Persuasion Strategies in Political Discourse: A Narrative Review of Recent Studies from Linguistics Perspective

Dunya Al Jazrawi[1], Zeena Al Jazrawi[2], Israa Mahmood[3]

[1]College of Business and Administration, Kingdom University, Manama, Bahrain
Email: *d.abdo[at]ku.edu.bh*

[2]College of Business and Administration, Kingdom University, Manama, Bahrain
Email: *z.abdo[at]ku.edu.bh*

[3]Department of English Language, AlIraqia University, Baghdad, Iraq
Email: *israismaeel20[at]gmail.com*

Abstract: *The examination of political language is not a recent development. The classical heritage of rhetoric, in its different forms, served as a method for systematizing how political speakers recruit language to achieve persuasion and other objectives. This article offers an overview of research concerning strategies of persuasion within political discourse, with a particular emphasis on the recent research that highlights the role of linguistic elements. This study sought to uncover gaps in our knowledge and areas necessitating additional investigation. It also aimed to guide researchers in developing new research questions and hypotheses, to advance our understanding of how persuasion functions in political discourse. The study confirms the thought that persuasion is achieved through a distinct set of strategies in political discourse, and this is due to the variety of purposes of the messages involved. We hope that such a review serves as a reference for future research endeavors in the same field.*

Keywords: linguistics, persuasion, political discourse, strategies

1. Introduction

Numerous research studies have been carried out to investigate persuasion, a prevailing and fundamental objective in human communication. Language's role in conveying persuasive messages is of utmost importance. Hosman (2002) observed that the lexical aspect of language, which forms an integral part of its structure, influences the persuader's choices concerning words and their meanings in a persuasive message.

In the political domain, language is also extensively utilized to influence different ideologies worldwide. Alvi and Jalilifar (2011; cited in Iqbal, 2013) highlighted that politicians strategically utilize political rhetoric to convince individuals to align their actions with their goals. They exert significant effort in utilizing their linguistic skills to specifically target audiences and accomplish their political goals. Bhatia (2006) further highlights how political discourse effectively facilitates communication to fulfill politicians' intended purposes. Chilton (2004) argues that language and politics are closely entangled; making their separation impossible, as language plays a vital role in shaping political activities.

Van Dijk (1997) observes that political discourse structures have the potential to meet the requirements for being both effective and persuasive. Lexical choices are made with the purpose of not only adhering to decorum but also effectively highlighting or downplaying political viewpoints, gaining backing, influencing public sentiment, shaping political consensus, or justifying political authority. Preferred structures and strategies in political discourse may exist to adequately accomplish political actions in such contexts.

As mentioned earlier, politicians captivate their audience through a variety of rhetorical techniques, influencing the art of leadership through their combined impact (Charteris-Black, 2011). To enhance our comprehension of the tactics and strategies used by politicians, this paper presents an overview of research on persuasion strategies in political discourse. The study aimed to explore the aspects of persuasion and examine how it manifests linguistically in recent political studies. Besides that, this study endeavors to help identify gaps in the understanding and areas that require further exploration in the context of political language. We hope that this study can guide researchers in crafting novel research inquiries and hypotheses, thereby progressing their understanding of how persuasion functions in the realm of political discourse.

As previously stated, when exhibiting the different types of studies conducted on persuasion and their specific strategies in political discourse, it becomes intriguing to delve into the diverse theories of persuasion research. Larson (1989) observes that these theories and approaches can be positioned along a continuum, ranging from qualitative and artistic research on one end to quantitative and scientific research on the other. At the qualitative end, we would find theories rooted in the analysis of persuasion, often referred to as rhetoric, which is viewed as an expressive and artistic practice. Conversely, at the quantitative end, some theories emerged with the development of the social sciences, treating persuasion research as a scientific pursuit.

2. Main Approaches to the Analysis of Persuasion Strategies

Throughout history, persuasion has captivated the interest of researchers examining human interactions, spanning from ancient times to the contemporary era. Scholars from diverse fields have explored the concept of persuasion, aiming to uncover its fundamental elements within communication and comprehend how persuasive language techniques are employed to impact human interactions.

Before delving into the different approaches to persuasion, it is essential to establish a comprehensive understanding of the term. When it comes to defining persuasion, it can be defined as a deliberate effort by an individual or a group to influence the attitudes, beliefs, or behavior of another individual or group by conveying a message (Bettinghaus & Cody, 1994, p. 6). It forms the basis for many of our efforts to offer social support (Gass & Seiter, 2011) and serves as a tool to raise positive pro-social interests. The process of persuasion typically revolves around four essential elements: a source (the one sending the message), a message (intended to convey the source's meaning), a channel (the medium through which the message is conveyed), and a receiver (the one decoding the message) (Larson, 1989).

If we want to focus more on the strategies and methods of persuasion, we can begin with Aristotle's Classical Rhetoric model, which he introduced in the fourth century BC (Perloff, 2020). This model is built around three persuasive appeals, which were later linked by Kinneavy (1971) to the fundamental elements of communication-the speaker, the message, and the audience (Killingsworth, 2005, p. 26). These appeals include:
1) Ethos: Ethos relates to the ethical appeal, which concerns the credibility and charm of the speaker's character.
2) Pathos: Pathos involves emotional appeal, targeting the audience's emotions, attitudes, and values.
3) Logos: Logos encompasses the logical appeal, relying on evidence and real-world references to engage the audience's rationality.

