

Critical Discourse Analysis of Social Media Utilization in Arabic and English Political Speech

تحليل الخطاب النقدي لاستخدام وسائل التواصل الاجتماعي في الخطاب
السياسي باللغتين العربية والانكليزية

أ.م. صلاح مهدي يوسف (*)

Asst. Prof. Salah Mahdi Yousif Al-Maliki

sssenglish89@uomustansiriyah.edu.iq

sssalmaliky@yahoo.com

المستخلص

استكشفت هذه الدراسة سياسات التواصل عبر وسائل التواصل الاجتماعي، لا سيما التفاعل والمشاركة، في المواقع الناطقة بالعربية والإنجليزية، حيث هدفت إلى دراسة كيفية تأثير البيئات الثقافية على استراتيجيات التواصل لدى القادة السياسيين، مستخدمةً سلوكيات الرئيس الأميركي دونالد ترامب والرئيس العراقي عبد اللطيف رشيد على تويتر كأمثلة. أظهر هذا البحث أن تواصل ترامب مثيرٌ للاستقطاب بخطاب تهديدي، ويهدف إلى تنظيم قاعدته الجماهيرية والدفاع عن المصلحة الوطنية. في المقابل، أتسم أسلوب تواصل الرئيس رشيد بمسؤولية جماعية، وشمولية، وتعاون، وهو انعكاس لأسلوب قيادة قائم على التعافي وإعادة البناء في سياق ما بعد الصراع. لا يوضح هذان الأسلوبان الأسس الأيديولوجية للواقع السياسي لكل قائد فحسب، بل يوضحان أيضًا الآثار الأكبر لاستخدام مواقع التواصل الاجتماعي كمساحات للمشاركة السياسية. توصلت هذه الدراسة إلى أهمية الإلمام بديناميكيات التفاعل بين السياق الثقافي والخطاب الرقمي لتعزيز تطور خطاب التواصل السياسي وديناميكياته في عالم معولم.

الكلمات المفتاحية: تحليل الخطاب النقدي، وسائل التواصل الاجتماعي، الخطاب السياسي.

(*) كلية الإدارة والاقتصاد/ الجامعة المستنصرية.

Abstract

This study explored the politics of social media communication, more so of interaction and engagement, in Arabic-and English-speaking sites. It aimed at examining how cultural environments affect communicative strategies by political leaders, using the Twitter behaviors of Donald Trump and Abdul Latif Rashid as cases in point. This investigation showed that Trump's communication is polarizing with threatening discourse and is aimed at organizing his base and vindicating national interests. In contrast, The President Rashid's style of communication is one of group responsibility, being inclusive, and working together, a reflection of a healing and reconstruction style of leadership in the context of post-conflict. Not only do these two styles illustrate the ideological foundations of the political reality for each leader, but also the greater implications of social media sites used as spaces of political engagement. What was found out in the present study was the significance of being acquainted with the dynamics between cultural context and digital discourse to further progress political communication discourse and evolving dynamics in a globalized world.

Key words: Critical Discourse Analysis, Social Media, Political Speech.

1. Introduction

In recent years, social media has fundamentally transformed the way political communication works, giving politicians a direct line to their audiences that traditional media just can't replicate. Social media platforms such as Facebook, Twitter, and Instagram facilitate real-time interaction, instant spread of information, and public narrative influence (Halpern et al., 2017). Consequently, it's essential to acquire the knowledge of how social media is engaged in political context. Critical discourse analysis (CDA) suggests a pathway to investigate how the digital language represents and sustains power relations, ideologies, and identities in political context. This study will seek to examine how social media manifests itself in political speech in Arabic and English discourses, bringing to the front the unique linguistic and rhetorical

strategies in both languages (Bossetta, 2018).

Political discourse in the Arabic nations own a significant contextual dimension and politically reverberates an emotional level with their particular populations. In most of the Arab countries, the social media platform has become the main site of political protest since the emergence of Arab Spring. The social media site provided the function of expressing objections by the citizenry, and the site itself generated the situation of planning the demonstration and political protests (Lynch, 2016). In these digital spaces, the language used is most of the time an amalgamation of traditional rhetoric and modern worries, illustrating the significance that cultural narratives place in political identity and agency.

On the other hand, English-speaking politics work with different dynamics. For example, in the United States and the United Kingdom, politicians use social media as a tool to engage various audiences and, in some cases, are expected to apply various rhetorical techniques that stress personal branding and direct communication. For instance, Barack Obama and Donald Trump have utilized Twitter not only to disseminate information but also build narratives that resonate with their followers that tend to foster polarization and reinforce existing political beliefs (Kreiss, 2016). These alterations in rhetorical styles and strategies found in political social media discourses in English and Arabic contexts symbolize larger cultural perceptions of authority, identity, and communication.

This study of Arabic and English political discourse attempted to examine the dynamic of power relations as they are established and contested in social media. Consequently, this study will throw light on the linguistic strategies that design claims for public opinion and political engagement by exercising critical discourse analysis on social media posts, messages, and mostly tweets by two famous politicians (Tsfati & Cohen, 2019).

Second, it encompasses the wider conclusions that social media has regarding political activism and engaging citizens. Recognizing how linguistics is being utilized for the construction of narratives to mobilize should further emphasize the importance of fostering critical media literacy among citizens

so that they can work through modern political discourses (Tsfati & Cohen, 2019). This research, further, also addresses a significant gap within CDA studies by concentrating on social media, where there is a peculiar feature of discourse that is dialogue-oriented. Hence, by implementing CDA methodologies in any digital articulations, the research will broaden the understanding of changing communication strategies and their implications (Fairclough, 1995; van Dijk, 1998). Finally, the comparative study of the Arabic and English political discourse provides further knowledge about the cultural distinctions encompassing political expressions, which helps ensure an understanding of the other in a globalized world. Such an insight is critical for extenuating bases to channel dialogue toward mutual respect and cooperation among a range of diverse political scenarios (Gana, 2014) and (Kreiss, 2016).

1.1. Statement of the Problem

The growing popularity of social media as a principal channel of political communication has severely changed the face of what many consider political discourse. Such a transformation can be truly seen in the sharp contrast of Arabic and English political speech on the internet. While social media serve as a type of mediator that supports more direct interpellation from politicians to citizens, it also presents challenges of discourse itself, representation, and power dynamics. Consequently, there is an urgent need to investigate the way language helps to construct political identities, enable collective action, and affect public opinion in this very regard. The present study is focusing on these issues by means of critical discourse analysis to contrast and compare political speech in Arabic and English on the Internet.

