

# A Descriptive-Comparative Analysis of the Impact of Machine Translation on the Rhetorical Features of AI-Generated Political Speeches

<sup>1</sup>Arqam Nasim Aziz Qabaha\*, <sup>2</sup>Tahani R. K. Bsharat

<sup>1</sup>An-Najah National University, Faculty of translation and applied linguistics

<sup>2</sup>An-Najah National University, Faculty of Humanities – Department of English Language and Literature, Department of Teaching English as a Foreign Language (TEFL).  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4029-4061>

\*Corresponding author: Arqam Nasim Aziz Qabaha

DOI:10.5281/zenodo.16877130

## ARTICLE INFO

### Article history:

Received : 09-07-2025

Accepted : 02-08-2025

Available online : 14-08-2025

Copyright©2025 The Author(s):

This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY-NC) which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium for non-commercial use provided the original author and source are credited.

**Citation:** Arqam Nasim Aziz Qabaha, Tahani R. K. Bsharat. (2025). A Descriptive-Comparative Analysis of the Impact of Machine Translation on the Rhetorical Features of AI-Generated Political Speeches. *IKR Journal of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences (IKRJAHS)*, 1(3), 83-92.



## ABSTRACT

## Original research paper

This paper examines the impact and implications of relying on machine translation (specifically, Google Translate) in translating culturally and ideologically charged political speeches, which are characterized by their rhetorical and functional formulation strategies. This paper utilizes three professionally generated Arabic and English political speeches, employing precise commands, as a case study for this research. The Hatem and Mason (1990 and 1997) model is used to analyze political speech and rhetorical elements before and after machine translation. The study concludes that machine translation is grammatically efficient and ineffective in preserving rhetorical, cultural, and ideological shifts. The data is analyzed speech by speech, each with its machine translation, according to the elements of political discourse as outlined in Hatem and Mason's model. Professional human translations are added to make the comparison and analysis more theoretically complete and convincing. Finally, this study recommends further research and collaboration on the potential of machine translation and professional human translation when handling sensitive data, such as political speeches.

**Keywords:** Translation, Political discourse, rhetoric, AI, Ideology, machine translation.

## I. Introduction

Rhetoric in discourse refers to the strategic use of language to inform, persuade, or motivate audiences within specific contexts. It involves choices in style, structure, and content that shape how messages are received and interpreted (Gill & Whedbee, 1997, p.

157) Therefore, rhetoric and its components are considered a vital part of the formation of political discourse, regardless of its various titles, such as freedom speeches, presidential candidacy, declarations of war or peace, or even treaties. Some believe that the essence of political discourse is revealed through

linguistic choices. In contrast, others argue that the prominence of politicians' and political goals is more evident as a feature of political discourse than linguistic choices. Political discourse is identified by its actors and institutions, rather than its intrinsic linguistic features—it is discourse produced by political actors in political contexts, typically with political goals (van Dijk, 1997, p. 12). Following the latter brief introduction to political discourse, this study attempts to delve into the ability and impact of machine translation (MT) on translating political discourse, the extent of accuracy, and the elements of rhetoric observed when converting discourse into another language automatically. The reference to machine translation reveals that translation is now no longer the preserve of human translators but, in a professional context, increasingly a process and product that marries computing power and the computerized analysis of language to the human's ability to analyse sense and determine appropriate forms in the other language (Hatim & Munday, 2004, p. 12). The case study will rely on commands I request from artificial intelligence platforms like ChatGPT. The AI will produce political texts and speeches that incorporate powerful and influential linguistic choices, tailored to the context I create and request. ChatGPT has undoubtedly proven its ability to provide robust and influential texts when specifically requested. The significant and pivotal challenge of this study will be the AI's ability to do so, and the MT's ability to preserve and transfer the verbal impact and metaphor of texts to another language. It is a linguistics-based study that aims to observe the challenges of MT in translating AI-generated political speeches and determine the appropriate theoretical approach to achieve the right equivalent, considering the communicative effect of words. As the title of the study suggests, key samples of translated texts will be compared with human translations based on relevant translation theories, making the comparison both practical and systematic.

Culture is a significant factor in this study's challenge, as machine translation's failure to account for cultural context during translation will have a substantial impact on the success or failure of MT in translating all texts and discourses required of it. This study does not predict the complete success or failure of machine translation; instead, it will note and document all that emerges, to conclude the study with an understanding of what may appear. Culture is viewed as a unique system of meaning and information shared among individuals, enabling the community to meet its fundamental

requirements of survival, seek pleasure and well-being, and derive meaning from existence (Matsumoto and Juang, 2015, p. 15). So, will MT go to link the latter? Or is culture undergoing a change or obscurity because MT lacks human insight into culture and translation? Despite the growing use of machine translation, can rhetorical nuance truly be preserved? The following chapters will classify the elements of rhetoric in political discourse to systematize analysis and comparison to the greatest extent.