While Aristotle's model places a strong emphasis on the speaker's persuasive intent, Modern Rhetoric has critiqued its analytical capacity, asserting that it overemphasizes logical arguments and depicts the speaker-audience relationship as one-sided and manipulative (Hogan, 2012; Lunsford & Ede, 1984; Mulholland, 2003). In contrast, the Modern Rhetoric approach re-evaluates the classical model by perceiving persuasion as a dynamic, dialogic, and interpretative practice in which the audience's role becomes paramount. Furthermore, it recognizes that speakers may adjust their roles to address diverse audiences (Bell, 1997). In this view, persuasion is considered to be a part of the larger concept of argumentation (Hogan 2012; van Eemeren et al., 2011). It includes a diverse array of discourse forms that seek to persuade and convince, and this is true irrespective of the audience or the specific subject matter (Perelman, 1982).

Concerning political discourse and its persuasive elements, the specific persuasive strategies used in various subgenres will differ based on the speaker's objectives, the target audience, and the subject matter. This variation is due to the diverse nature of political speeches (Halmari & Virtanen, 2005). However, the following concise overview of studies and approaches to persuasion within, specifically, the framework of discourse analysis and critical discourse analysis seeks to emphasize the key aspects of persuasion.

2.1 Persuasion and discourse analysis

Several studies have sought to uncover the linguistic elements of persuasive discourse across various contexts, with a specific focus on the use of persuasive language (e.g., Biber & Zhang, 2018; Crawford Camiciottoli, 2018; Goering et al., 2011; Halmari & Virtanen, 2005; Hyland, 2008; Pelclová & Lu, 2018; Wodak & Krzyzanowski, 2008). These investigations generally utilize such an approach to examine the interactional and dialogic aspects of persuasion, as well as the social and situational factors influencing language choices when conveying intended messages. More recently, qualitative discourse analysis has been augmented by the inclusion of corpus-based methods, which offer evidence of different lexico-grammatical patterns employed to express persuasive aims in diverse contexts.

Hunston and Thompson (2000) noted that the study of persuasion involves analyzing linguistic markers of evaluation, also known as appraisal, stance, modality, and voice (Biber et al., 2000; Hyland, 1998; Hyland & Guinda, 2012; Martin & White, 2007; Palmer, 2001). Evaluations serve three main functions which align with Halliday and Matthiessen's (1994) three functional approaches to language: reflecting the speaker or writer's opinions and values, establishing and maintaining relations with the audience, and organizing the discourse. The effectiveness of evaluation as a persuasive tool is rooted in its capacity to communicate power dynamics, ideology, and classifications of social actors. This impact can be further intensified through the use of metaphorical language. Hunston and Thompson (2000) propose that specific words can be readily identified as evaluative through lexical analysis. This viewpoint aligns with the idea that persuasion within the persuasion register (Biber & Zhang, 2018) hinges on the deliberate selection of appropriate (evaluative) vocabulary.

Another extensively studied strategy of persuasion within the framework of discourse analysis is metadiscourse resources (Beale, 1987; Kopple, 1989). Crismore (1989) emphasizes the importance of understanding how instances of metadiscourse in texts serve to complement the primary text in achieving persuasive objectives. Likewise, Hyland (2005) links the three means of persuasion (ethos, logos, and pathos) to metadiscourse. Many studies have examined the utilization of metadiscourse as a persuasive instrument in various fields, such as in academic discourse (AlJazrawi & AlJazrawi, 2019; Jiang, 2015; Noble, 2010); in religious discourse (Mahmood & Kasim, 2019, 2021; Malmström, 2016); and in political discourse (Abusalim et al., 2022; Kashiha, 2022).

2.2 Persuasion and critical discourse analysis

Persuasion and (CDA) are closely tangled areas of study, as

CDA often focuses on analyzing how persuasion is achieved through language and discourse, particularly in the context of power and ideology. CDA goes beyond surface-level analysis of persuasive techniques and delves into the underlying power dynamics, ideologies, and ethical considerations present in persuasive communication. It explores how language is used to influence, frame issues, and shape public opinion while considering the broader societal and political context. By critically evaluating the impact of persuasion, CDA contributes to a deeper understanding of how discourse influences our beliefs, attitudes, and the functioning of democracy.

Fairclough and Van Dijk are recognized for their pioneering work in the early development of Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA). Fairclough's (1985) approach emphasizes the examination of power distribution in social institutions and the examination of naturalized ideologies within discourse. In contrast, Van Dijk's (1990) approach aims to understand how text and spoken language are shaped by and contribute to social, political, and cultural processes, to intervene in and address issues of inequality and discrimination.

Luke (2002) sees that Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) should be viewed as a comprehensive collection of epistemic perspectives, instead of a rigid set of analytical and methodological practices. In this broader context, CDA practitioners utilize a wide range of theoretical and analytic frameworks, which extend beyond formalized methods. These frameworks encompass various disciplines, such as sociolinguistics, ethnography and linguistic anthropology, and more (Bahaa-eddin, 2007; Billig, 1991; Blommaert, 2001; Boussofara, 2011; Goodman & Speer, 2007; Harris et al., 2006; Myers, 2013; Schiffrin, 2001; Silverstein, 2010; West & Fenstermaker, 2002; Wetherell, 1998). The diversity and expansiveness of these frameworks contribute to the multifaceted nature of CDA research.

Concerning political discourse, CDA's method contributes to the reproduction of political power, abuse of power, and authority (Van Dijk, 1997). Political discourse is regarded as a form of political practice that performs ideological functions, exercises social control, and legitimizes power within the socio-political context. Consequently, language can influence the perception of social and political phenomena and shape people's responses to them.

3. Persuasion in Recent Political Discourse: An Overview

Several studies on political discourse emphasized the crucial role of persuasion in politics, and scholars have explored its aspect extensively (Chilton & Schäffner, 2002; Ferrari, 2007; Reyes, 2014; Sibtain et al., 2021; Van Dijk, 1997).