In the Arab countries, social media have been frequently used for political mobilization and activism. Arab Spring represents the case par excellence where Facebook and Twitter were used to organize protests and tutor dissent opinions against authoritarian regimes (Dawisha, 2013). With the trade-off gradually shifting toward state control in place of freedom of expression, discourse on these platforms may reflect governmental coercion, mis-informative propaganda, and much more. This reflects the contradictory dynamics of

empowerment and repression, which occur in the digital realm and therefore could shed light on the linguistic techniques (Gana, 2014). Thus, this study seeks to examine the ways in which language constructs political ideologies and identities through the lens of external sociopolitical influences in Arabic political discourses on social media.

On the other hand, political democracy within English-speaking contexts: in the USA and the UK has its own different dynamics of communicating political affairs through social media platforms. Again, leading CDA researchers: Norman Fairclough and Teun A. van Dijk underlined the ways through which discourse constructs social reality and the means by which it reflects mechanisms of power (Fairclough, 1995; van Dijk, 1998). Their frames could help elucidate how political leaders use social media to build personal brands, ideology, and rally support. However, the presiding polarization and misinformation in English political discourse loom very large and lurk behind the ethical question of just such a strategy. Consequently, for an all-encompassing understanding of the menace of digital political communication, the subtlety of language in Arabic is altogether equally important to that in English.

Al-Ali (2022) declares that social media is increasingly becoming a dominant means of expression, one that shapes political discourse and practice; it is, therefore, important to investigate power relations constructed and contested through language in these new contexts. Through a CDA of Arabic and English social media discourse on political speech, this work will contribute to the understanding of the implications of digital communication for democracy, social movements, and civic engagement. This article will extensively elaborate on the use of manipulative techniques applied by politicians in their speeches-and-bringing forth the disparities and similarities in the English and Arabic contexts. Insight into this is important to analyze the influence of political discourse on various cultures and audiences. As the political sphere ever so increases becomes globalized, language-culture interaction in political rhetoric gains even more importance (Kuzmenko et al., 2022).

The study at hand sets out to analyze the political posts delivered by Donald Trump, new President of the UAS, and Abdul Latif Rashid, the

president of Iraq as reflected in their Twitter. I used Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) as an approach for theory development in one of the social media platforms namely, Twitter. This study will answer these questions:

Q1. How do Donald Trump's and Abdul Latif Rashid's Twitter posts reflect their political ideologies and priorities?

Q2. How do the interactions and engagements in political discourse on social media differ on Arabic and English platforms?

2. Review of Literature

2.1. Critical Discourse Analysis

A Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) framework is naturally designed to examine both the obvious and latent structural dynamics of dominance, discrimination, power, and control in how they are mediated by language (Wodak & Meyer, 2008). Scholars bestow great importance on inter-disciplinary collaboration in employing a CDA framework (Chouliaraki & Fairclough, 1999; Wodak & Meyer, 2008). An interdisciplinary approach such as this enables Information Systems (IS) researchers to draw on theory from relevant areas like sociology, psychology, management, economics, and anthropology and hence enhance knowledge about the dynamic social practices through which social media increasingly comes to sit at the center.

Critical Discourse Analysis is that form of discourse analysis, as per Fairclough (1992), that aims to investigate the intricate and, most often, blurred causalities amongst discursive practices, events, and texts that are ideologically influenced by the contestation for power and dominance. Generally speaking, CDA has been understood to include the complex relationships between language, power, society, and historical ideologies found through their examination (Tian, 2018). The approach of CDA is inherently multi-dimensional, incorporating textual analysis but also considering the processes of the textualization of meaning and how that meaning is subsequently interpreted. As noted by Rogers (2011): "Language is a social practice, and since not all social practices are equal or treated

equally, all language analyses are therefore critical” (p. 2). This means that all such analyses are bound to be inherently critical.

According to Gee and Handford (2012), CDA is characterized as an exploration of language that transcends mere sentence structure, focusing instead on how sentences are interconnected to generate meaning and fulfill specific objectives. Also, Wodak and Meyer (2009) introduce CDA as a collective endeavor to disambiguate ideologies and relations of power by examining both oral and written semiotic data.

CDA is a dominant methodology for analyzing oral and written discourse, including but not limited to news articles, political speeches, novels, adverts, films, essays, and books. Political discourse analysis could enlighten readers on instances of biased language, thereby making understanding linguistic manipulation more effective. It is indeed the case that political discourse is often intertwined with concealed ideologies and strategically constructed discursive frameworks. Van Dijk (1993) posits that CDA fundamentally represents “discourse studies, focusing on the ways in which social influence, domination, and inequality are legislated, reproduced, and resisted through written and spoken communication in social and governmental contexts.” Some researchers contend that CDA aims to “uncover philosophical and inappropriate behaviors,” as well as the “systems of control inherent in municipal, state, and traditional processes.”

2.2. Political Discourse

The research body of political discourse parlays the complicated relation among language, power, and ideology. Many scholars investigated various scopes of rhetoric, pragmatics, and semantics under this framework. One may argue that political discourse is far more than a mere reflection of political realities; it is one of the most potent tools whatsoever by which these realities may be manipulated through public opinion and behavior (Kuzmenko et al., ٢٠٢٢). The negotiation of power relations by the political language is then understood within two fundamental frames: as either entrenching the status

quo or contesting it, thus imparting the relevance itself to the fields of linguistics and political science (Shigapova et al., 2021). This theoretical framework is a confluence of pragmatics and rhetoric that helps in understanding the justification of political communicative manipulative tactics. While pragmatics gives precedence to context in the dimension of meaning, rhetoric is what the persuaders do in order to influence the audience (Gomaa, 2023). Fundamental factors of persuasive language include Aristotle's appeals of *logos* (logical reasoning), *ethos* (credibility), and *pathos* (emotional appeal).

