



Mapping Political Strategies Over Rhetorical Devices in 2008 U.S. Pre-Presidential Debates: A Political Discourse Study

Research Article
pp. 97-114

Marjan Vosoughi*¹
Farnoush Karimi²

Received: 2020/04/15 Accepted: 2020/12/05

Abstract

In this research, it was tried to follow the recent Political Discourse Analysis (PDA) approaches that map text over relevant context as supported by Van Dijk (2006). The main intention is to look at political discourse via the lenses of PDA to see whether ideologies and power relations of interlocutors in the target setting of this study could have possibly been aligned with linguistic elements -here rhetorical devices- and to see to what extent such text-context mapping is recognized as relevant to language tools within the selected datasets. Accordingly, the researcher tried to follow a sample of political talk -live 2008 US presidential debates- between two republic vs. democratic campaigns. To do so, some political strategies for argumentation including Van Dijk's model representing 'Authority', 'Topos or burden', 'Future Representations', 'Comparison', 'Consensus', 'Counterfactuals', 'Populism', 'Generalizations', and 'Number Games' were mapped over some linguistic rhetorical devices such as 'Metaphor', 'Hyperbole', 'Irony', 'Euphemism', etc. The common discursual moves in Obama's vs. McCain's speech statements were compared and contrasted among similar strategies to find any emergent rhetorical devices. Findings indicate that 1) the political candidates had made use of rhetorical and political moves in tandem within the same propositional units, 2) some of the employed discourse devices were paralleled with the majority of political strategies like Repetition and Metaphor, and 3) some political strategies had been used to excess like 'Comparison', 'Populism', and 'Future Representation'.

Keywords: contrastive discourse analysis (CDA), political discourse analysis (PDA), political strategies, rhetorical devices, US pre-presidential speech

* Corresponding Author

¹ Assistant professor, English Department, Sabzevar Branch, Islamic Azad University, Sabzevar, Iran. vosoughee@iaus.ac.ir

² PhD in TEFL, English Department, Mashhad Branch, Islamic Azad University, Mashhad, Iran. tscstudents123@gmail.com

DOI: 10.22051/lghor.2020.31022.1292

Introduction

Within political discourses, language, no doubt, plays an indispensable role (Pennycook, 2017). Many prominent leaders in history have made best use of linguistically rich speeches through which they have gained success in attracting the related political parties. In nearly all forms of political discourses, genres such as propaganda, political advertising, political speeches, media interviews, parliamentary debates, presidential campaign speeches, etc., language plays its role in giving the prominent leaders the essential resources to various socio-political goals (Chilton & Schaffner, 2002). Van Dijk (1997), as one pioneering figures in analyzing political discourses, contended that, in each speech delivered by a politician, there is a realization of his/her intentions and it has its own functions. Matlock (2015) put forth a similar argument to signify *'how something is said may be as important as what is said'* (p. 3).

In political discourses, certain linguistic assets available to the interlocutors can achieve persuasion of the audience towards certain points in discussion, including literary rhetorical devices. Such strands might help politicians to argue well and cause a better transmission of key ideas to the audience. Literary rhetorical devices, which convey meaning and intentions in certain ways, may include 'anaphora', 'direct address', 'hyperbole', 'parallelism', 'metaphor' among others. As Burke (1969) once said, "Wherever there is persuasion, there is rhetoric. And wherever there is meaning, there is persuasion" (p. 72).

Discourse analysts use a variety of techniques to detect the rhetorical devices in texts and talks. Via CDA techniques, scholars can identify the discursive strategies, which have consistently been employed by speakers for meaning construction practices in many social confronts like commercial business settings, social speeches by prominent leaders, as well as sociopolitical contexts (Rahimi et al., 2010; Van Dijk, 1997).

Context of the Problem

With respect to the applied techniques in CDA for political contexts and discourses, Van Dijk (1997) believes that techniques in CDA could not lead to sound findings since each proposition must be dealt with in its own context with various rules for analyses. Ideologies and power relations in the discourse of politics, for example, must be dealt with in a new domain of inquiry as he termed as political discourse analysis (PDA):

PDA is both about political discourse, and it is also a critical enterprise. In the spirit of contemporary approaches in CDA, this would mean that critical-political discourse analysis deals especially with the reproduction of political power, power abuse or domination through political discourse, including the various forms of resistance or counter-power against such forms of discursive dominance. (p. 11)

Van Dijk (2006) has proposed eight political strategies and formulated them as some models for argumentation purposes in political contexts, which many political actors make best use of as useful strategies to support their case, including 'Authority', 'Topos', 'Future Representation', 'Comparison', 'Consensus', 'Counter-Factuals', 'Populism', and 'Number Game'. In 'Authority',