When examining various recent research in the field of linguistic persuasive strategies in political discourse, we find that they fall within three main categories: analysis of presidential speeches, cross-linguistic comparison of persuasion in political speeches, and exploration of political figures' discourse. In the upcoming section, a compilation of relevant studies from each category will be presented,

highlighting commonly employed effective methods for persuading and influencing the audience in the political arena. These studies provide valuable insights into the scope of research, prevalent persuasive strategies utilized by politicians, and the resulting findings.

3.1 Persuasion strategies in presidential speeches

The speeches delivered by presidents to the nation constitute the most significant and potentially influential resource in their political arsenal. According to Ragsdale (1993), these major national addresses serve as a crucial means for presidents to shape public opinion, affect other politicians, and influence the media. The idea of the President's speech skills has been widely discussed, highlighting their ability to rally and captivate the general population.

In the area of presenting persuasion appeals in presidential speeches, Crespo-Fernández (2013) closely examines the use of dysphemism as a rhetorical tactic in six significant political speeches delivered by Winston Churchill during a critical two-year period (1940-1941). The author analyzed the small corpus qualitatively following the tradition of critical discourse analysts. As for the utilized method, the researcher followed Schaefer (1997). The study commenced by focusing on the micro-level of language and aimed to identify the strategic purposes served by specific word structures. The research methodology primarily adopted a "top-down" approach to elucidate the obtained data. In this context, the speeches were thoroughly examined to identify dysphemistic lexical items which were chosen based on their tendency to be face-threatening acts. The identified dysphemistic items were categorized into metaphorical and non-metaphorical types, and the evaluative functions of nouns and adjectives were examined. To understand the dysphemistic figurative language found in the corpus, the author adopted Lakoff and Johnson's (1980) conceptual metaphor theory framework, which was subsequently refined in later publications (Lakoff, 1993; Lakoff & Turner, 2009). Additionally, the researcher employed critical metaphor analysis by Charteris-Black (2004) to gain deeper insights into the identified dysphemistic figurative language. The findings of the study show that Churchill's skillful use of dysphemism effectively served his political purposes. The emotional connotations of Churchill's dysphemistic words effectively capture attention and make the words serve his persuasive goals.

Mirzaei and Safari (2017) investigate the rhetorical linguistic techniques utilized by Rouhani (Iranian president) in his 2013 presidential campaign. The authors scrutinized specifically the use of repetition in parallel lines, metaphor, personalization, allusion, tripartite constructions, puns, and alliteration. Besides that, the researcher studied the visual symbol in Rouhani's performance. These techniques played a crucial role in presenting Rouhani's political ideology and potentially played a part in his later election success. Based on Fairclough's (2013) approaches of CDA, the researchers explored the socio-cultural, religious, and political values that underpinned the rhetoric found in the dataset. The findings suggest that Rouhani's speeches incorporated various rhetorical devices to enhance the acceptance of his views, thoughts, and policies among the audience. Through

the skillful use of these devices, he criticized the existing socioeconomic and cultural conditions in Iran, successfully embedding his messages within the discourse.

Alemi et al. (2018) take a different approach to analyzing persuasion in political speeches. The study uncovered the persuasive strategies employed in two speeches by President Obama addressing the issue of ISIS. The speeches were analyzed using Searle's (1969) typology theory and pronoun analysis. This involved examining the different speech acts, such as assertive, directive, commissive, expressive, and declarative, as well as the usage of first-person singular and plural pronouns to understand inclusiveness and exclusiveness. Additionally, the concept of agency was considered during the analysis. The findings indicated that assertive speech acts were the most commonly used in both speeches. Additionally, the analysis of first-person plural pronouns in terms of inclusiveness and exclusiveness revealed that Obama took a conservative attitude. This revealed that the structure and language used in these two speeches were strategically aligned with the goals of the US political system and authorities.

More other studies were conducted within the contexts of presidents' speeches, such as: (Abdullahi-Idiagbon, 2010; Khafaga, 2023; Khajavi & Rasti, 2020; Kubišová, 2021; Pu, 2007; Schubert, 2021; Sibtain et al., 2021; Wang, 2010). These studies suggest that presidents use to employ specific discursive practices, including rhetorical strategies, to fulfill conscious political objectives aligned with societal values and beliefs.

3.2 Cross-linguistic in comparison of persuasion in political speeches

Analyzing the shared rhetorical tactics used by two presidents offers valuable insights into the intentional and structured nature of political speeches. Such examination helps uncover the systematic techniques employed to persuade audiences and identifies the unique linguistic elements utilized in persuasive genres overall. Furthermore, it reveals important sociolinguistic norms and their influence on the distribution of power (Fairclough, 2001).

One of the comparative studies was tackled by Halmari (Halmari & Virtanen, 2005, pp. 105-134). The study undertakes an examination of the persuasive rhetorical techniques employed in the speeches of two influential presidents, Ronald Reagan and Bill Clinton. The study has a twofold purpose: to explore the manifestation of persuasion in contemporary times and to investigate the distinguishing features of "successful" persuasion strategies. The study employs discourse analysis as its theoretical framework and investigates both lexical similarities and traditional persuasive strategies rooted in the Aristotelian approach (ethos, pathos, and logos). This is achieved by focusing on the rhetorical questions, use of superlatives and "nice numbers", poetic elements of persuasion, employment of vocatives, incorporation of humor, unifying through addressing a common enemy, use of personal pronouns, rhetorical organization, and evoking historical continuity. The findings show that both presidents, Ronald Reagan, and Bill Clinton, skilfully employed the three classical rhetoric

concepts in their speeches, effectively appealing to their audiences.

On the other hand, the impressive rhetorical abilities demonstrated by Barack Obama caught the attention of researchers, prompting them to thoroughly examine his speeches (Leith, 2011, p. 14). For example, Reyes's (2014) study compared the stylistic differences by examining the persuasion strategies in Bush and Obama's speeches.