## II. Statement of the problem

Despite the increasing reliance on machine translation (MT) for rendering political texts across languages, little research has systematically examined how rhetorical, cultural, and ideological features are maintained or distorted in AI-translated political discourse. While MT tools such as Google Translate offer rapid access to multilingual content, they often lack sensitivity to the nuanced strategies that define political speeches, including metaphors, emotional appeals, and ideological markers. This gap raises critical concerns about the reliability of MT in politically sensitive contexts, particularly when AI systems produce the original texts. Therefore, this study addresses the challenge of assessing MT's rhetorical and ideological fidelity in translating AI-generated political speeches across Arabic and English.

## III. Literature Review

Translation research is still relatively new and is developing rapidly, as it is intertwined with many aspects, such as language, culture, religion, politics, and others. Researchers have developed frameworks for analyzing, comparing, and evaluating translations according to the types of texts classified in these approaches. This study uses available findings to examine and assess MT of AI-generated political speeches. The following previous studies aim to establish an information environment for research findings related to or serving the subject of this study.

A 2014 study by Mátyás BÁNHEGYI examined the field of translation and political discourse. The study, "Translation and Political Discourse," attempted to understand the relationship and influence between discourse, power, ideology, and translation. The article continues by presenting the author's classifications to structure the research and analysis process. The study argued that critical discourse can be examined to understand the formation of political discourse and its

structuring factors, such as language, political purpose, translator's background, and the type of rhetoric and manipulation that may occur to serve the publisher. Some specific circumstances and situations arise for the translator when describing their role in political discourse. There are two types of translators: those who intervene and influence the text, and those who merely serve as a means of conveying speech between two languages. The author explores the variety of approaches that can be adopted in understanding and analyzing political discourse, just as there are numerous forms of analysis and windows through which we can visualize the full context of a political text.

Artificial intelligence has become a near-essential tool for many people in various areas of life. Some question the suitability of AI for translating literary texts, including prose, poetry, and other works. "Evaluating Machine Translation of Literature through Rhetorical Analysis" aimed to assess the quality of translations of literary texts by AI platforms, such as ChatGPT, and determine whether human intervention is necessary or if modern technology can suffice for translation. This study, conducted by Karabayeva, I., & Kalizhanova (2024), also examines the history of machine translation and its potential for cooperation with human translation. Creative translation and creative writing are a significant focus of this research paper. Three types of rhetorical devices are examined: metaphors, rhyme, and imagery, using a corpus of English literary texts and their translations in the Russian language. The study evaluates the output using both automatic and human choices, and discusses the implications for the development of more linguistically knowledgeable and stylistically adept AI.

Zakariya Al Mahasees (2017) discussed in his article, "Assessing the Translation of Google and Microsoft Bing in Translating Political Texts from Arabic into English," two selected online automatic machine translation systems, highlighting their significant differences in effectiveness and accuracy. The author sought to achieve the best results through a comparative analysis of his study. Another valuable aspect of this study is its interest in comparing the results with human translation. The article also attempts to measure the closeness of machine translations to professional human translation, as stated in the study.

Following Jiang, K., & Lu, X. in "The Influence of Speech Translation Technology on Interpreter's Career Prospects in the Era of Artificial Intelligence. While it is currently impossible to

completely separate humans from the translation industry, this 2021 study explored the potential of machine translators and artificial intelligence, and the extent to which they can replace humans in the world of translation. The research addresses AI as both a powerful opportunity and a serious challenge. Perhaps the recommendations of this study will serve my research by preparing me cognitively regarding research findings on how to manage decisions related to translation, artificial intelligence, and machine translation. When comparing professional translators with translation technology, will any of the features of semantics and syntax, which human translators have always sought to preserve and account for, change according to the differences between languages and the purpose of translation?

China seeks to be an ally and a source of global commercial, knowledge, and military power around the world. Since discourse shapes the speaker's identity and relationships, the study "The Rhetorical Effects of the English Translations of Chinese Political Discourse" attempted to explore the extent to which the quality of translation of Chinese political discourse into English affects it. Using a mathematical analytical model and Aristotle's discourse analysis model, the study finds that interpersonal relationships and opportunities for interaction between Chinese and English are limited due to the English translation of Chinese discourse. The study also highlights the importance of political discourse analysis and translation. This study is beneficial for my research topic because it provides essential insights into the sensitivity of translating political discourse, its dimensions, and the like.

