

# Revealing The Phenomenon of Arrogance in Political Speech from Critical Discourse Perspective

<sup>1</sup>Safa Mohammed Hassan, <sup>2</sup>Asst.Prof. Wafaa Mokhlos Faisal, PH. D

Ministry of Higher Education , University of Babylon , Babylon, Iraq

hum324.safa.mohammed@student.uobabylon.edu.iq

hum.wafaa.mukhlus@uobabylon.edu.iq

## ARTICLE INFO

## ABSTRACT

Received: 15 Dec 2024

Revised: 16 Feb 2025

Accepted: 28 Feb 2025

Investing in actions meant to emphasize one's sense of superiority by insulting others is known as arrogance. People who are arrogant try to show themselves as unlimited and invincible. Arrogant people frequently hamper effective organizational functioning through behaviors linked to this exaggerated sense of entitled and superiority. This study investigated arrogance from a critical discourse analysis perspective. An eclectic model of the analysis consists of three levels of analysis namely, types of arrogance , micro analysis, and Macro analysis of the data under the study. As well as the methodology replies on the qualitative analysis only and the data collection spotlights on the particular people rather than another.

**KEYWORDS:** Critical Discourse Analysis, Approaches, Arrogance, Types of Arrogance

## 1 INTRODUCTION

Generally, dominance and inequality are viewed as illegitimate. The intrinsic essence of criticality is to concentrate on such viewpoints. As Cameron mentions as considering that language becomes one of the “social activities through how people perform relations of dominance and subordination “ it has not unexpected that research is being done on power and how it manifests itself in language. The principles of power and ideology are therefore fundamental to all forms of critical analysis. The term “critical discourse studies” refers to critical approaches to discourses, including feminist linguistics, critical discourse analysis, critical stylistics, and critical linguistics [1]. As Van Dijk presents, CDA examines how social forms including abuse, dominance, inequality, and power of society are performed, justified, produced and resisted within the text and discourse into a social plus political environment [2].

Therefore, according to Johnson, “arrogance is a collection of actions that convey an individual's inflated sense of superiority, frequently achieved by making fun of other people” [3] To put it another way, arrogance is an attitude that makes people act superior to others and believe they are more significant. The haughty individual structure in this paradigm includes actions like disregarding coworkers and their viewpoints, claiming to be more knowledgeable, evading responsibility, or blaming others. Higher ambition, inflated self-esteem, vanity, and narcissism are among the features that Larenz defines as arrogance. These traits are activated by a mix of internal and external behaviors . The researcher's best knowledge attempts to investigate the phenomenon of arrogance in political speech from CDA [4] . A problem of this study investigates how a phenomenon of arrogance is embodied within the framework of CDA.

## 2 . LITERATURE REVIEW

### 2.1 Definitions and Nature CDA

Harris (1952) credited in coining the concept “discourse analysis “ , to present the process of analyzing connected writing and speech. His main areas of interest include the relationship between

the study of language at a level above sentences and linguistic and nonlinguistic behavior. He focuses most of his attention on the first of his themes, trying to offer a structure for understanding how language components are distributed in texts plus their mixing in specific text kinds and styles. Thus, examining how a language expresses meaning has been central to the discipline of discourse analysis. Nonetheless, during the previous thirty years, CDA has developed with academics like Ruth Wodak, Norman Fairclough, and Teun van Dijk [5].

Accordingly, CDA means the discourse analysis that seeks to identify the nebulous 'causality' as well as 'determination' relationships among practice, events, and writings as well as 'wider social and cultural structures, relations, and processes' in order to examine how such are formed as well as much ideology and power influence them as Van Dijk used [6]. Fairclough investigates that it seeks to understand how the vagueness of these relations among discourse plus the community contributes to the security of hegemony and power. This is an effort to link discourse with society, which leads to the emergence of a number of phenomena that will manifest as a result, including racism, feminism, inequality, and abuse of power [7].