The author suggests employing a range of linguistic indicators to assess the formality level linked to Aristotelian modes. These indicators include linguistic choices, such as "lexical variables" (Schilling-Estes, 2004) and "marked register usages" (Myers-Scotton, 2001), as well as textual organization, non-verbal communication (Jefferson et al., 1987), and intertextuality (Blackledge, 2005; Fairclough, 1992, 2003). Additionally, the author proposes incorporating new voices (Bakhtin, 2010) to capture the current moment of discourse. Overall, the study incorporated a multidimensional approach to analyzing various aspects of the speeches, combining theories from Searle, Fairclough, Aristotle, and Wodak to offer a thorough comprehension of the persuasive tactics and discourse components in operation. The study shows that Bush's speech is characterized as a pseudo-conversation with the audience. The speech deviates from the main topic and emphasizes pathos by constantly interacting with the audience. In contrast, Obama avoids direct audience interactions and focuses on presenting the main topic promptly. He employs a formal approach, utilizing ethos to establish his expertise and command of the subject matter. Obama's speech maintains a serious tone, and the audience responds by understanding and collaborating without laughter.

Obama's use of rhetorical persuasive elements was also compared with Rouhani's by Rezaei and Nourali (2016). They use Moore's (2003) framework to explore mainly the speechmaking skills, such as "simile and metaphor, mixed metaphor or simile, extended metaphor, allusion, lists of three, repetition, parallelism, puzzled or redundant questions, alliteration and wordplay" (Rezaei & Nourali, 2016). The study reveals that they employ similar approaches but with variations in their persuasive techniques. Mr. Rouhani utilizes persuasive techniques more frequently, particularly relying on alliteration, while President Obama employs metaphors more prominently. Cultural influences are also evident in the use of persuasive techniques.

Similar studies were conducted in this field with different presidential contexts (Al-Faki & Abdul, 2014; Davletbaeva et al., 2016; Ghazani, 2016; Sarfo & Krampa, 2013). These studies aimed to uncover the diverse strategies employed by political leaders across languages while offering valuable insights into the interplay between language, culture, and politics. These studies have implications for effective communication, governance, and our understanding of political discourse on a global scale.

3.3 Persuasion strategies in political figures' discourse

Political persuasion can be used ethically and constructively

to engage citizens, inform debate, and promote positive change. However, it can also be employed manipulatively or misleadingly to exploit cognitive biases and deceive the public. Thus, some studies shed light on the different ways of influencing people.

A relevant study on this topic is the investigation proposed by Lillian (2008). The paper specifically examines the utilization of modal auxiliaries in two political texts written by Hugh Segal (representing a mainstream Canadian conservative perspective) and William D. Gairdner (representing a far-right neoconservative position within Canadian politics). The study adopts the (Fowler, 1985) framework, which categorizes modality into five dimensions: validity, predictability, desirability, obligation, and permission. These categories reflect the writer's attitudes toward the propositions he expresses. These attitudes encompass the level of confidence in the truth of the statements (validity), the likelihood of future events (predictability), practical, moral, or aesthetic judgments (desirability), the perception of obligation for others to perform certain actions (obligation) and granting permission for specific actions (permission) (Fowler, 1985, p. 72). It is important to note that the author distinguishes between persuasion and manipulation, acknowledging that the same linguistic devices that can be employed illegitimately for manipulation can also be used legitimately as tools of persuasion and information. However, the results indicate that the different use of modality by conservative authors Segal and Gairdner suggests that Segal's approach is more focused on persuasion, while Gairdner's discourse aligns with propaganda and manipulation. The heavy use of deontic modals in Gairdner's writing may indicate a shift from persuasion to manipulation. This suggests that modality can be considered a linguistic strategy employed by manipulators.

On the other hand, the notion of manipulation emerges as a facet of persuasion in Baldi's (2020) study. He sees that manipulation is employed to shape the desired "mental representations" in the recipient, even though with a level of unconscious influence. The author analyses the political language of significant leaders in Italian politics, such as Mussolini, De Gasperi, Togliatti, Berlusconi, and Salvini. The study explored the use of argumentative and rhetorical devices, metaphors, sentence structure, lexical selection, symbols, and images to uncover hidden messages conveyed by these leaders. The research considered persuasion as a property inherent in language usage, influenced by mental operations and the conceptualization of experiences and the world. The results show that Politicians employ a shared symbolic universe with their audience, using argumentation and rhetorical strategies to shape worldviews and persuade. Persuasion combines manipulative and argumentative approaches, with various linguistic devices generating semantic effects. Metaphors, narratives, impolite language, and hortative formulas contribute to interpretation levels and alternative perspectives. Persuasion arises through shared understanding, but politicians can exploit the audience's deep symbolic universe for power goals, utilizing rhetorical tools and appealing to emotions. The exchange of meanings in politics is grounded in shared values and cultural contexts. Persuasion serves as the means of communication within

this exchange.

In the same vein, Macdonald and Lorenzo-Dus (2020) investigated Persuasion strategies employed to promote acts of terrorism, aiming to enhance the legal comprehension of encouragement. The study draws upon illustrative examples derived from a comprehensive research project on online jihadist propaganda. The author uses Speech act theory to explore the locution, illocution, and perlocution aspects of communication. The article highlights that encouragement is an intentional and performative activity, aiming to persuade others to engage in acts of terrorism. It explores various linguistic strategies, such as rhetorical questions, statements of fact, suggestory formulae, and statements of obligation and prohibition. The illocutionary force of encouragement is centered on motivating the commission of terrorist acts. The legislation presented in the article defines both direct and indirect forms of encouragement, encompassing statements that glorify or denigrate. The assessment of whether a statement encourages acts of terrorism considers the content, intention, and manner of its publication. The offense is based on the potential danger posed by the statement in influencing others to commit an act of terrorism, regardless of specific targets or descriptions.