politicians refer to organizations or people who are supposedly above the fray of party politics, or who are generally recognized as experts or moral leaders. International organizations such as the United Nations (UN), the church, the courts, or other governmental organizations are, for instance, referred to by politicians. "Topos" (burden) refers to premises taken for granted as self-evident and sufficient reasons to accept a conclusion. For example, one of the topoi of anti-immigration discourse is that asylum seekers are 'a financial burden for us'. 'Future Representation' is another noted strategy used by political figures, in which case it is used as a legitimizing device to signify near-term policies and actions to persuade the audiences. 'Comparison', as another political strategy, typically occurs in talks about minorities like refugees when speakers compare in-groups with out-groups or insiders with outsiders with positive self and negative other orientations. 'Consensus', as another political strategy, refers to claims made by political actors to defend their territories by focusing on cross-party or national unanimities in situations where their country is at stake, for instance by an outside attack. In this way, they might even abandon or sacrifice some of their political values to save the country at large. 'Counterfactuals', is another mostly utilized persuasive political strategy in which professional politicians arise empathies within audience by typical expressions referring to as 'what would happen if' terms. In 'Populism', as another eminent strategy in Van Dijk's model, one of the well-known argumentation fallacies is used in conservative talks specifically on matters that the general public is concerned with like immigration, war, financial corruptions, etc. And finally, 'Number Game' is a kind of tactic used by politicians to accredit their arguments by objectifying their assertions. Statistics, records, numbers, and figures are the primary means here to persuasively display interlocutors' objectivity in political speeches.

Background of the Study

Debates on the underlying realizations of texts vs. contexts have always been current in CDA lines of research. On the one hand, some scholars believe that a text only displays tangible aspects of oral and written documents (Wodak, 2001), while discourse constitutes the system of knowledge and memory, which is more abstract than. Other figures such as Van Dijk (1988) have put one step forward by saying that discourse is not an isolated textual or dialogical structure but a complex communicative event also embodying a social situation involving participants and their belongings. There are grave debates among eminent scholars in the field of discourse analysis on this issue (Fairclough, 2013; Van Dijk, 2011). Critics of CDA mostly view the link and connection between hegemonic ideologies and language not to be compatible in meaning frameworks (Blommaert & Bulcaen, 2000; Krzyzanowski, 2005; Wodak, 2001). On the other hand, recent theoreticians in PDA campaigns like Van Dijk (2006) and Barton (2002) claim that conjoint processing analyses that combine text and context together might better achieve hidden meanings. Concerning PDA, hidden aspects in multidisciplinary studies comprise knowledge on audience as (recipients) and political presenters as (actors) as well as the activities and practices as (functions) within an interactional framework. Barton (2002) put forward a similar argument by saying: *Every*

study in the field is based implicitly or explicitly on the analysis of texts and/or talk in their various contexts" (p. 1). For instance, common and proper context media where political events take place for such analyses might include cabinet meetings, parliamentary sessions, election campaigns, rallies, interviews with the media, bureaucratic practices, protest demonstrations, and so on, and only when elected politicians are debating or interacting in parliament buildings, do they mostly reveal their ideologies on various topics like governmental issues, economical matters, socio-political stance, etc. Accordingly, if CDA specialists map texts on the proper ideological context, they can probably reveal many hidden aspects of power relations, which can be achieved through proper using of language between the participants as such.

In a recent study, Biria and Mohammadi (2012) explored inaugural speech by two US presidents: George Bush and Barack Obama. Through CDA techniques, they finally revealed how the two presidents had possessed some discursive mechanisms including the positive self and negative other-presentation strategies, which are a characteristic of political discourses to conquer rivals and a proper means in politicians' hands in order to influence their audience.

In still another research by Rahimi et al. (2010), the discursive structures of the 2008 presidential campaign speeches of Hillary Clinton and Barrack Obama were sought and it was found that significant discursal elements marked by gender and race within the analyzed speeches of the two presidential candidates were hidden.

Gowhari et al. (2014) did a similar study on two main Iranian political parties including Principalists vs. Reformists and concluded that the two selected nominees in their study had used language as a means of promoting their own social, political, and personal interests and as an effective means for power struggle.

Persuasion Analysis in PDA Studies

In studies pertaining to discourse analysis where the intention is to reveal power relations rarely have scholars employed PDA techniques.

Higgins and Walker, (2012) referred to three key types of persuasion, which have long been claimed to be in action from Aristotle's' time: ethos, pathos and logos. In ethos, credibility of the presenters makes them acceptable characters. If the speech stirs the audience's emotions, it has 'pathos' pertaining to it, and finally by 'logo', it is meant that persuasion can be said to be effective only when the speakers are able to prove a truth or a fact by means of persuasive arguments. It seems that in pathos and logos, linguistic elements play a more pivotal role since they are directly involved with language as a critical means for transmitting ideas by the interlocutors.

Similar approaches implemented by other scholars who had taken PDA frameworks supported this issue. In another study, Johnstone and Eisenhart cited a very interesting study by Deciu Ritivoi (2008) from Mellon University on how this scholar had explicated the roles of stylistic moves and variations used by a Romanian would-be government to constitute political actions and agents during the Cold War. She explained then how modality reinforced by transitivity had been used by this political actor to depict his power in unifying

his companions to fight against communism. Micro-rhetorical devices as such have been claimed to be conjoined with macro-rhetorical norms of successful leaders like power, responsibility appreciation, political independence and blaming antithesis ideologies among many other higher-order characteristics.

