



Croatian  
International  
Relations  
Review

CIRR

XXVIII (88) 2022,  
39-61

DOI 10.2478/  
CIRR-2022-0003

UDC 327 (4-6  
EU:73:55)

# The Use of Macro and Micro Structures in Pakistani Prime Minister's Speech at UNGA: A Critical Discourse Analysis Approach

**Naeem Afzal**

*Department of English, College of Science and Humanities, Prince Sattam Bin Abdulaziz University, Al-Kharj, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia*

Email: [n.awan@psau.edu.sa](mailto:n.awan@psau.edu.sa)

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4448-9624>

**Ansa Hameed**

*Department of English, College of Science and Humanities, Prince Sattam Bin Abdulaziz University, Al-Kharj, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia*

Email: [a.zahoor@psau.edu.sa](mailto:a.zahoor@psau.edu.sa)

<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3477-156X>

**Ismat Jabeen**

*Department of English, College of Science and Humanities, Prince Sattam Bin Abdulaziz University, Al-Kharj, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia*

Email: [i.jabeen@psau.edu.sa](mailto:i.jabeen@psau.edu.sa)

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2514-230X>

## Abstract

### Key words:

CDA,  
macrostructures,  
microstructures,  
ideologies,  
political speech

*Political speeches delivered by state heads or politicians may stir controversies sometimes, especially, when speakers give arguments for or against some issues. To investigate so-called political discourses, critical discourse studies are conducted in different contexts. Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA), for instance, explores connection between different uses of discourse structures and socio-political contexts in which these structures occur. It also highlights issues such as power, dominance, ideology, and manipulation. The current study investigated Pakistani Prime Minister Imran Khan's maiden speech to the 74<sup>th</sup> Session of the United Nations General Assembly (UNGA) on September 27, 2019 – watched by over four million viewers on YouTube. This study used [van Dijk's \(1980\)](#) framework to analyze macro and micro structures in the speech and the underlying agenda behind employing such discourse structures. The qualitative data consisted of speech transcript, delivered in English, which contained about 2577 words. Findings reveal that macro propositions in the speech summarized global, regional, and national issues such as climate change, money laundering, corruption, Islamophobia, Pakistan's war on terror, the Kashmir conflict, and Pakistan's relations with India. The use of microstructural elements (pronouns, rhetorical question, references, number game, presupposition, modality, lexis and conjunctions) enabled the speaker to voice his ideological and political beliefs on aforementioned issues.*

## Introduction

The term 'political discourse' refers to a variety of discourse genres in politics and discourses used by politicians, which means that discourse is a socially constructed range of genres connected with a social domain. It is "identified by its actors or authors, viz., politicians" ([van Dijk, 1998, p. 12](#)). Politicians mostly share ideologies, which are linked to discourses somehow and vice-versa. Ideologies empower people to position their social beliefs about what is good or bad and right or wrong for them to perform their actions ([van Dijk, 1998](#)). Context plays a decisive role in determining whether a discourse is 'political' or not. Although participants and actions are essence of a context, it may also be analyzed in relation to political and communicative events, each with its "own settings (time, place, circumstances), occasions, intentions, functions, goals, and legal or political implications" ([van Dijk, 1998, p. 14](#)). Political discourse and its genres may be considered an important empirical medium for 'doing politics' since it seems to be a particular form of action and interaction – that are mainly discursive. It is part of a political process, which has overall topics as its distinctive feature. These topics can be selected and adapted to, ideologically, serve a given context. Overall meanings in political discourse may relate to political events and systems, ideologies, institutions, and actors ([van Dijk, 1997](#)).

In investigating political discourses, for instance, a political speech by a world leader, van Dijk's framework of CDA has been considered revealing at the level of investigating macrostructures and microstructures (Annisa, 2018; Komaruddin, 2014; Nugraha, 2014; Pratiwi & Refnaldi, 2018). Given such background, this study investigates Pakistani Prime Minister Imran Khan's maiden speech to the 74<sup>th</sup> Session of the UNGA on September 27, 2019. The reason for selecting this particular speech was to analyze how renowned politicians, like Imran Khan, exploit language to voice their ideological and political concerns. Previous studies analyzing the same 2019 speech by Khan (Ahmed et al., 2020; Imtiaz, 2020; Mushtaq et al., 2021) have hardly focussed on macro and microstructural analysis and therefore failed to offer a holistic view of the speaker's ideologically voiced agenda. The qualitative data for this study consist of the speech transcript of about 2577 words. This study uses van Dijk's (1980) framework and uncovers macro and micro structures employed in the speech. It is limited to context and conditions set by the UNGA's general debate. It addresses the following research questions:

- (1) What are the macrostructures in Imran Khan's speech to the 74<sup>th</sup> Session of UNGA?
- (2) How do the microstructures function in the speech?
- (3) To what extent do the macro and micro structures complement each other in securing ideological import conveyed through the speech?

## Literature Review

Politics is usually both discursive and ideological, and ideologies are largely reproduced through discourse (text and talk). Hence, discourse, ideology, and politics are intertwined. Politics is ideological because political groups have to be 'ideologically conscious' to compete and save their interests (van Dijk, 2006c). Politics have characteristics such as conflict of interests, manipulation, persuasion, and labeling allies and opponents. The speaker can influence audiences' reasoning, actions, and involvement in society. In this regard, language acts as a powerful tool for persuasion, manipulation, dominance, and control (Matić, 2012). A political speech is the stance of a party or parliamentarian on a matter at hand (van Dijk, 1997). Delivered by a state head, essentially, its every word is selected to serve "as a function of its ideological and communicative presuppositions and implications" (van Dijk, 2006b, p. 129). Given such concepts, political speeches have been the focus of researchers from different perspectives. For instance, speeches of political leaders on different occasions have been analyzed using van Dijk's framework to examine macro and micro structures. Macrostructures, representing global meaning, organize complex (micro) information.

A macro structural analysis is required for different properties of the language use. For instance, language users make abstracts or summaries

of discourses that state the main topics or global meaning of a summarized discourse. On the other hand, microstructures are realized through words, phrases, clauses, sentences, and connections between sentences. Microstructures are “actually and directly expressed structures of the discourse” (van Dijk, 1980, p. 29).

To cite a few past studies, Pratiwi and Refnaldi (2018) investigated the use of macrostructures in the speeches of Indonesian President Jokowi. This study concluded that macrostructures helped readers realize the themes or topics representing the global meanings of political discourse. Annisa (2018) analyzed Turkish President Erdogan’s speeches to realize the topics (macrostructures) and microstructures (presuppositions, pronouns, conjunctions, lexicon, etc.). This study established that the speaker delivered messages effectively, respected all inside and outside the country, and convinced his citizens to work for a better future. Nugraha (2014) investigated macro and micro structures and ideology that described Hillary Clinton’s speech. This study revealed the presence of several main ideas, summary or main points (thematic elements) and presupposition, rhetoric elements, conjunctions, pronouns, lexicon, as microstructural elements in the speech. Komaruddin (2014) examined Hillary Clinton’s speech about women. Macro-structurally, it was revealed that the speaker expressed her ideology by stressing the importance of liberal or radical feminism. Microstructurally, the speaker used lexicon and propositions to deliver her speech emphatically.