Political language is a medium of power through which government programs and actions have been accomplished while also showing the value of the people of society. It is important in getting the votes of politicians and inciting conflict between them to meet their various demands at any time. This flexibility lends some justification for the belief that political language is either flexible and fuzzy or at worst, misleading (Goshgarian, 2011). Scholars such as Lasswell (1949) instead regarded political language as one form of a weapon of influence upon public opinion. Within this perspective, Van Dijk (2006) has claimed that "the language of politics represents the very substance of power". According to Schaffner and Chilton (2002), because political discourse is such a complex human activity, it must be comprehensively examined for the field itself to advance. Also, the researchers make a case for examining political language with other major factors that could in turn influence it, such as cultural contexts and audience dynamics.

As Schaffner (1996) noted, political speeches, while sharing an overlapping commonality with other genres of political discourse, will be viewed within a sub-genre. Schaffner (1996) argues that, though they generally follow a similar structure directed toward recruiting and persuading the public about an intuitive end, political speeches also play out in many other contexts. The analysis of speeches of this kind is appreciated because of its rhetorical traits and qualities typical of the kind of political speeches. As Klein (1995) states, in the essence of all classic political rhetoric, the general characteristics will be used in contemporary political discourse. And Sauer (1996) intro-

duced ‘hybridisation,’ which includes elements of classical and contemporary character. Political speeches are normally said to be among the sophisticated, powerful, and subtle modes of communication used, primarily because culture and ideology act as inputs into them. Political discourse, just like any other, is characterized by terminology that differs from one nation to another, jargon, and slogans that tend to have specific political meanings.

According to Woodward and Denton Jr (2009), this type of language promotes the attitudes, beliefs, and values of politicians. Beard (2000), on the other hand, refers to it as writing and speaking applied to the art of persuasion (p. 35). David (2014) further points out that, many researchers perceive rhetorical language to be a means of manipulating language, whereby persuasive techniques are employed to compel individuals to act politically and be moved by political discourse. Thus, it is not uncommon for politicians and political speechwriters alike to incorporate a series of effective strategies—including allusion, metaphor, and, to a great degree, repetition—into their speeches (Atkinson, 2005).

2.3. The Role of Social Media in Politics

The social media revolution has considerably affected the political arena, providing new channels of communication and engagement between politicians and their electorate. To Castells (2012), social media represent a paradigm shift in the essence of political discourse, giving way to decentralized and participatory political communication. This immediacy opens doors and markets to political parties and leaders as they accommodate the fast pace of interactivity on the Internet. Twitter, Facebook, and Instagram allow information to be shared in real time, which can create a favorable climate for public opinion and collective action.

Social media has played a major role in shaping political campaigns and the elections that accompany them. In these websites, candidates are able to practice two-way communication with their citizens, as pointed out by Enli (2017). With this kind of interactivity, a more connected and responsive relationship between politicians and their audience can be built—something that

traditional media can't quite achieve. Also, social media allows politicians to push messages through to certain audience segments; it enables targeted campaigning. For example, the Obama 2008 and 2012 presidential campaign, in which they flipped their social media strategy successfully to engage young voters and build grassroots support, was portraying a paradigm shift in electoral strategies (Kreiss, 2016).

The influence of social media goes beyond communication; it is central to the framing of political narratives. Hermida (2010) notes that social media makes individuals producers of content instead of being consumers only, hence assisting in the construction of political discourse. Such democratization of information enables opinions to be varied and take shape, often conflicting with the prevailing narratives disseminated by mainstream media houses. Yet the spread of disinformation and echo chambers is a significant downside, as algorithmic content can lead users to consume information that reinforces their existing beliefs (Sunstein, 2009). This is a danger to democratic deliberation and an informed citizenry.

Moreover, social media is a tool for political mobilization and political engagement. Boulianne (2015) believes that social media has the potential to increase political engagement, especially among underrepresented groups. The Arab Spring has also come to be known as a prominent example in which Facebook and Twitter were used to organize protests and disseminate information about government malfeasance (Howard et al., 2011). In the same vein, social movements #BlackLivesMatter and #MeToo have used social media to shape their public image and create social influence, pointing out how web sites can affect real-life activity and accountability.

Hence, the ethical implications of social media utilization in politics have to do with privacy, surveillance, and manipulation of data. Tufekci (2017) draws attention to the importance of close examination of how political figures utilize data garnered from social media to engage in tailored messaging and persuasion. The Cambridge Analytica affair, in which the manipulation of individual data was employed to influence voters, comes into perspective regarding the risks of misusing power in modern digital spaces (Cadwalladr

& Graham-Harrison, 2018). These events come into focus regarding the necessity for regulatory bodies to enforce the presence of ethical protection in political marketing and communication strategies.

While with the increased development of technology, the influence of social media is also growing much more on political matters. If one has to understand contemporary political dynamics, then one has to examine the role of social media in engaging with political activities and public participation as emphasized by scholars such as Bennett and Segerberg (2012). The convergence of social media and conventional means of political activism marks a revolutionary landscape where activism, information exchange, and public debate reinforce one another. Future studies need to investigate the challenge of digital inequalities, the spread of misinformation, and the impact of algorithmic rule to fully understand the revolutionary potential of social media in domain of politics.

2.4. Dynamics of social media, politics and public reactions in Iraq

Vali Nasr's writing (2020) suggests the way in which social media served as a medium for a variety of voices, whereby grassroots movements were able to be heard and gather massive popular support. The protests that occurred in Iraq during October illustrate how vital online activism has become in organizing public protests. Protesters used social media platforms not only for mobilization but also for recording and reporting their experiences. Hadi (2021) examines the central role social media played in generating support and creating global awareness, as #SaveIraq and #WeWantReform were some of the popular hashtags on various platforms. Careful use of social media created global attention and forced the Iraqi government to act on the demands of its citizens.

Iraq's political landscape has increasingly been organized by reports circulating on social media. Social media platforms during the protests allowed citizens to discuss political matters, share their personal experiences, and propose potential solutions. According to a study by the International Crisis

Group (2020), social media has been the primary medium that has challenged disinformation and fake news spread by political groups and parties, portraying more information. This interaction promotes unity among groups by showing the potential of social media to overcome a consolidated population in a diversified society Alshaer (2021).

The emergence of social media has provided the platform for independent news websites in Iraq, with several perspectives and news coverage. Independent journalists and citizens' journalists have employed social media for the dissemination of information and sharing firsthand accounts of events. The existence of websites such as Al Mada and other independent news websites has diversified the media landscape. According to Yaseen (2022), these platforms have facilitated critical reporting of state and society, bringing responsibility to rulers and citizens' involvement in politics.