This Study

In this study, the main intention was to look at political discourse via the lenses of PDA to see whether ideologies and power relations of interlocutors in the target setting of this study could have possibly been aligned with linguistic elements- here rhetorical devices- and to see to what extent such text-context mapping is recognized as relevant within the interlocutors' speeches. This could denote text-context balance within CDA lines of inquiry as a novel undertaking to be sought by future researchers as well. In other words, the argument that is going to be explored in depth is seeing textual elements within proper contexts of use, i.e., political speeches, which might depict a better and more concise picture of the realities in recent PDA.

The researchers tried to shed more light on the roots of another political discourse by giving access to many other dimensions hidden in political genres, which have rarely been considered by discourse analysts through a PDA framework. Hence, to fill in the research gap as to examine PDA frameworks for analyzing the political speech, the present researchers drew on precise methodological techniques for PDA.

To this aim, the US presidential debates of 2008 were chosen to reveal the relevant discursal moves that each candidate from two political parties of Democrats vs. Republicans had probably used to persuade the public and the related electoral.

The questions that were posed for this research are:

1. Which rhetorical devices had been additionally used in the two individual speeches given by Obama and McCain?
2. Which political strategies had been additionally used in the two individual speeches given by Obama and McCain?
3. Were detected rhetorical devices used in tandem with political strategies by the two US presidential candidates of 2008 or not?

Method

In this study, the main intention was to critically analyze the rhetorical structure of a political talk using PDA techniques, which, as Van Dijk (2006) recommended, might best reveal the politicians' capability in persuading their intended electoral teams to receive more votes.

Documentation

The required corpus data were retrieved from Wikisource international library at <http://en.wikisource.org/>. The debate talks chosen for this study had occurred four times at various locations around the United States in September and October 2008. In all, three of the 90-minute debates involved the presidential nominees, and one involved the vice-presidential nominees. The debates were mainly a confrontation of two political Senators, i.e., John McCain from the Republican party and Barack Obama from the

democratic counterpart, but the other present nominees were also Sarah Palin, an Alaskan governor from the Republican campaign, and Joseph Biden from Democratic counterpart. The present research relied on the data from the third debate held on September 26, 2008 at Belmont University in Nashville, Tennessee and moderated by Tom Brokaw of NBC news broadcast.

In this study, argumentation skills of the presidential candidates were analyzed through politically ideological perspectives using Van Dijk's model (2006). In this model, the approach for analyzing rhetorical devices for political contexts focused on some eight main political strategies for argumentation, including 'Authority', 'Topos or burden', 'Future Representations' (FR), 'Comparison', 'Consensus', 'Counterfactuals', 'Populism', and 'Number Games' as explicated in the previous sections. In this study, above-cited political strategies were mapped over linguistic rhetorical devices such as metaphor, hyperbole, irony, euphemism, and the like. For identifying common rhetorical devices used by the two interlocutors, a compiled list of common rhetorical devices used in public speaking for persuading the audience from <http://www.speaklikeapro.co.uk/> was used. In this list, some thirty-five rhetorical devices which had generally been used by famous political figures in history like Martin Luther King, Abraham Lincoln, Franklin D. Roosevelt, etc. have been exemplified. Largely, these devices have been reported to be useful for persuading the public and mainly various linguistic strategies are described to have been at work like 1) rearranging the order of sentences for emphasizing a point like Anastrophe in which a departure from normal word order is seen in the speakers' speech; 2) repeating certain words or phrases at different parts of the statement to reach an effect; 3) assimilating sensible events or things for the sake of persuasion such as 'metaphor', 'simile' and 'eponym'; 4) deleting some parts of the sentences such as Asyndeton which denoted a lack of conjunctions (e.g. 'and') between successive phrases or words, and 5) reversing the elements of a sentence to achieve more influence by associating two contrasting ideas. A clear reference to all these rhetorical devices and the coding procedures of the rhetorical devices cited above can be found in <http://phrontistery.info/rhetoric.html>.

Data Analysis

Randomly chosen scripts from a total of three existent US presidential debates were taken from 2008 inventory of talks and went under rigorous content analysis techniques to disclose the hidden discursual moves used by the presidential candidates from both republican and democratic parties. The reason why random selection was performed on the first two debates was two-fold. Firstly, these two debates were divided into nine 9-minute issue segments which allowed all four candidates to discuss some selected topics which kept ideation constant, and secondly, the authors were better able to analyze the political moves across unified topics to check the nominees' persuasive skills.

Following PDA techniques for content analysis of the present research required close consideration of some connection between ideological considerations in political contexts and linguistic discourses.

Using MaxQda (ver. 11) for qualitative data analysis, initially, six codes pertaining to detected rhetorical devices were assigned through open coding

strategy and then segmented under 1) Repetition with Alliteration, Assonance, Parallelism Amplification, Anadiplosis, Anaphora, Antistrophe, Parallelism and Diascopy as its sub codes, 2) Displacement, consisting of three sub codes as Anastrophe, Antithesis and Chiasmus, 3) Deletion (asyndeton), 4) Assimilation involving Metaphor, Simile and Eponym, 5) Reference to events involving allusion and Hypophora and 6) Parallelism, denoting parallel structures. To find possible responses to the three proposed research questions in this study, rhetorical devices above were mapped over eight political strategies coded with 'Authority', 'Topos or Burden', 'FR', 'Comparison', 'Consensus', 'Counterfactuals', 'Populism', and 'Number Games'.