In the context of Pakistan, only a few studies examined Imran Khan’s 2019 UNGA speech. Ahmed et al. (2020) investigated speech acts regarding the topics of Islamophobia in the speech based on Austin and Searle’s framework of Speech Act Theory. Mushtaq et al. (2021) explored the transitivity process in the speech by applying the ideational meta-function of Halliday’s systemic functional linguistics (SFL). In another study, Imtiaz (2020) used Referential Strategies provided by Reisigl and Wodak in 2001 to investigate how the PM used language to create in-group and out-group differences. Thus, previous studies hardly focused on macro and micro structural analysis of Khan’s speech – as well as corresponding links potentially holding between these two structural elements (macro-micro) in the political discourse underlying the speech itself. This study employs van Dijk’s (1980) framework of macro and micro structures to probe the selected speech and attempts to present a holistic view of political and ideological agenda realized in it.

## Theoretical Framework

Discourse macrostructures account for “global meaning, such as topic, theme, or gist...intuitive notion of coherence” (van Dijk, 1980, p. 10). It means that discourse is coherent at local and global levels – notions like global meaning, global reference, topic, or theme are closely connected and macrostructures are required to make such connections clear (van Dijk, 1980). Macrostructures are semantic because talking about notions

such as topic, theme, or gist of a text means dealing with “the meaning of larger fragments of text or about whole texts” but not isolated words or sentences (van Dijk, 1985, p. 74). Their essential semantic function is to define global or higher-level meanings derived from lower-level meanings. This process of derivation may contain the production of new meaning. Hence, macrostructures play a crucial function in this regard by allowing “additional ways of comprehension for complex information” (van Dijk, 1980, p. 15). Three rules may be used to derive macro-information or macrostructures from microstructures in a text: deletion/selection, generalization, and construction. Macro propositions can formulate the global topic of a *fragment* and they are called *global propositions* (van Dijk, 1980). A macro proposition “explicates the overall unity of a discourse sequence as it is intuitively known under such notions as theme, topic, or gist” (van Dijk, 1982, p. 180).

Microstructures (local meaning) have several semantic, syntactic, stylistic, and rhetorical features. For instance, selection of lexis (specific words) is deliberate with its ideological implications (van Dijk, 2006b). Similarly, rhetorical structures function ideologically in de-emphasizing information that is unfavorable to *us* (in-group) and emphasizing negative information about *them* (out-group) (van Dijk, 1995a). The number game, a well-known technique to present arguments, serves numerous purposes, including conveying objectivity and precision, and hence credibility (van Dijk, 2005). The syntactic use of pronouns indicates representation and manipulation of social relations, status, power, and underlying ideologies. Pronominal variation thus conveys in-group membership, solidarity, out-group derogation and distancing, and intergroup polarization (van Dijk, 1998).

In discourse, presuppositions may have an important ideological role as well. They are related to knowledge or beliefs that are simply assumed to be true by the speaker and allow him to make claims and take certain beliefs for granted that may not be the case in fact (van Dijk, 1995b). In political discourses, macro-propositions are often modalized. Events and acts may have occurred in the past, present, or future and actions may have been authorized or made necessary, hoped, or regretted. Choices of modality serve not only political functions but also a more general persuasive function (van Dijk, 1997). In addition, conjunctions both coordinating and subordinating, as a syntactic category, are a set of connectives that specify relationships between facts or propositions (van Dijk, 1977). Similarly, references and descriptions made to politicians, organizations, public figures, and their actions reflect politically and ideologically driven perspectives (van Dijk, 1997).

In the light of the above theoretical foundations, this study examined the employment of macro and micro structures in Khan’s speech. The purpose was to reveal whether or not the two discourse structures (macro and micro) complemented each other in securing ideological import conveyed through the speech.

## Methodology

Political speeches have been widely investigated using CDA tools (Fouzia et al., 2021; Khajavi & Rasti, 2020; Sartika, 2021; & Wang, 2020). CDA addresses non-linguistic elements such as society, culture, and ideology, all of which have a significant influence on the creation of a text in a certain context (Wodak, 1996). CDA studies social problems with a focus on language manipulation as one of its key characteristics (van Dijk, 2006a; Wodak & Meyer, 2009). It explores how discursive practices, texts, and events are linked to sociopolitical and sociocultural elements, and how these activities are given an ideological structure in accordance with power and domination (Fairclough, 2013; Kress, 1990). Through discursive engagements with texts, CDA identifies those mistreated by socio-political wrongs and proposes solutions. It seeks to clarify ambiguous aspects of a speech by exposing ideologically infused systems of power and dominance, as well as prejudice reflected in the language use (Wodak, 1996; Wodak & Meyer, 2009). However, analysis of political speeches may be questioned based on the claim that “a spoken text is never just verbal, but also visual combining with modes such as facial expression, gesture, posture and other forms of self-presentation” (Kress & van Leeuwen, 2006. p. 41). Such multimodal nature of political speech containing “tone, volume, facial expressions, eye contact, pausing, body language” (p. 640) may make their analysis “dubious” (Carreon & Svetanant, 2017).

This study investigated Pakistani Prime Minister Imran Khan’s speech to the 74<sup>th</sup> UNGA Session on September 27, 2019. Qualitative approach was adopted for in-depth analysis of the speech. The data consisted of speech transcript/text that was retrieved from <https://www.brecorder.com/news/524851>. The speech was delivered in English language and contained about 2577 words. To identify and analyze discourse elements, the speech was intensively read and watched on YouTube (<https://youtu.be/uyaQgnQCQ5k>). The data was categorized as macrostructures (macro propositions) and microstructures under van Dijk’s (1980) framework. The first step was to analyze macro propositions and the issues they summarized such as climate change, money laundering, corruption, Islamophobia, Pakistan’s war on terror, the Kashmir conflict, and Pakistan’s relations with India. The second step focused on analyzing microstructures such as the use of pronouns, rhetorical questions, references, number game, presuppositions, coherence, modality, and lexis. Finally, the analyzed data was interpreted to reveal the main aspects of the macro-micro interface.

While investigating ideologically laden discourses, for instance, political speeches may often become intricate because they address concerns, which are time-bound. To this, the duration in which data is collected must be specified, and generalizations over time must be curtailed (Carreon & Svetanant, 2017). This study was limited to the context, conditions, and time in which the speech was delivered at the UNGA

session. It focused on a small sample size (one speech) and, therefore, it may not reflect the speaker's mannerisms or personalized style in a true sense. In addition, it just analyzed the speech transcript and excluded other features such as facial expressions, eye contact, body language, etc.

## Results

This section illustrates macrostructures (part 1) microstructures (part 2) employed in the speech.

### *Part 1: Macrostructures in PM Imran Khan's UNGA Speech*

This section presents various macro propositions derived from the speech, which revealed topical macrostructures and represented the gist of the speech.