2.5. Main Principles of Wodak's CDA Model

2.5.1. Discourse and Power Relations

Wodak emphasizes that discourse is a means through which power relations are established, maintained, and challenged. She argues that language is not neutral; it reflects and shapes power dynamics in society. Wodak states:

“Discourse is always embedded in social processes, which shape its form, and whose form it shapes in turn. Discourse analysis thus has much to do with bringing out meanings, levels of meaning, as well as social relations of power” (Wodak & Meyer, 2009, p. 10).

2.5.2. Historical Context

This principle highlights the importance of the situational and historical context within which discourse occurs. Understanding the history gives a better understanding of how past events shape current discourses. Wodak asserts:

“Historical context matters as much as the immediate context of communicative interaction” (Wodak, 2001, p. 66).

2.5.3. Intertextuality

Wodak advocates for examining the connections between texts and how they reference or echo each other, a concept known as intertextuality. This principle urges researchers to look beyond isolated texts and consider broader discourse networks. She points out that:

“All texts are connected; they develop from and respond to other texts” (Wodak & Meyer, 2009, p. 22).

2.5.4. Identity Construction

Wodak argues that discourse plays a critical role in constructing social identities. This principle examines how individuals and groups use language to assert identities and navigate social group memberships. She states:

“Discourse is one of the primary social practices by which identities are formed”. (Wodak, 2001, p. 66).

2.5.6. Social Practices and Discursive Strategies

Wodak refers to the interlinkage of discourse and social practice and emphasizes applying some discursive strategies to reach social goals. This principle applies to the means of discourse that are utilized, such as framing, categorizing, and metaphor:

“The analysis blends a text-oriented perspective with a social practice approach”. (Wodak & Meyer, 2009, p. 25).

2.5.7. Critical Reflection

This principal advocates for examining ethical implications and ideologies behind the discourse. Wodak promotes a type of critical thinking towards discourse analysis, promoting the questioning of ideology:

“Critical discourse analysis not only attempts to understand how discourse is conditioned by social structures, but also how it is used to legitimize social practices” (Wodak, 2001, p. 66).

2.5.8. Multi-Dimensional Analysis

Wodak calls for a worldwide analytical approach founded on linguistic, contextual, and social grounds. This is the secret to good discourse understanding.

She notices:

“CDA is multi-dimensional in the sense that it looks not just at the text itself but also at the context in which the text was produced and received” (Wodak & Meyer, 2009, p. 10).

3. Methodology

This study extends the growing political communication research on TikTok platform through studying the representation of a major political campaigns in modern history of Iraq and the USA. The study is providing a cross-cultural comparison by studying the Tweets of the American and Iraqi Presidents namely Donald Trump and Abdul Latif Rashid about their election campaigns. The data in this study is the most liked Tweets posted by both presidents before their elections with top hashtags to find the common message themes. As for the framework, the study adopted Wodak's model (1999) of Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) that offers valuable methodologies for analyzing social media's role in political speech. The current study utilized qualitative approach to analyze data collected from tweets of both presidents.

3.1. Framework of the Study

Wodak's (1999) model of Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) is a systematic approach to the analysis of Arabic and English political communication on social media that focuses on the interplay between language and political power. The model emphasizes the significance of context, including historical and social practices that make up discourse. By examining linguistic elements, rhetorical techniques, and socio-political meaning within political discourse on social media, researchers are capable of uncovering the ways in which language operates to shape identity, establish public opinion, and delineate power relationships within various cultures. In this study, cultural

context, identity construction, and power relations were specifically studied using Wodak's model. Wodak's model stresses the significant role of historical and cultural contexts in discourse construction. It allows us to examine how political leaders construct their own identities and those of their nations. Moreover, it fosters the investigation of power relations in discourse. Tweets are a valuable data source in analyzing political leaders' establishment, negotiation, and management of power while addressing challenges of diverse types.

3.2. Data Collection and Procedure

This study employed qualitative approaches to explore Donald Trump, the United States' former and current President, and tweets of Abdul Latif Rashid, the President of Iraq. Tweets were collected with purposive sampling that is focused on significant political matters such as foreign policy, national cohesion, economic revival, and social affairs. The tweets collected were coded and examined systematically to examine tone patterns, audience engagement, and thematic emphasis. The tweets were collected within a temporal context, with special emphasis on those that were tweeted during times of major political events, like election campaigns, national crises, and international events.

This timeframe provides an insightful outlook on how the communication strategy of each leader might develop with the changing political landscape. Twitter was used as the main data collection source, with both the Twitter API and manual data collection methods being utilized to get the tweets that were not accessible via the API. Tweets written in both English and Arabic were prioritized to ensure the validity and integrity of analyzing the leaders' original statements. There was a comparison of 15 tweets from each of the leaders, making a total of 30 tweets. This sample was deemed adequate for the purposes of ascertaining significant patterns and themes without overcomplicating the analysis process. Upon collection of the tweets, a thematic analysis method was used with the aim of classifying the data under common themes and topics. Each of the tweets was carefully examined and categorized based on its subject, and thus significant themes were determined.

3.3. Data analysis and Results

3.3.1. Addressing Research Question One:

Wodak's model offers a theoretical framework for making sense of how the linguistic choices and rhetorical maneuvering deployed by both leaders reflect their political ideologies while concurrently fashioning their public personas within specific cultural milieux. In examining the chosen tweets of Trump and Abdul Latif Rashid, it becomes evident how their respective communication styles reflect their divergent political agendas. In this chapter, the researcher applies the first research question (In what ways do Donald Trump's and Abdul Latif Rashid's tweets reflect their political priorities and ideologies?) to Wodak's model (1999) with reference to cultural context, identity construction, and power relations.

3.3.1.1. Analyzing Donald Trump's tweets:

Tweet on Immigration: "We will build a wall, and Mexico is going to pay for it!"

This tweet is an example of nationalist ideology that emphasizes the protection of borders and control over immigration. This tweet constructs an identity of America as strong and protective. Trump uses this tweet in constructing an identity of protectionism and patriotism. In promising to construct a wall, he attempts to frame a message presenting immigrants as threat, hence assuring his base among employment-theft concerned and immigration-tied crime afraid voters.

Tweet on Foreign Policy: "The Fake News media is the enemy of the people!"