The data analysis took place in two succeeding stages. In the first step, an account of the events in the selected debate script was first recorded, through which existing political strategies could be mapped on linguistic devices. After also extracting the political strategies implemented in their speech statements, the common discursual moves in their speech statements were compared and contrasted to find any emergent patterns for juxtaposition of rhetorical devices with political strategies. To scrutinize the internal validity of the results from content analyses, inter coding was cross-checked through inter-rater coder for reliability check. Apart from the present researcher, a language teacher having a PhD in Applied Linguistics who had 15 years of teaching experience was invited to code one third of the corpus. Agreement index between the two coders in this research was calculated by inter-coder features in Maxqda and showed a sound overlap (0.89%).

Responses to the first two questions were mainly undertaken through quantitative content analysis by counting the number of cases for rhetorical devices (textual uses) vs. political strategies (contextual uses), while in case of the third question, the author catered for text-context mapping through qualitative interpretive approaches as Yin (2011) remarked by following the issues through more rigorous interpretive undertaking.

Findings

In this study, the intention was to find any instances of the political strategies mapped across rhetorical devices by the US presidential nominees.

To reiterate the intended research questions, the author decided to inspect the issue by seeing through the nature of rhetorical devices mostly used in tandem with political strategies by two major political parties - Barack Obama and John McCain- and checking if there was a relationship between the discursual moves of their speech in terms of linguistic (rhetorical devices) and non-linguistic elements (political strategies).

Response to the First Research Question

In response to the first question as to the kind of rhetorical device(s) in Obama's vs. McCain's two individual speeches, coded categories for rhetorical devices were tallied in Maxqda for all sampled speech scenes. Table 1 displays the results of descriptive statistics including the frequency counts and rates for each rhetorical device used within the two individual speeches by the two political figures, i.e., Obama vs. McCain, separately.

Table 1

Frequency Rates of Extracted Rhetorical Moves within Pre-Presidential Debates of Obama and McCain

	Reference to events	Displacement	Parallelism	Assimilation	Repetition	Deletion
Obama Frequency rates	11 22.91%	9 18.75%	2 4.16%	10 20.83%	15 31.25%	1 2%
McCain Frequency rates	17 35.41%	5 10.41%	3 6.25%	8 16.6%	14 29.16	1 2%

According to Table 1, the frequency counts of each rhetorical device indicated that within the two speeches, Obama had mostly taken benefit of 'repetition' with 31.25% and McCain had mainly made use of 'reference to events' with 35.41%.

Response to the Second Research Question

A closer look at the dataset could indicate among other things that the two political figures, though approximately similar in their overall adoption of linguistic elements, were different in terms of preference towards rhetorical devices. For example, in using 'reference to events', Obama had made use of this device only 22.91% compared with McCain (35.41%), or in case of 'displacement', Obama had used it 18.75%, while McCain had employed it 10.41%. Specific cases of rhetorical device uses as mapped with the targeted political strategies have been depicted in the later parts of this research. At this phase of the study, in line with the second research question, the same procedures for question one were replicated with the datasets to retrieve the frequency rates/counts of the tallied codes, this time for political strategies. To reiterate, the aim at this stage was to specify which political strategies had been mostly used in the two Obama's vs. McCain's individual speeches.

Table 2

Frequency Rates of Extracted Political Strategies within Pre-Presidential Debates of Obama and McCain

	Authority	Future representation	Populism	Disclaimer	Number game	Comparison
Obama Frequency rates	2 6.25%	10 31.25	8 25%	2 6.25%	2 6.25%	8 25%
McCain Frequency rates	0 0%	5 15.1%	8 24.2%	5 15.1%	7 21.2%	8 24.2%

The datasets in table 2 for strategy adoption by the two presidential candidates indicated that Obama had mostly preferred to use 'FR' with 31.25%, while McCain was different in this respect. He had mostly adopted 'populism' and 'comparison' with the same 24.2% for each strategy type. Obama had taken these two strategies after 'FR'. This second dataset also was evidence for the fact that the two political figures had different preferences.

Response to the Third Research Question

In the third research question of this survey, the intention was to clarify if the rhetorical devices used in the debate talks had been used in tandem with political strategies by the targeted US presidential candidates. Here, it was attempted to find any identified political strategies used in juxtaposition with the extracted rhetorical devices. In fact, the main aim was to make it clear to what extent the two political figures had used the two rhetorical devices and political strategies together to influence their talk for persuading their audience to accept their arguments. To answer this question, a rigorous qualitative content analysis was undertaken for the first three scenes of the sampled debate. Below, the occurrence of each political strategy with a probable rhetorical device has been analyzed and the retrieved categories are interpreted for each scene. In each scene in the following sections, coded rhetorical devices have been marked with “underlying entries” through word processor displays, while noticed cases for coding political strategies have been specified with “bold underlying” in the analyzed corpus Tables 3-15.

Speech Events, Scene One

The debate session started with a ritualistic welcoming message by the moderator, Brokaw of NBC News in Belmont University in Nashville, Tennessee. The first randomly selected question from the audience was concerned with the then current economic recession in American societies and Barak Obama was the first candidate to answer. Alan Schaefer -a candidate among the audience- proposed his question and Obama's response is given afterwards:

Alan: "With the economy on the downturn and retired and older citizens and workers losing their incomes, what's the fastest, most positive solution to bail these people out of the economic ruin?"