*Macro proposition 1:* There was an urgent need to address crucial world problems at the UN forum. This macro proposition summarized the reason given by Imran Khan for participating in the UNGA session. He claimed that he particularly came, e.g., *I specially came...despite a difficult time*, to address challenges such as climate change, money laundering, corruption, Islamophobia, and others; that is why he did not miss the UNGA session despite difficult time in his county.

*Macro propositions 2:* Climate change should be dealt with urgently, and productive measures should be adopted to avoid catastrophic consequences. This macro proposition summed up Khan's stance on global issue of climate change in several aspects. For instance, he pointed out to the UNGA audience the urgency to handle the issue that has affected world nations. However, he claimed that world leaders could not realize the situation as urgent. Khan stressed that the climate changes glaciers, main source of water, which are melting alarmingly and warned about consequences, e.g., *huge catastrophe*. The PM also revealed his intent to plant *a billion trees* in his country to avoid devastating consequences. He necessitated, e.g., *must be held accountable*, that rich countries should be questioned for greenhouse gas emission.

*Macro proposition 3:* Corruption and money laundering, by ruling elite in developing, countries are not treated seriously and inequality between the rich and the poor is growing rapidly. Through this macro proposition, Khan claimed that money laundering is not taken seriously like other crimes, e.g. *drug money* and *terror financing*. Khan also made the point that billions of dollars are siphoned from poor to rich countries, illegally invested in tax havens overseas, and properties are bought in Western capitals by *corrupt politicians* – described as '*devastating*' to developing world. He also spoke about corruption and exemplified the case of Pakistan through assertions that ruling elite stole, '*plundered*', the country's wealth – that should be retrieved and spent on human developments. It was also stressed that initiatives should be taken, e.g., *deterrent, political will*, to stop wealth, *flight of capital*, leaving poor

countries and questioned legitimacy of secret accounts abroad. Further, Khan demanded the role of monetary agencies to find ways and stop illegal transfer, *plunder*, of money.

*Macro proposition 4:* The alarming growth of Islamophobia and correlated issues of intolerance, marginalization and radicalization. Macro proposition 4 outlined Khan's stance on Islamophobia in the West. He claimed that since 9/11 Islamophobia has become worrisome, *alarming*, caused *divisions* between Muslims and non-Muslims, and is *marginalizing* Muslim communities. The speaker metaphorically described that wearing *Hijab* is seen as a *weapon* because some Western leaders equated Islam with terrorism. The PM also emphasized that there was no relationship between Islam and radicalism; rather it concerns all religions – e.g., *radical fringes in every society*. Khan stressed that there is only *ONE Islam* preached by the Prophet (PBUH) and declared it unfortunate that the Muslim world failed to explain to the West that Islam is not, *there is no such*, a radical religion. To him, equating suicide attacks only with Islam post 9/11 incidents was strange, *bizarre*. Khan also pointed out that some people provoke Muslims through blasphemy against the Holy Prophet Muhammad (PBUH), immensely respected, *the ideal*, which hurts Muslims' sentiments, and then their reaction is termed as intolerant. He demanded that blasphemous acts against Islam should be treated with great sensitivity just like sensitive issues in other religions, e.g., *in western society, the holocaust*.

*Macro proposition 5:* Treatment of women, minorities, and slaves has to be exemplary according to Islam. This macro proposition revealed Khan's stand about handling of women, minorities, and slaves in Islam. He asserted that it is an unusual act, e.g., *strange things*, to go against minorities and women and asserted that there is no room for unjust treatments in Islam, e.g., *against the teachings of our religion*. Khan reminded the audience that Islam takes responsibility for the poor, widows, and women, treats *all humans* equally, and freeing a slave in Islam is a part of sacred acts, *greatest deeds*.

*Macro proposition 6:* Pakistan joined the war on terror and faced worst losses to economy and human lives. This macro proposition captured Khan's statements on Pakistan's joining of war on terror and its adverse effects, e.g., *worst periods*, in the form of massive harms to people and economy for nothing, e.g., he asserted as *a war Pakistan had nothing to do with*. Khan claimed that it all happened after the 9/11 incidents when Pakistan joined the war on terror all *indoctrinated* people (first *freedom fighters* vs. later *terrorists*), who fought against the Soviets in the 1980s, turned against Pakistan.

*Macro proposition 7:* India-Pakistan hostile relations, revoking of the special status of Kashmir and related crises. This macro proposition recapitulated the India-Pakistan standoff and Kashmir conflict. Khan claimed his seriousness, e.g., *first priority*, about bringing peace in the

region. By citing the Indian government's claims about militant organizations in Pakistan, he insisted on the UN observers to see the situation, e.g., *come and see*. Khan shared that India without any evidence, *any proof*, blamed Pakistan for the *Pulwama incident* – when a Kashmiri boy radicalized by Indian forces attacked an Indian convoy by blowing himself up. He, further, stated that India not only sponsored attacks in Pakistan, e.g., *had actual proof*, but also directly attacked Pakistan in 2019, e.g., *tried to bomb us*.

Khan reminded the UNGA audience that revoking Article 370 by India deprived Kashmiris of their right, *special status*, and questioned curfews and lockdowns imposed by India. He also maintained that Indian PM is a *life member* of an organization (RSS) that relies on racial supremacy, e.g., *racial superiority* and *hate ideology* towards others. Khan also shared with the audience killings and locking up of women and children, *caged*, arresting politicians, and radicalization in Kashmir. The speaker also questioned the response of internal communities on cruel happenings, e.g., *atrocities*, in the Muslim world, particularly, Kashmir – the dispute between India and Pakistan. He also made the UN realize to take responsibility and give Kashmiris their rights, e.g., *the right to self-determination* that it promised.

#### *Part 2: Microstructures in PM Imran Khan's UNGA Speech*

This section presents various several microstructures (discursive devices) including pronouns, rhetorical questions, references, number game, presupposition, modality, lexis and conjunctions used in the speech.

