

Topic identification behind political discourse: What was said and what was meant?

Khadija Hadj Djelloul^{a1}, Moulay Taher University of Saida, BP 138 cité ENNASR 20000, Saida, Algeria, khadija.hadjdjelloul@univ-saida.dz

M'hamed Benzayed^b, Moulay Taher University of Saida, BP 138 cité ENNASR 20000, Saida, Algeria, benzayedabdelkader58@yahoo.com

Suggested Citation:

Djelloul, K.H. & Benzayed, M. (2024). Topic identification behind political discourse: What was said and what was meant?. *International Journal of New Trends in Social Science*, 8(2), 43-52. <https://doi.org/10.18844/ijss.v8i2.9601>

Received May 10, 2024; revised September 2, 2024; accepted November 08, 2024.

Selection and peer review under the responsibility of Prof. Dr. Ana Carvalho Campina, Universidade Fernando Pessoa, Porto, Portugal.

©2024 by the authors. Licensee United World Innovation Research and Publishing Center, North Nicosia, Cyprus. This article is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

©iThenticate Similarity Rate: 10%

Abstract

Language plays a crucial role in shaping meaning, yet the same words can convey different messages depending on context, intent, and audience perception. This phenomenon is particularly evident in political discourse, where leaders strategically use language to persuade, influence, and control narratives. While extensive research has examined political rhetoric, there remains a gap in understanding how key political figures manipulate discourse to align with their agendas. This study aims to analyze the underlying themes in the speeches of Egyptian President Hosni Mubarak during the 2011 Arab Spring Uprising and British politician Andrea Leadsom's Prime Minister campaign speech on July 4, 2016. Using a discourse analysis methodology, the study examines how linguistic choices, rhetorical strategies, and implicit messaging shape audience interpretation. The findings reveal a significant disparity between the explicit content of these speeches and their underlying political intentions, highlighting the strategic use of language in crisis and leadership narratives. This research contributes to the field of political communication by offering insights into how discourse is employed as a tool of persuasion and control, emphasizing the need for critical analysis in interpreting political rhetoric.

Keywords: Discourse; political discourse; speech; topic identification.

* ADDRESS FOR CORRESPONDENCE: Khadija Hadj Djelloul, Moulay Taher University of Saida, BP 138 cité ENNASR 20000, Saida, Algeria. E-mail address: khadija.hadjdjelloul@univ-saida.dz

1. INTRODUCTION

Discourse analysis has recently gained prominence in many fields of knowledge where researchers have interests and their studies aim at discovering related features. As such, political discourse has peculiar characteristics that make it different from other forms of discourse. Among these features, words or terms play a pivotal role in politicians' efforts to legitimize their quest and maximize the effectiveness of their communication with the receiving end (Sun & Liu 2023); they systematically influence the audience to adopt a positive attitude, alter their perceptions and beliefs, and guide them toward a specific political action. Implicit target topics are identified behind politicians' discourses.

Accordingly, the present work intends to shed some light on the issue by selecting two sample speeches. It revolves around the role of words in the speech of Egyptian President Hosni Mubarak during the Arab Spring Uprising in 2011 and the candidacy speech by Andrea Leadsom held on July 4, 2016. Contemporary incidents motivated the selected speeches, helping to uncover the study's purpose. Before delving in, it is necessary, first, to account for the concepts of discourse, political discourse, and external contexts. After that, it is important to consider term analyses that lead to the identification of different topics.

It is difficult to define the term discourse since there are a plethora of academic works that offer analyses of selected texts. Harmon (2017) purposefully used the term "descriptions" instead of "definitions" because attempts to explain the concept and pass for a clear definition seem to capture some of its aspects but lack sufficient precision.

1.1. Literature review

1.1.1. Discourse

Discourse remains an ambiguous field; however, it is an entity that requires understanding and realization of its content and connotation. Researchers in this field are required to have a grasp of the linguistic, anthropological, psychological, social, communicative, analytical, and critical aspects of a speech to arrive at a full and thorough understanding (Anderau & Barbarrusa 2024). However, they encounter a dilemma where they have to specify and select concepts, even though the terminology is widely used in common social and cultural spheres.