Obama initiated his talk over the issued question on economic status of the US at that time as verified below in Table 3 from Maxqda document tables.

Table 3

Excerpt Quotes 1 by Obama from Speech Events, Scene One

Document:	no. 1
Weight:	0
Position:	15 - 15
Code:	repetition/populism/metaphor

*"...And a lot of you I think are worried about your jobs, your pensions, your retirement accounts, your ability to send your child or your grandchild to college...**The middle-class** needs a rescue package. And that means tax cuts for **the middle-class**. It means help for homeowners so that they can stay in **their homes**. It means that we are helping state and local governments set up road projects and bridge projects that keep **people** in their jobs.*

As clear in Table 3, Obama then suggested three solutions with reference to tax, energy, and health care system with an emphasis on refraining pressure esp. from the middle class citizens. Regarding political strategies, this could initially show, among other things, not only an allusion to the then

current economic status as given by Obama by addressing the middle class' immediate concerns, but also this signified an evidence of 'populism' since this could arise feelings among the involved target group regarding their jobs, homes, children's education, and family conditions. As to rhetorical devices, in this first scene, a detected rhetorical device was coded for "repetition" when Obama evidently used 'middle-class' (two entries) and 'your' (six entries) to strengthen commitments that he had decided to establish among a specific group of social class that signified "populism" as explicated above. These could be interpreted as evidence for the presence of 'amplification' by repeating those parallel insertions along with a proposition for strengthening his accounts.

Within the same paragraph, sporadic cases of metaphor were also detectable like the people he was addressing needed "a rescue package" {Obama: "The middle-class needs a rescue package"}. Successively with this device, then Obama used "comparison" as another political strategy this time along with "metaphor" {would rain down on...} probably to strengthen his arguments in the same paragraph (Table 3).

Table 4

Excerpt Quotes 2 by Obama from Speech Events, Scene One

Document:	no. 1
Weight:	0
Position:	15 - 18
Code:	comparison/deletion/metaphor

*Obama: "...**strongly promoted by President Bush and supported by Senator McCain**, that essentially said that we should strip away regulations, consumer protections, let the market run wild, and prosperity would rain down on all of us..."*

In another case in the first speech scene, "populism" had been again paralleled with a metaphor as displayed by "a rescue package" as seen in Table 5 below.

Table 5

Excerpt Quotes 3 by Obama from Speech Events, Scene One

Document:	q no. 1
Weight:	0
Position:	18 - 18
Code:	populism/metaphor

*Obama: "...But that's only step one. **The middle-class** need a rescue package."*

In the succeeding paragraph, another overlapping discursual move was detected where Obama was providing some future measures using 'FR' strategy and "populism", in which again he used "repetition" as a rhetorical device concurrently in the same utterance:

Table 6*Excerpt Quotes 4 by Obama from Speech Events, Scene One*

Document:	q no. 1
Weight:	0
Position:	20 - 20
Code:	future representation/repetition

Obama: "... And then long-term we've got to fix our health care system, we've got to fix our energy system that is putting such an enormous burden on families. You need somebody working for you and you've got to have ..".

These four occurring cases from the first scene urged the present researcher to still continue finding more evidences this time by McCain as the probable recurring indications of both dependability and trustworthiness in this research through which the spotted political figures had made use of both political strategies and rhetorical devices simultaneously to reinforce their talks. In the following, speech cases by McCain are brought from the first scene. The first evidence was the co-occurrence of populism with assimilation in the two successive sentences in the first analyzed scene.

Table 7*Excerpt Quotes 1 by McCain from Speech Events, Scene One*

Document:	q no. 1
Weight:	0
Position:	22 - 22
Code:	populism/ assimilation

McCain: "... And, Alan, thank you for your question. You go to the heart of America's worries tonight. Americans are angry, they're upset, and they're a little fearful."

As table 7 displays, in McCain's speech, "populism" had been used with "assimilation". Further on, in another case, "populism" was used by McCain this time along with "repetition" from among rhetorical devices.

Table 8*Excerpt Quotes 2 by McCain from Speech Events, Scene One*

Document:	q no. 1
Weight:	0
Position:	23 - 23
Code:	populism/ repetition

McCain: "... We have to keep Americans' taxes low. All Americans' taxes low."

In cases where both political strategies and rhetorical devices were concurrent in the examined speech scenes, the example evidences in the table are displayed with both underlying and bold typing in the same utterance like the above utterance by McCain.

In the first scene, other political strategies were also discernible like "Number Game" by Obama. But it was interesting to note that no rhetorical device had been used in parallel with this strategy (Table 9).

Table 9*Excerpt Quotes 5 by Obama from Speech Events, Scene One*

Document:	q no. 1
Weight:	0
Position:	17 - 17
Code:	number game

Obama: "...And, in fact, we just found out that AIG, a company that got a bailout, just a week after they got help went on a **\$400,000 junket.**"

In order to find more evidences/counter evidences, the present researcher still continued with the rest of this talk to explore more rebuttals that co-occurrence of political strategies and rhetorical devices were managed randomly by the targeted political figures in this research. In the following section, other examples are brought as evidence from the second selected scene in the corpus under the study.