ZhaorongZong's 2018 study entitled "Research on the relations between machine translation and human translation" reminds me of a saying I learned in elementary school: that global languages change with the changing forces and circumstances of the world around us and the world we live in. It also applies to speech and translation. Language constantly evolves and adapts depending on context and discourse. Given the limitations of machine translation, this paper explores its shortcomings through examples and proposes a hybrid model that integrates human input with machine translation. In the era of artificial intelligence, the collaboration between deep-learning-enabled machines and human translators is expected to yield more efficient and higher-quality translation outcomes. Here is another study that confirms the importance of the human translator's role, even today,

despite the tremendous developments in translation technology and the translation industry. This study will undoubtedly help us understand the importance of human-machine collaboration in translation. It will also provide important information about the vital role of the translator and the impact of their absence. The study highlights the significance of machine translation across various fields. However, it also raises questions about how specific issues emerge when the term "machine translation" is linked to political discourse. We will undoubtedly see the extent of this in the coming chapters when we discuss the variables that form the basis for analyzing and comparing the data that my research relies on.

The chapter, "Man Versus Machine: Can Software Truly Replace Human Translators?" published in 2021, critically explores the relationship between human and machine translation, raising a central question: can translation software truly replace human translators? In this context, the chapter discussed the capabilities of modern software, particularly machine translation techniques based on artificial intelligence and deep learning, and compares them to human competencies in terms of contextual understanding, interpretive ability, and conveying cultural and rhetorical meanings. It also highlights the challenges facing machine translation, such as dealing with linguistic ambiguity, cultural context, and complex structures. It explains that these elements often require human intervention to ensure accuracy and relevance. Ultimately, the chapter presents a strong argument for a complementary human-machine model, where software capabilities are leveraged to improve efficiency, without compromising the human skills that remain essential for achieving high-quality translations and accurate meaning. ZhaorongZong's 2018 study entitled "Research on the relations between machine translation and human translation" reminds me of a saying I learned in elementary school: that global languages change with the changing forces and circumstances of the world around us and the world we live in. It also applies to speech and translation. Language constantly evolves and adapts depending on context and discourse. Given the limitations of machine translation, this paper explores its shortcomings through examples and proposes a hybrid model that integrates human input with machine translation. In the era of artificial intelligence, the collaboration between deep-learning-enabled machines and human translators is expected to yield more efficient and higher-quality translation outcomes. Here is another study that

confirms the importance of the human translator's role, even today, despite the tremendous developments in translation technology and the translation industry. This study will undoubtedly help us understand the importance of human-machine collaboration in translation. It will also provide important information about the vital role of the translator and the impact of their absence. The study highlights the significance of machine translation across various fields. However, it also raises questions about how specific issues emerge when the term "machine translation" is linked to political discourse. We will undoubtedly see the extent of this in the coming chapters when we discuss the variables that form the basis for analyzing and comparing the data that my research relies on.

The chapter, "Man Versus Machine: Can Software Truly Replace Human Translators?" published in 2021, critically explores the relationship between human and machine translation, raising a central question: can translation software truly replace human translators? In this context, the chapter discusses the capabilities of modern software, particularly machine translation techniques based on artificial intelligence and deep learning. It compares them to human competencies in terms of contextual understanding, interpretive ability, and conveying cultural and rhetorical meanings. It also highlights the challenges facing machine translation, such as dealing with linguistic ambiguity, cultural context, and complex structures. It explains that these elements often require human intervention to ensure accuracy and relevance. Ultimately, the chapter presents a strong argument for a complementary human-machine model, where software capabilities are leveraged to improve efficiency, without compromising the human skills that remain essential for achieving high-quality translations and accurate meaning.

#### IV. Theoretical Framework

This study adopts Hatim and Mason's model of discourse and translation (1990, 1997) as a theoretical base to analyze the rhetorical features and translations of AI-generated political speeches. as their model is viewing translation as a communicative act that relates not just transmitting lexical choices but also the negotiation of textual, contextual, and semiotic dimensions. Hatim and Mason's framework emphasizes the translator's role in mediating between source and target cultures, ideologies, and rhetorical intentions. Hatim and Mason explain three levels of meaning in the sphere translation: communicative, pragmatic, the