Purvis & Hunt (1993), Oswald, (2024), and Hu, (2024) determined discourse as a platform of interaction through any means of effective communication. Fairclough and Wodak (1997) stressed the implications and social consequences of discourse, especially the relation between it and power. Chilton (2004) connected discourse with institutions and pointed out the essential correspondence between them. To define discourse, one should make a distinction with texts; however, a hang back occurs when coming to that point.

1.1.2. The political discourse

Traditionally, political discourse is strictly connected to power (Kwame et al., 2023). Schäffner (1996), Gherghina et al., (2023), and Kujanen et al., (2024) argued that politicians do not deliver speeches as individuals, but rather as representatives of political parties'


Djelloul, K.H. & Benzayed, M. (2024). Topic identification behind political discourse: What was said and what was meant?. *International Journal of New Trends in Social Science*, 8(2), 43-52. <https://doi.org/10.18844/ijss.v8i2.9601>

governments, or nations. Van Dijk (1997) clarifies that political discourse involves more than just politicians. Other various recipients of political communicative events, such as the public, the people, citizens, the masses, and other groups are included.

Political speech as a part of political discourse does not need much explanation for it has always been scholars' and journalists' favorite subject of interest and investigation (Wodak, 2005). A political speech is meant for a broad audience. It typically addresses questions of common interest. In other words, a political speech is built upon an exigence as a situation that is "marked by a sense of urgency" (Bitzer 1968) and needs action to be solved. This perception of the essence of political speech seems to fit in with the concept by Fairclough (2012) since it is in agreement with what they call "circumstances"

Figure 1

Structural constituents of political discourse



Source: Fairclough (2012).

The speeches by the Egyptian president and the British prime minister candidate, which will be presented below, align with specific circumstances and, therefore, unquestionably form the core of political discourse. This can be found in the established typology by Reisigl & Wodak (2005).

1.1.3. External contexts

1.1.3.1. The Arab Spring uprising

The end of 2010 witnessed unprecedented tensions as masses of anti-government protests began in Tunisia. Shortly after, a series of revolts in countries in the Middle East and North Africa occurred. From Libya to Syria, there have been countless losses notably in Egypt. On January 25, 2011, marches, demonstrations, and civil resistance began in Cairo, and lasted for 18 days until Hosni Mubarak finally succumbed to an overturn after being in power for 30 years.

1.1.3.2. British Prime Minister Campaign 2016

Djelloul, K.H. & Benzayed, M. (2024). Topic identification behind political discourse: What was said and what was meant?. *International Journal of New Trends in Social Science*, 8(2), 43-52. <https://doi.org/10.18844/ijss.v8i2.9601>

In the Brexit referendum held on 23rd June 2016, the majority of British people chose to leave the European Union, and David Cameron, who supported the “Remain” campaign, announced his resignation as the Conservative Party Leader and Prime Minister, which meant the necessity of appointing his successor. Andrea Leadsom, an internationally known politician, was one of the candidates who ran for office. The present study analyzes Leadsom’s launch speech held on July 4, 2016.

1.2. Purpose of study

This study aims to analyze the underlying themes in the speeches of Egyptian President Hosni Mubarak during the 2011 Arab Spring Uprising and British politician Andrea Leadsom’s Prime Minister campaign speech on July 4, 2016.

2. METHOD AND MATERIALS

This study employs a discourse analysis methodology to examine the implicit and explicit meanings within political speeches, focusing on the linguistic and rhetorical strategies used by Egyptian President Hosni Mubarak during the 2011 Arab Spring Uprising and British politician Andrea Leadsom in her Prime Minister campaign speech on July 4, 2016. The analysis involves identifying key themes, lexical choices, and persuasive techniques to uncover the underlying messages conveyed in each speech. By comparing the divergence between what was explicitly stated and the intended meaning, the study highlights how political figures manipulate language to shape public perception and maintain authority. This qualitative approach provides a deeper understanding of political rhetoric and its role in influencing audiences during moments of political tension and leadership transition.

