JJMLL

A Critical Discourse Analysis of the Persuasive Strategies Employed by Queen Rania of Jordan in her Interview with MSNBC

Muneera Jaradat *
Department of English, Jadara University, Jordan

Abstract

This study examines the persuasive linguistic strategies employed by Queen Rania of Jordan (QR) in her interview with the American News Network MSNBC on May 3, 2024. These strategies are analysed based on the Aristotelian theoretical model of persuasion, which comprises ethos, pathos, and logos appeals. The study employs the Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) approach. The findings show that QR utilised all persuasive strategies. In the ethos appeal, she leveraged her global positive character and employed the persuasive techniques of effectively using personal pronouns, "we," "I," and "you. " In a pathos appeal, QR raised rhetorical questions, told stories, and reflected on personal experiences. Regarding logos appeal, QR employed four persuasive techniques: statistics, authoritative and reliable sources, contrastive pairs, and reasoned arguments. The findings of this study aim to contribute significantly to linguistic studies in general and to the study of persuasion as a linguistic device in particular.

Keywords: Persuasive Strategies, Aristotelian Model, Critical Discourse Analysis, Queen Rania, MSNBC.

1. Introduction

Language and politics are so closely intertwined that they cannot be separated. According to Chilton (2004), language plays a fundamental role in shaping political activities, particularly in forming perceptions of social and political phenomena and influencing people's responses. As such, the nature of language in political discourse—whether written or spoken—is crucial, as political language is inherently linked to persuasion. In this context, Virtanen and Halmari (2005) argued that persuasion is part of all linguistic behaviour that seeks to change an audience's thinking, attitudes, or behaviour or strengthen its beliefs. Therefore, political figures, whether leaders, politicians, or legislators, depend on language as the most effective means of persuasion to influence their intended audiences and gain support for the issues they address. On this basis, the ability of political figures to use language effectively plays a significant role in the success of their political endeavours. Such effectiveness in using language depends not only on

applying the proper grammatical and linguistic rules but, more importantly, on the language user's ability to choose the appropriate lexical units at the right time and in the proper context.

In political discourse, whether written or spoken, the effectiveness of language is measured by its ability to persuade the target audience by influencing their attitudes, values, or actions. As such, persuasion is viewed by Van Dijk (1998) as a process through which listeners change their views, attitudes, and opinions in response to specific discourse, where this change depends on the discourse producer presenting their arguments to move, motivate, or change the audience. Similarly, Virtanen and Halmari (2005) define persuasion as *"those linguistic choices that aim at changing or affecting the behaviour of others or strengthening the existing beliefs and behaviours of those who already agree, the beliefs and behaviours of persuaders included."* This has led Beard (2000) to argue that rhetoric in language is the art of persuasive discourse. Accordingly, language can be an effective persuasive tool for political figures, whether in their written or spoken politics, to influence and attract people to one side or another. Thus, it can be safely argued that political discourse is more eminently persuasive than any other kind of discourse, as political speeches or interviews represent a unique form of persuasion and argumentation.

Considering the above, the fundamental question is how language used in political discourse can be persuasive. In other words, what linguistic strategies can the producer of political discourse employ to persuade? Neither this question nor the attempts to answer it are new. Instead, it has been raised and seriously addressed since the fourth century BC, when the famous Greek philosopher Aristotle developed his classical model for persuasion, which identifies three basic strategies for any language to be persuasive (Aristotle, 1984; Perloff, 2020). These strategies include the ethos appeal (i.e., the speaker's ethical appeal, credibility, and charm), the pathos appeal (i.e., the appeal to the audience's emotions and values), and the strategy relating to the logos appeal (i.e., the appeal to the audience's rationality through reliance on logic, evidence, and real-world references). Although Aristotle envisioned these strategies centuries ago, scholars (e.g., Beard 2000; Charteris-Black 2005) still discuss and analyze them in various contexts today.

2. Aim and Questions of the Study

This study examines the persuasive strategies that Queen Rania of Jordan (QR) employed in her interview with MSNBC's Joy Reid on May 3, 2024. Given the highly sensitive and globally debated subject matter of the interview (i.e., the events of October 7, 2023, and Israel's ongoing war on Gaza in response to these events), it provides a unique opportunity to analyze the persuasive strategies utilised by QR. The primary audience for this interview is the American public, who are often labelled as pro-Israel. Therefore, the study aims to determine the persuasive strategies that QR employs in her spoken political discourse, as reflected in the interview based on the Aristotelian model of persuasion. Accordingly, it seeks to answer the following questions: What persuasive strategies did QR utilise during her interview with MSNBC? Which persuasive strategies from the Aristotelian model did QR employ? Did QR utilize all the persuasive strategies outlined by Aristotle, and if so, which strategies were employed more frequently than others? Finally, what persuasive techniques were used within each strategy, and how?

3. The Study of Persuasive Strategies

Although several studies (Kennedy 1980; Brower and Guilfoy 2004; Richard 2008) have examined the concept, history, or theoretical models of persuasion, many contemporary studies, like the present one, have focused on the persuasive strategies employed in written or spoken discourses, particularly in political contexts. In these contemporary studies, while some researchers (Hansen 2004; Al-Abed Al-Hag and Al-Sleibi 2015; Iqbal et al. 2020; AbuAlhuda and Alshboul 2022; Albzour 2022; Jaradat 2022a; Akbar and Ekawati 2024; Amaireh 2023) analyze the persuasive strategies used by a political figure in specific occasion(s), as this present study does, others (Anderson 2008; Sharififar and Rahimi 2015; Ghasemi 2020; Jaradat 2022b; Al Hawamdeh and Qudah 2024; Al-Mutairi 2025) attempt to compare the persuasive strategies employed by different political figures in various political discourses.

A thorough examination of contemporary studies on linguistic persuasive strategies reveals that, although the classical Aristotelian Model of persuasion was developed in the fourth century BC, it has significantly influenced and guided many of these studies. For example, the persuasive strategies of the Aristotelian Model, as outlined by Killingsworth (2005), were later linked to the model of the essential elements of communication (i.e., the speaker, the message, and the audience) developed by Kinneavy (1971). Similarly, Hyland (2005) connects the three models of persuasion— ethos, pathos, and logos — articulated in the Aristotelian Model to the metadiscourse persuasion framework. This framework, according to Beale (1987) and Kopple (1989), relies on instances of metadiscourse (e.g., however, so, nevertheless, but, I believe, or I think) to enhance its primary theme and achieve persuasive aims. Several studies (Malmström 2016; Aljazrawi and Aljazrawi 2019; Abusalim et al. 2022; Kashiha 2022; Oktavia and Ekawati 2024) have examined the use of metadiscourse as a persuasive tool in various discourses, particularly in political discourse.

Moreover, the impact of the Aristotelian Model of Persuasion is significantly reflected in Johnstone's theoretical framework for persuasive strategies, developed in 2008. In this framework, Johnstone classified the persuasive strategies into three groups: the quasilogical, the presentational, and the analogical. Johnstone's theoretical persuasion framework was recently used by AbuAlhuda and Alshboul (2022) to examine the persuasive strategies in two speeches of King Abdullah II about the Impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. In this study, the authors found that King Abdullah II employed three persuasive strategies — quasi-logical, presentational, and analogical — in the two speeches, respectively. Findings also reveal that the presentational strategy is the most frequently used. The second most frequently used strategy is the quasilogical. The last employed persuasive strategy is analogical. Similarly, the impact of the Aristotelian Model of persuasion was evident in the study by Amaireh (2023), who applied the exact Aristotelian classifications of persuasive strategies to examine the rhetorical techniques employed by King Abdullah II in his speeches to persuade his audience during the COVID-19 pandemic. The researcher found that King Abdullah II employed ethical appeals to establish a connection with the audience by using first-person pronouns and the inclusive pronoun "we" for rhetorical purposes to persuade the audience. Additionally, King Abdullah II employs logical arguments, such as an argument

from statistics, quotations from the Holy Quran, and an argument from a dilemma, among others, to convince the audience of his viewpoints and persuade them to take specific actions.

4. Theory, Approach, and Methodology of the Study

4.1. The study's Theoretical Framework

Although the theoretical Aristotelian Model of Persuasion (Aristotle 1984) was envisioned centuries ago, it continues to guide studies of persuasion today. From this study's perspective, this model's influence lies in its originality in classifying persuasive strategies into three primary groups (i.e., ethical, emotional, and logical) that encompass all persuasion strategies. Moreover, the usefulness of this theoretical model arises from the fact that under the umbrella of each primary persuasion strategy, several persuasive techniques or sub-strategies can be identified. Therefore, this study examines the persuasive strategies employed by QR in her interview with MSNBC based on the theoretical framework of the Aristotelian Model of persuasion. This is achieved through an in-depth analysis and deconstruction of the linguistic lexical choices used by QR to determine when and how she employed the three persuasive strategies Aristotle envisioned and which persuasive technique(s) were utilised within each strategy.

4.2. The Study's Approach

Based on the study's aim and questions, Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) is the most appropriate approach for this study. This is due to the views of the founders of CDA (Fairclough 1989, 1992, 2001, 2013; Fairclough and Fairclough 2012; Van Dijik 1993, 1997, 1998; Wodak 1997, 1999) as this approach is an effective instrument to reveal the hidden or non-obvious dimensions of the language used in discourses, whether in written or spoken forms. Therefore, it is a very suitable approach to analyze political discourses because producers of these discourses, according to Van Dijk (1997), made their linguistic lexical choices not only to meet stylistic or decorum purposes but also to downplay political viewpoints, gain support, influence public sentiment and attitudes, and in the end, shape the consensus and stands of their audience.