semiotic meaning. At the communicative level, the focus is on the text as a message. The pragmatic level involves the intentions of the speaker and how these intentions are inferred by readers. The semiotic level refers to the cultural and ideological signs embedded in the discourse. Hatim and Mason's model is useful when dealing with politically charged texts, where persuasive strategies, cultural reference, in addition to ideological interpretations that are essential to complete this comparative-analytical model. Rhetoric, as mentioned in Hatim and Mason's model, is not merely stylistic but functional. They categorize rhetorical strategies into argumentation, emphasis, mitigation, and legitimation, all of which serve specific functions within political discourse. Their approach allows for a detailed exploration of how these strategies operate in source texts and how they may shift, weaken, or increase in translation process, especially when translations are done through machine translation systems. This framework will be applied to three political speeches generated by an AI model (ChatGPT) in response to given tasks. Each original speech, written in English or Arabic, will be analyzed for its rhetorical composition, coherence, and persuasive strategies. These speeches will then be translated into Arabic or English using machine translation system. The Arabic and English outputs will be critically compared with the source texts using Hatim and Mason's model, assessing how rhetorical and ideological elements are preserved, altered, or lost in the translation process. Ultimately, this framework facilitates a descriptive-comparative analysis that bridges discourse analysis, translation studies, and the domain of AI. It enables the study to explore not just what is translated, but how and why shifts occur in the rhetorical and ideological content of machine-translated political speech.

## V. Methodology Data Collection

This study employs a descriptive-comparative qualitative methodology to examine how machine translation (MT) processes rhetorical features in political discourse generated by AI. Anchored in Hatim and Mason's model of discourse and translation (1990, 1997), the study aims to assess the extent to which cultural, ideological, and rhetorical elements are preserved or altered when AI-generated political speeches are rendered into another language through automated systems. The research does not merely evaluate linguistic accuracy, but focuses on the communicative, pragmatic, and semiotic dimensions of

translation as shaped by both machines and human interpreters.

The data set comprises three AI-generated political speeches, created using OpenAI's ChatGPT. These texts were produced based on specific user prompts, each tailored to simulate distinct rhetorical contexts. The first is a Palestinian liberation speech, generated in Arabic, invoking themes of national struggle, resistance, and identity. The second is a Detroit mayoral campaign speech, written in English, reflecting the voice of a local politician engaging with American voters on themes such as urban renewal, equity, and justice. The third is an Egyptian presidential candidacy speech, composed in Arabic, rich with nationalistic overtones, socio-political promises, and references to Egyptian cultural norms. Those three texts were selected for their rhetorical density and cultural embeddedness, allowing for an in-depth analysis of how MT handles the transference of political persuasion, culturally specific vocabulary, and ideological positioning. Following the AI-generated source texts, each speech was translated using a widely used machine translation engine (Google Translate) into the opposite language (i.e., Arabic to English or English to Arabic). It creates a corpus of six texts: three originals and their corresponding machine translations. To enable a rigorous comparison, a professional human translation of each speech will also be provided by the researcher. These human translations aim to preserve not only semantic content but rhetorical intent and cultural nuance. The comparison between the original texts, their MT versions, and their human translations will be conducted using Hatim and Mason's framework, examining shifts in rhetorical strategies (argumentation, legitimation, mitigation), cultural references, and ideological markers across the given versions.

The analysis will proceed in three phases: (1) identifying rhetorical features and discourse strategies in the source texts; (2) evaluating the accuracy and transformation of these features in the machine translations; and (3) comparing the MT outputs with human translations to assess whether machines can approach the interpretive depth achieved by human translators. This approach allows the research to uncover both the linguistic and extra-linguistic consequences of relying on MT for political discourse. Its genre relies heavily on nuances, audience sensitivity, and persuasive purpose.

Eventually, by combining AI-generated content, machine translation tools, and human expertise, the

study offers a unique triangulation of modern translation processes and rhetorical analysis.

## VI. Data Analysis

“Translation is an act of communication which attempts to relay, across cultural and linguistic boundaries, another act of communication which may have been intended for different purposes and different readers or hearers” (Hatim & Mason, 1997, p. 1). This chapter will deal with the original texts and the machine-generated translations as a first step to begin the analysis and comparison to answer the research problem, which asks about the impact and possibility of machine translation in conveying the meaning and text professionally and adequately for the target text of the political speeches that constitute the case study of this research. The ideological, textual, and pragmatic shifts between the source and target texts will be examined. Ideology is considered an essential part of the identity of a discourse and a necessary feature for determining its features and the successful functioning of that discourse. “Ideology encompasses ‘the tacit assumptions, beliefs, and value systems which are shared collectively by a social group’ (Hatim & Mason, 1997, p. 120). The study will formulate the analysis results of the case study and demonstrate whether the discursive ideology has been preserved in the machine-translated texts. Professional human translations will be provided that are appropriate to the context and culture of the source text, making the comparison and analysis more legitimate and logical. Three case studies will be analyzed in order: first, a Palestinian liberation speech delivered in Arabic; second, a political election speech by the mayor of Detroit in English; and third, an Egyptian presidential candidacy speech delivered in Arabic.