3. RESULTS

3.1. The analysis of Mubarak’s speech

Lahlali (2011) examined the themes and structures of the last speech by President Hosni Mubarak before he was forced out of office. One of the significant aspects of his speech was the repetition of themes rather than phrases or single words. This aspect was observed by Al-Majali (2015) who concluded that repetition in the presidential speeches was intended to threaten civilian protestors. Al-Majali (2015) examined Mubarak’s speeches using Halliday and Hassan’s (1976) framework of cohesion. Results revealed that Mubarak used linguistic features different from the ones he usually did. He used repetition, hyponyms, and synonyms to serve purposes such as political ideologies and to threaten the protestors in the current study.

Anagondahalli (2013) examined the image repair strategies used by Hosni Mubarak during the Arab Spring. The researcher aimed to investigate how Mubarak responded to and represented himself. According to him, Mubarak used: *denial*, *evasion of responsibility*, *reduction of offensiveness*, and *corrective action*. The *mortification* strategy was never used by Mubarak, who tried to deflect the anger toward “unnamed others” instead of himself. Furthermore, Adimi (2011) used three words to describe Mubarak’s speech: *paternalism*, *selfishness*, and *falsity*. He posited that the latter depicted himself as a father figure in an

attempt to sympathize with the protesters. Mubarak used the first-person pronoun (I) many times, signifying his geocentrism. He also blamed others for conspiracy theories that supported his delusions. As previously illustrated, we inferred all of this by analyzing Mubarak's speech and identifying significant topics.

3.2. The analysis of Leadsom's speech

Two big values are strongly accentuated in Leadsom's speech: *freedom* ("We are choosing freedom away from the stifling EU institutions") and *democracy* ("Our democracy is the oldest in the world"). It is pointed out that *freedom* enables *democracy*. Hence, the consequence of a referendum is illustrated as a big success that gave back freedom to the British people. The conceptualization offered is that of a war just won against an oppressor. The use of the fall of the Berlin Wall puts an additional emphasis.

Leadsom states "*a division within the nation*", with an observation that "the referendum did not cause divisions but it rather reveals them", which dismisses the idea that the referendum is the origin of the problem. She hurried with an appeal for unity and the assurance that there were no worries: "What I would like to say to them is please: Don't be afraid; We haven't lost our senses; We haven't stopped caring about each other; We haven't stopped loving our families and children; We haven't stopped loving our country either".

Leadsom realizes that many citizens are not happy about their economic situation, ("The importance of wealth and job creation is core to all my beliefs...", "Workers' rights under my leadership will be protected and enhanced."). She further implicitly points out the guilty of the situation: "*The EU elites failed to handle crucial problems*". She attributed the British people's wish to exit the EU to the responsibility of the EU elites. Leadsom's set of circumstances justifies the need to respond with solutions.

"*Bringing the nation together*" and "*building a greater Britain*" (outside the EU) were the relevant goals to be pursued by the new government as the speaker mentions. Since the decision about Brexit is considered final, *bringing the nation together* can only mean convincing the unconvinced about the 'leave'. Building a greater Britain appeals to her because she believes that Great Britain is already great and can only become even better.

The call for action in every election campaign speech is always the same: *Vote for me*. It is a transparent invitation to elect her. "Why me?" she claimed, why her? She claims to have the right attitude (reflected in her promises and commitments), skills, and qualifications. So, it is recommended to select her for leadership (call for action).