#### **Pronouns**

To exemplify, different types of 'pronouns' used in the speech included: subjective personal pronouns (*I, we, you, they*), possessive personal pronouns (*my, our, their*), and objective personal pronouns (*us, them*). For instance, the pronoun 'I' was subjectively used to stress Khan's purpose for coming to the UN as *I especially came...I would not have come...I want the United Nations*. Similarly, the collective/inclusive 'we' was used to convey concerns regarding the issue of climate in the context of Pakistan as *we depend on our rivers...we are mainly...we fear...a huge catastrophe...we detected...glaciers...we planted...trees*. Other uses of pronouns referred to money laundering, corruption, and overseas assets of Pakistani politicians such as *...revenue we collect...into debt...our total debt went up 4 times...our money was plundered...we located properties...corrupt leaders...we find it so difficult to retrieve it...we don't have the money to hire....* In addition, the collective use of pronouns 'we' and 'our' drew the audience's attention towards Islamophobia and blasphemy against Islam in the West. Khan expressed, e.g., *we...faced Islamophobia...we must address...we failed as the Muslim... ridiculing our Prophet (PBUH)...malign our Prophet...witness to our Divine book...is the*

*ideal we want...lives in our heart...he is maligned, it hurts us... do not hurt our sentiments...That is all we ask.*

Khan also relied on pronouns while talking about Pakistan's relation with India and curfews and lockdowns in Kashmir. For instance, the subjective/possessive use of pronouns 'I' and 'my' represented Khan himself as *my relationship with India...I have great friends...I've always loved going to India...my first move...to Modi...I said let's work...* The use of 'we', 'our' and 'us' represented Khan's government or Pakistan as a country as *leave our past...our main priority...our people... we thought we should wait...give us any proof...we had...proofs of Indian intervention...our...province...we...caught their spy...they tried to bomb us...we retaliated...we captured their pilot... we did not want...to escalate... we realised Indians... economically isolate us...* On the contrary, Khan used the pronoun 'they' and 'their' to describe the Indian government/ruling party and their actions towards Pakistan and Kashmir, e.g., *they...racial superiority... they believe...Hinduism...they openly...hatred...their own cruelty in Kashmir, they will blame us ... bomb us again.* Similarly, the personal pronoun, 'you', addressed the audience to draw their attention to revoking of the special status of Kashmir, e.g., *you think Kashmiris will accept* and the UN in relation to Kashmir conflict, e.g., *you are the one who said...self-determination, this is why you came into being...etc.*

### **Rhetorical Questions**

The element of 'rhetorical questions' was microstructurally utilized by Khan to create a specific impact on certain matters. For instance, several rhetorical questions were posed to underscore money laundering done by ruling elite and corrupt politicians in poor countries. The speaker has marshaled the following rhetorical questions: *How will we spend ...our money was plundered by the ruling elite? How can poor countries meet...SDG's when money...leave our countries? Why is it legal to have tax havens....secret accounts?* Similarly, rhetorical questions also emphasized PM's point of view on the alleged association of Islam with terrorism and racialization, e.g., *And why has this happened? What is radical Islam? Why is there Islamophobia? How...a moderate Muslim and a radical Muslim?* Most rhetorical questions addressed the issue of Kashmir. For instance, curfews imposed by India after revoking the special status of Kashmir were represented through the rhetorical questions such as: *What will happen...curfew is lifted? But what will happen...Kashmiris come out...and...troops?* Lockdowns in Kashmir were questioned as *What kind of a mindset locks up... people?* Similarly, Khan's position on world community's inaction on the Kashmir conflict was seen in the questions: *How would the Jewish community react if...Jews were under lockdown? How would the Europeans...any human community react? What has been the response of the world community...? Will the word community appease a market...or...justice and humanity, etc.?*

## References

The PM also included 'references' in his speech. While giving his viewpoint about Islamophobia and its spread, references like *since 9/11, Post 9/11, the 9/11 bombers*, pointed out that Islamophobia has grown since 9/11 incidents because, according to Khan, suicide attacks and radicalization were equated with Islam. He referred to *the Tamil Tigers* and *Japanese Kamikaze bombers* to claim that when they carried out suicide attacks no religion was blamed as in the case of Islam. Other references such as *1989, this book, Prophet (PBUH), the Holy Quran, Divine Book* were made to argue about blasphemous acts against Islam. Similarly, Khan also used references to talk about the treatment of minorities, the poor, widows, and women in Islam –*The state of Medina* that took responsibility for all humans and *The 4th Caliph of Medina* who lost case to a citizen in a court. Other references, which represented the ruling party in India, included *RSS... inspired by Hitler and Mussolini...same way that the Nazi's believed.... racial superiority of Hindus...PM Modi and BJP*. Some more references were also made to claim India's interventions in Pakistan such as *our Balochistan province* and *the FATF blacklist*. Similarly, references like *Article 370, Pulwama attack, a movie Death Wish, in 1939, in Munich, Czechoslovakia* were made to draw attention to violent situations in Kashmir.

## Number Game

Khan also employed the micro device of 'number game' to express his stance about the challenge of climate change, its effects, and counter steps taken by his government in Pakistan, e.g. *Pakistan...among...10 nations...80 percent of our water...5000 glaciers...a billion trees in 5 years....targeting 10 billion trees*. Another use of figures such as *billions of dollars siphoned...10 years....debt went up 4 times....our 220 million population* were employed to claim money laundering by the ruling elite/politicians that preceded his government. Likewise, numbers such as *70,000 people, 150 billion dollars* were used to speak about Pakistan's joining of war on terror and losses caused. To opine about curfews, lockdowns, Indian troops, arrests of people, cruelties in Kashmir, PM used numbers; for instance, *8 million...under curfew...locks up 8 million people....8 million animals...100,000 Kashmiris killed....900,000 troops...13,000 boys picked ...180 Million Muslims...locked up for 50 days...to free the 13,000 Kashmiris*, etc.

## Presupposition

Several instances of 'presupposition' were also analyzed in the speech. For instance, the statement *if nothing...we fear...a huge catastrophe* conveyed PM's concern about climate change and its effects. Through presumptions like *if we retrieve the plundered money, we could spend on...human* and *If the poor get poorer and the rich...there will be a crisis soon*, the speaker emphasized money laundering issue and desired to

retrieve and spend this money on humans. Khan also assumed that Kashmiris would not accept revocation of Article 370 (abolishing special status), e.g., *what will happen when the curfew is lifted...a bloodbath...only lead to further radicalization*. Similarly, it was presupposed by Khan that India would blame Pakistan again for another *Pulwama attack* as, e.g., *we fear another Pulwama incident.... India.... will...blame Pakistan...us.... bomb us again....* A war between the two countries over the Kashmir dispute was also presumed, e.g., *if a conventional war...nuclear countries...anything could...* and so on.

### Modality

The use of microstructure 'modality' was also analyzed in the speech. For instance, in giving an opinion about climate change and countermeasures to control it, Khan stated, e.g., *very urgent problem that the world must address, rich countries...gas emissions must be held accountable*, etc. Khan also employed modality while discussing countermeasures to stop money laundering and corruption, e.g., *the rich countries must show political will... must be a deterrent...corrupt ruling elite must not be allowed...The World Bank...IMF...must find a way....* The speaker also used modality to address the UN in relation to the Kashmir issue such as *must urge India to lift the curfew...must insist on Kashmiri's right to self-determination!*

### Lexis

Likewise, specific lexis as a micro-discursive element was also used by Khan. For instance, word choices such as *urgent problem, urgency, a huge catastrophe* describe the issue of climate change. In addition, lexis like *devastating, impoverishing, plundered money, corrupt, criminals*, etc. contained Khan's message about money laundering and corruption by politicians/ruling elite. Lexical choices such as *alarming...creating divisions, Hijab...a weapon, marginalizing, radicalization*, etc. reflected speaker's concern about Islamophobia and its effects. The expression *a bizarre thing* meant that it was unusual to equate suicide attacks with only one religion Islam while there were instances from other beliefs as well. The lexical choices *live in our heart, the ideal we want to live up to* were used to describe the Holy Prophet (PBUH). Through lexis such as *maligning, ridiculing, it hurts us, our sentiments, provoked*, Khan made his point about blasphemous acts and their effects on Muslims. Similarly, through word choices such as *worst periods, nightmare, turned against us, indoctrinated people, lost their lives* Khan conveyed losses to Pakistan by joining the war on terror. Khan's word choices such as *great friends in India, loved going to India, first move, leave... past behind, main priority*, described his relations with India. Other lexical choices that described the Indian ruling party and its actions included *racial superiority, RSS goons, ideology of hate, locks up, killed, raped*, etc. Khan believed that international community was more interested in business with India than resolving the Kashmir conflict, as reflected in lexis, e.g., *materialism has trumped humanity, appease a market of 1.2 billion*. Besides, lexical choices

such as *caged like animals, locked up* metaphysically conveyed his stance about the situation in Kashmir.