Further investigations were carried out in the context of political figures' speeches (Al-Sowaidi et al., 2017; Glonti, 2020). The significance of such studies lies in their contribution to informed citizenship, democratic accountability, effective communication, policy influence, academic advancement, historical comprehension, and potential applications in conflict resolution.

In essence, it is crucial to acknowledge that political persuasion has the potential to serve ethical and constructive purposes, engaging citizens, fostering informed debates, and driving positive transformations. On the other hand, it can also be utilized manipulatively or deceptively, taking advantage of cognitive biases and misleading the public. Engaging in critical thinking and fact-checking is essential for individuals to navigate political discourse proficiently and make well-informed choices.

4. Conclusion

This article explores the body of literature concerning frequently explored linguistic tactics and their influence on discourse designed to persuade, with a specific focus on the political domain. Initially, the study offers an understanding of the primary methodologies employed to scrutinize strategies of persuasion as a whole. It subsequently provides a concise of research and methodologies concerning persuasion within the prevalent frameworks of DA and CDA highlighting the crucial facets of persuasion. The article then takes a more specific direction by presenting an overview of persuasion within contemporary political discourse. Through the scrutiny of existing research, we aimed to present solely the most extensively scrutinized research domain, namely: analysis of presidential speeches, comparative studies involving presidential discourse, and analysis of persuasion in political figures' language.

In general, the study confirms the thought that persuasion is

achieved through a distinct set of strategies in political discourse, and this is due to the variety of purposes of the message involved. As viewed above, the strategies can be achieved through various linguistic approaches. For example, in presidential speeches studies we notice that the researchers explored metaphorical and non-metaphorical dysphemistic (Crespo-Fernández, 2013); the use of tripartite constructions, alliteration, metaphor, personalization, allusion, repetition in parallel lines, and pun (Mirzaei & Safari, 2017); and assertive, directive, commissive, expressive, declarative speech acts, pronoun and agency (Alemi et al., 2018). Moreover, in comparative studies involving presidential discourse, we found linguistic devices such as rhetorical questions, appeal to authority, appeal to logic, superlatives and "nice numbers, poetic aspects of persuasion, vocatives, humor, unification via addressing the enemy, personal pronoun use, rhetorical organization (Halmari & Virtanen, 2005); linguistic and paralinguistic indicators of (in)formality and modes of persuasion (Reyes, 2014); and simile and metaphor, mixed metaphor or simile, extended metaphor, allusion, lists of three, repetition, parallelism, puzzled or redundant questions, alliteration and wordplay (Rezaei & Nourali, 2016). Furthermore, the linguistic strategies applied in political figures' discourse are like, modality (Lillian, 2008); metaphors, the structure of the sentence, lexical selection, symbols and images (Baldi, 2020); rhetorical questions, statements of obligation and prohibition, statements of fact, and suggestory formulae (Macdonald & Lorenzo-Dus, 2020).

However, the reviewed studies' domain and strategies might not reflect the entire areas and strategies of persuasion in political discourse. There are more strategies of persuasion have been shown in several different ways, such as identity construction, stance and evaluation, engagement with the audience, and intertextuality, (Halmari & Virtanen, 2005; Van Leeuwen, 1996); or even similar to those outlined in this study, such imperatives, modality, personal pronoun choice questions, interactive features, and humor (Cotterell & Turner, 1989; Dillard & Pfau, 2002; Hogan, 2012). Yet, we believe that this overview will spark curiosity in the field, prompting the formulation of numerous hypotheses regarding the underlying mechanisms outlined in this paper. Our objective is for this investigation to aggregate noteworthy advancements in the arena of research focused on linguistic strategies for persuasion.

Number equations consecutively with equation numbers in parentheses flush with the right margin, as in (1). First use the equation editor to create the equation. Then select the "Equation" markup style. Press the tab key and write the equation number in parentheses.

References

[1] Abdullahi-Idiagbon, M. S. (2010). Language use in selected Nigerian presidential election campaign speeches: A critical discourse analysis perspective. *Journal of the Nigeria English Studies Association (JNESA)*, *13*(2), 30-44.

[2] Abusalim, N., Zidouni, S., Alghazo, S., Rababah, G., & Rayyan, M. (2022). Textual and interpersonal metadiscourse markers in political discourse: A case study. *Cogent Arts & Humanities*, *9*(1), 2124683. DOI: 10.1080/23311983.2022.2124683

[3] Al-Faki, I. M., & Abdul, K. (2014). Political speeches of some African leaders from linguistic perspective (1981-2013). *International journal of humanities and social science*, *4*(3), 180-198.

[4] Al-Sowaidi, B., Banda, F., & Mansour, A. (2017). Doing politics in the recent Arab uprisings: towards a political discourse analysis of the Arab Spring slogans. *Journal of Asian and African Studies*, *52*(5), 621-645. https://doi.org/10.1177/0021909615600462

[5] Alemi, M., Latifi, A., & Nematzadeh, A. (2018). Persuasion in political discourse: Barak Obama's presidential speeches against ISIS. *Russian Journal of Linguistics*, *22*(2), 278-291.

[6] AlJazrawi, D. A., & AlJazrawi, Z. A. (2019). The use of meta-discourse an analysis of interactive and interactional markers in English short stories as a type of literary genre. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics and English Literature*, *8*(3), 66-77.

[7] Bahaa-eddin, M. M. (2007). Presuppositions and strategic functions in Bush's 20/9/2001 speech: A critical discourse analysis. *Journal of language and politics*, *6*(3), 351-375.

[8] Bakhtin, M. M. (2010). *The dialogic imagination: Four essays*. University of texas Press.

