1996). *The Representation of Islam in the American media*. *Hamdard Islamicus*, 19(3):87-102.

Baker, P., Gabrielatos, C., Khozravini, M., Krzyzanowski, M., McEnery, T. and 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 & Society*, 19(3), 273-305.

Baker, P., Gabrielatos, C., & McEnery, T. (2016). Sketching Muslims: A Corpus Driven Analysis of Representations Around the Word 'Muslim' in the British Press 1998-2009. *Applied Linguistics*, 34 (3), 255-272. Retrieved from <http://apllj.oxfordjournals.org/content/34/3/255.full>

Bridge Initiative Team, (BIT) (2015) 'Trump Calls for Ban on Muslims, Cites Deeply Flawed Poll'. Retrieved from <http://bridge.georgetown.edu/new-poll-on-american-muslims-is-grounded-in-bias-riddled-with-flaws/>.

**The Image of Muslims in Three Political Speeches: A Corpus-based  
Critical Discourse Analysis**

---

Dunn, K. (2001). Representations of Islam in the Politics of Mosque Development in Sydney. *Tijdschrift voor Economische en Sociale Geografie*, 92(3), 291-308. Retrieved from <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/1467-9663.00158/epdf>

Fairclough, N. (1995). *Critical Discourse Analysis: The Critical Study of Language*. London: NewLongman.

Fairclough, N. (2001). *Language and Power*. Pearson Education.

Fairclough, N. (2015). *Critical Discourse Analysis*. Retrieved from [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/281506450\\_Critical\\_Discourse\\_Analysis](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/281506450_Critical_Discourse_Analysis)

Halliday, M.A.K. (1994). *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*. 2nd edition. London: Edward Arnold.

Halliday, M.A.K. and Hasan, R. (1976). *Cohesion in English*. London: Longman.

Hasan, M. (2016). *Thank you Obama for your Mosque Speech*. Retrieved from <http://www.aljazeera.com/indepth/opinion/2016/02/big-obama-mosque-speech-160204075434687.html>

Janks, H. (2016). *Critical Discourse Analysis as a Research Tool*. Retrieved from <http://www.uv.es/gimenez/Recursos/criticaldiscourse.pdf>

Krzyzanowski, M. (2005). 'European identity wanted!': On discursive and communicative dimensions of the European Convention. In R. Wodak, & P. Chilton (Eds.), *A New Agenda in (Critical) Discourse Analysis: Discourse Approaches to Politics, Society and Culture*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company (pp. 137-163).

Lamb, B. (2016). *Analyzing Persuasive Language*. Retrieved from <http://lessonbucket.com/english/year-9-english/persuasive-language/analysing-persuasive-language/>

## Dr. Manar Shalaby

Lee, K. (2014). *How to Use 10 Psychological Theories to Persuade People*. Retrieved from <https://www.fastcompany.com/3030173/work-smart/how-to-use-10-psychological-theories-to-persuade-people>

Meyer, M. (2001). 'Between theory, method, and politics: positioning of the approaches to CDA'. In R. Wodak and M. Meyer (Eds.), *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis: Introducing Qualitative Methods*. London: SAGE Publications (pp. 14-31), retrieved from [http://www.fib.unair.ac.id/jdownloads/Materi%20Kuliah/Magister%20Kajian%20Sastra%20dan%20Budaya/Analisis%20Wacana/methods of critical discourse analysis ruth wodak and michael meyer sage publications 2001.pdf](http://www.fib.unair.ac.id/jdownloads/Materi%20Kuliah/Magister%20Kajian%20Sastra%20dan%20Budaya/Analisis%20Wacana/methods%20of%20critical%20discourse%20analysis%20ruth%20wodak%20and%20michael%20meyer%20sage%20publications%202001.pdf)

Miller, D (2004). " . . . to meet our common challenge": Engagement Strategies of Alignment and Alienation in Current US International Discourse. In M. Gotti and C. Christopher (Eds.), *Textus*, 14(1), 39-62.