### Conjunctions

Several instances of 'conjunctions' in the speech reveal that ideas and statements are well connected. For instance, the use of 'but' by Khan directs how he considered world leaders' reaction to the challenge of climate change as *...leaders talk about this. But I don't see... the urgency*. The expression such as *a lot of ideas...but...ideas without funding...* suggests how Khan wanted to tackle this challenge. Another use of conjunction, e.g., *as a result, the total revenue... into debt servicing*, referred to money laundering, corruption, and their bad results such as using Pakistan's revenue to pay debts. The use of conjunction 'because' in the statement *because the 9/11 bombers did suicide attack*, Khan claimed that suicide attacks were equated with Islam because of 9/11 attacks. The use of correlative conjunction in the comment *either you surrender, or you fight* contextualized that if India imposed war on Pakistan, then it might have to face two options: surrender or fight. The subordinating conjunction 'if' in the statement *if you are doing this to human beings, pushing...to radicalization* was made to highlight repressions faced by Kashmiris that could force them towards radicalization. Similarly, the conjunction 'when' in the statement *when a Muslim community is unjust to a Minority.... against...our religion* clarified that injustice towards a minority by Muslims is not an Islamic practice.

### Discussion

This section answers the three research questions: the type of macro and micro structures, their functions and how these discourse structures supplemented each other in constructing the speech. As represented, macro-level analysis of the speech unveiled macro propositions, which summarized issues in global, regional, and national contexts such as climate change, corruption, money laundering, Islamophobia, Pakistan's war on terror, the Kashmir conflict, and Pakistan's relation with India. These macro propositions were supported by multiple micro-level devices such as pronouns, rhetorical questions, references, number game, presuppositions, coherence, modality, and lexis. Macro and micro structures in political discourses reflect different stances, personal backgrounds, and worldviews of speakers (Makarova & Shakoury, 2021). This study confirms that the two types of discourse structure (macro and micro) complemented each other in securing ideological import conveyed through the speech. As observed, Macro proposition (1) accomplished by the micro-level device of pronoun 'I' (*I especially came*) intended to convince the audience of Khan's personal responsibility and seriousness in addressing global challenges by giving the UN' session preference over other commitments. The use of macro and micro structures and their implications in this study conform to the findings that Khan's emotional address was to promote world peace and unity and

persuade the audience about the importance of global issues so that the UN could take appropriate actions (Mushtaq et al., 2021).

Crucially, macrostructures used in speeches enable readers to understand topics, themes and reveal salient information (Pratiwi & Refnaldi, 2018). As noticed in study Macro proposition 2 that summarized Khan's stance on climate change was constructed through several microstructural elements. For instance, the use of pronoun 'we' positively represented Pakistani nation, a collective identity, or a shared responsibility (*we planted*) taken by Khan's government to minimize the threat of climate change by planting trees in billions. Pronouns are used in political discourses for a variety of reasons, including self-emphasis, solidarity, self-responsibility, inclusion, and unity of purpose (Sharndama, 2015). To prove his arguments true about climate change and show credibility, Khan employed the micro-level device of the number game (*10 nations...80 percent...5000 glaciers...10 billion trees*). In the same context, the pre-suppositional meaning encoded in the expression *if nothing is done....* implicated that Khan was very concerned about addressing climate change and was in favor of taking concrete measures to handle this challenge.

Similarly, Khan maintained his serious tone about climate change by employing another micro-device modality (*must address, must be held*) – implying obligation and seriousness in controlling the threat of climate change. The semantic implications encoded in lexical choices (*urgent, urgency, catastrophe*) also seemed convincing for the audience to realize climate change a serious threat as the speaker intended. Macro proposition 2 was also supported by contrastive or adversative conjunctions (*leaders talk... But I don't see world leaders...the urgency*). Khan tried to imply that he was more serious in reacting to the threat of climate change than other world leaders, who did not treat the phenomenon as urgent enough. Thus, he again positively represented himself through this self-made claim. Conjunctions as a discourse structure indicate semantic meaning between what has been said and what will be stated next. A speaker can deliver a speech more confidently by skillfully using conjunctions (Setimaji et al., 2019).

A political speech attempts to persuade others to think, feel, or behave in a specific manner; it tries to motivate, convince, and influences others to perceive things from a particular angle (Finlayson & Martin, 2008). Khan in his speech also blatantly spoke against money laundering and corruption done by ruling elite/politicians as indicated in Macro proposition 3, constructed through several microstructures. For instance, exploitation of personal pronouns 'we' (*we don't have the money*) and 'our' (*our money*) by Khan represented the case of Pakistan, as a collective identity, to earn sympathies from his countrymen and showcase a sense of belonging towards his nation and the problems it faced. From a political perspective, pronouns are the most interesting words because they reveal who the speakers identify with; they have the power to alter

the impact of a speech on audiences (Håkansson, 2012). This macro proposition was also accomplished by rhetorical questions (*How can poor countries...? Why is it legal...?*) intended to influence the audiences' mind that money laundering and corruption have devastating consequences on poor countries and should be considered illegal and crime. As evidenced, rhetorical questions promote a political message in an argumentative manner, express the positions of the speakers, and persuade an audience to change their mind rather than seeking a response (Al-Jumaily & Al-Azzawi, 2009).

Macro proposition 3 was also supplemented by the number game strategy (*billions of dollars, 220 million population*) to justify that Khan's self-claimed assertions about money laundering were right. Likewise, the micro-device presupposition also contributed to achieving his macro-goals in this regard. Khan's assumptions (*If we retrieve..., development*) about retrieving *plundered* money and spending it on human development proved his sincerity towards his people and country. Similarly, the use of modality of obligation (*must be a deterrent... must not be allowed...must find a way*) supported that Khan remained forceful in his argument and sought necessary measures to curb these malpractices. Different types of modality, such as 'obligation', support a political speech and reveal the tendencies underlying it (Yunisda & Firmansyah, 2019). Equally, the use of negative lexicalization (*corrupt, criminals*) by Khan created a negative image/evaluation of those involved in money laundering implied that such malpractices were ethically against his political manifesto. Khan's macro-level critical assessments about money laundering and corruption were also supported by micro-structural device of conjunction (*as a result*) – to underline detrimental effects of these malpractices such his government was forced to consume the country's revenues to pay debts etc.