Given its effectiveness, CDA has frequently been employed in studies examining persuasive strategies in political discourse (Hyland 2008; Biber and Zhang 2018; Pelclová and Lu 2018; Jaradat 1999, 2022a). This is because CDA is instrumental in demonstrating how the producer of a given political discourse attempts to influence the attitudes and values of its recipients. Thus, using CDA suggests that the researcher employing this approach is more active and involved than in stylistic discourse analysis, as the evaluative role of the researcher in the former is more pronounced in uncovering certain hidden or less visible dimensions (e.g., persuasive strategies) of the discourse under analysis. Regarding political discourse analysis, Van Dijk (1998) views it as a branch of CDA that focuses on the analysis of "political discourse" and, therefore, is both about political discourse and regarded as a critical enterprise. Therefore, the study of language in any political discourse (e.g., political speeches, political interviews, political debates, parliamentary hearings, and discussions) extends beyond the domains of literature and linguistics. In this context, Pelinka (2007) argued that "language must be seen (and analyzed) as a

political phenomenon" and that "politics must be conceived and studied as a discursive phenomenon." As such, by employing the "critical-political discourse analysis" approach in this study, the primary emphasis is on the lexical and linguistic choices of the political discourse producer. Accordingly, in the present study, this approach will deconstruct the linguistic lexical choices of QR to determine how she employed them to persuade her audience of her points of view and stances regarding the interview's subject matter.

4.3. The Study's Methodology

The study uses a qualitative content analysis approach to achieve its findings. According to Hsieh and Shannon (2005), this method systematically examines textual, visual, or audio data within political discourse to identify the prevalent themes, patterns, or trends. Applying this method alongside CDA should uncover some of the hidden dimensions in the language used by QR in her interview, helping to determine the nature of her persuasive strategies. This involves analysing linguistic lexical units, including words, phrases, expressions, and sentences chosen by QR to persuade her audience. With this in mind, the theoretical Aristotelian model of persuasion is operationalised in this study, focusing on the type of linguistic lexical units used by QR in the interview. Do these units—whether words, phrases, expressions, or sentences—reflect the ethos appeal (i.e., the speaker's ethical appeal, credibility, and charm), the pathos appeal (i.e., the appeal to the audience's emotions and values), or the logos appeal (i.e., the appeal to rationality through logic, evidence, and real-world references)? According to Schaffner (2004), the nature of linguistic lexical choices plays a significant role in influencing persuasive language. Unlike the quantitative content analysis method, which is deductive in nature for testing hypotheses derived from theories, qualitative content analysis is inductive, drawing conclusions from the analysed data (Berg 2004; Schreier 2012). In this study, through qualitative analysis of the language used in QR's interview, conclusions are drawn regarding the persuasive strategies employed by QR in her political discourse, as reflected in the interview.

5. The Subject Matter of QR's Interview and her Profile

The subject matter of QR's interview, the context in which it was produced, and QR's character are crucial for understanding the study's findings. Fairclough and Fairclough (2012) argue that understanding any political discourse necessitates considering the context in which it is produced and the orientation of its producer.

5.1. The Subject Matter of the Interview

The events of the 7th of October 2023, carried out by Hamas (i.e., the Palestinian Islamic Resistance Movement) and the ongoing war by Israel on Gaza have captured the attention of the world in the past two years. It is believed that these events and their reactions have resulted in serious consequences for the Palestinians and Israelis, the stability in the Middle East, and the world. The number of people killed on both sides has so far exceeded 60,000; most of them are Palestinians, and over 80% are civilians. Furthermore, over one hundred thousand were injured and became severely handicapped, in addition to

an unknown substantial number of missing people. This is accompanied by unprecedented destruction of homes, schools, health centres, and hospitals in Gaza and the displacement of hundreds of thousands of people on both sides. In this context, some in the media have equated the events of the 7th of October 2023, and the reaction to them, with the events of 9/11, 2001, that occurred in the USA. This comparison is because both events created unprecedented worldwide debate concerning world order, international law, and international humanitarian law. Regarding the events of October 7, 2023 (i.e., the subject matter of this study), the debate centers on which side is to be blamed. On the one hand, the Israeli side argues that Israel's reaction to these events was part of its right to self-defense. On the other hand, the Palestinian side contends that the event of the 7th of October 2023 was a reaction to 75 years of the Israeli occupation of their land, and, thus, they believe that they have the right to use all the available means to liberate their occupied lands. Naturally, each side attempts to use all means to persuade its audience. Amongst this heated and continuous debate, QR was interviewed by Joy Reid on MSNBC to reflect on these events. Therefore, the highly debatable subject matter of the interview and the context in which it took place provide a unique opportunity to study the linguistic strategies employed by QR to persuade her audiences, mainly the American people, who are generally perceived to be pro-Israel. This unique research opportunity can be compared to the one created by 9/11, which led to numerous critical inquiries into these events' discursive and linguistic dimensions (e.g., Silberstein, 2002; Arkin, 2005; Dunmire, 2009). For example, in her book "War of Words: Language, Politics, and 9/11", Silberstein (2002) analyzed various discursive forms of the political language that emerged after 9/11, focusing on how language was used in a moment of national crisis to justify the war on Afghanistan and the broader war on terrorism.

5.2. QR's Profile

QR is known as the wife of King Abdullah II ibn Al Hussein, the king of Jordan, and is also considered an internationally recognized and respected political and social figure. She gained this global recognition through her continuous efforts to advocate peace, tolerance, compassion, and empathy among people of all cultures and backgrounds, promoting greater understanding and acceptance among individuals of all faiths. This has earned her national, regional, and global recognition as reflected in receiving many prestigious awards (Full list of awards and honorary degrees and medals). Moreover, QR has authored several books, including the New York Times bestseller The Sandwich Swap, which is inspired by her childhood experiences. (View the complete list of publications). According to Forbes magazine's 2009 list, QR is considered one of the 100 most powerful women in the world. This implies that QR, as the producer of the studied political discourse reflected in her interview, is a credible political figure who has gained a reputation for being objective and balanced in her views and stands. Regarding her linguistic capabilities, QR is considered fluent in her native language (Arabic) and English, and she is perceived as an impressive communicator. In this context, Al-Khalidy (2018) stated, *"Queen Rania is not only an effective communicator but also an eloquent speaker."*

The globally respected character of QR is perhaps why MSNBC has interviewed her to reflect on the events of the 7th of October and their reactions. She was also interviewed on the same issue by other major media networks, such as with CNN's Christiane Amanpour on March 11, 2024, and CBS's

Margaret Brennan on Face the Nation on May 5, 2024. Moreover, on May 7, 2024, QR was a guest on the discussion with MSNBC's Ali Velshi at the 2024 Milken Institute Global Conference, where she also addressed issues related to the subject matter of this study. Therefore, in this study, it is hypothesized that QR will utilize her charm, character, and credibility to influence her target audience through her interview.

6. The Importance of the Study

Given its aim and questions, this study is expected to make an original contribution to linguistic persuasion studies. This originality stems from two main aspects. The first is that persuasion studies in political discourse usually focus on political speeches rather than political interviews, as shown earlier in the reviewed studies. This study argues that political figures appear more persuasive in political speeches than in political interviews. This is because political speeches, as written discourses, are usually prepared in advance. Thus, they tend to be formal, closed, and structured. In contrast, political interviews, as spoken discourses, are generally less structured and more spontaneous and are more susceptible to interference or follow-up from the interviewers. Moreover, when preparing political speeches, political figures often seek help and advice from their advisors and consultants and could review and refine them before delivery to ensure quality and persuasiveness. However, in political interviews, although political figures may have some help from their advisors and consultants on the subject matter of their interviews in general terms and the kind of questions expected, they mainly must depend more on their abilities to be persuasive in their interviews, especially regarding the unexpected questions or the flow-up questions on the part of the interviewer. This implies that the studies of persuasive strategies in political interviews may better reflect the persuasive abilities of political figures. It is, therefore, hoped that this study will open the door to further linguistic studies of persuasive strategies employed in political discourses, as reflected in political interviews, since most studies in this area have focused on political speeches.

The second angle is related to the fact that while only a few studies (Amaireh 2023; Alkalidy 2018) have addressed QR political discourses, none have explicitly examined the persuasive strategies employed in any of QR's interviews. As such, this study aims to be the first to systematically examine the persuasive strategies employed by QR in many of her interviews. The originality of this study is further emphasized when it is considered that very few studies have addressed the political discourses produced by women in general and by Arab-Islamic women in particular. As such, this study could pave the way for further research examining the persuasive strategies employed in political discourses produced by women in general and Arab-Islamic women in particular. From a gender perspective, it is important to see whether women, compared to men, address their audience differently and whether Arab-Islamic women address their audience differently from women from other cultures.

7. Findings and Discussions

7.1. Introduction

QR's interview with MSNBC is relatively long and comprehensive, comprising 3,861 words. After the welcoming words, the interviewer (Joy Reid) said, "*This interview comes at a difficult time and circumstance, and I would like you to reflect on what is happening in Gaza not only as the Queen of Jordan but also as a Palestinian woman, as a mom.*" The 3,861 words were distributed across eight questions, covering various dimensions of the interview's subject matter. The questions raised by the interviewer related to highly debatable and sensitive issues. For instance, whether QR believes that Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu is a war criminal, and QR's view of the world's reaction to the unprecedented number of casualties among civilians, coupled with the real threat of mass starvation. In addition to QR's assessment of how President Biden had handled the war in Gaza, QR's reflection on the protests and demonstrations against what is happening in Gaza that have taken place around the world and at university camps in the United States particularly, and, finally, QR's view of the viability of the two-state solution. The interviewer's questions and QR's answers are available on MSNBC's official website. Additionally, the entire interview is also available in its written form in the original language of the interview (i.e., English) on the official website of the Jordan Royal Court.

Before presenting the findings of this study, three general observations must be kept in mind. First, although this study examines each persuasive strategy independently, they are not mutually exclusive, as they can be interconnected, where each one may reinforce the other. Sometimes, a statement of discourse may imply the three persuasive strategies, two of them, or just one. This implies that the choice of one persuasive strategy over another is determined by the context in which the discourse is delivered, the background and orientation of the discourse's producer, and the nature of the target audience. However, the more the producer of a political discourse attempts to balance the use of persuasive strategies, the more persuasive the discourse will be. In this context, Wróbel (2015) stated that *"Aristotle himself characterizes persuasion as a feat that can be achieved when the speaker's character is by the way the speech is spoken"* and *"the audience is prone to grant him credibility"*.