Here, Trump builds an "us vs. them" narrative. He recognizes mainstream media as adversarial to his administration, declaring power by delegitimizing critics.

Tweet on Economic Growth: "Jobs are coming back to America! Unem-

ployment is at the lowest level in decades!”

This tweet accentuating on economic nationalism and prosperity. It highlights the benefits of success that defines his presidency, appealing to American workers.

Tweet on Trade: “China has been taking advantage of us for years. Those days are over!”

The sovereignty concept surrounding economic matters gets a boost from this tweet. Framing the narrative in antagonistic terms defines Trump, setting him up against the realms of global exploitation, painting him as the one who presides over American interests.

Tweet on Law and Order: “We must restore law and order! The Democrats are trying to take it away!”

This reflects a law-and-order ideology usually associated with conservative values. It situated Trump as a defender against chaos, refining his authority.

Tweet on the Election: “The 2020 election was rigged and stolen!”

Here, Trump is delegitimizing democratic institutions, giving power to his base to mobilize so that they can protest against injustice they feel. It also paints him as a victim, trying to mobilize support by projecting himself as under siege.

Tweet on Globalism: “America First! We will no longer be taken advantage of by nations that treat us badly!”

The “America First” slogan outlines a broader denial of globalism, appealing to a constituency that values national independency over international concerns.

Tweet on the Economy: “Record stock market, jobs numbers, and wages. America is winning!”

Here he is attempting to create a self-image of success, connecting it to his presidency immediately. It creates a dichotomy of prosperity (under him) and failure (under them).

3.3.1.2. Analyzing Abdul Latif Rashid's Tweets:

Tweet on National Unity:

"معاً، سنبنّي عراقاً موحداً حيث يمكن لكل قومية أن تزدهر."

"Together, we will build a unified Iraq where every ethnicity can thrive."

This tweet promotes a vision of inclusivity and unity, highlighting diversity as an asset. The president constructs an identity that embraces pluralism in Iraq.

Tweet on Water Resources:

"الاستثمار في بناء المياه لدينا هو استثمار في مستقبلنا."

"Investing in our water infrastructure is investing in our future."

He emphasizes sustainable development, showcasing the importance of resources management. This reflects a forward-thinking approach to governance, signaling responsibility.

Tweet on Ethnic Unity:

"العراق هو موطن للعديد من الجماعات العرقية، وكل منها يساهم في ثقافتنا الغنية. دعونا نحتفل

بتنوعنا!"

"Iraq is home to many ethnic groups, and each of them contributes to our rich culture. Let's celebrate our diversity!"

Here, the President of Iraq constructs an inclusive identity that values diversity as a strength. This narrative is crucial in a country with significant ethnic divides, fostering unity.

Tweet on Youth Engagement:

"شبابنا هم مستقبل العراق. يجب أن نستثمر في تعليمهم وتمكينهم!"

"Our youth are the future of Iraq. We must invest in their education and empowerment!"

This tweet highlights the importance of young people engagement, constructing a narrative that is prospective. President's focus on education and empowering youth suggests a democratic tenet that prioritizes future leadership emanating from within Iraq.

Tweet on International Relations:

"يجب احترام سيادة العراق. لن نخضع لسلطة خارجية."

The Iraqi president is asserting national sovereignty in the face of external pressure here. It can be seen as responding to regional developments and also beseeching dignity of governance.

Tweet on Reconciliation:

"يجب أن نعمل معاً لشفاء جراح ماضينا. المصالحة ضرورية لتق."

"We must work together to heal the wounds of our past. Reconciliation is essential for our progress."

In this tweet, he emphasizes on the significance of recovery and moving forward, constructing an identity concentrating on acceptance post-conflict.

Tweet on Environmental Policy:

"إدارة المياه المستدامة ضرورية لمستقبل العراق. معاً، سنحمي مواردنا!"

"Sustainable water management is vital for Iraq's future. Together, we will protect our resources!"

This is a promise of sustainable development. Abdul Latif Rashid crafts a stewardship narrative and holds himself accountable towards future generations and fosters a sense of trust between the citizenry and government regarding resource control.

Tweet on Democracy:

"الديمقراطية هي طريقنا نحو الازدهار. لكل عراقي صوت يجب أن يُسمع."

"Democracy is our path to prosperity. Every Iraqi has a voice that must be heard."

The president's commitment to the ideals of democracy highlights his political ideology, welcoming engagement and responsibility among the masses.

Tweet on National Reconstruction:

"نحن ملتزمون بإعادة بناء البنية التحتية للعراق. معاً، يمكننا استعادة بلدنا."

"We are committed to rebuilding Iraq's infrastructure. Together, we can restore our nation."

This tweet emphasizes a collective effort toward rebuilding. Iraqi president constructs a national identity rooted in cooperation and resilience, appealing to a sense of shared responsibility among Iraqis.

Based on comparative analysis of the first research question, examining some tweets by Trump and Rashid, the researcher learned in the cultural con-

text Trump operates in the context of post-9/11 America marked by increased polarization around issues of immigration, nationalism, and race that Trump's tweets have a tendency to articulate populist inclinations and the desire to regain what is perceived as lost national integrity. On the other hand, Iraq's president Abdul Latif Rashid Works in a post-war nation, where reconciliation and reconstruction are his main agenda. The cultural environment emphasizes stability as well as healing the rifts caused by decades of conflict and suffering.

With regards to the identity construction, Trump's identity constructs a strong, defiant, and protective American identity. His tweets reflect a vision of America that resists foreign threats and fights for national interests assertively. And examining Abdul Latif Rashid identity, his tweets seek to construct an open Iraqi identity that accommodates diversity and seeks collective progress. His tweets focus on unity, democracy, and embracing cultural diversity.

The last item was power dynamic. Power in his tweets exhibit through rhetoric marginalizing opponents (e.g., media, political rivals) but unifying followers. Populism is utilized by him, portraying himself as a champion fighting on behalf of the forgotten American. Abdul Latif Rashid's tweets, however, facilitate empowerment and citizen engagement in support of his role as a facilitator of national development and unity. His approach is focused on healing and collaboration rather than division, as an attempt to create democratic engagement.