The source text, an AI-generated speech of liberation addressed to the Palestinian people, and its English machine translation are thoroughly compared in this section. The framework developed by Hatim and Mason (1990, 1997), which distinguishes four levels of alteration in translation —textual, pragmatic, ideological, and rhetorical —is the foundation of the analysis. Each level illustrates how language and context interact, showing how translation, especially when automated, may maintain, change, or obscure crucial communicative intents presented in the original text. The objective is not only to evaluate the translation's quality but also to shed light on the kind of shifts that take place when highly charged, culturally

embedded political discourse is translated from Arabic into English and English into Arabic, using machine translation.

First, the Arabic source text is rich in syntactic balance and lexical rhythm, contributing to a cohesive and emotionally charged textual fabric. For instance, the passage “لا نحترق بل ننهض من الرماد، لا نركع بل نقاتل، لا نستسلم” uses repetition and antithesis to construct a highly rhetorical aspect that builds emotional intensity. The machine translation renders it as: “We do not burn, but we rise from the ashes. We do not kneel, but we fight. We do not surrender, but we write in blood the wills of the fields.” While syntactically accurate, the translation flattens the rhythm and disrupts the original momentum. The stylistic function of repetition is reduced to a mechanical listing of oppositions, which loses the clear rhetorical force evident in the original. From a pragmatic perspective, the Arabic text draws heavily on cultural symbols and implied meanings within the Palestinian context. The metaphor “نحن أبناء شعبٍ تعمَّد في زيت الزيتون، ورضع الكرامة مع حليب الأمهات” blends religious symbolism and maternal imagery to evoke national identity. Translated as “We are the sons of a people baptized in olive oil and nurtured with dignity by the milk of our mothers,” the phrase becomes pragmatically problematic in English due to its unfamiliar metaphoric frame. A more culturally harmonic human rendering might be: “We are a people rooted in the blessings of the olive tree and raised with dignity from our mothers’ milk.” This preserves the intended symbolism while making it accessible to English-speaking audiences. Ideologically, the Arabic text presents a confrontational tone that the machine translation frequently softens. For example, “كفاكم صمتًا. فالحياد أمام الظلم انحياز” is rendered as “Enough of your silence. Neutrality in the face of injustice is bias.” While accurate in meaning, the English version dilutes the accusatory imperative tone of “كفاكم” and instead adopts a more neutral, declarative voice. Similarly, the phrase “نحن لا نطلب صدقة من الأمم، ولا نرجو شفقة من التاريخ” becomes “We do not ask for charity from nations, nor do we hope for pity from history,” which, although lexically correct, fails to carry the same rhetorical accumulation of defiance. On the rhetorical level, the machine translation often distorts or neutralizes poetic and symbolic imagery. A clear example is “نحن لا نحزن على شهدائنا، بل نزفهم كالعطر” translated as “We do not mourn our martyrs; we bleed them like perfume,” a phrase that unintentionally evokes grotesque imagery. A more accurate human

rendering might be: "We do not grieve our martyrs; we release them like fragrance, noble and eternal." Lastly, the powerful anaphoric conclusion "أنتم الفجر، وأنتم الشمس، وأنتم الحكاية التي لن تنتهي إلا بنصر تكتبه السواعد، لا الأقلام" is rendered mechanically as "You are the dawn, you are the sun, and you are the story that will only end with a victory written by hands, not pens." While correct in structure, the English version lacks the poetic and mobilizing effect of the original. This reflects a broader limitation: machine translation often misses the rhetorical and affective dimensions of language, especially in politically and emotionally charged texts.

Second, the Arabic machine translation of the Detroit mayoral campaign speech also reveals multiple transformation levels when analyzed through Hatim and Mason's model. Textually, the original English relies heavily on rhythmic cadence and identity-laden metaphors to evoke a sense of local pride and emotional connection. For instance, the phrase "I was raised on the rhythm of Motown and the roar of assembly lines" embeds sound and culture into a vivid narrative of belonging. The translation, "نشأت على إيقاع موسيقى موتاون"، "وضجيج خطوط التجميع" captures the literal meaning but loses some of the internal musicality and nostalgic resonance present in the original. The Arabic rendering is semantically correct yet stylistically restrained, lacking the same auditory and cultural momentum. Moreover, syntactic compression in the Arabic version occasionally disrupts the source text's carefully constructed rhetorical rhythm, flattening its impact. Pragmatically, the metaphorical identity claim "Detroit is not just where I live. Detroit is who I am" is translated into "ديترويت ليست مجرد مكان أعيش فيه. ديترويت هي أنا" a grammatically correct but pragmatically ambiguous phrase in Arabic. The personalization and symbolic merging of speaker and city may not carry the same interpretive clarity in Arabic, where such formulations are less conventional. A more pragmatically fluent rendering might be: "ديترويت ليست مجرد مدينة أسكنها، بل هي جزء مني" to convey both identity and intimacy without lexical awkwardness. Ideologically, the English speech positions the speaker as a grassroots candidate, aligned with everyday Detroiters, using expressions like "This election isn't just about policies. It's about our people." The Arabic version maintains this intent, but the emotive register is somewhat toned down. For example, the reference to working-class constituents "the mechanic, the nurse, the barista who never gave up on this city" is rendered as "الميكانيكي، والممرض، وصانع القهوة -"