4. DISCUSSION

Generally speaking, political discourses reflect the crisis that is experienced, if not exacerbating it further. They are primarily exploited by political leaders to persuade the public to adopt their policies and to convince them of their righteousness in facing threatening crises. In the political domain, terms often undergo a shift, deviating from their original meanings and acquiring new connotations that vary in their proximity or divergence from the primary identified topics. Sometimes the terms employed do not reach the level of

Djelloul, K.H. & Benzayed, M. (2024). Topic identification behind political discourse: What was said and what was meant?. *International Journal of New Trends in Social Science*, 8(2), 43-52. <https://doi.org/10.18844/ijss.v8i2.9601>

expectation held by the receiving audience. When extracted from their original contexts, these terms might confine us to narrow connotations. Nevertheless, if we return a word to its original context, we can unravel embedded meanings and subsequent topics, that the speaker and subsequently the recipient intend to convey.

Certain thematic fields within Mubarak's speech have exhibited recurring topics, notably: authoritative messages devoid of sympathy. Mubarak employed the father figure image as a strategy to steer clear of the dictatorial image. Mubarak's speech could have been more sympathetic and realistic if the geocentrism he used had not been apparent in his use of the (I) pronoun. Rather, he could have shown greater understanding, awareness, and appreciation of the protesters' demands. He failed to uphold the expectations of someone who truly listened to their concerns. Ultimately, Mubarak employed positive tactics to present himself as informed and to convey goodwill and virtue to the public. However, his real political objective was to remain in power or transfer it to his successor.

5. CONCLUSION

All the above points in Leadsom's discourse can lead to the deduction that what was meant was that British people appreciated democracy and freedom and since Brexit did not occur, these values could not be converted. The referendum result with its ramifications means a big chance for the British people to regain democracy and freedom. Due to the difficult economic, political, and social circumstances, achieving targets posed a big challenge for the new prime minister. However, given Leadsom's qualifications, it was advisable to entrust her with leadership.

Despite attempts to understand the meanings of the used terms, it is impossible to fully identify the intended topic. Consequently, the process of analysis remains limited endeavors in any given work or discourse. However, emphasizing the importance of context does not, in any case, nullify the meaning, which still retains its significance in exploring the textual connotation.

Conflict of interest: No potential conflict of interest was reported by the authors.

Ethical Approval: The study adheres to the ethical guidelines for conducting research.

Funding: This research did not receive any specific grant from funding agencies in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

REFERENCES

- Adimi, A. (2011). Analysing Hosni Mubarak's Speech: Paternity, Selfishness and Deception. *Dr. Ahmed Adimi Blog*. <http://adimiahmed.overblog.com/article-68720736.html>
- 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 Education and Practice*, 6(14), 96-108. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1080129>