Macro proposition 4 unveiled Khan's political and ideological stances on Islamophobia. His macro-strategy was to create a positive picture of Islam, disassociate it from radicalization, and point out negative impacts of Islamophobia such as marginalization of Muslims and blasphemy. Employing micro-level discursive devices such as pronouns (*ridiculing our Prophet, we want...in our heart... hurts us.... our sentiments... all we ask*) Khan collectively represented all the Muslims, shared identity/in-group representation, conveyed their sentiments about blasphemy against the Holy Prophet (PBUH), demanded respect and condemned blasphemy in all its forms. The use of personal pronouns by politicians is a strategy to gain public support and retain the authority of their administration. For instance, 'we' and 'our' are used to foster global empathy on certain issues (Dahnilsyah, 2017). Another micro-device of a rhetorical question (*What is radical Islam... Why... How...?*) was used by Khan to back his ideological position on defending Islam and negating all negative conceptions associated with it. The PM also relied on the discursive device of reference (*the Tamil Tigers, Japanese Kamikaze*) to authentic his claim that suicide attacks in other communities were not

equated with their beliefs like associated with Islam. He disapproved of such a negative association and described it as unusual (*bizarre*) to equate suicide attacks with any religion including Islam. Khan's pro-Islam ideology, macro-strategy, was also reinforced by the micro-level device of conjunction (*because the 9/11 bombers...*) which signaled that the only reason for equating suicide attacks with Islam was the 9/11 incidents.

Similarly, in Macro proposition 4, Islamic references (*the Holy Quran, Divine Book*) supported Khan's macro-arguments against the blasphemy of the Prophet (PBUH) and reminded the audience about the revelation of the Holy Book to the Prophet – a scared phenomenon. Explicit references to Holy Scriptures establish a speaker-audience relationship by providing a recognizable context (Kitaeva & Ozerova, 2019). Khan also employed specific lexical choices (*lives in...heart, the ideal*) that demonstrated his ideological belief of showing extreme respect and liking for the Holy Prophet (PBUH), which an ideal Muslim should have as a part of his faith. Another lexis (*maligning, ridiculing, hurts us*) evidenced that Khan considered blasphemy extremely sensitive and hurting for the Muslim community and disliked it. Lexical choices are not employed by chance, but they demonstrate speakers' ideological beliefs in relation to facts or reality (Komaruddin, 2014; Nugraha, 2014). Also, lexical choices in this context (*alarming...creating divisions*) implied that Khan as a leader of a Muslim majority country is well aware of Islamophobia and its negative consequences.

Macrostructures in speeches are examined not only for speakers' intentions but also for positive-self and negative-other representations (Annisa, 2018; Makarova & Shakoury, 2021). Macro proposition 5 refuted the claims that Islam is against women and minorities. Khan using the micro-device of reference, historically, (*The State of Medina, the 4th Caliph of Medina*) represented a positive image of Islam and negated claims of unjust treatments. The purpose was to defend Islam and present it as a religion of peace and justice just like all other religions. This macro proposition was also supported by conjunctions (*when...is unjust... against...religion*) to show that injustice towards a minority was never a part of Islam. Microstructural elements, such as number game strategy in political discourses, are intended to make arguments more credible or factual (Nasih & Abboud, 2020; Unvar & Rahimi, 2013). With reference to Macro proposition 6, Khan relied on numbers and statistics (*70,000 people, 150 billion dollars*) which implied his dissatisfaction/unhappiness over human and economic losses that Pakistan suffered by joining the war on terror, which he believed was not needed. This macro proposition was also maintained by another micro-device, lexicalization. For instance, the use of specific words such as *worst periods, nightmare, turned against us, lost their lives* held his claims that Pakistan had to face dreadful consequences in handling the war on terror.

Macrostructures in discourse reveal the most salient information and ideological notions of positive self-representation and negative other-

representation (Matić, 2012). As noticed, Macro proposition 7 captured tensions between India and Pakistan and Kashmiris' deprivation of their special status by India. Khan utilized several macro-level elements to achieve negative other representation as a macro-level strategy. To cite, the ideological use of pronouns (we, our, us vs. they, their) has been noticeable in this regard. A positive image of Khan's government/Pakistani nation was created with a sense of shared identity (*our main priority, we thought, bomb us*). On the contrary, a negative image of the Indian government/ruling party (*they...racial superiority, their own cruelty*) was created in relation to their actions towards Pakistan and Kashmir. Pronouns functioned to serve ideologies of political leaders and help study images of 'self' and 'others' (Masroor et al., 2019). Also, the use of pronouns (*my relationship...I have...friends...I've always...my first move*) positively emphasized Khan's personal relations and his concerns/involvement to resolve disputes with India. The use of 'I' and 'my' demonstrate a state leader's strictness and integrity (Dahnilyah, 2017). Similarly, the pronoun 'you' was used in support of the arguments on Kashmir issue. It was used to address the UN (*you, the United Nations*), shifted the responsibility to the body, and reminded it to get involved in lifting curfews and give Kashmiris their right to self-determination.

A political speech as a principal means of influencing people employ rhetoric to persuade audiences in accepting a speaker's viewpoint, excite them, intensify or change a specific phenomenon, and claim leadership (Carreon & Svetanant, 2017). This study conforms to such notions as exhibited in Macro proposition 7. Khan employed rhetorical questions at a micro level to construct pro-Kashmir arguments at a macro level. These questions were intended to point out atrocities faced by Kashmiris (*What...locks up...people...what will happen...?*) and criticize the world community (*what...the world community...will the world community...?*) for ignoring the issue. The remarks implied the speaker's seriousness and commitment to resolving the conflict and backing Kashmiris ideologically and politically. Political discourses also contain references, which strengthen arguments and assertions made by politicians (Kulo, 2009; Masroor et al., 2019).

References employed in Khan's speech were ideologically as well as politically driven, which negatively represented the ruling party in India, its racially motivated ideology (*inspired by Hitler and Mussolini*), and exposed their negative actions towards Pakistan (*attacks...Balochistan*) and Kashmir (*Article 370*). Such descriptions of certain actors represent in-depth information about someone and their roles and contribute to macro-level positive-self and negative other-representations (Makarova & Shakoury, 2021). Khan's macro strategy of staying pro-Kashmir and anti-India was also attained by using the micro-strategy of number game, utilization of figures, to persuade the audience, show precision, and support his arguments about curfews and lockdowns (*8 million...under*

*curfew*), Indian troops' presence (*900,000 troops*), arrests of people (*13,000*) and brutalities (*100,000...killed*) in Kashmir.