## **2.2 Central Approaches of CDA**

There are several approaches for doing CDA. We shall highlight the works of three eminent academics among them. They are Wodak, Van Dijk, and Fairclough:

### **2.3.1. Fairclough's Theory**

Within Similar to Halliday's (1994, 2004, 2014) functional analysis, Fairclough's discourse analysis method consists of three components: (A) a text (spoken or written), (B) a discourse practice that introduces a consumes, and distributes of the work and (c) as the a sociocultural practice. The three-dimensional framework that Fairclough offers for text and discourse analysis is as follows: the formal qualities of the text are described linguistically in (a); the connection between the text and rhetorical processes/interaction is interpreted in (b); and the link between discourse and cultural and social reality is clarified in (c). According to Fairclough, certain speech decisions are based on underlying assumptions. Drawing from this foundation, Fairclough presents the claim that 'the exercise of power, in recent society, has contributed to be accomplished during the ideology' [8].

### **2.3.2. Van Dijk's Theory**

Van Dijk's socio-cognitive viewpoint views speech as a type of social action, which is in keeping with Fairclough's critical perspective. It does not, however, stress discursive action. Instead, Van Dijk highlights social thinking as the link between society and literature. According to him, CDA must take into account the different types of social cognition that exist in the common social communities of organizations, groups, and institutions [9]. Based on him, social cognition includes 'socially shared depictions of societal structures, groups, and relations, as well as mental processes such as interpretation, reasoning and arguing, interpreting and learning' Van Dijk further differentiates between discourse analysis's micro and macro levels.

### **2.3.3 Wodak's Theory**

Wodak's discourse-historical theory demonstrates that discourse has this kind of community use, similar to that of Fairclough and Van Dijk. Since issues are too complex in today's culture to have examined From one point of view, Wodak has focused on the interdisciplinary and eclectic features of CDA. Hence, it is essential to mix some approaches and methods to collect plus explain the term undertaking the evaluation [10].

## **2.4 Arrogance: An overview**

The Oxford Dictionary of English defines arrogance as 'a very highly or exaggerated opinions of one's own skills, importance and so on, that gives to presuming or exaggerated higher self-confidence or to an image or views to being greater to others' [11]. A sense of superiority coupled with an exaggerated, frequently fabricated, sense of self-worth that shows itself as too bold and presumptuous remarks is known as arrogance by Bauer. People who are arrogant often behave as though they are superior to others and wish to be valued and appreciated for their unique traits and/or outstanding accomplishments. Arrogance is a deep-seated drive to control others and an overconfidence in one's own skills, believing that one is deserving of greater achievement [12].

#### 2.4.1 Types of arrogance

Through this research is verified that there are three types of arrogance that are adopted by Cowan [13]:

**A. Individual arrogance:** It is the exaggerated view of an individual's own skills, qualities, or achievements that is out of proportion to reality. It entails inflating our accomplishments and skills, which distorts our perception of ourselves.

**B. Comparative arrogance :** It is the exaggerated categorization of one's own skills, characteristics, or accomplishments in relation for those of others. This kind of hubris indicates a distorted perception of other people in addition to embellishing one's own image.

**C. Antagonistic arrogance :** Being able to disparage others based on a sense of superiority makes it the pinnacle of arrogance. In addition to thinking he is better than everyone else, the conceited individual acts as though they are, frequently making fun of or disregarding others.

### 3 METHODOLOGY

#### 3.1 The selecting Data

An information selected for the purpose of analysing the data in this chapter includes five excerpts from the political speech , all of which are characterized as arrogant speech since they linguistically fit the definition of arrogance. The speech that makes up the investigated data in this study are gathered from the internet, specifically from the official, authentic, and open access websites for political speech, such as Google's transcripts and YouTube's transcripts. Additionally, the data solely pertains to a particular time period in 2024 in order to show the topic of arrogance in the present study. Additionally, the time allotted for these interviews.

#### 3.2 Data Description

The study's data are explained by regarding genre kinds, the data from this study are presented in the appendices that correspond to each genre type (interviews and speeches, respectively). Various excerpts from each genre that are believed to contain arrogance are chosen for close examination. The utterances extracted from speeches are typically transcriptions of spoken forms. Regarding the length of the snippets, some might only contain one utterance, whereas others might use two or more utterances to convey conceit. Additionally, the current study employs only qualitative analysis as its analytical tool. The eclectic approach is applied step-by-step in qualitative analysis.