The second observation relates to this study, under the umbrella of each of the three main strategies of persuasion envisioned by Aristotle, different persuasive techniques or sub-strategies can be employed. For example, as will be apparent later in the analysis, within the persuasive strategy relating to the logos appeal, various persuasive techniques or sub-strategies can be employed to persuade the audience by appealing to their reason and rationality. The third observation relates to how the interview extracts are presented during the analysis. Depending on the context, while some extracts from the interview presented in the tables below may be complete sentences, others may not be in the form of complete sentences, as only a few words or expressions are presented in the tables to facilitate the analysis of the findings.

7.2. The Persuasive Strategies Employed by QR during the Interview

A thorough examination of the linguistic and lexical choices used by QR in her interview reveals that she employed a combination of strategies to persuade her audience. QR creatively utilised, to varying

degrees, all the persuasive methods outlined in Aristotle's theoretical persuasion framework. It is evident that QR leveraged her established global credibility, charisma, and careful lexical choices to influence her audience. Moreover, QR effectively used the appropriate language to win the hearts and passions of her audience when necessary. Additionally, QR relied more often on logic and reasoning to engage her audience's minds whenever needed. Below is a detailed critical analysis of the linguistic and lexical choices made by QR in her interview, aimed at determining how she employed the persuasive strategies envisioned by Aristotle to persuade her audience. What persuasive techniques did QR utilise in each of these strategies?

7.2.1. The Persuasive Strategy Relating to Ethos Appeal

In this strategy, the producer of political discourse relies on credibility, righteousness, character, believability, and decency, which are difficult to question. As such, persuasion is achieved through the perceived image of the character and the posture of the discourse's producer, as well as their ability to appear clever and knowledgeable to their target audience regarding the addressed issues (Crowley & Howhee, 2004). As clarified earlier, QR has established a credible, sincere, and objective reputation. This is the reason behind her numerous regional and international awards, which have led, as indicated earlier, to her being approached and interviewed by major international news networks.

In this interview, QR attempted to emphasise her perceived global image of credibility and decency by presenting a well-balanced and objective view regarding the events of October 7th and the reactions to them, despite being an Arabic-Islamic woman of Palestinian background. This is evident in the extracts from her answers to the interviewer's questions in Table I.

Table I: The Extracts Reflecting the Objectivity of QR

Number of the extract	Extracts	Number of the reviewer's question
1	*"Rightfully after October 7th, the whole world stood up and condemned those actions, but we are not seeing the same kind of reaction towards what is happening today".*	1
2	*"How come international law is applied selectively?"*	1
3	*"What does it mean when international humanitarian law is applied selectively?"*	2
4	*"It does not matter what I believe. I think what matters is what international law says."*	3
5	*"I mean, you mentioned my Palestinian background. And, because of that background, I'm aware of the fact that I might identify with the Palestinian side more. And that's why every day, I challenge myself to actually put myself in the shoes of an average Israeli, to try to see things from their point of view – a relative of a hostage or just an average person who's worried about missiles flying onto them. I try to think of that. All I want is for people to just for once try to put themselves in the shoes of Palestinians".*	4
6	*"Well, I just want people to understand that, in the eyes of the world, the US is part of this war." ....*	6
7	*"And, if we take that as a starting point, and we work on compromises on both sides, then we can find a situation that safeguards Israel's security and also gives Palestinians statehood".*	8

The above extracts illustrate that QR attempted to reinforce the perceived global image of her objectivity, credibility, righteousness, and believability. This study argues that reinforcing a positive image of her personality is necessary for persuasive purposes through an ethos appeal, but it is insufficient. This image must also be reflected and supported by QR's careful selections of lexical and linguistic choices to align with her perceived image. Therefore, QR relied on her charisma and employed three persuasive linguistic techniques to gain more support for her views and stance, using ethos appeal. These three persuasive techniques are:

7.2.1.1 The Use of the First-Person Pronoun: The Inclusive "we"

To create a sense of partnership and harmony with the audience, speakers strive to use the inclusive form of the personal pronoun "we" as often as possible while minimizing the use of its exclusive form. The inclusive "we" persuades the audience by establishing rapport, making the speaker appear part of their group. Using the pronoun "we" helps the speaker persuade the target audience by not excluding or detaching themselves from the audience but attempting to align themselves with them, creating a sense of belonging, involvement, and unity. In this context, while discussing the idea of "Ideological polarization," Van Dijk (1997) emphasized the importance of implementing pronouns such as "we" and "our" to represent the self positively, compared to presenting the self negatively by choosing the pronouns "them" or "their." According to Zheng (2000), the inclusive persuasive technique through personal pronouns such as "we" is usually employed by politicians to convince their audience that both themselves and their ideas are "of the people." As such, the role of personal pronouns is to serve an interpersonal function in discourse, linking the speaker and the listener.

In this interview, a critical deconstruction of QR's language shows that she effectively employed the personal pronouns "we" and sometimes "our" in their inclusive form whenever it was linguistically appropriate. This was to build trust and a state of intimacy with her audience by creating a harmonious relationship and mutual understanding between the interlocutors. This is apparent in QR's answers to the interviewer's questions, as in the following extracts in Table 2.

Table 2: Extracts Reflecting the Use of the First-Person Pronoun "we" in its Inclusive Form

Number of the extract	Extracts	Number of the reviewer's question
1	*"We have been quite devastated..."*	1
2	*"We have been seeing...."*	1
3	*"We cannot justify..."*	1
4	*"At what we are seeing..."*	1
5	*"But we are not seeing..."*	1
6	*"And we are seeing people..."*	1
7	*"The way we are viewing our world order..."*	1
8	*"The way our world order..."*	1
9	*"But we cannot wait..."*	2
10	*"And we are already very late..."*	2
11	*"The longer we wait..."*	2
12	*"We are talking about..."*	2

Number of the extract	Extracts	Number of the reviewer's question
13	*"We were even debating ..."*	2
14	*"In our international community..."*	2
15	*"But we do not want symbolic gestures..."*	2
16	*"We have in our world ..."*	2
17	*"We have seen..."*	2
18	*"So, we need these measures..."*	2
19	*"That we are not going to continue..."*	2
20	*"That we are going to apply..."*	2
21	*"We need to just..."*	2
22	*"For us to really..."*	2
23	*"Are we supposed to think that ..."*	3
24	*"Are we supposed to believe..."*	3
25	*"Are we supposed to believe that..."*	3
26	*"We can all agree..."*	4
27	*"We are losing sight..."*	4
28	*"We have been taught..."*	4
29	*"We are sending..."*	4
30	*"We need to face the realities..."*	4
31	*"We were told..."*	4
32	*"We are seeing..."*	4
33	*"We have seen ..."*	4
34	*"We have seen that..."*	6
35	*"We cannot go back..."*	8
36	*"We are where we are today..."*	8
37	*"For us..."*	8
38	*"When we say..."*	8
39	*"We have to be ready..."*	8
40	*"We have to understand..."*	8
41	*"We have to remember..."*	8
42	*"We will take, for example..."*	8
43	*"If we take that..."*	8
44	*"Then we can..."*	8

It should be evident that QR's high reliance on the personal pronoun "we" in its inclusive form, along with its other forms (our and us), indicates that she wanted to engage and involve her audience in the issues raised so that they would become active participants in the discourse. As such, QR effectively utilised this persuasive technique to build trust, partnership, and a state of intimacy with her audience by creating a harmonious relationship between the interlocutors. Several studies (Al-Abdel Al-Haq and Al-Sleibi 2015; Amaireh 2023) have demonstrated that this persuasive technique is prevalent in political discourse, as political figures often tend to identify with their audience.

However, this heavy dependence on the inclusive "we," "our," or "us" does not imply that QR did not use the exclusive "we," "they," or "them." Depending on the nature of the question, QR sometimes did, though as rarely as possible, use these exclusive pronouns. In QR's answer to the fifth question, she used the personal pronoun "we" or "them" in the exclusive form when discussing her relationship with her father-in-law, late King Hussein, who signed a peace agreement with the late Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin. Here, QR tends to use the pronoun 'they' to refer exclusively to the late King Hussein and the late

Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin (e.g., I know they wanted a warm peace) or to use the pronoun "we" to refer exclusively to her relationship with the late King Hussein (e.g., we have had many conversations about this). Additionally, the use of the exclusive "we" or "them" was linguistically justified in QR's answer to the seventh question when she spoke exclusively about the Israelis or the Palestinians, where she used the exclusive pronouns "they" or "them" to refer to either group.

7.2.1.2. The Use of the First-Person Pronoun: "I"

In addition to effectively using the personal pronoun "we" in its inclusive form, QR used the first-person pronoun "I" throughout her answers. This technique was intended to build on QR's already established image of credibility, objectivity, and trustworthiness. Therefore, in her attempt to utilize this image, QR frequently employed the persuasive technique of presenting a substantial aspect of her personality to persuade her audience of her views and stance. The critical analysis of the language employed by QR in the interview reveals that the first-person pronoun "I" was used in response to all the questions raised by the interviewer, as shown in Table 3.