Speech Events: Scene Two. In the second scene, a question was posed by the coordinator as who the two candidates had in mind to appoint for their treasury secretary. The coded political strategies used by the two candidates here were also worthy of note since again they had been paralleled with some rhetoric for persuasion aims. This time first McCain was to initiate the talk.

Two strategies were conspicuous in McCain's response that could signify his tactic to bring confidence and trust on his part by suggesting some candidates. He first made use of 'populism' strategy by using the term {qualified Americans}, which was abundant in number. Here, "repetition" by McCain's use of the word '*immediately*' in this following utterance twice was noticeable, which most probably indicated his urgency towards his fellow citizens on the face of it (Table 10).

Table 10*Excerpt Quotes 4 by McCain from Speech Events, Scene Two*

Document:	q no 2
Weight:	0
Position:	6 - 6
Code:	populism/ repetition

*MCCAIN: "...You know that's a tough question and **there's a lot of qualified Americans.** But I think the first criteria, Tom, would have to be somebody who immediately Americans identify with, immediately say, we can trust that individual..."*

In response to this second question, Obama's response was conspicuous when he used two political moves along with one rhetorical move in tandem within the same propositional unit (Table 11).

Table 11*Excerpt Quotes 6 by Obama from Speech Events, Scene Two***Document:** q no 2**Weight:** 0**Position:** 11 - 12**Code:** populism/ metaphor

Obama: "...Well, Warren would be a pretty good choice, Warren Buffett, and I'm pleased to have his support. But there are other folks out there. The key is making sure that the next treasury secretary understands that **it's not enough just to help those at the top.** Prosperity is not just going to trickle down. We've got to help **the middle class...**"

As evident in Table 11, first, he attacked McCain's assertions through 'Comparison' when he reflected on some certain flaws in McCain's utterances {that it's not enough just to help those at the top} and by 'Populism' as he advocated his fellow Americans again here by having recourse to metaphor as a rhetorical device. Afterwards, in the succeeding paragraph unit, Obama used populism along with "repetition" to defend himself (Table 12).

Table 12*Excerpt Quotes 6 by Obama from Speech Events, Scene Two***Document:** q no 2**Weight:** 0**Position:** 12 - 12**Code:** populism/repetition

For many of you, it is getting harder and harder to save, harder and harder to retire.

Afterwards, Obama mixed "comparison" this time with "repetition" when he said: { *...But underlying that is loss of jobs and loss of income* } as evident in Table 13 below:

Table 13*Excerpt Quotes 7 by Obama from Speech Events, Scene Two***Document:** q no 2**Weight:** 0**Position:** 14 - 14**Code:** comparison/repetition

Obama: "**Senator McCain is right that we've got to stabilize housing prices. But underlying that** is loss of jobs and loss of income..."

For brevity reasons, and to bring evidences from other diverse speech scenes, some other examples are brought from the third scene to strengthen the arguments put forward in favor of juxtaposed text-context moves.

Speech Events: Scene Three. For the next question, a person from the audience- Oliver Clark- asked about the efficiency and the mechanism of bailout package formerly proposed by the nominees to rescue American people out of the economic crisis. McCain initiated the talk on this issue, and "comparison" along with "disclaimer" were paralleled with a "metaphor" {a match that lit this fire} to strengthen his arguments on defending a case in which he had been innocent:

Table 14*Excerpt Quotes 5 by McCain from Speech Events, Scene Three***Document:** q no.3**Weight:** 0**Position:** 7 - 7**Code:** disclaimer/comparison/metaphor

McCain: "...one of the real catalysts, really the match that lit this fire was Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac. I'll bet you, you may never even have heard of them before this crisis. **But you know, they're the ones that, with the encouragement of Senator Obama and his cronies** and his friends in Washington..."

'Comparison' strategy was also obviously used in McCain's talk when he referred to some famous responsible institutions, organizations, or people who had created the crisis pertaining to Obama's team in the past when Obama had had responsibilities in Washington. The pronouns 'us', 'we' and 'they' below are just some examples to imply positive self vs. negative other used by McCain as Table 15 below verifies.

Table 15*Excerpt Quotes 6 by McCain from Speech Events, Scene Three***Document:** q no.3**Weight:** 0**Position:** 9 - 9**Code:** comparison/metaphor

McCain: "...There were some of us that stood up against it. There were **others who took a hike.**"

Here, he continued his defense again using comparison with his competitor. The pronouns 'us' and indefinite pronoun of 'others' here are evidences to this strategy. Immediately, another metaphor was issued 'who took a hike'. This was said to mean that the rival team had benefitted by previous undertakings while his team had taken a more sensible measure by criticizing the crisis.

In the succeeding paragraph, McCain made an attempt to describe his future measures using FR strategy again along with another rhetorical move, here "repetition" (Table 16).

Table 16*Excerpt Quotes 7 by McCain from Speech Events, Scene Three***Document:** q no.3**Weight:** 0**Position:** 9 - 9**Code:** future representation/repetition

McCain: "...and we're going to have **to buy up these bad loans** and we're going to **have to stabilize home values,** and that way..."