### 3 ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

#### Extract 1

*“The nation of the United States is not at war anywhere in the world, as I am the first president to tell the American people of this century. To avoid Putin from annexing Ukraine and doing additional harm, we will continue to unite a group of proud countries. I will strengthen NATO while creating it more unified and powerful than it has ever been in the past. For our allies in the Pacific, I will continue to act in the same ways. You know, it was widely held when I first arrived here that China would one day surpass America “*

#### Types of Arrogance

Biden used comparative arrogance, one of the types of arrogance, in his remarks. It involves the idea that one's country is better than others. According to the speech, the speaker supports preserving American dominance over other nations like China and Russia. Moreover, he highlights plans to make NATO “ powerful, more united, and stronger than it has ever been in the past” This assertion implies that prior attempts were insufficient or less successful in addition to highlighting a dedication to fortifying partnerships. Declaring that NATO will be improved under their direction exudes confidence but also suggests that earlier leaders did not fully see the possibilities of NATO.

### **Micro-Analysis**

Joe Biden employs active construction in this speech, as shown in these instances : “We will keep rallying...” , “I will continue the same...” , “I will strengthen” , “I will do..” , and “I came to the office..” in order to highlight direct agency and accountability by utilizing the active voice. Conversely, passive construction is used, especially when talking about thoughts or perceptions in which there are no obvious agents acting in such capacities. The popular view, for example, “when I first arrived here that China would one day surpass America ” a passive structure since “

“I first arrived here” (subject) receives an action rather than performing it. What was believed, not who held that belief, is the main focus.

In the Oval Office, the political figure employs several acts to convey his message to his audience. Representative speech acts include statements like “I am the first president to tell the American people of this century” , “To avoid Putin from annexing Ukraine and doing additional harm, we will continue to unite a group of proud countries” Here, the speaker declares their plans for dealing with Russia's aggressiveness and taking action in international affairs. Second, directive speech acts like “I will strengthen NATO while creating it more unified and powerful than it has ever been in the past” .This remark calls attention to upcoming activities aimed at building NATO and indirectly calls for support for them. Lastly, “For our allies in the Pacific, I will continue to act in the same ways” commissive speech acts.

### **Macro-Analysis**

The president uses the pronouns 'I' and 'we' to express solidarity and to express ideal emotions about Americans as part of his in-group strategy. These pronouns are used to illustrate the phenomenon of arrogance.”The nation of the United States is not at war anywhere” the speaker asserts forcefully at the outset. Because it portrays the United States as a peaceful country in contrast to previous periods where military action was common, this phrase functions as a significant positive self-presentation. Positive statements like “we will continue to unite a group of proud countries” , “ I will strengthen NATO” , , “I will continue” , and “ when I come to the office...” are also reflected in these examples.

“To avoid Putin from annexing Ukraine and doing additional harm, we will continue to unite a group of proud countries” the speaker says in reference to Russia's actions against Ukraine in the excerpt supplied, Out-group strategy, explicitly addressing Vladimir Putin's attempts to seize control of the country. This statement, which is attributed to Russia and its leadership, uses the pronoun “them” to explicitly highlight the harmful actions.

### **Extract 2**

*“We are a great nation because we value people. I swore to you when I was elected to this workplace that I would always be honest and level with you. The truth, which is the sacred cause of the nation, is greater than any one of us, and those of us who appreciate it greatly. It is the purpose of our democracy in itself, and we must work jointly to defend it. In the past few weeks, it has become evident to me that I need to unite my party in this important endeavor. I think my record as president, my role in the world, and my hopes for the future of America all need a second term. But nothing, even my own personal ambition, can get in the way of keeping our democracy”*

### **Types of Arrogance**

This excerpt exhibits individual arrogance because the speaker uses the phrases “We are a great nation because we are value people” , “I believe my record as president, my role in the world, and my hopes for the future of America all need a second term” ,and “nothing, nothing, even my own personal ambition, can get in the way of keeping our democracy..” to highlight his accomplishments, which could be interpreted as self-centered. These instances all demonstrate the speaker's arrogance as he or she starts to speak about their accomplishments to the audience and the American people.