3.3.2. Addressing Research Question Two

Second section explored differences in audience engagements and interactions with political discourse by English and Arabic-speaking audiences. These differences can explain how cultural norms and values influence the reception and interpretation of political messages. Through the comparison of engagement rates in terms of likes, retweets, and comments, the researcher aimed to elicit the distinctive dynamics of English and Arabic social media. Following is the analysis of tweets based on second research question: How do interactions and engagements in political discourse on social media differ on Arabic and English platforms?

3.3.2.1. Analyzing Donald Trump's tweets:

Tweet on Foreign Policy: "China is a foe and the trade deal will never happen unless they stop cheating! America First!"

This tweet is representative of Trump's pugilistic style, noting an "us vs. them" attitude. The tone is confrontational, calling on nationalism. The replies usually have polarized responses, with his fans thrilled at his aggressive stance and his critics decrying it as irresponsible.

Tweet on Domestic Policy: "I have done more in 4 years than any President in history! The best is yet to come!"

Through the use of exaggeration, Trump establishes a rags-to-riches story that affirms and provokes loyalty from supporters, generating high levels of interaction and debate in comments. This tends to provoke personal attacks on the individual, imitating the personalized mode of English discourse.

Tweet on Gun Control: "Democrats are trying to take away your Second Amendment rights. Stand strong and protect your freedoms!"

This tweet is capitalizing on the high American values of personal freedom and right to bear arms. Trump is positioning himself as a guardian of those against governmental overreach, appealing to his base's belief. The reply to this tweet will tend to be a mixture of approval by those who have faith in the right to bear arms and outrage by those who have faith in stricter controls on guns, reflecting polarized interactions.

Tweet on COVID-19 Response: "We are making great progress in our fight against the virus. Vaccine is coming soon! America will be back on track!"

Trump is using an optimistic tone to reassure his base and make them feel confident in the U.S. response to the pandemic. The vaccine is being used as a rallying point. The comments are optimistic on the part of his base, with critics being more likely to doubt the timeline and efficacy, so there is a combination of supportive and critical debate in the comments.

Tweet on Immigration: "We will not allow anyone to invade our country. Our borders must be secure!"

This is indicative of Trump's hardline immigration stance. The rhetoric is used to appeal to a hard national identity, provoking fear regarding immigration. This would typically bring about resolute support from his base and fervent opposition from immigrants' rights defenders, used to show the polarizing nature of such a topic.

3.3.2.2. Analyzing Abdul Latif Rashid's Tweets:

Tweet on National Unity:

"!يجب أن نعمل معاً لبناء عراق موحد. الوحدة في التنوع هي قوتنا"

"We must work together to build a unified Iraq. Unity in diversity is our strength!"

This tweet is conciliatory and fosters cohesion and national unity, eliciting a call for unity. The reactions typically carry a respectful demeanor, pushing for positive interaction and shared aspirations for the country's future.

Tweet on Water Resource Management:

"!الإدارة المستدامة لمواردنا المائية أمر حيوي للأجيال القادمة. انضموا إلينا في هذا الجهد"

"Sustainable management of our water resources is crucial for future generations. Join us in this effort!"

Abdul Latif Rashid emphasizes sustainability and national commitment. Engagement around this tweet usually consists of constructive suggestions from citizens, displaying a collaborative atmosphere typical of Arabic discourse.

Tweet on Economic Recovery:

"!اقتصادنا يتعافى، ولكن يجب أن نستثمر في التعليم والبنية التحتية من أجل مستقبل أفضل"

"Our economy is recovering, but we must invest in education and infrastructure for a better future!"

Abdul Latif Rashid believes in development through infrastructure and education, appealing to aspirations for growth in Iraq. The response portion typically features considerate discussion of potential projects, with agreement on wishing to better the country and universal focus on the future.

Tweet on Pluralism:

"!احترام جميع المعتقدات أمر حاسم لانسجام العراق. نحن إخوة وأخوات في التنوع

"Respect for all beliefs is crucial for Iraq's harmony. We are brothers and sisters in diversity!"

Respect and harmony among different religions and ethnic groups in Iraq are emphasized here, with a common sense of identity. Interaction typically involves positive remarks from users who embrace diversity, along with calls for continued dialogue between different communities, showing a positive discourse.

Tweet on Environmental Policy:

"!تغير المناخ هو تحدٍ عالمي. يجب أن نعمل معاً لحماية بلدنا الجميل وكوكبنا"

"Climate change is a global challenge. We must work together to protect our beautiful country and planet!"

The president is highlighting responsibility to the environment, framing it as a collective effort. The tweet provokes discussions about sustainable practices, and individuals are likely to respond with how to protect Iraq's natural resources, with the ensuing supportive and solution-oriented responses.

Comparative analysis of the second research question showed that Donald Trump employed Confrontational Style and Polarization in Responses. Tweets tend to be likely to elicit a strong response, emphasize differences, and instill a sense of urgency among followers. The style is confrontational and highly dependent on the rhetorical use of threats and defense of freedoms. The replies to Trump's tweets are normally highly polarized; his supporters are eager and vocal, and his critics fight back with strong counterarguments. Alternatively, Abdul Latif Rashid came with a Constructive Engagement and Collaborative Tone. His tweets have a warm and friendly tone of engagement and unity. He employs inclusive language to try to build the image of mutually shared objectives and collective issues. Reactions towards his tweets lean towards being courteous, which instills constructive interaction where empower citizens to voice their opinions and allowed to contribute towards

national affairs.

4. Discussion

A contrast between the Twitter engagement of Donald Trump and Abdul Latif Rashid illustrates how their respective political contexts shape their priorities and approaches to communication. Trump tweets frequently feature accusations and are combative in nature, reflecting his strategy of rallying his base while also self-defining against perceived threats, including political rivals, the media, and parts of society. His rhetoric is heavily based on national security and economic nationalism themes, and he uses provocative language that is intended to draw strong emotional responses and appeal to his base's immediate impulses. Scholars contend that Trump's distinctive style has fostered a polarized political environment whereby both his detractors and supporters are engaged in contentious controversies characteristic of the divisiveness that characterizes contemporary American politics (Boulianne & Fuchs, 2020; Himmelboim et al., 2017).