- Djelloul, K.H. & Benzayed, M. (2024). Topic identification behind political discourse: What was said and what was meant?. *International Journal of New Trends in Social Science*, 8(2), 43-52. <https://doi.org/10.18844/ijss.v8i2.9601>
- Anagondahalli, D. (2013). Prior reputation and the transition from image repair to image makeover: The case of Hosni Mubarak. *Public relations review*, 39(3), 241-244. <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0363811113000465>
- Anderau, G., & Barbarrusa, D. (2024). The Function of Memes in Political Discourse. *Topoi*, 43(5), 1529-1546. <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s11245-024-10112-0>
- Bitzer, L. F. (1968). The rhetorical situation. *Philosophy & Rhetoric*, 1-14. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/40236733>
- Chilton, P. (2004). *Analyzing political discourse: Theory and practice*. Routledge. <https://www.taylorfrancis.com/books/mono/10.4324/9780203561218/analysing-political-discourse-paul-chilton>
- Fairclough, I. (2012). Political discourse analysis.
- Fairclough, N., & Wodak, R. (1997). Critical Discourse Analysis. In T.A. van Dijk (Ed.), *Discourse Studies: A Multidisciplinary Introduction 2* (pp. 258-284). London: Sage.
- Gherghina, S., Soare, S., & Jacquet, V. (2023). Political parties and deliberation: from challenges to opportunities. *Acta Politica*, 58(3), 487-494. <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1057/s41269-023-00294-7>
- Halliday, M.A.K. and R. Hasan. (1976). *Cohesion in English*. London: Longman.
- Harmon, L. (2017). Political discourse as practical reasoning: A case study of a British Prime Minister candidate speech. *Linguistics Beyond and Within (LingBaW)*, 3(3), 74-86. <https://www.ceeol.com/search/article-detail?id=716615>
- Hu, C. (2024). Modeling the audience's perception of security in media discourse. *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications*, 11(1), 1-10. <https://www.nature.com/articles/s41599-024-03079-1>
- Kujanen, M., Koskimaa, V., & Raunio, T. (2024). President's constitutional powers and public activism: a focused analysis of presidential speeches under Finland's two presidencies. *Comparative European Politics*, 1-22. <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1057/s41295-023-00375-z>
- Kwame, A., Makarova, V., Hudu, F., & Petrucka, P. M. (2023). The Covid-19 pandemic in Ghana: exploring the discourse strategies in President Nana Addo's speeches. *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications*, 10(1). <https://www.nature.com/articles/s41599-023-02253-1>
- Lahlali, M. (2011). The Arab Spring and the discourse of desperation: shifting from an authoritarian discourse to a "democratic one". *The Journal. of Arab Media and Society. —Cairo: American Univ. in Cairo*, (13).
- Oswald, L. (2024). More than news! Mapping the deliberative potential of a political online ecosystem with digital trace data. *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications*, 11(1), 1-16. <https://www.nature.com/articles/s41599-024-03115-0>
- Purvis, T., & Hunt, A. (1993). Discourse, ideology, discourse, ideology, discourse, ideology... *British journal of sociology*, 473-499. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/591813>

- Djelloul, K.H. & Benzayed, M. (2024). Topic identification behind political discourse: What was said and what was meant?. *International Journal of New Trends in Social Science*, 8(2), 43-52. <https://doi.org/10.18844/ijss.v8i2.9601>
- Reisigl, M., & Wodak, R. (2005). *Discourse and discrimination: Rhetorics of racism and antisemitism*. Routledge. <https://www.taylorfrancis.com/books/mono/10.4324/9780203993712/discourse-discrimination-martin-reisigl-ruth-wodak>
- Schaffner, C. (1996). Political speeches and discourse analysis. *Current issues in language & society*, 3(3), 201-204. <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/13520529609615471>
- Sun, J., & Liu, Z. (2023). Evaluation Mechanism of Political Discourse: A Holistic Approach. *Journal of Psycholinguistic Research*, 52(6), 2143-2179. <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s10936-023-09988-7>
- Van Dijk, T. A. (1997). What is Political Discourse Analysis? Retrieved from: <http://www.discourses.org/OldArticles/Politics,%20Ideology%20and%20Discourse.pdf>
- Wodak, R. (2005). *Language and Politics*.

Appendices

Appendix I: The Speech of Andrea Leadsom

The decision we took on the 23rd of June was a great moment in history. Not just a historic opportunity for our country but for Europe as a whole. Perhaps the biggest moment since the Berlin Wall came down. We are not leaving any of our historic ties with our European friends, we are choosing freedom away from the stifling EU institutions. Through NATO we remain bound through the 1949 treaty to come to the defense of Europe's democracies if they are attacked. The nations and peoples of Europe remain our close friends, staunch allies, and key trading partners. I believe, however, that our vote to leave the EU will be a positive wake-up call for those European elites who have been far too complacent about:

- Youth unemployment that is wrecking lives in S Europe
- The declining share of world trade that threatens Europe's progress, and
- The failure of the Brussels machine to respond to globalization.