### **Micro-Analysis**

In his speech, Biden uses two active constructions of polarization: “We are a great nation because we value people”, “I was elected to this workplace..”, “...I swore to...”, “The truth, which is the sacred cause of the nation..”, “I think my record....”, and “, which is the sacred cause of the nation, is greater than any one of us, and those of us who ...” The verb expresses an activity that is carried out by the subject in these active voice sentences. Conversely, passive construction, as in “...But nothing, even my own personal ambition, can get in the way of keeping our democracy”. The fact, “nothing” functions as a subject receiving an action (may come) in this instance suggests a passive construction.

The president uses representative speech acts, like “We are a great nation because we value people” to programmatically display his arrogance and “The truth, which is the sacred cause of the nation, is greater than any one of us, and those of us who appreciate it greatly” A belief about the character of the country and its citizens is expressed in these two statements. Second, Directives serve as a reminder that “we must unite to protect it” Thirdly, the commission speech act states that “I swore to you when I was elected to this workplace” Finally, statements like “those of us who appreciate it greatly” are examples to expressive speech acts.

### **Macro-Analysis**

The president places a strong emphasis on our positive characteristics as part of the in-group strategy. This dimension involves utilizing inclusive language to highlight our positive traits. For example, the speaker opens with the following statements: “we are a great nation because we value people”, “I swore to a....”, “I think my record as president, my leadership..”, and “the way of saving our democracy” By representing people as members of a moral community, these comments help the audience develop a shared identity.

By stating that “But nothing, even my own personal ambition, can get in the way of keeping our democracy”, the president begins to make negative comments about them the out-group implying that there are forces or people who may harm democracy itself. By depicting enemies as barriers rather than participants, this subtly paints them as harmful to the democratic process. Additionally, personal ambition is a bad quality: “That includes personal ambition” is used to criticize people who might put their goals ahead of democratic principles as a whole.

### **Extract 3**

*“Now, Putin is told to do everything the hell he wants by my previous version, a former Republican president. It's an estimate. In fact, the past president made a similar comment when submitting to a Russian ruler. It's unsafe, absurd, and unacceptable, in my view. NATO, an international military organization of democratic countries created to prevent conflict and keep peace in the wake of World Disagree II, counts the USA as one of its founding members. And we've increased NATO more than previously today. Sweden officially rejoined the alliance this morning, and their government is here tonight. Last year, we welcomed Finland to the alliance. Come up. Greetings. Welcome, welcome, welcome. They are also talented fighters. Welcome to NATO, the most powerful military alliance in history, Mr. the prime minister “*

### **Types of Arrogance**

There are three types of arrogance that apply to the excerpt from Biden's speech. The speaker's scorn for a previous president's remarks about Russia and Vladimir Putin is the first example of individual arrogance. The speaker presents oneself as morally superior by calling the comment “outrageous, dangerous, and unacceptable” implying that their viewpoint on world affairs is more responsible or enlightened than that of their predecessor. This displays personal arrogance as the speaker feels they are more knowledgeable about geopolitical dynamics and moral leadership. The second instance of comparative arrogance is when the speaker implies that their approach to NATO and foreign alliances is significantly more successful and morally sound by contrasting their own opinions and behavior with those of the past president. The speaker implies that, in contrast to previous administrations, their leadership has resulted in notable advancements in international security by declaring that “we've made

NATO stronger than ever” and highlighting recent expansions. Lastly, this excerpt exhibits antagonistic arrogance by seeming defensive in response to the former president's comments regarding Putin. The expression “do whatever the hell you want” is used disparagingly, showing disdain for anything interpreted as weakness or submission to outside forces.

### **Micro-Analysis**

To demonstrate the grammatical structure of the sentences the president utilized, this excerpt is examined from both an active and passive point of view. The following instances include an active perspective: “Now, Putin is told to do everything the hell he wants by my previous version, a former Republican president”, “I believe it’s ...”, “NATO, the most powerful military alliance in history, Mr. the prime minister”, “welcome to...”, “Sweden officially rejoined the alliance....”, “They recognise how to fight....” According to an active viewpoint, the speaker is strongly against the remarks and acts of a past Republican president. Simply these examples are included in passive construction: “NATO, an international military organization...”, “NATO, the most powerful military alliance in history....”