Table 3: Extracts Reflecting the Use of the First-Person Pronoun "I"

Number of the extract	Extracts	Number of the reviewer's question
1	*I think it is not my background...."*	1
2	*But I think....."*	1
3	*"And I think that this...."*	1
4	*"I think the way our world...."*	1
5	*"So yes, I think it is important ..."*	2
6	*"And I think this is causing much outrage..."*	2
7	*"To say illegal settlement should be stopped..."*	2
8	*"And I think we need ..."*	2
9	*"It does not matter what I believe..."*	3
10	*"I think what matters..."*	3
11	*"I will leave..."*	3
12	*"I am not a legal expert..."*	3
13	*"But what I can say..."*	3
14	*"But I think passions..."*	4
14	*So I have not been...*	4
15	*"I have been seeing..."*	4
16	*"But I have not seen..."*	4
17	*"I think this collective dismissal..."*	4
18	*"I think it is quite insulting..."*	4
19	*"I think when ..."*	4
20	*"And I think..."*	4
21	*"But I think..."*	4
22	*"I mean..."*	4
23	*"I am not aware of the fact that I might..."*	4
24	*"I challenge myself..."*	4
25	*I try to think..."*	4
26	*"All I want..."*	4
27	*"Well, look I was..."*	5
28	*"And I saw..."*	5
29	*"I know that..."*	5
30	*"And I truly am inspired by his vision..."*	5
31	*And I genuinely am very inspired..."*	5
32	*"I have never forgotten..."*	5

A Critical Discourse Analysis of the Persuasive Strategies Employed by Queen Rania of Jordan in her Interview with MSNBC

Number of the extract	Extracts	Number of the reviewer's question
33	*"I used to..."*	5
34	*"Because I always ..."*	5
35	*"And so I think..."*	5
36	*"Well, I just want ..."*	6
37	*"But I think words..."*	6
38	*"Because I said..."*	6
39	*"I would say..."*	6
40	*"So I think..."*	7
41	*"But I think ..."*	7
42	*"I am not saying it..."*	7
43	*"If I have hope..."*	8
44	*"It is because I believe..."*	8
45	*"And I know that..."*	8
46	*"But I think the fact..."*	8
47	*"I know for sure..."*	8
48	*"When I say statehood..."*	8
49	*"I mean a sovereign state..."*	8

As Table 3 shows, while QR frequently used the first-person pronoun "I," she rarely used the objective pronoun "me" or the possessive pronoun "my." In her frequent use of the personal "I," QR attempted to build and enhance her character by expressing her views, thoughts, hopes, and feelings, thereby identifying herself with the recipients. There are two critical observations regarding how QR has used the personal pronoun "I." The first relates to using the pronoun "I" in the affirmative rather than the negative form to convey a positive image in her discourse. This is apparent in that almost all instances when QR used the pronoun "I" were in the affirmative form. This technique gives the audience the impression that QR has knowledge, awareness, and confidence in what she is saying. The only exception to QR's use of the pronoun "I" in the affirmative form was when she said, "I am not a legal expert," as this perhaps reflects a kind of modesty in her answers.

The second and more critical observation regarding QR's use of the pronoun "I" is that she frequently used it, diplomatically, politely, and less assertively to show respect to her audience. This is evident in the fact, as shown in Table 3, that in most instances, QR used the pronoun "I" simultaneously with either "I think," "I would," "I can say," or "I believe." The use of these kinds of hedging words, according to Lakoff (1975), has two main functions: showing indirectness and politeness. In this interview, with its sensitive subject matter and target audience (i.e., Americans), it seems that QR attempted to make her points indirectly, politely, and diplomatically by avoiding direct criticism to minimize confrontation between differing opinions. This persuasive technique employed by QR aligns with Hyland's (2005, 2008) view that hedging words convey the speaker's caution while expressing their thoughts by negotiating claims diplomatically. Moreover, the findings of this study lend further support to the arguments presented by both Lakoff (1975) and Holmes (1990), who suggest a relationship between gender and the use of hedge devices and tag questions. Lakoff (1975) argued that women use hedges

more than men to convey "uncertainty." While Holmes (1990) asserted that women use hedges more than men to show politeness or uncertainty, depending on the circumstances.

7.2.1.3. The Use of the First-Person Pronoun: "you"

In addition to frequently using the first-person pronouns "We" and "I" in the interview, QR also relied on the personal pronoun "you" in her responses. As shown in Table 4, QR used the pronoun "you" in all her answers to the eight questions posed by the interviewer.

Table 4:   Extracts Reflecting the Use of the First-Person Pronoun "you"

Number of the extracts	Extracts	Number of the reviewer's question
1	*"Well, you know, I think..."*	1
2	*"Well, you know, Israeli..."*	2
3	*"When you deprive ..."*	3
4	*"When you adopt..."*	3
5	*"And you hinder..."*	3
6	*"When you displace..."*	3
7	*"When you kill...*	3
8	*"And when you use..."*	3
9	*"When you have a patch..."*	3
10	*"How can you not kill..."*	3
11	*"When you say..."*	3
12	*"You know, prioritizing quantity ..."*	3
13	*"Well, look, we can..."*	4
14	*"Dismissing these students, as you know..."*	4
15	*"You have been invested..."*	4
16	*"Your reaction..."*	4
17	*"To defend what you believe in..."*	4
18	*"It pushes you out of your comfort zone..."*	4
19	*"I mean, you mentioned..."*	4
20	*"It is about; you know routine days..."*	4
21	*"You know; Israel is ..."*	4
22	*"We want you..."*	4
23	*"Well, look, I ..."*	5
24	*"Is that, like you said..."*	5
25	*"You know, I used to..."*	5
26	*"It is like you are either taking..."*	5
27	*"And then you have the politics..."*	5
28	*"Because you provide the arms..."*	6
29	*"Where You know ..."*	6
30	*"And you provide the assistance..."*	6
31	*"And also you use..."*	6
32	*"Where, you know, international..."*	6
33	*"If you could free ..."*	7
34	*"Then you can go and continue..."*	7
35	*"You know, there is an omnipresent..."*	7
36	*"And you see officials...."*	8
37	*"You have to be ready..."*	8

Table 4 illustrates that the frequent use of the pronoun "you" in QR's answers is intended to maintain a productive and dynamic interchange and a positive interaction throughout the interview. As such, using the pronoun "you" is viewed in this study as an effective persuasive technique since it seeks

to elicit the acceptance or agreement of the interviewer, who is intended to represent the audience. Therefore, when QR says to the interviewer, "*you know,*" or "*as you know,*" this functionally means that the issues brought up by QR are already known to the interviewer and, thus, should be persuasive for the audience who are supposed to trust the interviewer as she is representing them.

Moreover, this technique is viewed as part of the speaker's expressions of politeness and respect towards the interviewer and the audience, reflecting the character of QR. This technique, used correctly by QR, was effectively emphasised by the positive reaction of the interviewer to QR's answers to her questions. This positive reaction by the interviewer has two implications. The first is that the interviewer generally did not question or disagree with the issues raised by QR when answering the questions. The only time the interviewer attempted to question QR's answers was in QR's response to the fifth question, when she said, "*There is no one left to talk to anymore,*" referring to those inside Israel. Here, the interviewer, Joy Reid, followed up on QR's answer by saying, "*And so, there does seem to be a "left still"*. Then, QR justified her view regarding this issue by saying, *"Most of the protests against the war are because they want to free the hostages, not because they are actually against the war"*. The interviewer seemed to accept the follow-up of QR to this issue when he reacted by saying, *"Absolutely."* The second dimension relates to the positive reaction of the interviewer, which is evident in that on six occasions during the interview, Jo Read reacted to the QR's answers positively by saying "Right," and on one occasion, the interviewer said "Absolutely," meaning *"Absolutely,"* right. These two implications are crucial from a persuasive perspective, as they provide additional support for the arguments advanced by QR, thereby enhancing the persuasive impact of QR's discourse on the audience.

The findings of this study regarding QR's effective use of the pronoun "you" to engage the interviewer and the audience in the issues raised through the interview are in line with the findings of other studies of persuasion (Biber 2006; Kashiha and Chan 2014; Lee and Subtirelu 2015; Zare and Tavakoli 2016). These studies, especially those relating to spoken language, such as this study, have demonstrated that using the pronoun "you" by the discourse producer contributes to audience engagement in the discourse and, therefore, prepares them to be active participants. Notably, in her study on the use of the personal pronoun ("you know," "as you know," or "as we know") in spoken discourse, Kashiha (2022) argued that these shared knowledge expressions position audiences within naturally occurring agreements. This indicates that the reliance on the pronoun "you" in a discourse attracts the audience to become active participants, creating a sense of solidarity between the discourse producer and its recipients.

Based on the findings presented in this section, QR effectively employed the persuasive strategy relating to ethos appeal. QR's well-established global positive character, along with her creative use of the personal pronouns ("we," "I," and "you"), significantly plays a vital role in constructing positive social and interpersonal relations with her audience as she attempts to engage them to become discourse participants. The more positive these relations are built through the discourse, the more persuasive and convincing the producer of such discourse will be.

7.2.2. The Persuasive Strategy Relating to the Pathos Appeal

Persuasion through pathos appeal depends on approaching the emotional and passionate sides of the discourse's recipients. According to this persuasive strategy, the producer of the discourse, whether written or spoken, attempts to stir or arouse the audience's emotions and passions to stimulate them to accept his/her ideas and viewpoints. According to Aristotle (1984), orators can appeal directly to the emotions and passions of their audience by stimulating their anger, friendship, kindness, pride, shame, love, hate, hope, fear, jealousy, generosity, or admiration, among others. However, in addition to directly appealing to the emotions and passions of the audience, political figures can also use indirect techniques to stimulate their audiences' emotions and passions, such as raising rhetorical questions, telling stories, evoking shared memories and experiences, or reflecting on personal experiences. Browse (2018) states that for a discourse producer to use pathos appeal effectively, *"they are supposed to harness the feelings of the audience to move them to an agreement."* This implies that the target of the pathos mode of persuasion, whether used directly or indirectly, is the audience's heart, rather than their mind, to create a shared emotional experience. The following section of this study demonstrates how QR employed the pathos appeal, utilizing various persuasive techniques to address the interview questions and appeal to the emotions and passions of her audience.

QR employed the persuasive strategy of pathos appeal to stimulate the emotions of her audience, winning their hearts and moving them to agree with her views. In addition to establishing a harmonious partnership with her audience through the ethos appeal, QR used the pathos appeal whenever appropriate to persuade her audience as much as possible in her discourse. Although QR, throughout the interview, spoke about the unprecedented and devastating consequences of the human crisis in Gaza to evoke fear, anger, pity, and scorn in her audience, she more frequently did so indirectly. This is due to two considerations. The first relates to QR's realization that the issues she addresses are highly debatable and sensitive, and, as such, people's emotions are divided. Secondly, as said earlier, QR knows that her primary audience is Americans, the majority of whom are generally believed to be pro-Israel. Therefore, instead of directly appealing to the emotions and passions of her audience, QR attempted to convey her ideas as indirectly as possible.