الذين لم ييأسوا أبداً من هذه المدينة" which, while accurate, lacks the rhythmic emphasis and oral intimacy of the original. Furthermore, rhetorical elements such as the call to action "Let's write the next chapter together" translated as "دعونا نكتب الفصل التالي - معاً" retain structure but lack the same motivational cadence. The original builds toward collective momentum through metaphor and alliteration (e.g., "Motor City" to "Momentum City"), but this play on words is entirely lost in the Arabic "مدينة الزخم" a phrase that, while conceptually similar, does not replicate the rhetorical effect. Such losses are emblematic of machine translation's general inability to handle rhetorical wordplay and branding language, elements crucial to political discourse. Overall, the machine translation remains serviceable but ultimately dulls the affective and rhetorical limits of the original, offering a functional yet uninspired version of a speech built to mobilize and inspire.

Third and finally, the machine translation of the Egyptian presidential candidacy speech illustrates multiple shifts across Hatim and Mason's textual, pragmatic, and ideological dimensions. Textually, the Arabic original thrives on poetic repetition, parallel structures, and emotionally charged metaphors rooted in the national identity. "Repetition, parallelism and other rhetorical devices often pose considerable challenges to translators, not only because they are culture-specific but also because their rhetorical function may be diluted or lost altogether in the process of translation. The translator must make interpretive decisions that balance fidelity to the original with communicative impact in the target language" (Hatim, B., & Mason, I., 1997, p. 147). For example, the phrase "خرج من ترابه، وشرب من نيله، وعاش أفراحه وأحزانه" evokes a deep sense of organic belonging through rhythm and metaphorical layering. Its machine-translated counterpart "emerged from its soil, drank from its Nile, and experienced its joys and sorrows" is semantically correct but loses the original's internal cadence and emotive buildup. A more rhetorically human rendering can be: "Born of its soil, nourished by its Nile, and shaped by its joys and sorrows", restoring the lyrical structure and intensifying emotional resonance. Pragmatically, key identity-laden statements such as "لن أكون رئيساً خلف الحواجز، بل واحداً منكم، بينكم، يسمعكم ويخاطبكم بلغة القلب قبل لسان السياسة" serve not merely as political promises, but as performative utterances constructing an ethos of humility and accessibility. Google's translation: "I will not be a president behind barriers, but one among you, listening to you and speaking to you in the language of the heart"

before the language of politics." At the same time, it is accurate in content, but it retains a somewhat mechanical tone that blunts the warmth and familiarity of the original between speaker and audience. A pragmatically improved human translation could be: "I will not rule from behind walls, but live among you, hearing your voices, and speaking with the heart before politics." Such rephrasing maintains the original's informal intimacy and oral register, essential in persuasive Arabic rhetoric. Ideologically, the Arabic text positions the speaker as a reformist patriot rooted in the people's suffering and aspirations, with vivid lines like "أن لا يبيت طفل جائع، ولا تبكي أم على باب مستشفى، ولا يسافر شاب ليبحث عن كرامته في غربة مرة" forming a triadic structure of socio-economic empathy between discourse, speaker and audience. The machine translation delivers this faithfully in form but somehow weakens its rhetorical weight due to the literal tone and lack of emotional progression. Furthermore, ideological motifs like national stewardship "أن نحفظ ماء النيل كما نحفظ" "دماء أولادنا" are translated literally but lack the dramatic gravity the Arabic metaphor evokes. A more effective rendering might be: "To guard the Nile's waters as we guard the blood of our children." This version preserves both metaphor and emotive force, essential for mobilizing national sentiment. "Translators, like all other producers of texts, cannot avoid being influenced by ideological positions, whether consciously or unconsciously. Their choices in translation often reflect specific ideological agendas, especially when dealing with politically or culturally sensitive material" (Baker, 2006, p. 6).