As a discursive-analytic tool, presupposition reflects hidden assumptions. Presupposed meanings are implicitly encoded into the explicit microstructure of language to enable the encoder to convey the politically sensitive and ideological import unspoken at a surface-structure level. Khan presumed/feared an intensified situation in Kashmir with severe consequences (*when the curfew is lifted...a bloodbath*) as an outcome of curfews. Again, he wanted to draw audiences' attention towards revocation of the special status of Kashmir by the Indian authorities – which he opposed ideologically and politically. Khan even negatively assumed that India would blame Pakistan for future wrongs in Kashmir (*will blame...bomb us again*). It implied that he had no trust in India whatsoever. As a property of language, presupposition is often utilized to (re) shape audiences' ideology, deepen the understating of a speech, and realize the speaker's political intentions (Liang & Liu, 2016). Macro proposition 7, which revealed Khan's ideological and political beliefs to back the Kashmir cause, was also accomplished by the microstructural element modality. Khan reminded the UN that the body was mandated with an obligation/duty (*must urge India, must insist on Kashmiri's right*) to attend to Kashmiris and let them decide about their future through plebiscite.

Similarly, lexicalization is intentionally employed to achieve positive self-presentation and negative other-presentation – as structures of ideologies in political speeches (Matić, 2012). Khan used this micro-device to create a positive self-representation/image by proclaiming that he personally liked India (*loved going to India*) and was committed to resolving all disputes (*leave...past behind*). To create a negative other-representation/image of his opponents, the Indian ruling party, Khan's macro-level dichotomy and ideological perspectives were implied by his lexical choices (*racial superiority, RSS goons, hatred for the Muslims & Christians*). Similarly, Khan's choice of words (*materialism has trumped humanity*) suggested his extreme resentment with little or no-response policy of the international community on Kashmir conflict. Lexical choices such as *these are humans* were meant to oppose curfews and lockdown and intended to persuade the audience of inhuman circumstances faced by Kashmiris. Macro proposition 7 was also completed by the microstructural element of conjunctions (*either...or*) used in the context of an assumed war between India and Pakistan. Khan wanted the UN forum to acknowledge serious belligerences between the two countries over the Kashmir dispute and wanted to seek the UN's interference to deescalate the situation.

The analysis reflects those important political speeches may have some goals, which are politically or ideologically oriented. To this assumption, such speeches are accomplished by employing essential linguistic tools to infuse intended messages into audiences. Manipulations at the level of

language in a political speech are maneuvered by politicians for, possible, self-projections or (re) shaping public opinion on certain matters. The employment of macro and micro structures in Khan's speech implies that the speaker as a political actor mostly adopted the strategy to present a good image of the 'self'/his government/country to the UN audience. This was achieved through emphasizing his political actions, in relation to national and global changes, and self-made claims/praises on a number of occasions. On the contrary, Khan de-legitimized his ideological and political opponents and criticized their actions. This study has been no exception to previous critical studies (Makarova & Shakoury, 2021; Masroor et al., 2019) which confirmed that varied discursive strategies are invoked to construct positive-self and negative other representations in political discourses. Overall, the findings also conform to the previous claim that Khan, through his UNGA speech, shared his political and ideological perspectives on regional and global issues in a sentimental and clear manner (Khan, 2019).

## Conclusion

This study analyzes macro and microstructures in Imran Khan's political speech to the 74<sup>th</sup> Session of the UNGA. It underscores correspondences holding between the two structures (macro and micro) with regard to the research questions – discussed in the previous section. To sum up, the speech comprises macro propositions (macro-level ideologies) that capture/summarize global, regional, and national issues such as climate change, corruption, money laundering, Islamophobia, Pakistan's war on terror, relations with India, and the Kashmir conflict. The global message (macrostructures) in the speech was enabled by microstructures (micro-level linguistic devices) such as pronouns, rhetorical questions, references, number game, presuppositions, coherence, modality, and lexis. To achieve his political and ideological motives, Khan used such discourse structures. For instance, there has been a creation of the impression that Khan treated the challenge of climate change and recommended countermeasures more urgently than other world leaders. By macro and microelements, Khan demonstrated that he was against malpractices such as corruption and money laundering by politicians and ruling elite.

The employment of macro and microstructures of discourse also empowered Khan to blatantly refute negative associations with Islam and Muslims such as radicalization, unjust treatment of minorities and women, and oppose equating suicide attacks and terrorism with just Islam. Hence, he created a positive image of Islam. Khan adopted a strong position against blasphemous acts worldwide that hurt Muslims and demanded the same respect for sensitive issues in Islam like all other beliefs. The speaker also clarified how Pakistan was involved in the war on terror and suffered severe consequences for no good reasons. The two types of structure (macro and micro) also complemented each other in securing Khan's ideological stance on the Kashmir conflict and hostile

relationship with India. He created a positive self-image, showed commitment, and legitimated his actions in solving disputes with India. On the contrary, he opposed revocation of the special status of Kashmir and imposition of curfews and lockdowns by the Indian government—created a negative image of the Indian government/ruling party and delegitimized their actions in Kashmir. Khan also expressed his disappointment with the world community for not rescuing Kashmiris and insisted on the UN's involvement. Overall, then, the use of macro and micro structures in the speech constructed Khan's ideological and political beliefs the way he intended. Hence, it is recommended to have critical insights into UNGA addresses, by world leaders, which reveal ideological stances governed by the national interests of a country.

## Acknowledgments

This project was supported by the Deanship of Scientific Research at Prince Sattam Bin Abdulaziz University under the research project # 2021/02/17599

## References

- Ahmed, H. R., Amir, S., & Ahmad, F. (2020). A speech act analysis of the Prime Minister of Pakistan Imran Khan's speech at UNGA with respect to Islamophobia. *International Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities*, 5(2), 59-71.
- Al-Jumaily, A. A., & Al-Azzawi, J. N. (2009). Identification, description and interpretation of English rhetorical questions in political speeches. *Ahl Al-Bait Jurnal*, 1(9), 7-20.
- Annisa, L. (2018). *A critical discourse analysis in President Erdogan's speeches on the republic of Turkey official website* (thesis, University of Sumatera Utara). Retrieved from <http://repositori.usu.ac.id/handle/123456789/12833>
- Carreon, J. R., & Svetanant, C. (2017). What lies underneath a political speech?: Critical discourse analysis of Thai PM's political speeches aired on the TV programme returning happiness to the people. *Open Linguistics*, 3(1), 638-655.
- Dahnilyah, D. (2017). The implied power through the use of personal pronouns in Obama's speeches: Critical discourse analysis. *International Journal of Educational Best Practices*, 1(2), 59-71.
- Fairclough, N. (2013). *Language and power* (3rd ed.). London, England: Routledge.
- Finlayson, A., & Martin, J. (2008). 'It Ain't What You Say...': British Political Studies and the Analysis of Speech and Rhetoric. *British Politics*, 3(4), 445-464.
- Fouzia, Z., Assia, B., & Rachid, M. (2021). Critical discourse analysis of the political speech of the Algerian President, Abdelmajid Tebboune, after contracting the COVID-19. *العمدة في اللسانيات وتحليل الخطاب*, 5(2), 464-474