This indirect approach by QR aims to evoke emotions in her audience, fostering a shared emotional experience that encourages them to agree with and accept her views and stances. Therefore, in her responses to the questions, QR extensively utilised persuasive techniques, such as posing rhetorical questions, narrating stories, and reflecting on personal experiences, to indirectly engage her audience's emotions and passions. These techniques are discussed below.

7.2.2.1. The Use of Rhetorical Questions

Rhetorical questions are a well-known persuasive technique often used by political figures. They offer a practical approach to engaging the audience by evoking their emotions, prompting them to consider the questions raised without requiring direct answers. As Table 5 below shows, in her responses to the interviewer's questions, QR employed the persuasive technique of posing rhetorical questions to arouse her audience's emotions and passions.

Table 5: Extracts Relating to the Persuasive Technique of Raising Rhetorical Questions

Number of the extracts	Extracts	Number of the reviewer's question
1	*"How come international law is applied selectively?"*	1
2	*"Why are our lives worth less?*	1
3	*"Do we matter in this world?"*	1
4	*"Who wants to err on the side of genocide?*	2
5	*"Is it a genocide? Isn't it?"*	2
6	*"What does it mean when international law is broken with no consequence?"*	2
7	*"What does it mean when UN resolutions are ignored or dismissed?"*	2
8	*"What does it mean when international humanitarian law is applied selectively?"*	2
9	*"What does it mean when certain countries are punished for poor human rights records, whereas Israel, which is accused of possibly committing genocide, is rewarded with more arms?"*	2
10	*"Where is the fairness here?"*	2
11	*"The question is, what does international law say?"*	3
12	*"What does it mean when you use an unprecedented number of massive bombs, those 2,000-pound bombs, or the unguided bombs or so-called dumb bombs?*	3
13	*"How can you not kill civilians?"*	3
14	*"Are we supposed to believe they are trying to avoid innocent civilians?"*	3
15	*"What does it mean when 80% of the schools had been bombed, 80% of health centres, and 60% of houses had been destroyed?"*	3
16	*"Was there a Hamas operative under every ambulance, in every clinic, in every schoolyard?*	3
17	*Are we supposed to believe that?" 3*	3
18	*"Well, if that is the case, why are we seeing what is happening in the West Bank, which is run not by Hamas, but by the Palestinian Authority?"*	4
19	*"They are saying that these are children of darkness, that they only understand the laws of the jungle, how can it be okay to be saying that?"*	7
20	*"What is the alternative for Israelis and Palestinians?*	8
21	*What is the alternative?"*	8
22	*"Are we going to keep going through cycles of violence?"*	8
23	*"Is Israel going to occupy the Palestinians indefinitely?" 8*	8
24	*"Are they going to become a pariah state, an apartheid state?" 8*	8
25	*"Are Palestinians going to be continuously subjugated?" 8*	8
26	*"Is it just going to be more realities created on the ground?" 8*	8
27	*"And yet, whenever negotiations occur, the departure point is always 'What will Israel accept?*	8
28	*"What will Israel agree to? Rather than what is the minimum they are required to do by international law?"*	8

QR relied on the persuasive technique of rhetorical questions. She raised twenty-eight questions to evoke the emotions of fear, anger, pity, scorn, friendship, kindness, and hope in her audience so that they would be emotionally sympathetic and ready to agree with her viewpoints. QR raised those rhetorical

questions in reaction to the most debatable and sensitive interview questions (e.g., *"Do you believe that Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu is a war criminal?"*). Instead of directly answering these questions, QR attempted to engage her audience by evoking their emotions to prompt them to consider the answers, as they are indirectly implied in the questions she raised, and therefore, the answers should be obvious.

What is unique about the way QR uses rhetorical questions is her creative attempt to integrate these inquiries with either rightful promises or relevant statistics, leaving no doubts in the hearts or minds of her audience regarding the implications of these rhetorical questions. As argued, this demonstrates that the persuasive techniques are not mutually exclusive. QR's reliance on raising rhetorical questions to stimulate the audience's emotions through the pathos appeal is simultaneously accompanied by the persuasive mode of logos appeal, which, as discussed below, is based on appealing to the audience's rationality.

The persuasive technique of raising rhetorical questions, which QR employed, is often used by political figures, especially in their spoken discourses. For example, Atkinson (2005) documented how Abraham Lincoln, Margaret Thatcher, and Winston Churchill effectively used rhetorical questions to move their audience and garner support.

7.2.2.2. The Use of Telling Stories or Reflecting on Personal Experiences

In addition to using rhetorical questions to stimulate the audience's emotions, telling stories is another indirect means of the pathos appeal. The technique of telling emotive stories is not meant to entertain the audience but rather to engage them in political discourse, win their hearts, and thus prepare them to be persuaded by the argument provided. In emphasising the importance of telling stories for persuasive ends, Perloff (2020) states, *"Narrative evidence is more compelling than statistics; vivid case histories evoke stronger mental images.*" As such, political figures rely on this technique to stimulate the audience's emotions and persuade them of their opinions. Given the context in which the interview took place and the nature of the questions raised, QR did employ the persuasive technique of telling stories and reflecting on personal experiences in her answers. Although not as frequently as the technique of raising rhetorical questions discussed above, the critical analysis of the language used by QR reveals that she employed this technique (i.e., telling stories) primarily to answer two questions (i.e., the fourth and fifth questions), as shown in the extracts presented in Table 6.

Table 6: Extracts Relating to the Use of Telling Stories or Reflecting on Personal Experiences

Number of the extract	Extracts	Number of the reviewer's question
1	*"I mean, you mentioned my Palestinian background. And because of that background, I am aware of the fact that I might identify with the Palestinian side more. And that is why every day, I challenge myself to actually put myself in the shoes of an average Israeli, to try to see things from their point of view – a relative of a hostage or just an average person who is worried about missiles flying onto them. I try to think of that. All I want is for people to just for once try to put themselves in the shoes of Palestinians".*	4
2	*"Well, look, I was around when King Hussein signed the peace treaty with Rabin, and I saw the relationship. It was a relationship of trust between two men who understood that they had to make sacrifices and compromises for a larger vision of peace. I know that they wanted warm peace. It was not just a strategic peace; they wanted peace between the two people. I saw how passionate my father-in-law was about this, and we have had many conversations about it. I truly am very inspired by his vision. And he is the one who once said to me, 'Rania, you always have to put yourself in the other person's shoes.' I have never forgotten those words. It is a simple thing to do – but very rarely are people doing that these days. And that is the door to empathy." But then what happened after Rabin's assassination is that, as you said, Prime Minister Netanyahu came in. We gradually saw the politics in Israel shift further and further to the right until now, there are hardly any peace groups. You know, I used to routinely sit with Palestinian and Israeli peace groups to have these conversations, to keep bridges, because I always thought that was so important."*	5

In this persuasive technique, QR shared a story about her relationship with her father-in-law and reflected on her personal experiences as a political figure from a Palestinian background, aiming to stimulate the audience's emotions and passions and encourage them to sympathize with the issues she raised. Andersen (2008) noted that both Barack Obama and Hillary Clinton employed the persuasive storytelling technique during their presidential campaigns to convince their audience of the healthcare system's failure in the United States.

In conclusion, QR effectively employed a persuasive strategy that appealed to the emotions and passions of her audience, aiming to stimulate and persuade them of the issues she addressed. In doing so, QR used two persuasive techniques: the effective use of rhetorical questions and the technique of telling stories and reflecting on personal experiences. It was clear that QR relied more on the first technique, where she raised twenty-eight rhetorical questions, than on the second, in which she told only one emotive story and reflected on only one personal experience. This may be due to the nature of the interview questions, the context in which they took place, and the audience she addresses.

7.2.3. The Persuasive Strategy Relating to the Logos Appeal

The logos appeal is often called "the logical appeal." In this mode of persuasion, discourse producers attempt to appeal to their audience's rationality, stimulating their minds. In doing so, they can

utilize techniques such as facts, figures, evidence, logical arguments, statistics, numerical data, charts, surveys, and test results, among other tools, to support their arguments rationally. Hence, they make it difficult for others to dispute. As such, this mode depends on logic and reasoning to encourage the audience to agree with the discourse producer's views and positions. Accordingly, in comparison to the ethos and pathos modes discussed earlier, the Logos mode is concerned with the content of the message included in the discourse, specifically whether such content relies on logic and reasoning to convince the audience (Aristotle 1984). As such, based on the context and circumstances, political figures attempt to appeal to the rationality of their audience through the use of the logos mode of persuasion. As shown below, an in-depth deconstruction of QR's interview text reveals that while QR creatively employed persuasive strategies related to ethos and pathos appeals, she effectively and more frequently relied on the persuasive strategy related to logos appeals. QR employed four persuasive techniques to appeal to the rationality of her audience, persuading them to agree with and accept her views and positions. These persuasive techniques are discussed below.

7.2.3.1. The Persuasive Technique of Using Facts and Statistics

The discourse producer uses numbers and percentages to support the presented argument in this persuasive technique. Given the sensitivity and debatable issues of the interview subject matter and the nature of her primary audience (i.e., the American people), who tend to value numbers and statistics, QR attempted to rely on this persuasive technique very frequently in answering the interview's questions, as apparent in the following extracts presented in Table 7.