Representative speech acts, such as “NATO, the USA as one of its founding members” are used pragmatically in some excerpts. Additionally, “Welcome to NATO, the most powerful military alliance in history, Mr. the prime minister”. These claims provide accurate information on recent changes in NATO membership. Secondly, the speaker communicates strong views about past remarks made by a prior president by using expressive speech, saying, “In fact, the past president made similar comments when submitting to a Russian ruler. It's unsafe, absurd, and unacceptable”. This demonstrates the speaker's emotional reaction and dissatisfaction of what their predecessor said. Lastly, saying “Welcome” is a declarative speech act that, particularly in an official setting, declares Sweden's new NATO status.

### **Macro-Analysis**

Regarding the in-group strategy, by highlighting our strengths as In order to highlight the good features of the US and its role within the organization, the speaker uses a number of rhetorical devices. For example, he states that “NATO, the most powerful military alliance in history” highlighting the group's effectiveness and strength under the current leadership. Second, by recognizing new members' military safety, the statement “they know how to fight” indirectly improves the perception of American leadership in NATO.

Conversely, Out-group strategy, the speaker uses a number of rhetorical strategies to highlight the bad parts to the previous president's remarks and deeds. The previous president's exact comment, “do whatever the hell you want” highlights what is seen as leadership weakness and carelessness. Additionally, he claims that the previous president's attitude toward Putin is described using terms like “outrageous”, “dangerous”, and “unacceptable”.

### **Extract 4**

*“I will stay away from dehumanizing immigrants by saying that they are "harm in our country's blood." I isn't going up with my family. I won't bar anyone founded on their religious beliefs. Compared to my predecessor, I suggested a comprehensive bill to reform the immigration system on my first day in office. Look at it. It has all of this and more: it guards the border, gives Dreamers a path to citizenship, and much more. Nevertheless, I am aware of our heritage as Americans, unlike my prior. We have a heart and soul that draws in both the old and the new, unlike every other nation in the world. Native Americans who resided here for thousands of years call this place homeland. People from all over the globe call this place home. They arrived without hesitation. They arrived without limitation. A few arrived in chains. Others like my Irish ancestors, arrived when famine hit. Some people escape inequality in order to pursue dreams that are only possible in America. We all come from various locations, but we are all Americans. That's American “*

## **Types of Arrogance**

Biden's speech demonstrates two different forms of arrogance, the first of which is individual arrogance, as seen in the following instances: By recognizing the worth of every person, regardless of their origins, the speaker fights individual arrogance by categorically rejecting the idea that immigrants are "poison" to the nation. "I won't bar anyone founded on their religious beliefs", "I isn't going up families", and "Dreamers a path to citizenship, and much more". Conversely, he displays comparative arrogance by comparing his own government to his predecessor and stating, "Unlike my predecessor". Additionally, he completes his arrogance by saying, "but we are all Americans. That's American".

## **Micro-Analysis**

The president utilizes both the active and passive voices in this instance. There are some instances of activation used in the active voice. For instance, "I will stay away from dehumanizing", "I will not give up families", "I won't bar anyone based on their religious beliefs...", "but we are all Americans. That's American", "We are unlike every other nation in the world", "We are Americans". These examples show how the use of active voice makes messages more effective and personal, which improves clarity and audience engagement. However, only the phrases "Some came in chains" and "People from every place on Earth" use the passive voice. Here, the passive voice can highlight shared experiences or elicit empathy without openly blaming or providing agency.

During his address, Biden used representative speech like the phrases "I will stay away from dehumanizing immigrants", "I will not separate families", and "I won't bar anyone". These remarks clarify misconceptions about immigrants and express the speaker's desire for a more gentle immigration policy. Second, the phrase "Take a look at it" contains the directive speech act. Thirdly, Commissives speech acts, as in "I suggested a comprehensive bill to reform the immigration system on my first day in office". Finally, the statement "We all come from various locations, but we are all Americans. That's American" is an example of expressive speech.