In contrast, Abdul Latif Rashid's rhetoric is driven by a value system more aptly attuned to Iraq's socio-political context. His messages appeal to collective responsibility, inclusivity, and cooperation among various segments of society. Rashid's policy initiatives are aimed at mending societal cleavages and achieving a sense of togetherness in a nation that has undergone utmost upheaval and fragmentation. The literature suggests that leaders who preach messages of cooperation and reconciliation are more likely to be viewed as credible and trustworthy, especially in post-conflict environments (Hassan & Taha, 2021). By framing his message in terms of cooperation and reconstruction, Abdul Latif Rashid comes across as a leader committed to addressing national issues through collective effort, which is in sharp contrast with Trump's individualistic and combative rhetoric.

This difference in strategy highlights also the contrast between the ideologies of the two leaders and directs us to the contrast in priorities imposed by each of their political environments. Trump's language comes out of an ultra-

partisan environment of seeking to rally a loyalist bloc through strife and division, while Abdul Latif Rashid's messages are articulation of the nuances of a society seeking to reconcile and progress. This difference illustrates broader patterns of political rhetoric, in which cultural context heavily influences language. While the language on social media like Twitter evolves, the contrast in styles of these two politicians underscores how social media can both be a political battle ground for ideologies and a common conversation ground (Mickel, 2021; Wright & Street, 2020).

In political discourse analysis on digital media, verification of the distinct nature of interactions and engagements in Arabic and English contexts is required. Arabic websites highlight a collective mode of audience interaction, with discussion seeking similarity and in conformity with cultural expectations of respect and shared identity (Hassan, 2020). This is most evidently observed in the frequency of tweets that urge collective discussion among society members, thereby creating the platform for a sense of mutual understanding. English websites, however, concern individual expression, where users give voice to their own opinions, which will sometimes increase decomposition (Khan, 2021). An ideal case in point is public responses of politicians such as Donald Trump to their critics on Twitter, a step that tends to deepen conflicts and precipitate consolidated debates (Himmelboim et al., 2017).

Moreover, tone and character of political discussion widely vary depending on cultural contexts. Arabic tweets tend to be directed towards issues of unity, regard for heritage, and formal and diplomatic in character, in tune with the cautious political climate of the Arab region (Elmasry, 2018). For instance, an economic tweet would invoke appeals to national unity, which would ring very strong within the social-political reality of the area. English rhetoric, however, tends to be more contentious in style, with political leaders employing provocative language to rally support or stimulate reactions (Wright & Street, 2020). A prime example of this tendency is Trump's rhetorical style, which has a proneness to be based on sensationalized language not just to capture attention but also to rally his base of support amidst conten-

tious debates.

Such variations are compounded by cultural sensitivities and the histories that inform political discussions on such platforms. Debates in Arabic social media are often centered on critical socio-economic issues and national identity informed by the unique histories of the region (Rugh, 2020). English-language platforms focus more on expansive debates surrounding free speech and human rights, embodying Western democratic values (Mickel, 2021). Thus, these cultural dimensions significantly impact the character of political issues and web discussions, which reflect diverse societal norms and values.

5. Conclusion

In conclusion, the political discourse on social media platforms demonstrates stunning variations in the discussion and interaction between English and Arabic contexts, as evident in the variation in communication styles of politicians such as Donald Trump and Abdul Latif Rashid. Whereas Trump's tweeting is characterized by divisive language to rally his supporters through confrontation and the prioritization of national interest, Abdul Latif Rashid's approach is one of shared responsibility and unity, one that attempts to heal and cooperate in the environment of a post-conflict area. These varying strategies not only indicate the varying ideological realities from which they issue but also how cultural context informs political communications and public opinion.

In addition, the study determines the double-edged character of social media as both politics and sign of deeper social forces. While in so far as places like Twitter facilitate discussion in real time, they are places where tension between individual and collective identity gets played out in living colors. The political rhetoric differs between these websites not only informs citizens about the ideologies and agendas of their politicians but also defines the tone of public discussion itself, outlining how communities interact with politics. As social media continues to develop, it will be even more essential to recognize these dynamics in order to comprehend the significance of

political debate and participation in a range of cultural settings.

References

1. Al-Ali, S. (2022). Critical discourse analysis of Arabic political discourse on social media: Challenges and implications. *Journal of Language and Politics*, 21(3), 345-367. <https://doi.org/10.1075/jlp.21035.ali>
2. Alshaer, A. (2021). "Surveillance and Repression in the Age of Digital Activism: The Case of Iraq." *Journal of Global Security Studies*, 6(2).
3. Atkinson, M. (2005). *Lend Me Your Ears: All You Need to Know about Making Speeches and Presentations*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
4. Beard, A. (2000). *The Language of Politics*. London: Routledge.
5. Bennett, W. L., & Segerberg, A. (2012). The logic of connective action: Digital media and the personalization of contentious politics. *Information, Communication & Society*, 15(5), 739-768.
6. Bossetta, M. (2018). The digital architectures of social media: Comparing political campaigning on Facebook, Twitter, Instagram, and Snapchat in the 2016 U.S. election. *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly*, 95(2), 471-496. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1077699018763307>
7. Boulianne, S., & Fuchs, C. (2020). *The Role of Social Media in Political Polarization: A Critical Review of the Literature*. *Media and Communication*, 8(2), 67-74. Boulianne, S. (2015). Social media use and participation: A meta-analysis of current research. *Participation and Content Creation*, 20(1), 1-41.
8. Cadwalladr, C., & Graham-Harrison, E. (2018). The Cambridge Analytica files. *The Guardian*. Retrieved from theguardian.com
9. Castells, M. (2012). *Networks of outrage and hope: Social movements in the Internet age*. Polity Press.
10. Chilton, P., & Schaffner, C. (2002). *Politics as Talk and Text: Analytical Approaches to Political Discourse*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company. <https://doi.org/10.1075/dapsac.4>
11. Chouliaraki, L., & Fairclough, N. L. (1999). *The critical analysis of dis-*

course. *Discourse in Late Modernity* (pp. 60–69).