In response to McCain's claims, Obama continued:

Table 17*Excerpt Quotes 8 by Obama from Speech Events, Scene Three***Document:** q no. 3**Weight:** 0**Position:** 9 – 10**Code:** populism/metaphor

Obama: " Well, Oliver, first, let me tell you what's in the rescue package for you. Right now, the credit markets are frozen up and what that means, as a practical matter, is that small businesses and some large businesses just can't get loans. If they can't get a loan, that means that they can't make payroll. If they can't make payroll, then they may end up having to shut their doors and lay people off. And if you imagine just one company trying to deal with that, now imagine a million companies all across the country. So it could end up having an adverse effect **on everybody**, and that's why we had to take action. But we shouldn't have been there in the first place..."

Here, as evident in Table 17, Obama mentioned three successive 'If clauses'. In fact, in this declaration, in the opening section of his talk, he used two rhetorical devices: one amplification by repeating 'if conditional' three times consecutively, which could also be an indication of rhetorical "hypophora" where the political figures raise empathies within audience by typical 'what would happen if' terms; however, it was used in its positive way by directing the conditions without asking the questions 'what if' from the audience, only providing the effects themselves. Interestingly, here rhetorical 'hypophora' had been used in tandem with another rhetorical device, i.e., repetition, for reinforcing an argument.

Further on in the document, when Obama severely attacked McCain's claims, he referred the audience to how history had been misrepresented by McCain, using 'comparison' strategy and metaphor as a rhetorical device (Table 18).

Table 18*Excerpt Quotes 9 by Obama from Speech Events, Scene Three***Document:** q no.3**Weight:** 0**Position:** 12 – 12/15**Code:** comparison / metaphor

Obama: "Now, I've got to correct a little bit of Senator McCain's history, not surprisingly. Let's, first of all, understand that the biggest problem in this whole process was the deregulation of the financial system. Senator McCain, as recently as March, bragged about the fact that he is a deregulator. On the other hand, two years ago, I said that we've got a sub-prime lending crisis that has to be dealt with. I wrote to Secretary Paulson, I wrote to Federal Reserve Chairman Bernanke, and told them this is something we have to deal with, and nobody did anything about it...he jumped on it a year later.... So look, you're not interested in hearing politicians pointing fingers... What you're interested in is trying to figure out, how is this going to impact you? This is not the end of the process: this is the beginning of the process. And that's why it's going to be so important for us to work with homeowners to make sure that they can stay in their homes."

Here at this point, two other rhetoric's along with a 'repetition' were also observed: 1) two metaphors, when Obama was accusing McCain at how he had ignored a warning by Obama before: 'but McCain jumped on it a year later',

and '*pointing fingers*' when he wanted to mention how McCain had managed to accuse his rival, 2) repetition, when Obama was talking on how his mannerism may affect his country: '*This is not the end of the process; this is the beginning of the process*'. As it is clear, 'process' and 'this is' were repeated twice each as specified in the talk above.

For further evidence, still lots of other propositions could be examined in the following scenes; however, for brevity reasons, at this point, possible inferences are brought to discuss the points in greater depth.

In line with the third research question, all in all, it could be argued that the nature of each political move with specific rhetorical devices was amorphous in the analyzed sample in that not specific political strategies had been mapped over specific rhetoric's but what was clear was that, in the majority of cases, both discursal moves had been used together to reinforce the effect of arguments. This could indicate, as Van Dijk had asserted, surveying both text and context together; this could reveal the nature of discourse better than the time when we examine each individually.

Discussion

The implications from the content analyses on the first three scenes of US presidential events in 2008 are brought to summarize the inferences. In this article, based on the evidence given in the results section, the following interpretations could be enumerated:

- 1) In both talks given by the two political parties, the political candidates had made use of rhetorical and political moves in tandem within the same propositional unit to reinforce the influence of their speech in line with Van Dik's model for PDA (1997). This could indicate how they had realized both macro level (political) and micro level (rhetorical) elements of language realization to strengthen their talk. It could also prove that they had not just devoted their linguistic resources to either rhetorical devices or political strategies exclusively.
- 2) There were cases where some political moves had not been paralleled with any rhetorical devices. 'Number Game' was a case in point in the retrieved document for question no. 1{Position: 17 - 17}.
- 3) There were very rare cases where rhetorical devices had been used but no political moves had been paralleled with them. This signified that rhetorical devices had been used for a political purpose in mind but when the candidates had used any of political strategies, this did not necessarily coincided with using a rhetoric like the Number Game referred to above.
- 4) Within some political and rhetorical moves, some of the discursal forces employed were paralleled with the majority of political strategies like repetition and metaphor. As evidence, a case is brought here from all three speech events analyzed and across the two candidates not to bring any bias to the dataset: 1) The document retrieved for question no. 3, position 6-6: here repetition had been paralleled with disclaimer by McCain, 2) The retrieved document for question no. 2, position: 6-6: here repetition had been mapped over populism by McCain, 3) The document retrieved for question no. 2,

- position 12-12, where Obama used repetition with populism, 4) The document retrieved for question no. 3, position 16-16, by Obama mixing repetition with populism.
- 5) Some rhetorical devices and political strategies had been used to excess compared with other rhetorical devices like 'repetition' (twenty nine cases), 'reference to events and people' with twenty eight entries, and within political strategies 'comparison', 'populism', and 'future representation' with sixteen, sixteen, and fifteen entries respectively.