[9] Baldi, B. (2020). Persuasion we live by: symbols, metaphors and linguistic strategies. *Quaderni di Linguistica e Studi Orientali*, *6*, 337-382. https://doi.org/10.13128/qulso-2421-7220-9706

[10] Beale, W. H. (1987). *A pragmatic theory of rhetoric*. SIU Press.

[11] Bell, A. (1997). Language Style as Audience Design. I Coupland og Jaworski (red.): Sociolinguistics, A Reader and Coursebook, Modem Linguistics Series. 240-250. In: Macmillan.

[12] Bettinghaus, E. P., & Cody, M. J. (1994). *Persuasive Communication*. Harcourt Brace College Publishers.

[13] Bhatia, A. (2006). Critical discourse analysis of political press conferences. *Discourse & Society*, *17*(2), 173-203. https://doi.org/10.1177/0957926506058057

[14] Biber, D., Johansson, S., Leech, G., Conrad, S., & Finegan, E. (2000). Longman grammar of spoken and written English. In: Longman London.

[15] Biber, D., & Zhang, M. (2018). Expressing evaluation without grammatical stance: Informational persuasion on the web. *corpora*, *13*(1), 97-123. https://doi.org/10.3366/cor.2018.0137

[16] Billig, M. (1991). *Ideology and opinions: Studies in rhetorical psychology*. Sage Publications, Inc.

[17] Blackledge, A. (2005). Discourse and power in a multilingual world. *Discourse and Power in a Multilingual World*, 1-262.

[18] Blommaert, J. (2001). Investigating narrative inequality: African asylum seekers' stories in Belgium. *Discourse & Society*, *12*(4), 413-449. https://doi.org/10.1177/0957926501012004002

[19] Boussofara, N. (2011). Bleaching a dialectal voice in political discourse: Sociolinguistic choices in re-writing political speeches. *Journal of language and politics*, *10*(2), 204-226. https://doi.org/10.1075/jlp.10.2.04bou

[20] Charteris-Black, J. (2004). Critical metaphor analysis. In *Corpus approaches to critical metaphor analysis* (pp. 243-253). Springer.

[21] Charteris-Black, J. (2011). *Politicians and rhetoric: The persuasive power of metaphor*. Springer.

[22] Cheung, M. (2008). Click Here': The impact of new media on the encoding of persuasive messages in direct marketing. *Discourse Studies*, *10*(2), 161-189. https://doi.org/10.1177/1461445607087007

[23] Chilton, P., & Schäffner, C. (2002). *Politics as text and talk: Analytic approaches to political discourse* (Vol. 4). John Benjamins Publishing.

[24] Chilton, P. A. (2004). *Analysing political discourse: Theory and practice*. Psychology Press.

[25] Cotterell, P., & Turner, M. (1989). Linguistics and Biblical Interpretation (Downers Grove, IL. In: InterVarsity Press.

[26] Crawford Camiciottoli, B. (2018). Persuasion in earnings calls: A diachronic pragmalinguistic analysis. *International Journal of Business Communication*, *55*(3), 275-292. https://doi.org/10.1177/2329488417735644

[27] Crespo-Fernández, E. (2013). Words as weapons for mass persuasion: dysphemism in Churchill's wartime speeches. *Text & Talk*, *33*(3), 311-330. https://doi.org/10.1515/text-2013-0014

[28] Crismore, A. (1989). *Talking with readers: Metadiscourse as rhetorical act*. P. Lang.

[29] Davletbaeva, D. N., Yashina, M. E., & Sharafieva, A. D. (2016). Linguistic peculiarities of the modern political discourse of Russia and the USA. *Journal of Organizational Culture, Communications and Conflict*, *20*, 242.

[30] Dillard, J. P., & Pfau, M. (2002). *The Persuasion Handbook: Developments in Theory and Practice*. SAGE Publications. https://books.google.iq/books?id=I_ByAwAAQBAJ

[31] Fairclough, N. (1992). *Discourse and social change*. Polity Press.

[32] Fairclough, N. (2001). *Language and power*. Pearson Education.

[33] Fairclough, N. (2003). *Analysing discourse: Textual analysis for social research*. Psychology Press.

[34] Fairclough, N. (2013). Critical discourse analysis. In *The Routledge handbook of discourse analysis* (pp. 9-20). Routledge.

[35] Fairclough, N. L. (1985). Critical and descriptive goals in discourse analysis. *Journal of pragmatics*, *9*(6), 739-763. https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166(85)90002-5

[36] Ferrari, F. (2007). Metaphor at work in the analysis of political discourse: investigating apreventive war'persuasion strategy. *Discourse & Society*, *18*(5), 603-625. https://doi.org/10.1177/0957926507079737

[37] Fowler, R. (1985). Power. In T. A. v. Dijk (Ed.), *Handbook of discourse analysis* (pp. 61-82). Academic Press

[38] Gass, R. H., & Seiter, J. S. (2011). Persuasion, social influence and compliance gaining, 4e éd. In: Pearson Education inc.

[39] Ghazani, A. Z. (2016). Study of persuasive strategies in selected American presidential speeches. *INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL*, *3*(2).

[40] Glonti, B. (2020). Proverb as a Tool of Persuasion in Political Discourse (on the Material of Georgian and French languages). *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, *10*(6), 632-637. http://dx.doi.org/10.17507/tpls.1006.02

[41] Goering, E., Connor, U. M., Nagelhout, E., & Steinberg, R. (2011). Persuasion in fundraising letters: An interdisciplinary study. *Nonprofit and voluntary sector quarterly*, *40*(2), 228-246. https://doi.org/10.1177/0899764009339216

[42] Goodman, S., & Speer, S. A. (2007). Category use in the construction of asylum seekers. *Critical Discourse Studies*, *4*(2), 165-185. https://doi.org/10.1080/17405900701464832

[43] Halliday, M. A., & Matthiessen, C. (1994). An introduction to functional grammar: Edward Arnold. In: London.