Table 7: Extracts Relating to the Use of Facts and Statistics

Number of the extract	Extracts	Number of the reviewer's question
1	*"The displacement of 1.7 million people from their homes, some displaced more than once. ---The fact that out of those 35,000 people killed, 70% were women and children."*	1
2	*"This conflict has killed more children in five months than all the conflicts in the world in the past four years."*	1
3	*"So children have not been killed at this rate at any other time in history, and it has had the highest kill rate since the genocide in Rwanda in 1994."*	1
4	*"When you have a patch of land as small as Gaza, one of the most densely populated places in the world, and you use an unprecedented number of massive bombs, those 2,000-pound bombs, or the unguided bombs or so-called dumb bombs, how can you not kill civilians?"*	3
5	*"Are we supposed to believe they are trying to avoid innocent civilians when 80% of the schools were bombed, 80% of health centres, and 60% of houses were destroyed?"*	3
6	*"8,000 people have been arrested in the West Bank."*	4
7	*"Armed settler attacks are on a record high."*	4
8	*Almost 500 people were killed, again without due process, 124 of them children.*	4
9	*"We are seeing land grabs in the West Bank. The largest land grab in 30 years occurred in March – 800 hectares of Palestinian land."*	4

Considering the above extracts, QR effectively employed the persuasive technique of using verifiable facts, statistics, and percentages to persuade her audience by appealing to their rationality. Moreover, QR could utilize some of these numbers in comparative and historical ways, thereby consolidating her arguments and gaining additional rational support from her audience. Furthermore, QR effectively linked the use of these facts and statistics with the technique of raising rhetorical questions, enhancing their persuasiveness. Finally, it is vital to keep in mind that all the numbers, statistics, and percentages provided by QR were at the time of the interview (i.e., May 3, 2024), as since then, all these figures have already drastically changed; some of them have perhaps doubled or tripled at the time of writing this study. The findings of this study regarding QR's use of facts and statistics to persuade her audience align with several studies (Ehninger and Brockried 2008; Amaireh 2023), which have revealed that political figures often use verifiable facts and statistics as persuasive techniques.

7.2.3.2. The Persuasive Technique of Using Authoritative and Reliable Sources

Political figures often utilize authoritative sources and credible testimonies in their discourse to support and validate their arguments, thereby gaining the agreement of their audience. This technique is instrumental in producing political discourse, especially when the issues addressed are sensitive and debatable, as in the subject matter of this interview. As shown below, the critical analysis of the interview reveals that QR effectively used the persuasive technique of citing authoritative and reliable sources to answer the questions the interviewer raised. This is apparent in the following extracts presented in Table 8.

Table 8: Extracts Relating to the Use of Authoritative and Reliable Sources

Number of the extract	Extracts	Number of the reviewer's question
1	*"Humanitarian workers who have seen everything have said they have never seen anything like it."*	1
2	*"Now, the International Court of Justice is the highest in the land, and they have deemed it plausible that Israel is committing acts of genocide against the Palestinians. And they have since issued provisional orders, asking them to prevent acts of genocide and to provide unhindered aid".*	2
3	*"You know, Israel is the only country that prosecutes children in military courts. Save the Children has written reports about how children are usually taken from their beds at night. They are arrested without charge. Sometimes the charge is just stone throwing, which could land you 20 years in prison".*	4
4	*"The US is part of this war by enabling it. Israeli officials themselves say that: "We could not wage this war without the support of the US."*	6
5	*"And that is reflected, by the way, in the statements that we have heard from officials (here, QR is referring to the Israeli officials) right now – I am not saying it; they are saying it. They are saying "human animals." They are saying that every single Gazan is a legitimate target. They are saying that these are children of darkness, that they only understand the laws of the jungle – how can it be okay to be saying that?"*	7
6	*"So we will take, for example, negotiations over land. Territories that were occupied in 1967. Under Resolution 242, those are Palestinian lands".*	8

The above extracts from the interview clearly show that QR appropriately employs the persuasive technique of using authoritative sources and reliable testimonies to appeal to the rationality of her audience and persuade them of her views and positions. Given the sensitivity of the interviewer's subject matter, its primary audience, and her Palestinian background, QR seems to rely on this technique as a somewhat influential one in persuading the audience by demonstrating that her advanced arguments do not reflect her personal views but are well-supported by authoritative sources or reliable testimonies. Several studies (Al-Harahsheh 2013; Serrieh 2017; Amaireh 2023) have demonstrated that this technique is often employed in political discourses, where political figures use it to support and validate their arguments, thereby winning the agreement of their audience.

7.2.3.3. The Persuasive Technique of Using Contrastive Pairs

This persuasive technique employs contrastive pairs in two parts, often oppositional, and may involve repetition to achieve the desired persuasive effect. In Greek literature, Aristotle (1984) on rhetoric indicated that the first pair is called the "thesis, " while the second pair is known as the "antithesis." Typically, the "thesis" and the "antithesis" relate to adversative conjunctions, such as "but", "yet ", or "however." This strategy emphasises the difference between two ideas or arguments by presenting the first pair (i.e., the "thesis") and then contrasting it with the second pair (i.e., the "antithesis"). Usually, the "thesis" represents an accepted truth or premise, while the "antithesis" provides a counterargument to support reasoning. Although this persuasive technique primarily appeals to the audience's mind and rationality, it may also evoke their emotions and values. Therefore, political figures often employ this technique in their discourses to maximise persuasiveness, depending on the circumstances.

As shown below, the critical deconstruction of QR's answers to the interview questions reveals that she effectively employed contrastive pairs as a persuasive technique to appeal to her audience's rationality while simultaneously appealing to their values and emotions as appropriate. This is evident in the following extracts from QR's answers to the interview questions in Table 9.

Table 9: Extracts Relating to the Use of the Contrastive Pairs

Number of the extract	Extracts	Number of the reviewer's question
1	*"Well, you know, I think it is not just my background, but I think for everyone in the Arab world."*	1
2	*"Every war is ugly, but humanitarian workers never seen anything like it."*	1
3	*"And so there is outrage in the Arab World and worldwide at what we are seeing. But also, there is outrage at the world's apathy, the fact that this is allowed to happen."*	1
4	*"Rightfully after October 7th, the whole world stood up and condemned those actions, but we're not seeing the same kind of reaction toward what is happening today."*	1
5	*"Now, it might take years for them to come out with a final ruling, but we cannot wait."*	2
6	*"So yes, I think it is important the ICC take action, that the ICJ take action, but we do not want symbolic gestures."*	2
7	*"It does not matter what I believe. I think what matters is what international law says."*	3

Number of the extract	Extracts	Number of the reviewer's question
8	*"Antisemitism is a real thing, and it is on the rise, and no student should feel unsafe on their campus. But I think passions are running so high on all sides that we are losing sight of what these students are actually protesting for."*	4
9	*"So I have been seeing coverage of the protests, but I have not been seeing enough coverage of what they are protesting."*	4
10	*"There are always people who would want to crash the protests and try to hijack the message, but there are also many people who really are standing for something."*	4
11	*"They are saying that, yes, we want you to divest from illegal occupation, but they are also suggesting that there is more to the story than we have been led to believe."*	4
12	*"Well, if that is the case, why are we seeing what is happening in the West Bank, which is run not by Hamas, but by the Palestinian Authority?"*	4
13	*"Now, there has definitely been a change in tone and language from President Biden; we have seen that. He is trying to apply pressure. But I think words alone are not sufficient."*	6
14	*"Palestinians have less resources, they have less influence, they have less leverage, but they do not have less rights."*	8
15	*"And yet, whenever negotiations occur, the departure point is always 'What will Israel accept? What will Israel agree to?' Not, 'what is the minimum they are required to do by international law?"*	8

As evident in Table 9, QR effectively employed the persuasive technique of using contrastive pairs in her responses to the interviewer's questions. Interestingly, she utilised this technique to appeal to her audience's rationality, emotions, and humanitarian values. This is evident in that, although QR applied the technique of contrastive pairs logically to appeal to her audience's rationality, she also associated with the inclusive "we," the personal pronoun "I," and rhetorical questions to engage their emotions and values. The findings of this study in this regard are consistent with those of other studies (Zheng 2000; Atkinson 2005; Jaradat 2022b; AbuAlhuda and Alshboul 2022), which have demonstrated that political figures tend to rely on the persuasive technique of contrasting arguments in their political discourses to make their arguments as convincing as possible.

7.2.3.4. The Persuasive Technique of Using Reasoning Argumentation

In this persuasive technique, the discourse producer relies on arguments grounded in logical reasoning to derive conclusions from verifiable facts or widely accepted premises and truths. Here, the arguer either infers a conclusion from the preceding premises (i.e., formal logic) or justifies a claim based on earlier premises, which are presupposed to be true (i.e., informal logic). The former type of reasoning is typically referred to as the Aristotelian model of reasoning (Aristotle, 1984), while the latter type was initially developed by Toulmin (2003). The persuasive technique of reasoning argumentation is commonly employed in contexts where the issues addressed in the discourse are sensitive and debatable, as is the subject matter of this interview. In this case, the discourse producer applies this technique by

linking premises to conclusions or claims to conclusions using causal conjunctions such as: "thus," "hence," "consequently," "accordingly," "so," "because," "since," or "therefore." This persuasive reasoning technique primarily appeals to the audience's rationality. A critical analysis of QR's answers to the interviewer's questions reveals that she relied on this persuasive technique. This is evident in the following extracts from QR's answers to the questions in Table 10.