Overall, while the machine translation offers a serviceable approximation of meaning, it struggles to transmit the rhetorical intensity, cultural rhythm, and persuasive ethos of the Arabic original, precisely the elements Hatim and Mason highlight as crucial in political discourse. The result is a technically correct but stylistically flattened speech that underrepresents the speaker's emotional and ideological positioning. The same applies to the English text, as the Arabic machine translation could not capture the American cultural and societal specificity of the Detroit residents.

## VII. Limitations of the study

This study is limited by its reliance on machine-translated texts without human post-editing, which may affect the accuracy of rhetorical feature identification. Moreover, the political speeches analyzed were generated by AI tools trained primarily on English

corpora, which may not fully reflect authentic Arabic political discourse and vice versa. Additionally, the sample size is relatively small, consisting of only three speeches, which may limit the generalizability of the findings.

## VIII. Recommendations

Based on the results of this study, several recommendations could help improve the quality of machine translation (MT) for political speeches. First, it is essential to train MT systems on specialized political texts, not just general language data. Political speeches often include emotional language, cultural expressions, and persuasive techniques that general systems cannot always understand or translate well. Using political corpora to train MT engines may help them better handle these challenges. Second, human translators should continue to play a key role in translating political texts. While MT can be useful for saving time, it often fails to keep the emotional, cultural, and rhetorical meaning of the original speech. Having professional translators review and edit machine-translated texts can improve their accuracy and make them more effective for real audiences. Third, it would be helpful to include translation models like Hatim and Mason's in the design of MT systems. These models look not just at words, but also at meaning, intention, and cultural background. If such models are considered during development, MT tools might become more sensitive to the rhetorical and ideological aspects of language. Fourth, this research should be repeated using a larger number of political texts, from different cultures and languages. This would help confirm the results and show whether the same issues appear in other contexts. Finally, it is recommended that students and translators receive training in political language and rhetorical analysis. This will prepare them to work with complex texts, especially those produced by AI tools. Together, these steps can help ensure that machine translation becomes more useful in the future, without losing the power and purpose of the original speech.

## IX. Conclusion

This study demonstrates that while machine translation (MT) achieves basic semantic equivalence in translating AI-generated political speeches, it significantly compromises their essential rhetorical, cultural, and ideological dimensions. Analyzing three speeches, a Palestinian liberation address (Arabic), a Detroit mayoral campaign (English), and an Egyptian



presidential candidacy (Arabic), using Hatim and Mason's discourse framework revealed consistent failures: MT flattened persuasive devices like rhythmic repetition, antithesis, and culturally embedded metaphors (e.g., "baptized in olive oil" became pragmatically awkward in English; Detroit's "rhythm of Motown" lost auditory resonance in Arabic); diluted ideological positioning by softening confrontational tones and imperative urgency (e.g., Arabic accusatory rhetoric transformed into neutral declarations); and eroded affective power, stripping speeches of their emotional cadence and mobilizing force. Human translations consistently outperformed MT by adapting rhetorical strategies to target-language conventions, preserving cultural intentionality, and maintaining persuasive ethos. These findings underscore MT's inability to handle the nuanced interplay of language, culture, and power inherent in political discourse, where persuasion relies on contextual sensitivity beyond lexical accuracy. Consequently, MT alone is insufficient for sensitive political communication. The study advocates for a hybrid approach, using MT for efficiency but mandating human post-editing to recover rhetorical depth and cultural resonance. Future research should explore MT systems trained on political genre corpora and deeper integration of pragmatic translation frameworks to mitigate these limitations, ensuring automated tools complement rather than compromise the strategic goals of political speech.