[44] Halmari, H., & Virtanen, T. (2005). *Persuasion across genres: A linguistic approach*. John Benjamins Publishing.

[45] Harris, S., Grainger, K., & Mullany, L. (2006). The pragmatics of political apologies. *Discourse & Society*, *17*(6), 715-737. https://doi.org/10.1177/0957926506068429

[46] Hogan, J. M. (2012). Persuasion in the rhetorical tradition. *The Sage handbook of persuasion: Developments in theory and practice*, 2-20.

[47] Hosman, L. A. (2002). Language and persuasion. *The persuasion handbook: Developments in theory and practice*, 371-390.

[48] Hunston, S., & Thompson, G. (2000). *Evaluation in text: Authorial stance and the construction of discourse: Authorial stance and the construction of discourse*. Oxford University Press, UK.

[49] Hyland, K. (1998). Persuasion and context: The pragmatics of academic metadiscourse. *Journal of pragmatics*, *30*(4), 437-455. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166(98)00009-5

[50] Hyland, K. (2005). *Meta-discourse continuum*. London: New York.

[51] Hyland, K. (2008). Persuasion, interaction and the construction of knowledge: Representing self and others in research writing. *International journal of English studies*, *8*(2), 1-23.

[52] Hyland, K., & Guinda, C. S. (2012). *Stance and voice in written academic genres*. Springer.

[53] Iqbal, A. (2013). Discourse Analysis of Prominent Politicians' Public Speeches: Pre and Post-Election 2013 Pakistan. *Amna Iqbal (2018). Discourse Analysis of Prominent Politicians' Public Speeches: Pre and Post-Election*, 1-18.

[54] Jefferson, G., Sacks, H., & Schegloff, E. (1987). Notes on laughter in the pursuit of intimacy. Teoksessa Graham Button & John R. Lee (toim.) Talk and social organisation s. 152–205. *Multilingual Matters, Clevedon*.

[55] Jiang, F. K. (2015). Nominal stance construction in L1 and L2 students' writing. *Journal of English for academic Purposes*, *20*, 90-102. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2015.07.002

[56] Kashiha, H. (2022). On persuasive strategies: Metadiscourse practices in political speeches. *Discourse and Interaction*, *15*(1), 77-100.

[57] Khafaga, A. (2023). Imperatives as persuasion strategies in political discourse. *Linguistics Vanguard*(0). https://doi.org/10.1515/lingvan-2021-0136

[58] Khajavi, Y., & Rasti, A. (2020). A discourse analytic investigation into politicians' use of rhetorical and persuasive strategies: The case of US election speeches. *Cogent Arts & Humanities*, *7*(1), 1740051. https://doi.org/10.1080/23311983.2020.1740051

[59] Killingsworth, M. J. (2005). *Appeals in modern rhetoric: An ordinary language approach*. SIU Press.

[60] Kinneavy, J. L. (1971). Discourse and the Field of English. A Theory of Discourse: The Aims of Discourse. In: New York: WW Norton & Co.

[61] Kopple, W. J. V. (1989). *Clear and coherent prose: A functional approach*. Pearson Scott Foresman.

[62] Kubišová, D. (2021). Verbal Manipulation in Political Discourse: Metaphors, Clichés, Emotions and Symbols in F. Tuđman's Speeches During Wartime Period 1990-1995. *Балканистичен Форум*, *30*(3), 169-182.

[63] Lakoff, G. (1993). The contemporary theory of metaphor. In A. Ortony (Ed.), *Metaphor and thought* (pp. 202–251). Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139173865.013

[64] Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1980). Metaphors we live by. *University of Chicago, Chicago, IL*.

[65] Lakoff, G., & Turner, M. (2009). *More than cool reason: A field guide to poetic metaphor*. University of Chicago press.

[66] Larson, C. U. (1989). *Persuasion: Reception and responsibility*. Publisher Belmont, Calif. : Wadsworth Pub. Co.

[67] Leith, S. (2011). *You talkin'to me?: Rhetoric from Aristotle to Obama*. Profile Books.

[68] Lillian, D. L. (2008). Modality, persuasion and manipulation in Canadian conservative discourse. *Critical Approaches to Discourse Analysis across Disciplines*, *2*(1), 1-16.

[69] Luke, A. (2002). 5. Beyond science and ideology critique: Developments in critical discourse analysis. *Annual review of applied linguistics*, *22*, 96.

[70] Lunsford, A. A., & Ede, L. S. (1984). On distinctions between classical and modern rhetoric. *Essays on classical rhetoric and modern discourse*, 37-49.

[71] Macdonald, S., & Lorenzo-Dus, N. (2020). Intentional and Performative Persuasion: The Linguistic Basis for Criminalizing the (Direct and Indirect) Encouragement of Terrorism. Criminal Law Forum, https://doi.org/10.1007/s10609-020-09405-x

[72] Mahmood, I. I., & Kasim, Z. M. (2019). Interpersonal metadiscursive features in contemporary Islamic Friday sermon. *3L, Language, Linguistics, Literature*, *25*(1). http://doi.org/10.17576/3L-2019-2501-06

[73] Mahmood, I. I., & Kasim, Z. M. (2021). Metadiscourse Resources across Themes of Islamic Friday Sermon. *GEMA Online Journal of Language Studies*, *21*(1). http://doi.org/10.17576/gema-2021-2101-03

[74] Malmström, H. (2016). Engaging the congregation: The place of metadiscourse in contemporary preaching. *Applied linguistics*, *37*(4), 561-582. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amu052

[75] Martin, J., & White, P. R. (2007). *The Language of Evaluation: Appraisal in English*. Springer.

[76] Mirzaei, A., & Safari, F. (2017). Exploring rhetorical-discursive practices of Rouhani's presidential campaign and victory of his prudence-and-hope key: A discourse of persuasion. *Russian Journal of Linguistics*, *21*(1), 161-182.