Table 10: Extracts Relating to the Use of the *Reasoning Argumentation*

Number of the extract	Extracts	Number of the reviewer's question
1	"…And we are seeing people letting Israel violate international law and international humanitarian law without any consequence…. 'How come international law is applied selectively?"	1
2	"So yes, I think it is important the ICC take action, that the ICJ take action, but we do not want symbolic gestures."	2
3	".… So are we supposed to think that Israel is also using Artificial intelligence generated systems to generate the most significant number of targets…. to avoid innocent civilians?"	3
4	"...So, that is collective punishment, and that is a war crime."	3
5	"...So, we were told that everything happening today is a retaliation to October 7th. Well, if that is the case, why are we seeing what is happening in the West Bank, which is run not by Hamas but by the Palestinian Authority?"	4
6	"And so I think the future generations are not the priority here. Rather, they were the priority for King Hussein in 1994."	5
7	"And so clearly, the US has much leverage over Israel. And for many people, this leverage has not been used as effectively as it could be."	6
8	Because, as I said, there is a great deal of a sense of impunity and, I would say, belligerence among Israeli officials, where, you know, international law does not have to apply to them."	6
9	"It is not because they are actually against the war. So, I think for many, if you could free the hostages, then you can go and continue the war."	7
10	"If I have hope, it is because I believe that the status quo is not sustainable – not for Israelis, not for Palestinians."	8
11	"And I know that people roll their eyes when we say two-state solution because they think it is not viable."	8
12	"But I think the fact that we are where we are today is all the more reason, the greater impetus, for us to have a two-state solution because what is the alternative for Israelis and Palestinians?"	8
13	"So while these peace processes were happening, Palestinians gradually and consistently saw the reality getting worse and worse and worse."	8
14	"And yet, whenever negotiations occur, the departure point is always 'What will Israel accept? What will Israel agree to?' Not what is the minimum they are required to do by international law?"	8
15	"And, if we take that as a starting point, and we work on compromises on both sides, then we can find a situation that safeguards Israel's security and also gives Palestinians statehood."	8

The above extracts from QR's answers to the questions raised show that QR used logical reasoning to persuade her audience by appealing to their minds and rationality. If these extracts are read in the full context of the interview, they will clearly demonstrate that QR attempted to arrive at her conclusions or

justify them based on well-accepted premises or established truths. Moreover, QR was also able to connect her reasoning arguments with some rhetorical questions to arouse the emotions and passions of her audience, in addition to appealing to their minds and rationality. This persuasive technique employed by QR in this interview is common in other political discourses. Many studies (Ghasemi 2020; AbuAlhuda and Alshboul 2022) have demonstrated that political figures often employ formal and informal logic to appeal to their audience's minds and rationality.

The overall findings of this section show that QR depended heavily on the persuasive strategy relating to the logos appeal. To this end, QR effectively employed four persuasive techniques: statistics, authoritative and reliable sources, contrastive pairs, and reasoning arguments. Although these techniques were analysed independently, they are highly interconnected, forming a persuasive strategy: logos appeal. This suggests that each of these persuasive techniques was designed to amplify the persuasive effect of the others on QR's target audience.

The overall findings of this study show that QR balances the use of the three persuasive strategies envisioned by Aristotle. This aligns with Aristotle's original vision, who, according to Wróbel (2015), viewed persuasion as "a feat that can be achieved when the speaker's character is in accordance with the way the speech is spoken" and "the audience is prone to grant him credibility." In the same vein, Perloff (2020, 22) argued that a persuasive speaker should always find the right balance between all three parts of persuasion, stating that persuasion "has to be composed of three parts: ethos – the nature of the communicator, pathos – the emotional state of the audience, and logos – message arguments." Reflecting on the same issue, Johnstone (2008) argued that the logos appeal becomes more effective when combined with the other two modes of persuasion, ethos and pathos, emphasizing that for persuasion to be effective, displays of rationality and logic are necessary for specific contexts, whereas emotions are necessary for others.

8. Conclusion

The findings of this study reveal that in her political discourse, as reflected in her interview with MSNBC, QR utilised all the persuasive strategies outlined in the Aristotelian mode of persuasion. This is evident in the fact that she effectively employed persuasive strategies such as ethos, pathos, and logo appeals. The in-depth critical analysis of QR's linguistic choices demonstrated that within each persuasive strategy, QR used different persuasive techniques in her answers to the questions raised by the interviewer.

In employing the persuasive strategy of ethos appeal, QR utilized her positive global character and charisma to gain the audience's support. She did not rely solely on this character; as shown, QR effectively employed persuasive techniques by using the personal pronoun "We" in an inclusive form to connect with her audience and foster a sense of partnership. Additionally, she appropriately used the personal pronouns "I" and "You" in a polite, diplomatic, indirect, and less assertive manner, accompanying them with the phrases "I think," "I believe," "you know," and "you should." This approach

helped her earn the respect of her audience without antagonising them, thus gaining their support and agreement with her views and positions.

In implementing the persuasive strategy related to the pathos appeal, the findings showed that QR employed techniques such as raising rhetorical questions, telling stories, and reflecting on personal experiences to win the hearts of her audience by arousing their emotions. Within this strategy, as evident in the analysis, QR relied heavily on raising rhetorical questions, posing twenty-eight questions in her responses to the interviewer's inquiries to stimulate and provoke her audience's feelings. This technique appeared to work well, particularly with the highly debatable and sensitive questions posed by the interviewer. This approach is effective because direct answers, rather than rhetorical questions, may divide the audience, preventing them from engaging with the answers and inferring conclusions.

Concerning the persuasive strategy related to the logos appeal, the critical analysis of QR's responses to the questions revealed that she employed four persuasive techniques: statistics, authoritative and reliable sources, contrastive pairs, and reasoning arguments. Although these techniques were analyzed independently, they seemed to reinforce each other's effect on the minds and rationality of the target audience, persuading them of the addressed issues logically.

The overall findings support the argument that persuasive strategies related to ethos, pathos, and logos can be highly intertwined and interactive; one discourse statement may reflect the nature of the discourse producer's charisma, the audience's emotional state, and the message content's rationality. As shown above, QR could connect one persuasive strategy to another, linking reasoning arguments with rhetorical questions to arouse the emotions and passions of her audience, in addition to appealing to their minds and rationality. Moreover, the overall findings of this study showed that while QR balanced the use of all three persuasive strategies as much as possible, she tended to rely more on the persuasive strategy relating to logos. This could be attributed to QR's realization of the sensitivity and debatable nature of the addressed issues and her concern that most of her audience is generally pro-Israel. Consequently, appealing to their minds and rationality is perhaps the most effective persuasive strategy to influence them and persuade them to agree with her arguments.

A Critical Discourse Analysis of the Persuasive Strategies Employed by Queen Rania of Jordan in her Interview with MSNBC

تحليل خطابي نقدي لاستراتيجيات الإقناع التي استخدمتها الملكة رانيا ملكة الأردن في مقابلتها مع شبكة MSNBC خطابي

منيرة جرادات
قسم اللغة الانجليزيّة، جامعة جدارا، الأردن

الملخص

تتناول هذه الدراسة الاستراتيجيّات اللغويّة الإقناعيّة التي استخدمتها الملكة رانيا ملكة الأردن في مقابلتها مع شبكة MSNBC الإخباريّة الأمريكيّة بتاريخ 3 مايو 2024. وتستند هذه الاستراتيجيات إلى نموذج أرسطو للإقناع، الذي يتكون من ثلاثة أساليب: الأخلاق، والعاطفة، والمنطق. وقد اعتمدت الدراسة على منهج التحليل النقدي للخطاب(CDA) . وأظهرت النتائج أن الملكة رانيا استخدمت جميع الاستراتيجيات الإقناعيّة، فقد استخدمت الملكة رانيا أسلوب الأخلاق المتمثلة في الاستخدام الفعّال للضمائر الشخصية "نحن" و"أنا" و"أنتم". وفي الأسلوب العاطفي، فقد طرحت الملكة رانيا أسئلة بلاغيّة، وسردت قصصاً من تجارب شخصيّة. أما فيما يتعلق بأسلوب المنطق، فقد استخدمت الملكة رانيا أربع تقنيات إقناعيّة: الإحصائيّات، والمصادر الموثوقة، والثنائيّات المتناقضة، والحجج المنطقيّة. إن نتائج هذه الدراسة تقدم إسهامات قيّمة للدراسات اللغويّة عامة، ودراسة الإقناع كأداة لغويّة خاصّة.

الكلمات المفتاحيّة: استراتيجيات الإقناع، الملكة رانيا، قناة MSNBC، نموذج أرسطو للإقناع، تحليل الخطاب النقدي.

References

AbuAlhuda, Amal, and Sabri Alshboul. 2022. Persuasive Strategies in Two Speeches of King Abdullah II about the Impact of the COVID-19 Pandemic. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies* 12 (12): 2658-2668.

Abusalim, Zidouni, Siham, Sharif Alghazo, Ghaleb Rababah, and Mohammad Rayyan. 2022. Textual Interpersonal Metadiscourse Markers in Political Discourse: A Case Study. *Cogent Arts & Humanities* 9 (1): 2124683. DOI: 10.1080/23311983.2022.2124683

Al-Abed Al-Haq, Fawwaz and Nazek Al-Sleibi. 2015. A Critical Discourse Analysis of Three Speeches of King Abdullah II. *US-China Foreign Language* 13 (5): 317-332.

Albzour, Baseel. 2022. Intersemioticity of King Abdullah's II' Speech from the Throne 2021' Discourse: from infratextuality to Ultratextuality. *Journal of Arts and Humanities* 10 (12): 44-52.

Al- Harahsheh, Ahmad. 2013. The Translatability of Figures of Speech in Khalid Mishaal's Political Speeches: A Critical Discourse Analysis. *International Journal of English Linguistics* 3(3): 100-114.

Al Hawamdeh, Reema, and Mahmoud Qudah. 2024. A Contrastive Analysis of Persuasive Appeals in Political Speeches by Arab and Western Leaders during the COVID-19 Pandemic. *Jordan Journal of English Language and Literature* 10(1): 24–40. https://jaesjo.com/index.php/jaes/article/view/726

Aljazrawi, Dynia, and Zeena Aljazrawi. 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. DOI: 10.7575/aiac.ijalel. v.8n.3p.66

Al-Khalidy, Hatmal. 2018. The Use of Conjunctions as Grammatical Cohesion in the Speeches of Her Majesty Queen Rania of Jordan. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics & English Literature* 7 (5): 207-2011.

Al-Mutairi, Furat. 2025. The Persuasive Language Strategies and Techniques in Political discourse: Differences and Similarities between the United States of America and the Middle East Region in the Language of Political Speeches *ResearchGate.* DOI: 10.13140/RG.2.2.17047.89767

Akbar, Faris, and Rosyida Ekawati,. 2024. Interactive Metadiscourse on Joe Biden's Presidential Speeches *LingPoet: Journal of Linguistics and Literary Research 5* (3): 133–144. Retrieved from https://talenta.usu.ac.id/lingpoet/article/view/16761

Amaireh, Hanan. 2023. Rhetorical Analysis of King Abdullah's English Speeches during the Covid-19 Pandemic. *Dirasat Human and Social Sciences* 50 (1): 311–323.DOI: 10.35516/hum.v50i1.4414

Andersen, Christian. 2008. *The Obama Phenomenon: A Comparative Rhetorical Analysis*. MA thesis. Copenhagen Business School, Denmark.