Conclusion

The innovation in this study was two-fold: 1) It was tried to find two discursal moves in association with one another in a specific context to find any hidden factors that reveal the speakers' ideology and power in using the language to win the political debates. In previous studies, such a measure had been mainly followed through a uni-dimensional CDA, 2) In similar studies, researchers had mostly explored the CDA through quantitative research methodologies by enumerating the number of intended linguistic elements only. This, by intuition, could not reveal all the hidden ideological intentions of the speakers under study to a maximum way. In Wang (2010), for instance, Barack Obama's speech was analyzed in terms of Systematic Functional Linguistics of Halliday and through CDA; he analyzed the speech in terms of modality and transitivity and the functions by enumerating all the instances of tense, voice, and modal verbs to reveal the hidden ideological power of Obama's speech on linguistic grounds. Although this study could indicate some discursal elements pertaining to ideology through analyzing as such, this still needed to be evaluated in terms of specific political moves at macro level as well, which had explicitly been recognized by politicians to be influential. As Van Dijk (1985) asserts, in CDA, as a type of discourse analytical research that primarily studies the way social power abuse, dominance, and inequality are enacted, reproduced, and resisted by text and talk in the social and political context, critical discourse analysts prefer to take explicit positions in order to understand, expose, and ultimately struggle with social equality. Such measures in PDA research methodologies, as was done in the present study, could bring about more straightforward results as desired by Van Dijk. In this regard, it is intended that further research look at other aspects of the socio-political discourses through such means that can hopefully explicitly touch the relationship between ideology, power and language.

References

- Barton, E. (2002). Resources for discourse analysis in composition studies. *Style*, 36(4), 575-594.
<https://www.jstor.org/stable/10.5325/style.36.4.575>
- Biria, R., & Mohammadi, A. (2012). The socio pragmatic functions of inaugural speech: A critical discourse analysis approach, *Journal of pragmatics*, 44(10), 1290-1302.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2012.05.013>
- Blommaert, J., & Bulcaen, C. (2000). Critical discourse analysis. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 29, 447-466.
- Burke, K. (1969). *A rhetoric of motives*. University of California Press.
- Chilton, P., & Schaffner, C. (2002). *Politics as text and talk: Analytic approaches to political discourse*. John Benjamins.
- Deciu Ritivoi, A. (2008). Talking the (political) talk Cold War refugees and their political legitimation through style. In B. Johnstone & C. Eisenhart (Eds.), *Rhetoric in detail* (pp. 32-56). John Benjamins Publishing Co.
- Fairclough, N. (2013). *Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language*. Routledge.
- Higgins, C., & Walker, R. (2012). Ethos, logos, pathos: Strategies of persuasion in social/environmental reports. *Accounting Forum*, 36(3), 194-208.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.accfor.2012.02.003>
- Krzyzanowski, M. (2005). European identity wanted! In on discursive dimensions of the European convention. In R. Wodak & P. A. Chilton (Eds.), *A new agenda in (critical) discourse analysis: Theory, methodology and interdisciplinarity*, (pp. 137-163). Benjamins Co.
- Matlock, T. (2012). Framing political messages with grammar and metaphor. *American Scientist*, 100(6), 478-483.
<http://profpam4peace.pbworks.com>
- Pennycook, A. (2017). *The cultural politics of English as an international language*. Routledge.
<https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315225593>
- Rahimi, M., Amal Saheh, E., & Deghat, S. (2010). The CDA of 2008 presidential campaign speeches of democratic candidates with respect to their gender & race. *Iranian journal of applied linguistics*, 13(2), 75-99.
<https://www.sid.ir/en/journal/ViewPaper.aspx?id=247564>
- Van Dijk, T. A. (1985). *A handbook of discourse analysis*. Academic Press Limited.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (1988). *News analysis: Case studies of international and national news in the press*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (1997). What is political discourse analysis? *Belgian journal of linguistics*, 11(1), 11-52.
<https://e.l.unifi.it/pluginfile.php>
- Van Dijk, T. A. (2006). Ideology and discourse analysis. *Journal of political ideologies*, 11(2), 115-140.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/13569310600687908>
- Van Dijk, T. A. (2011). Discourse and ideology. *Discourse studies: A multidisciplinary introduction*, 379-407.
<http://www.discourses.org/OldArticles/Discourse%20and%20Ideology.pdf>
- Wang, J. (2010). A critical discourse analysis of Barack Obama's speeches. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 1(3), 254-261.
<https://doi.org/10.4304/jltr.1.3.254-261>
- Wodak, R. (2001). What CDA is about: A summary of its history, important concepts and its developments. In R. Wodak & M. Mayer (Eds.), *Methods of critical discourse analysis*, (pp. 1 -13). Sage publications.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.4135/9780857028020>
- Wodak, R., & Weiss, G. (2005). Analyzing European Union discourses: Theories and applications. *A new agenda in (critical) discourse analysis*, 13, 121-135.
- Yin, R. K. (2011). *Qualitative research from start to end*. The Guilford Press.