Because of our decision on June 23, we are no longer bound to that EU model. We will have our freedom back. Today I want to talk first about our future place in Europe, second about building a greater Britain, and then, third, about why I am the best choice to lead our country forward. I want to start with the result of the referendum and the clear choice of the British people. The result is final. It must be respected and I will respect it. The United Kingdom will leave the European Union. Freedom of movement will end and the British parliament will decide how many people enter our country each year to live, work, and contribute to our national life. Billions of pounds more will be invested in the NHS from the savings we make from canceling our EU membership fee. The laws and regulations that govern the British people will be made in Britain – and not Brussels. And at elections, the British people will be able to appoint or sack politicians, secure in the knowledge that the EU bureaucracy cannot undermine their wishes. I intend to keep the negotiations as short as possible. Neither we nor our European friends need prolonged uncertainty and not everything needs to be negotiated before Article 50 is triggered and the exit process is concluded. My team will set out trade, border, and security agreements – our renegotiation will be in the hands of a dedicated Cabinet colleague. I emphasize 'dedicated'. The team that I will assemble to lead Britain out of the EU will consult opposition politicians, business people, farmers, trade unions, and trade negotiators. I will closely consult with colleagues from the Scottish, Welsh, and Northern Irish devolved parliaments, as well as here in Westminster, to make the most of the huge opportunity that lies ahead. I will do everything in my power to keep the United Kingdom United.

And this brings me to my second of three themes for today. The next prime minister must bring the nation together. The EU referendum didn't cause divisions but it certainly did reveal them. Many people are shocked at the result but they really shouldn't be. What I would like to say to them is please: Don't be afraid; We haven't lost our senses; We haven't stopped caring about each other; We haven't stopped loving our families and children; We haven't stopped loving our country either; We've just rediscovered our Freedom!

Many fellow citizens are unhappy with the way the economy works for them. So, it won't be enough to protect the working people of this country by just reducing the flow of low-skilled labor – although that is necessary. When there is room for tax cuts they must be focused on the low-paid. The importance of wealth and job creation is core to all my beliefs

but the richest people of Britain should know that they will not be my priority. Britain will make her way in the world by investing in the skills of her people – not by expecting them to adopt unacceptable conditions. And those people who have become rich by winning boardroom pay rises that bear no relation to company performance should be aware that I find this unacceptable. Too few people in my old field of financial services were ever brought to book for their part in the 2008 crash.

I'll continue to build on the good work that George Osborne has done in reducing the deficit. We have to get our house in order. The Chancellor's sound northern powerhouse project needs to be supercharged, and I won't forget that Sunderland was one of the first to make very clear, last Friday morning, the desire for change. I will appoint a key minister for housing and try my hardest to keep him or her in the job for the rest of the parliament. I want a minister who thinks of nothing other than how to use a bigger housing budget to deliver on the aspirations of the working people of this country. As well as spending more on roads, railways, and broadband I'll make rapid decisions on airport expansion. Business needs certainty. I will prioritize new trade deals with the fastest-growing parts of the world, a simpler tax system, and an immigration policy focused on bringing the most talented people to our country. Workers' rights under my leadership will be protected and enhanced, as my friend Gisela Stuart MP and I made clear during the referendum debates. The national living wage, the apprenticeship levy, and Michael Gove's important pupil premium will all be safe under my watch. And commit today to immediately guaranteeing the rights of our EU friends who have already come here to live and work. We must give them certainty – they will not be bargaining chips in our negotiations.

Finally, why me? It was a big decision to put myself forward to lead our country. One that was driven by my absolute conviction that our future, and that of our children and grandchildren, will be so much better outside the EU. But my real passion in politics is my desire for social justice – for a transformation of our society. For nearly two decades I've been chairing and founding new charities to support the earliest years of life. There is no doubt that the period from conception to the age of two is critical...it is during this period that the lifelong emotional capacity of a human being is largely set up and established. Being able to learn, being able to make friendships, to hold down a job, to have a sense of self-worth. These sound very basic, but for too many in our country, these things are elusive. And there's a financial angle to this. The choice our country faces is simple: We spend more on early intervention or we spend much more later on picking up the pieces of lives that struggled at school, struggled in work, and all too often found themselves without hope. I am certain we can change that, and my absolute commitment to it and the emotional health of our nation.