Aristotle. 1984. *Rhetoric: The Complete Works of Aristotle*. Barnes, J. (ed.) Princeton University Press.

Arkin, William. 2005. *Code Names: Deciphering U.S. Military Plans, Programs, and Operations in the 9/11 World*. Hanover, NH: Steerforth Press

Atkinson, Max. 2005. *Lend Me Your Ears: All You Need to Know about Making Speeches and Presentations*. Oxford. New York: Oxford University Press.

Beale, Walter. 1987. *A Pragmatic Theory of Rhetoric*. Southern Illinois University Press.

Beard Adrian. 2000. *The Language of Politics*. New York: Routledge.

Berg, Bruce. 2004. *Qualitative Research Methods for the Social Sciences*. Boston: Pearson.

Biber, Douglas. 2006. Stance in spoken and written university registers. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes* 5 (2): 97-116.

Biber, Douglas, and Meixiu Zhang. 2018. Expressing Evaluation without Grammatical Stance: Informational Persuasion on the Web. *Corpora* 13(1): 97-123. https://doi.org/10.3366 /cor.2018.0137

Brower, Jeffrey, and Guilfoy, Kevin (Eds.). 2004. *The Cambridge Companion to Abélard*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Browse, Sam. 2018. *Cognitive Rhetoric: The Cognitive Poetics of Political Discourse*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Charteris-Black, Jonathan. 2005. *Politicians and Rhetoric: The Persuasive Power of Metaphor*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan**.**

Chilton, Paul. 2004. *Analyzing Political Discourse: Theory and Practice*. London and New York: Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group.

Crowley, Sharon, and Debra Hawhee. 2004. *Ancient Rhetoric for Contemporary Students.* New York: Pearson. Leadership. New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

Dunmire, Patricia. 2009. 9/11 Changed Everything: An Intertextual Analysis of the Bush Doctrine. *Discourse & Society* 20(2):195-222. DOI: 10.1177/0957926508099002

Ehninger, Douglas, and Wayne Brockriede. 2008. *Decision by Debate*. New York: International Debate Education Association.

Fairclough, Isabela, and Norman Fairclough. 2012. *Political Discourse Analysis: A Method for Advanced Students*. New York and London: Routledge.

Fairclough, Norman. 1989. *Language and Power*. London: Longman.

Fairclough, Norman. 1992. *Discourse and Social Change*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Fairclough, Norman. 2001. The discourse of New Labour: Critical Discourse Analysis. In Margaret Wetherell, Stephanie Taylor and Simon Yates (eds.), *Discourse as Data: A Guide for Analysis*, 229–266. London: Sage and Open University Press.

Fairclough, Norman. 2013. *Critical Discourse Analysis: The Critical Study of Language*. Routledge, Taylor, and Francis Group, London and New York.

Ghasemi, Farshad. 2020. Persuasive Language in Presidential Speeches: A Contrastive Study based on Aristotelian Rhetoric. *Buckingham Journal of Language and Linguistics* 12: 19-38. DOI*:* 10.5750/bjll.v12i.1872

Hansen, Drew. 2004. *The Dream: Martin Luther King, JR. and the Speech that Inspired a Nation*. New York: Harper Collins.

Holmes, Janet. 1990. Hedges and Boosters in Women's and Men's Speech. *Language & Communication* 10 (3):185-205. https://doi.org/10.1016/0271-5309(90)90002

Hsieh, Hsiu, and Sara Shannon. 2005. Three approaches to qualitative content analysis. *Qualitative Health Research* 15(9):1277-1288. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1177/1049732305276687

Hyland, Ken. 2005. *Meta-Discourse Continuum*. London: New York.

Hyland, Ken. 2008. Persuasion, Interaction and the Construction of Knowledge: Representing Self and Others in Research Writing. *International Journal of English Studies* 8 (2): 1-23.

Iqbal, Zafar, Aslam, Aslam Muhammad, Ashraf Talha, Muhammad Rehana, and Hafiz Nasir. 2020. Persuasive Power Concerning COVID-19 Employed by Premier Imran Khan: A Socio-Political Discourse Analysis. *Register Journal* 13(1): 208-230.

Jaradat, M. 1999. *Strategies of Persuasion Used in Arabic Among Jordanians: A Sociolinguistic Study*. A Master Thesis, Yarmouk University, Jordan.

Jaradat, Muneera. 2022a. Persuasion Strategies Employed by Bill Clinton and Barack Obama in Their Presidential Nomination Speeches in 1992 and 2008: A Comparative Study. *The Jordanian Association for Educational Sciences, Jordanian Education Journal* 7 (1):33-54.

Jaradat, Muneera. 2022b. Rhetorical Strategies Employed in the 2007 Speech of King Abdullah II before the US Congress. *International Journal of Liberal Arts and Social Science* 10 (2):87-102.

Johnstone, Barbara. 2008. *Discourse Analysis*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.

Kashiha, Hadi. 2022. On Persuasive Strategies: Metadiscourse Practices in Political Speeches. *Discourse and Interaction*, 15(1):77-100.

Kashiha, Hadi, and Heng Chan. 2014. Using Multi-Word Units to Take a Stance in Academic Lectures. *Journal of Language and Communication* 1(1): 31-40.

Kennedy, George. 1980. *Classical Rhetoric and Its Christian and Secular Tradition from Ancient to Modern Times*. New York: Croom Helm.

Killingsworth, Jimmie. 2005. *Appeals in Modern Rhetoric: An Ordinary Language Approach*. Southern Illinois University Press.

Kinneavy, James. 1971. *A Theory of Discourse: The Aims of Discourse*. New York: WW Norton & Co.

Kopple, William. 1989. *Clear and Coherent Prose: A Functional Approach*. Pearson Scott Foresman.

Lakoff, Robin. 1975. *Language and Woman's Place*. New York: Harper & Row.

Lee, Joseph, and Subtirelu, Nicholas. 2015. Metadiscourse in the Classroom: A Comparative Analysis of EAP Lessons and University Lectures. *English for Specific Purposes* 37 (1): 52-62. DOI: 10.1016/j.esp.2014.06.005

Malmström, Hans. 2016. Engaging the Congregation: The Place of Metadiscourse in Contemporary Preaching.
 Applied linguistics 37(4): 561-582. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amu052

Oktavia, Agll, and Rosyida Ekawati. 2024. Interactional Metadiscourse Markers in the U.S. House Republican Primary Debate . *LingPoet: Journal of Linguistics and Literary Research 5* (1): 24–30. Retrieved from https://talenta.usu.ac.id/lingpoet/article/view/15553

Pelclová, Jana, and Wei-Lun Lu. 2018. *Persuasion in Public Discourse: Cognitive and Functional Perspectives*. Amsterdam: John Benjamin's Publishing Company.

Pelinka, Anton. 2007. Language as a Political Category: The Viewpoint of Political Science. *Journal of Language & Politics* 6(1):129-43. DOI: 10.1075/jlp.6.1.09pel

Perloff, Richard. 2020. *The Dynamics of Persuasion: Communication and Attitudes in the Twenty-First Century*. Routledge.

Richard, Jennifer. 2008. *Rhetoric*. New York: Routledge.

Schaeffner, Christina. 2004. Political Discourse Analysis from the Point of View of Translation Studies. *Journal of Language and Politics*. 3(1):117-150.

Schreier, Margrit. 2012. *Qualitative Content Analysis in Practice*. Los Angeles: Sage.

Serrieh, Nadiyah. 2017. A Stylistic Analysis of the English Speeches of His Majesty King Abdullah II bin Al-Hussein of Jordan. Unpublished MA Thesis, Philadelphia University, Jordan.

Sharififar, Masoud, and Elaheh Rahimi. 2015. Critical Discourse Analysis of Political Speeches: A Case Study of Obama's and Rouhani's Speeches at UN, *Theory and Practice in Language Studies* 5 (2): 343-349. DOI: 10.17507/tpls.0502.14

Silberstein, Sandra. 2002. *War of words: Language, Politics, and 9/11*. London: Routledge.

Toulmin, Stephen. 2003. *The Uses of Argument*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Van Dijk, Teun. 1993. Principles of Critical Discourse Analysis. *Discourse and Society* 4(2):249-283. https://doi.org/10.1177/0957926593004002006

Van Dijk, Teun. 1997. What is Political Discourse Analysis? *Belgian Journal of Linguistics* 11(1):11-52.

Van Dijk, Teun. 1998. Towards a Theory of Context and Experience Models in Discourse Processing. In Herre Van Oostendorp and Susan Goldman (eds) *The Construction of Mental Models during Reading* 123-148. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum. https://doi.org/10.1177/1461445606059565

Virtanen, Tuija, and Helena Halmari. 2005. Persuasion across Genres: Emerging Perspectives. In Halmari, Helena.and Virtanen, Tuija. (Eds.), *Persuasion across Genres: A Linguistic Approach* (3–24). Amsterdam: John Benjamin's Publishing Co. Wodak, Ruth (ed.). 1997. *Gender and Discourse*. London: Sage.

Wodak, Ruth. 1999. Critical Discourse Analysis at the End of the 20th Century. *Research on Language and Interaction* 32(1-2):185–193. https://dx.doi.org/10.1075/hoph.8.04wod

Wróbel, Szymon. 2015. Logos, Ethos, Pathos. Classical Rhetoric Revisited. *Polish Sociological Review* 191:401-421. https://search.ebscohost.com/

Zare, Javad. and Mansoor Tavakoli. 2016. The Use of Personal Metadiscourse over Monologic and Dialogic Modes of Academic Speech. *Discourse Processes* 54 (2): 163-175. DOI: 10.1080/0163853 X.2015.1116342

Zheng, Tongtao. 2000. Characteristics of Australian Political Rhetoric: Tactics of Gaining Public Support and Shirking Responsibility. *Journal of Intercultural Communication* 2 (2):1-12. DOI: 10.36923/ jicc.v2i2.380