[77] Moore, A. (2003). Language and power. In: Bristol: Zigzag Education and Computing Center Publications.

[78] Mulholland, J. (2003). *A Handbook of persuasive tactics: A practical language guide*. Routledge.

[79] Myers, G. (2013). Stance-taking and public discussion in blogs. In *Self-Mediation* (pp. 55-67). Routledge.

[80] Noble, W. (2010). Understanding metadiscoursal use: Lessons from a 'local'corpus of learner academic writing. *Nordic Journal of English Studies*, *9*(2), 145-169.

[81] Palmer, F. R. (2001). *Mood and modality*. Cambridge university press.

[82] Pelclová, J., & Lu, W.-l. (2018). *Persuasion in Public Discourse: Cognitive and functional perspectives (Volume 79)*. John Benjamins Publishing Company.

[83] Perelman, C. (1982). The realm of rhetoric, trans. *William Kluback (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1982)*, *30*.

[84] Perloff, R. M. (2020). *The dynamics of persuasion: Communication and attitudes in the twenty-first century*. Routledge.

[85] Pu, C. (2007). Discourse Analysis of President Bush's Speech at Tsinghua University, China. *Intercultural Communication Studies*, *16*(1), 205-216.

[86] Ragsdale, L. (1993). *Presidential politics*. Houghton Mifflin.

[87] Reyes, A. (2014). Bush, Obama:(in) formality as persuasion in political discourse. *Journal of language and politics*, *13*(3), 538-562.

[88] Rezaei, S., & Nourali, N. (2016). Language and power: The use of persuasive techniques in Iran and US president speeches. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, *7*(6), 1203. http://dx.doi.org/10.17507/jltr.0706.19

[89] Sarfo, E., & Krampa, E. A. (2013). Language at war: A critical discourse analysis of speeches of Bush and Obama on terrorism. *International J. Soc. Sci. & Education*, *3*(2).

[90] Schaefer, T. M. (1997). Persuading the persuaders: Presidential speeches and editorial opinion. *Political Communication*, *14*(1), 97-111.

[91] Schiffrin, D. (2001). Language and public memorial:America's concentration camps'. *Discourse & Society*, *12*(4), 505-534.

[92] Schilling-Estes, N. (2004). Investigating stylistic variation. *The handbook of language variation and change*, 375-401.

[93] Schubert, C. (2021). Rhetorical moves in political discourse: closing statements by presidential candidates in US primary election debates. *Text & Talk*, *41*(3), 369-390. https://doi.org/10.1515/text-2019-0189

[94] Searle, J. R. (1969). *Speech acts: An essay in the philosophy of language* (Vol. 626). Cambridge university press.

[95] Sibtain, M., Aslam, M. Z., & Zia-ur-Rehman, D. H. M. (2021). A study of rhetorical element and political persuasion in Trump's speech at UNGA 74th session: A political discourse analysis. *PalArch's Journal of Archaeology of Egypt/Egyptology*, *18*(08), 1428-1439.

[96] Silverstein, M. (2010). Society, polity, and language community: An enlightenment trinity in anthropological perspective. *Journal of language and politics*, *9*(3), 339-363. https://doi.org/10.1075/jlp.9.3.01sil

[97] Van Dijk, T. A. (1990). Discourse & Society: a new journal for a new research focus. *Discourse & Society*, *1*(1), 5-16.

[98] Van Dijk, T. A. (1997). What is political discourse analysis. *Belgian journal of linguistics*, *11*(1), 11-52.

[99] van Eemeren, F. H., Grootendorst, R., Blair, J. A., & Willard, C. A. (2011). *Perspectives and Approaches* (Vol. 3). Walter de Gruyter.

[100] Van Leeuwen, T. (1996). The representation of social actors. *Texts and practices: Readings in critical discourse analysis*, *1*, 32-70.

[101] Wang, J. (2010). A critical discourse analysis of Barack Obama's speeches. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, *1*(3), 254-261.

[102] West, C., & Fenstermaker, S. (2002). Accountability in action: the accomplishment of gender, race and class in a meeting of the University of California Board of Regents. *Discourse & Society*, *13*(4), 537-563.

[103] Wetherell, M. (1998). Positioning and interpretative repertoires: Conversation analysis and post-structuralism in dialogue. *Discourse & Society*, *9*(3), 387-412. https://doi.org/10.1177/0957926598009003005

[104] Wodak, R., & Krzyzanowski, M. (2008). *Qualitative Discourse Analysis in the Social Sciences*. Palgrave Macmillan

Author Profile

Dunya Al Jazrawi, PhD, is an associate professor of English in Kingdom University in Bahrain. She received the B.A in 1994, M.A in 1998 and PhD in 2004, all from the College of Arts, University of Baghdad. From 1997-1998, she worked as a lecturer in the Department of English, College of Arts/ University of Baghdad and from 1998-2006, she was a teaching staff member in the same department. From 2006-2013, she was working as the director of the English Language Development Center in Gulf University in Bahrain. Later she joined Arab Open University in Bahrain as a part timer.

Zeena Al Jazrawi, PhD is an assistant Prof of English in Kingdom University in Bahrain. She got her B.A in 2002, M.A in 2005 and PhD in 2008, all from the College of Arts, University of Baghdad. From 2004- 2006, she worked as a lecturer in the Department of English, College of Arts/ University of Baghdad. From 2006-2013, she was working as a teaching staff member in the English Language Development Centre in Gulf University in Bahrain. Later, she joined Arab Open University in Bahrain as a part timer. In 2019, I joined Kingdom University in Bahrain.

Israa Mahmood received her Master degree in linguistics from University Putra Malaysia in 2019. Her main research interests include discourse analysis and genre analysis.