Moore, K., Mason, P., & Lewis, J. (2008). Images of Islam in the UK: The Representation of British Muslims in the National Print News Media 2000-2008. *Cardiff School of Journalism, Media and Cultural Studies*. Retrieved from <http://orca.cf.ac.uk/53005/1/08channel4-dispatches.pdf>

Moustafa, B. (2015). *Linguistic Gender Identity Construction in Political Discourse: A Corpus-Assisted Analysis of the Primary Speeches of Barack Obama and Hillary Clinton*. PhD Dissertation. Johannes Gutenberg University of Mainz. Retrieved from <http://ubm.opus.hbz-nrw.de/volltexte/2015/4031/pdf/doc.pdf>

Rahimi, Foroug and Riasati, Mohammad J. (2011). Critical Discourse Analysis: Scrutinizing Ideologically-Driven Discourses. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science Vol. 1 No. 16; November 2011*: 107-112

Rashidi, N. & Souzandehfar, M. (2010). A Critical Discourse Analysis of the Debates between Republicans and Democrats over the Continuation of War in Iraq. *The Journal of Linguistic and Intercultural Education*,

**The Image of Muslims in Three Political Speeches: A Corpus-based  
Critical Discourse Analysis**

---

3, 55-82. Retrieved from [http://www.uab.ro/jolie/2010/4\\_rashidi-souzandehfar.pdf](http://www.uab.ro/jolie/2010/4_rashidi-souzandehfar.pdf)

Savoy, J. (2009). *Lexical Analysis of Obama's and McCain's Speeches*. Retrieved from <http://members.unine.ch/jacques.savoy/Papers/USspeeches.pdf>

VanDijk, T. A. (2004). *Politics, ideology and discourse*. Retrieved from <http://www.discourses.org/OldArticles/Politics,%20Ideology%20and%20Discourse.pdf>

Van Dijk, T. (2009). Critical Discourse Studies: A Sociocognitive Approach. In R. Wodak & M. Meyer (Eds.), *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*, 2(1), 62-86.

VanLeeuwen, T.J. (1996). The Representation of Social Actors. In C.R. Caldas-Coulthard & M. Coulthard (Eds.), *Texts and Practices. Readings in Critical Discourse Analysis*. London: Routledge (pp. 32-70).

Wang, J. (2010). A Critical Discourse Analysis of Barack Obama's Speeches. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 1 (3), 254-261. Retrieved from <http://www.academypublication.com/issues/past/jltr/vol01/03/12.pdf>

Wei, J. M. Y. (2003). Codeswitching in Campaigning Discourse: The Case of Taiwanese President Chen Shui-bian. *Language and Linguistics*, 4(1), 139-165.

Wodak, R. (1996). The Genesis of Racist Discourse in Austria since 1989. In C.R. Caldas-Coulthard & M. Coulthard (Eds.), *Texts and practices: Readings in Critical Discourse Analysis*. London: Routledge (pp. 107-128).

Wodak, R. (2001). The Discourse-Historical Approach. In R. Wodak & M. Meyer (Eds.), *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*. London: Sage. Retrieved from

---

[http://fib.unair.ac.id/jdownloads/Materi%20Kuliah/Magister%20Kajian%20Sastra%20dan%20Budaya/Analisis%20Wacana/methods\\_of\\_critical\\_discourse\\_analysis\\_ruth\\_wodak\\_and\\_michael\\_meyer\\_sage\\_publications\\_20010.pdf#page=23](http://fib.unair.ac.id/jdownloads/Materi%20Kuliah/Magister%20Kajian%20Sastra%20dan%20Budaya/Analisis%20Wacana/methods_of_critical_discourse_analysis_ruth_wodak_and_michael_meyer_sage_publications_20010.pdf#page=23)

Wodak, R. (2011). *'Us' and 'them': inclusion and exclusion – discrimination via discourse*. In G. Delanty, R. Wodak, P. Jones (Eds.). *Identity, Belonging and Migration*. Liverpool: University of Liverpool Press (pp. 54-77).

Wooffitt, R. (2002). Rhetoric in English. In J. Maybin & N. Mercer (Eds.). *Using English: From Conversation to Canon*. The Open University, Dublin, York: Longman.

Zurloni, V., Anolli, L. (2013). Fallacies as Argumentative Devices in Political Debates. In I. Poggi, F. D'Errico, L. Vincze, & A. Vinciarelli (Eds.). *Multimodal Communication in Political Speech: Shaping Minds and Social Action*. Italy: Springer (pp. 245- 257).