- Håkansson, J. (2012). *The Use of Personal Pronouns in Political Speeches: A comparative study of the pronominal choices of two American presidents*. [Bachelor thesis, Linnaeus University]. Retrieved from <http://lnu.diva-portal.org/smash/record.jsf?pid=diva2%3A531167&dswid=-996>
- Imtiaz, A. (2020). A critical discourse analysis of prime minister of Pakistan Imran Khan's speech on Kashmir issue (2019). Retrieved from <http://oric.kinnaird.edu.pk/wp-content/uploads/2020/09/Ayesha-Imtiaz.pdf>
- Khajavi, Y., & Rasti, A. (2020). A discourse analytic investigation into politicians' use of rhetorical and persuasive strategies: The case of US election speeches. *Cogent Arts & Humanities*, 7(1), 1740051.
- Khan, M. (2019). Thematic analysis of PM speech at UNGA. Retrieved from <https://pakobserver.net/thematic-analysis-of-pm-speech-at-unga/>
- Kitaeva, E., & Ozerova, O. (2019). Intertextuality in political discourse. In *Language, Power, and Ideology in Political Writing: Emerging Research and Opportunities* (pp. 143-170) <https://doi.org/10.4018/978-1-5225-9444-4.ch007>
- Komaruddin, A. (2014). *A critical discourse analysis on meaning levels in Hillary Diane Rodham Clinton's speech about women* (Undergraduate thesis, Universitas Islam Negeri Maulana Malik Ibrahim). Retrieved from <http://etheses.uin-malang.ac.id/8592/>
- Kress, G. (1990). Critical discourse analysis. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 11(84), 84-99.
- Kress, G., & van Leeuwen, T. (2006). *Reading images: The grammar of visual design*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Kulo, L. (2009). *Linguistic features in political speeches\_ how language can be used to impose certain moral or ethical values on people*. (Bachelor thesis, Lulea University of Technology). Retrieved from <https://www.diva-portal.org/smash/get/diva2:1028973/FULLTEXT01.pdf>
- Liang, R., & Liu, Y. (2016). An analysis of presupposition triggers in Hilary Clinton's first campaign speech. *International Journal of English Linguistics*, 6(5), 68-73.
- Makarova, V., & Shakoury, K. (2021). Critical discourse analysis of micro and macro structures in talks by two Iranian Presidents at the United Nations General Assembly: A socio-cognitive perspective. *Iranian Journal of Applied Language Studies*, 13(1), 29-46.
- Masroor, F., Khan, Q. N., Aib, I., & Ali, Z. (2019). Polarization and ideological weaving in Twitter discourse of politicians. *Social Media+ Society*, 5(4), 1-14.

- Matić, D. (2012). Ideological discourse structures in political speeches. *Komunikacija i kultura online*, 3(3), 54-78.
- Mushtaq, M., Saleem, T., Afzal, S., & Saleem, A. (2021). A corpus-based ideational meta-functional analysis of Pakistan Prime Minister Imran Khan's speech at United Nations general assembly. *Cogent Social Sciences*, 7(1), 1-17.
- Nasih, R. K., & Abboud, Z. A. (2020). A critical discourse analysis of two iraqi politicians' speeches in terms of van Dijk's socio-cognitive model. *Journal of Basra researches for Human Sciences*, 45(3), 1-16.
- Nugraha, R. (2014). *A critical discourse analysis on Hillary Clinton's speech American for marriage equality* (thesis, State Islamic University Syarif Hidayatullah). Retrieved from <http://repository.uinjkt.ac.id/dspace/handle/123456789/29440>
- Pratiwi, A., & Refnaldi, R. (2018). Macrostructures and superstructures patterns of Jokowi's speeches. *English Language and Literature*, 7(4), 547-556.
- Sartika, T. (2021). Critical discourse analysis of Donald Trump's and Joe Biden's language in use in the 2020 United States presidential debates. In *International Conference on Education of Suryakencana (IConnects Proceedings)*. Retrieved from <https://jurnal.unsur.ac.id/cp/article/view/1379>
- Setimaji, F., Abdullah, T., & Haryudin, A. (2019). The use of conjunction: Elaboration in Donald Trump's speech. *Project (Professional Journal of English Education)*, 2(4), 475-481.
- Sharndama, E. C. (2015). Political discourse: A critical discourse analysis of President Muhammadu Buhari's inaugural speech. *European Journal of English Language and Linguistics Research*, 3(3), 12-24.
- Unvar, S., & Rahimi, A. (2013). A critical discourse analysis of discursive structures in a political text. *International journal of science and advanced technology*, 3(3), 12-20.
- van Dijk, T. A. (1977). *Text and context explorations in the semantics and pragmatics of discourse*. London: Longman
- van Dijk, T. A. (1980). *Macrostructures: An interdisciplinary study of global structures in discourse, interaction, and cognition*: New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Publisher.
- van Dijk, T. A. (1982). Episodes as units of discourse analysis. *Analyzing discourse: Text and Talk*. 177-195.
- van Dijk, T. A. (1985). Structures of news in the press. In T. A. van Dijk (Ed.), *Discourse and communication* (pp. 69-93). Berlin: de Gruyter
- van Dijk, T. A. (1995a). Discourse analysis as ideology analysis. In C. Schäffner & A. Wenden (Eds.), *Language and peace* (pp. 17-33). Aldershot, England: Dartmouth Publishing.
- van Dijk, T. A. (1995b). Discourse semantics and ideology. *Discourse & Society*, 6(2), 243-289.
- van Dijk, T. A. (1997). What is political discourse analysis? *Belgian Journal of linguistics*, 11(1), 11-52.
- van Dijk, T. A. (1998). *Ideology: A multidisciplinary approach* (1st ed.). London: SAGE publications.

- van Dijk, T. A. (2005). War rhetoric of a little ally: Political implicatures and Aznar's legitimatization of the war in Iraq. *Journal of Language and Politics*, 4(1), 65-91
- van Dijk, T. A. (2006a). Discourse and manipulation. *Discourse & Society*, 17(2), 359-383.
- van Dijk, T. A. (2006b). Ideology and discourse analysis. *Journal of Political Ideologies*, 11(2), 115-140.
- van Dijk, T. A. (2006c). Politics, ideology, and discourse. Retrieved from <http://www.discourses.org/OldArticles/Politics,%20Ideology%20and%20Discourse.pdf>
- Wodak, R. (1996). Disorders of discourse. *London, England: Longman*.
- Wodak, R., & Michael Meyer. (2009). Critical discourse analysis: History, agenda, theory and methodology. In R. Wodak & M. Meyer (Eds.). *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*, (pp. 1-33). London, England: SAGE Publications.
- Yunisda, P., & Firmansyah, A. Y. (2019). Political discourse: The modality in Donald J. Trump's Speech in Riyadh Summit. *Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities Research*, 380, 218-222.
- Zhu, L., & Wang, W. (2020). A critical discourse analysis of the US and China political speeches—based on the two speeches respectively by Trump and Wang Yi in the general debate of the 72nd session of UN Assembly. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 11(3), 435-445.