## References

1. Aljanadbah, A., Al Marri, R. H., & Almarri, H. M. (2025). The Future of Foreign Language Learning in the Age of Artificial Intelligence: A Critical Analysis of Trends, Challenges, and Opportunities. *Dibon Journal of Languages*, 1(2), 200–217. <https://doi.org/10.64169/djl.84>
2. Al-Kaabi, M. H., AlQbailat, N. M., Badah, A., Ismail, I. A., & Hicham, K. B. (2024b). Examining the cultural connotations in human and machine translations: A corpus study of Naguib Mahfouz's Zuqāq Al-Midaqq. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 15(3), 707–718. <https://doi.org/10.17507/jltr.1503.03>
3. Almahasees, Z. M. (2017). Assessing the translation of Google and Microsoft Bing in translating political texts from Arabic into English. *International Journal of Languages, Literature and Linguistics*, 3(1), 1-4.
4. Baker, M. (2006). *Translation and Conflict: A Narrative Account*. Routledge.
5. Bánhegyi, M. (2014). Translation and political discourse. *Acta Universitatis Sapientiae, Philologica*, 6(2), 139-158.
6. Daghamin, H., & Daghamin, N. (2025). Between Innovation and Tradition: The Impact of AI on Literature Education. *Dibon Journal of Education*, 1(1), 42–55. <https://doi.org/10.64169/dje.11>
7. Dey Sarkar, P. (2025). Exploring Perceptions of Learners Towards Using ChatGPT: A Qualitative Study. *Dibon Journal of Education*, 1(2), 120–133. <https://doi.org/10.64169/dje.68>
8. Fadel, R., & El-Farra, N. (2022). Ideology and omission: A corpus-based study of political news translation by neural MT systems. *Translation and Interpreting Studies*, 17(3), 312–330.
9. Gill, A., & Whedbee, K. (1997). Rhetoric. In T. van Dijk (Ed.), *Discourse as structure and process* (pp. 157–184). Sage Publications
10. Guddad, P. (2025). Challenges Faced by the Visually Impaired Students during Online Learning: Lessons for Teachers. *Dibon Journal of Education*, 1(1), 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.64169/dje.6>
11. Hatim, B., & Mason, I. (1990). *Discourse and the Translator*. London: Longman.
12. Hatim, B., & Mason, I. (1997). *The Translator as Communicator*. London: Routledge.
13. Hatim, B., & Munday, J. (2004). *Translation: An advanced resource book*. Routledge.
14. Hicham, K., AlQbailat, N. M., Ismail, I. A., Qpilat, N. M., Al-Khawaldeh, N. N., Al-Shboul, O. K., & Masrar, F. Z. (2025b). Interculturalizing ELT: Culture-Based classes to enhance language skills and intercultural communicative competence dimensions. *Ampersand*, 100221. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.amper.2025.100221>
15. Ismail, I. A., & Alosi, J. M. (2024). Data privacy in AI-Driven education. In *Advances in educational marketing, administration, and leadership book series* (pp. 223–252). <https://doi.org/10.4018/979-8-3693-5443-8.ch008>
16. Ismail, I. A., & Qbailat, N. A. (2025). Intergenerational Perspectives: Examining the adoption of emerging technologies across

- generations X, Y, and Z. *Ubiquitous Learning an International Journal*, 19(1), 95–117. <https://doi.org/10.18848/1835-9795/cgp/v19i01/95-117>
17. Ismail, I. A., Alkhateeb, M. O., & Alkaabi, M. H. (2025). AI-Driven learning. In *Advances in computational intelligence and robotics book series* (pp. 1–32). <https://doi.org/10.4018/979-8-3693-7873-1.ch001>
  18. Ismayilli, T., & Nuri, A. (2025). Applications that can be used in Mobile-Assisted Language Education. *Dibon Journal of Education*, 1(2), 111–119. <https://doi.org/10.64169/dje.82>
  19. Jiang, K., & Lu, X. (2021, March). The influence of speech translation technology on interpreter's career prospects in the era of artificial intelligence. In *Journal of Physics: Conference Series* (Vol. 1802, No. 4, p. 042074). IOP Publishing.
  20. Karabayeva, I., & Kalizhanova, A. (2024). Evaluating machine translation of literature through rhetorical analysis. *Journal of Translation and Language Studies*, 5(1), 1-9.
  21. Khan, M. F. (2025). Syntactic Transformation in Large Language Models (LLMs): A Transformational Generative Grammar (TGG) Perspective. *Dibon Journal of Languages*, 1(1), 24–43. <https://doi.org/10.64169/djl.23>
  22. Laketić, K. D. Man Versus Machine: Can Software Truly Replace Human Translators. *Zbornik radova Sbornik Statej*, 244.
  23. Matsumoto, D., & Juang, L. P. (2015). *Culture and Psychology* (6th ed., p. 15). Wadsworth Publishing.
  24. Schäffner, C. (2014). Unknown agents in translated political discourse. In *The known unknowns of translation studies* (pp. 131-153). John Benjamins Publishing Company.
  25. Silva, M., & Huang, Y. (2025). Pragmatic failure in MT of political discourse: A relevance-theoretic approach. *Applied Linguistics Review*, 16(2), 205–222.
  26. Sun, Y., Hu, S., Wei, L., Wu, J., & Wang, Q. (2025). More Target-Oriented? The Rhetorical Effects of the English Translations of Chinese Political Discourse. *Open Journal of Modern Linguistics*, 15(2), 339-357.
  27. van Dijk, T. A. (1997). *What is political discourse?* In J. Blommaert & C. Bulcaen (Eds.), *Political linguistics* (pp. 11–52). John Benjamins.
  28. Zong, Z. (2018, September). Research on the relations between machine translation and human translation. In *Journal of Physics: Conference Series* (Vol. 1087, No. 6, p. 062046). IOP Publishing.