## **Macro-Analysis**

In keeping with the in-group strategy, the president of the United States is positively portrayed by claiming that the country is "People from all over the globe call this place home", "I suggested a comprehensive bill to reform the immigration system on my first day in office", "I am aware of our identity as Americans. We have a heart and soul that draws in both the old and the new, which is home to individuals from all over the world and allows them to pursue aspirations that are unattainable elsewhere".

In contrast, in his out-group strategy, Biden displays his arrogance by disparaging immigrants by calling them "poison in the blood of our country" and "They came freely". A few arrived in chains. Some, like my Irish ancestors, arrived when famine struck. act as a clear illustration of demonization. It implies that immigrants are essentially destroying the national identity in addition to causing harm. Additionally, the reference to not separate families runs counter to a previously implied policy that accomplished just that.

## **Extract 5**

*"Well, I did something by creating the first-ever Office of Gun Violence Prevention in the White House, where the vice president is leading the effort. In the meanwhile, my great predecessor told the N.R.A. he was proud that he did not do anything about guns during his time as president of the United States and after another shooting in Iowa, he said, 'Just get across it.' Here is his quote: 'Just get over it.' I said stop it. Stop it, stop it, stop it. I'm proud that we beat the N.R.A. when I agreed upon the most important gun safety law in nearly 30 years thanks to this Congress. Now, we possess to defeat the N.R.A. after more. I'm contacting for a ban on attack weapons and high-capacity publications. Pass universal experience checks"*

## **Types of Arrogance**

Three types for arrogance are discussed in this section of the speech. First of all, the speaker in the excerpt displays individual arrogance by highlighting their achievements and downplaying the deeds (or lack thereof) of their predecessor. A tone of self-congratulation is suggested by statements such as “when I agreed upon the most important gun safety law in nearly 30 years thanks to this Congress” and “I’m proud that we beat the N.R.A.” This sense of superiority is strengthened by their insistence on calling for more action “I’m calling for a ban on assault weapons”, which suggests that their strategy is not only right but also ethically required. The second type is comparative arrogance, which happens when the speaker minimizes their accomplishments and elevates their own behavior by contrasting it with that of their predecessor. When one party is seen as neglecting important issues, such as “my predecessor told the N.R.A. he was proud that he did not do anything about guns during his time as president of the United States and after another shooting in Iowa” this comparison might heighten feelings of conceit. At the final, antagonistic arrogance portrays the predecessor and groups like the N.R.A. as a challenge to advancement. This antagonistic nature might give the impression that one is arrogant, particularly if it suggests that opposing viewpoints are worthy of attention, as in “we beat the N.R.A. when I agreed upon the most important gun”.

## **Micro-Analysis**

There are two polarization constructions from a syntactic perspective: passive construction and active construction. Several statements in this excerpt have active construction, including “I did something”, “my predecessor told the N.R.A.”, “I’m proud that we beat the N.R.A.”, “I signed the most”, “I say stop it”, “we beat the N.R.A” and “I’m contacting for a ban on attack” Active construction is used to highlight the speaker’s achievements with a high degree of superiority because the subject carries out the activity that the verb expresses. Conversely, passive construction is used in the following sentences: “...when he was president”. Since it concentrates on his state as president rather than naming specific individuals who carried out actions during his presidency, this term suggests a passive structure. Additionally, “....because of this Congress”

This speech is referred to as the representative speech act from the perspective of the speech act. “my great predecessor told the N.R.A.”, “I’m proud that we beat the N.R.A. when I agreed upon the most important gun safety law in nearly 30 years thanks to this Congress”. Secondly, directive speech acts like “Pass universal background checks” and “I’m contacting for a ban on attack weapons and high-capacity publications”. These guidelines seek to change behavior or elicit particular gun control-related activities. Finally, the phrases “I say stop it, Stop it, stop it, stop it” are examples of expressive speech acts.