12. Dawisha, K. (2013). Arab nationalism in the 21st century: The relevance of timeless values in political discourse. *Middle Eastern Studies*, 49(5), 679-692. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00263206.2013.764038>
13. Elmasry, N. (2018). *The Role of Social Media in Arab Political Discourse*. *Journal of Middle East Media*, 14(1), 45-60.
14. Enli, G. (2017). Social media and political participation: The role of social media in political campaigns. In *The Cambridge Handbook of Social Media and Politics* (pp. 146-162). Cambridge University Press.
15. Fairclough, N. (1992). *Discourse and Social Change*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
16. Fairclough, N. (1995). *Media Discourse*. Edward Arnold.
17. Gana, N. (2014). Social media in the Arab world: A socio-political perspective. In I. A. S. Mohamad (Ed.), *The Arab Spring: The quest for democracy* (pp. 54-79). Springer.
18. Gee, J. P., & Handford, M. (2012). *The Routledge Handbook of Discourse Analysis*. Routledge.
19. Gomaa, M. (2023). Rhetorical strategies in political discourse: A comparative analysis of Western and Arab perspectives. *International Journal of Linguistics*, 15(1), 12-30.
20. Goshgarian, G. (2011). *Exploring Language* (14th ed.). London: Longman Publishing Group.
21. Hadi, A. (2021). "Online Activism and the Iraqi Protest Movement: Social Media's Role in Mobilization." *Arab Studies Quarterly*.
22. Hassan, A. (2020). *Community Engagement on Arabic Social Media: A New Paradigm*. *Arab Media & Society Journal*, 29, 32-50.
23. Hassan, A., & Taha, R. (2021). *Building Trust Through Dialogue: Political Communication in Post-Conflict Societies*. *Journal of Peacebuilding & Development*, 16(3), 22-35.
24. Halpern, D., Valenzuela, S., & Katz, J. E. (2017). We face, I tweet: How

- different social media influence political participation through collective and internal efficacy. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 22, 320-336. doi:10.1111/jcc4.12198
25. Hermida, A. (2010). Twittering the news: The emergence of ambient journalism. *Journalism Practice*, 4(3), 297-308.
 26. Himmelboim, I., et al. (2017). *The Twitter Network of Political Discourse: Information, Engagement, and Polarization*. *The Journal of Social Media in Society*, 6(1), 117-138.
 27. Howard, P. N., Aiden, H., & Hussain, M. (2011). Opening closed regimes: What was the role of social media during the Arab Spring? Project on Information Technology and Political Islam. Retrieved from oxford.edu
 28. International Crisis Group. (2020). "Iraq's October Protests: Voices for Change."
 29. Khan, A. (2021). *Politics and Polarization: The Impact of Social Media on Political Discussions in Western Democracies*. *European Journal of Communication*, 36(3), 264-278.
 30. Kreiss, D. (2016). *Prototype politics: Technology-intensive campaigning and the data of democracy*. Oxford University Press.
 31. Kuzmenko, E., Shigapova, F., & Zhuravlev, V. (2022). Language manipulation in political discourse: A cross-cultural perspective. *Discourse Studies*, 24(4), 567-589.
 32. Lasswell, H. (1949). Style in the Language of Politics. In N. Lasswell (Ed.), *Language of Politics: Studies in Quantitative Semantics* (pp. 20–39). New York: George W. Stewart.
 33. Lynch, M. (2016). *The Arab Uprisings: The unfinished revolutions of the new Middle East*. PublicAffairs.
 34. Mickel, A. (2021). *Rights, Freedom, and Engagement: Cultural Contexts of Political Discourse on Social Media*. *International Journal of Communication Studies*, 43(2), 102-118.
 35. Nasr, V. (2020). "The October Protests in Iraq: Understanding the Role of

Social Media." *Middle East Policy*.

36. Rugh, A. (2020). *The Politics of Communication: Historical Contexts in Arab Media*. *Middle East Journal of Communication*, 4(2), 110-125.
37. Sauer, C. (1996). Echoes from Abroad-speeches for the Domestic Audience: Queen Beatrix' Address to the Israeli Parliament. *Current Issues in Language & Society*, 3(3), 233-267. American University Press in Cairo.
38. Schaffner, C. (1996). Political Speeches and Discourse Analysis. *Current Issues in Language & Society*, 3(3), 201-204.
39. Shigapova, F., Zhuravlev, V., & Kuzmenko E. (2021). Power dynamics in political discourse: A critical analysis through CDA lens. *Critical Discourse Studies*, 18(1), 15-32.
40. Sunstein, C. R. (2009). *Republic.com 2.0*. Princeton University Press.
41. Tsifti, Y., & Cohen, J. (2019). Online news and public opinion: The impact of news consumption on political dispositions and participation. *Media Psychology*, 22(2), 203-222. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15213269.2017.1398852>
42. Tufekci, Z. (2017). *Twitter and tear gas: The power and fragility of networked protest*. Yale University Press.
43. van Dijk, T. A. (1998). *Discourse as social interaction*. Sage Publications.
44. Van Dijk, T. A. (2006). Discourse and Manipulation. *Discourse & Society*, 17(3), 359-383. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0957926506060250>.
45. Wodak, R. (1996). Orders of Discourse: The Uses of Language in the Politics of Class, Gender, and Nation. In S. C. H. D. J. K. (Eds.), *Discourse and Society* (pp. 12-32). London: SAGE Publications.
46. Wodak, R. (1999). *The Discourse of Politics in Action: Politics as Usual*. Palgrave Macmillan.
47. Wodak, R. (2000). Discourse and Politics. In C. R. (Eds.), *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis* (pp. 220-240). New York: Wiley.
48. Wodak, R. (2001). The Discourse-Historical Approach. In R. Wodak & M. Meyer (Eds.), *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis* (pp. 63-94).

London: SAGE Publications.

49. Wodak, R., & Meyer, M. (2008). Critical Discourse Analysis: History, Agenda, Theory, and Methodology. *Methods for Critical Discourse Analysis* (Second., pp. 1–33). London: Sage.
50. Wodak, R., & Meyer, M. (2009). Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis. In R. Wodak & M. Meyer (Eds.), *Discourse Studies: A Multidisciplinary Introduction* (pp. 1-14). SAGE Publications.
51. Woodward, G. C., & Robert, E. D. Jr. (2014). *Persuasion and Influence in American Life*. Illinois: Waveland Press.
52. Wright, S., & Street, J. (2020). *Provocation and Polarization: Understanding Political Rhetoric on Social Media*. *Media, Culture & Society*, 42(5), 811-828.
53. Yaseen, R. (2022). "The Role of Alternative Media in Iraq: Opportunities and Challenges." *Iraqi Journal of Media Studies*.
54. This Study Used the Official Twitter Pages of Donald Trump and Abdul Latif Rashid (examined for thematic content).