## **Macro-Analysis**

Joe Biden highlights the good aspects of Americans in the extract above by saying that “I did something by creating the first-ever Office of Gun Violence Prevention...”, “I said stop it”, “I’m proud that we beat the N.R.A.”, “we possess to defeat the N.R.A.”, “I’m contacting for a ban on attack...” All of these statements are examples of in-group strategy used to draw attention to themselves by highlighting the positive elements of America. For instance, the speaker highlights how the White House developed the first-ever Center of Gun Violence Control in an unprecedented attempt to curb gun violence. This extract presents a political figure’s statement that “he did nothing on guns” and “we possess to defeat the N.R.A.” in reference to the out-group strategy introduced by mentioning negative things about others. The speaker is talking about ways to prevent gun violence and comparing their actions with those of a predecessor. The speaker highlights the perceived shortcomings of the previous government while welcoming their accomplishments.

## **4 CONCLUSIONS**

The study comes to the following conclusion based on the data analysis findings.: The politician uses individual arrogance more often than others since he wants to emphasize his own achievements by

highlighting certain works. political member is a self-centered person who thinks he is the world's president and has a voice that can be heard everywhere. He also presents himself as being more informed than everyone else. Additionally, Biden's manner reveals his true nature as a political speaker, using straightforward language mixed with strong emotions and insulting phrases that don't appear at all presidential. CDA aims at revealing all the positive and negative sides of a discourse rather than revealing the formal features when conducting a CDA. CDA is achieved through using linguistic analysis; namely, structural, pragmatical lexical analyses within micro-analysis : A) In structural analysis, the President tackles active construction rather than passive construction since the president wants to emphasize on their own achievements as they are arguent of the action . B) In pragmatic analysis, representative and expressives speech acts are commonly used rather than others . Lastly, in the ideological square, there are two strategies analyzed namely, in-group strategy as well as out-group strategy. Ingroup strategy is more effective than out-group strategy. Because the president wants to spotlight their achievements rather than others as well as give superior positions towards American people rather than other people.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Cameron, L. Teaching Languages to Young Learners. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511733109> . 2001.
- [2] Van Dijk, T.A. Analyzing Racism through Discourse Analysis: Some Methodological Reflections. In Stanfield, J. (ed). Race and ethnicity in Research Methods. Newbury Park: Sage Publications, 1993a .
- [3] Johnson, R. E., Silverman, S. B., Shyamsunder, A., Swee, H. Y., Rodopman, O. B., Cho, E., & Bauer, J. . Acting superior but actually inferior? Correlates and consequences of workplace arrogance HumanPerformance, 2010.
- [4] Larenz, Rudolf . Physics – 'Alienation From' Instead Of 'Orientation Towards' the creator? roczniki teologii moralnej, 3(58) . pp. 5-37, 2011.
- [5] Coulthard, M. An Introduction to Discourse Analysis. London: Longman , 1985.
- [6] Van Dijk, T. The Discourse-Knowledge Interface. In G. Weiss, & R. Wodak (Eds.), Critical Discourse Analysis . Hampshire: Palgrave MacMillan , 2003.
- [7] Fairclough, N . Language and Power. London: Longman, 1989.
- [8] Fairclough, N . Critical Discourse Analysis: The Critical Study of Language. Essex: Pearson Education Limited , 1995a.
- [9] van Dijk, T.A. Critical Discourse Analysis. In D. Schiffrin; D. Tannen H. Hamilton (eds) .The Handbook of Discourse Analysis. Oxford: Blackwell. 2001a
- [10] Wodak, R. and Meyer, M. (eds) . Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis. London: Sage , 2001
- [11] Oxford University Press . Arrogance. In the Oxford English dictionary. Retrieved , November 26, 2023.
- [12] Bauer, J., Cho, E., Johnson, R. E., & Silverman, S. B . Acting superior but actually inferior? Relationships of arrogance with motivation and cognitive ability. Paper presented at the Southern Management Association Meeting, St. Pete Beach, FL., 2008 .
- [13] Cowan, N., Adams, E. J., Bhargal, S., Corcoran, M., Decker, R., Dockter, C. E., Eubank, A. T., & Gann, C. L. vd. Foundations of Arrogance: A Broad Survey and Framework for Research. Review of General Psychology , 2019.