

*University of Algiers2
Faculty of Letters and Foreign Languages
Department of English*

***A Rhetorical Analysis of the Persuasive
Strategies in Political Discourse
The Case of Barack Obama's Campaign Speeches***

*A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the
degree of the Magister in Linguistics/ Didactics*

Submitted by

Rima MEDJEDOUB

Supervised by

Prof. Fatiha HAMITOUCHE

Academic Year

2014



Examining Board

- Chairman: Professor Zoulikha BENSAFI, University of Algiers 2.
- Supervisor: Professor Fatiha HAMITOUCHE, University of Algiers 2.
- Internal Examiner: Professor Mokhtar MEHAMSADJI, University of Algiers 2.

Declaration

I hereby declare that this dissertation is entirely the result of my investigation, and that due reference or acknowledgement is made, whenever necessary, to the work of other researchers.

Date: 06 May, 2014

Signed: Miss Rima MEDJEDOUB



Acknowledgements

First, my sincere gratitude goes to my supervisor Professor Hamitouche for her invaluable help, wise guidance, immeasurable devotion, unconditioned encouragement and lasting patience. I would like to deeply thank her in particular for allotting time to give me comments and suggestions along the way whenever an appointment was a must. The support I received on her part will always be remembered and forever appreciated.

Special thanks are also due to the examining board members who have accepted to devote their precious time to read this dissertation and function as an advisory panel who would give advice and recommend amendments.

I am here to note my profound indebt to all the authors whose works are cited or discussed in the present thesis for no academic work can boast if not having drawn on previous works on the subject.

Lastly, completing the current work would not have been possible without the generous unending support of my family members. They tirelessly and enthusiastically pushed me to work hard all the way through. I really owe special debt to all of them. Frankly, the memory of my father has also been an important force accompanying me along the process of writing.

Dedication

- ✓ *For my mother,*
- ✓ *For my late father,*
- ✓ *For all my family members.*

Abstract

The present dissertation is the outcome of a long interest in politics, an outstanding importance bestowed on Rhetoric as it aids an individual to improve one's use and knowledge of language, and a high regard for persuasive strategies as they are critical in many spheres. In this dissertation, I analyzed persuasive political discourse applying a rhetorical framework so as to answer the following questions: what are the employed persuasive devices? how are they used? and what are their effects? The contribution of this research lies in (i) providing answers to these questions and (ii) suggesting an inductive perspective to carry out rhetorical analyses. This new perspective is grounded in Burke's cluster analysis method which has originally been proposed to discern the rhetors' motives. The data are comprised of three 2012 campaign speeches of Barack Obama.

In spite of the fact that the newly suggested method cannot account for all the persuasive techniques, including the paralinguistic and prosodic features; the results proved its efficiency as it permitted the identification of a combination of strategies Obama utilized. They are: arguments (reasoning, statistics, and authorities), emotional arousals (hope, needs, fear, humour, values and ideals), credibility, scapegoating, attack, and metaphor. They work mutually to guarantee persuasion albeit the existence of a heavy reliance on pathos.

The findings of such a work can be a source for both teachers and students of discourse analysis, literature and written expression. Similar future studies applying cluster analysis and incorporating a larger corpus could form a basis to formulate a theory on persuasive discourse. Furthermore, the current dissertation can be regarded as an initial step towards conducting research on the degree of benefit the English students will gain if rhetoric is introduced in their curriculum.

Contents

General Introduction

General Introduction	2
Rationale	3
Research Question	5
Aims of the Study	6
Corpus	6
Method of Analysis	6
Significance of the Study	8
Organization of the Dissertation	9

Chapter One: On Discourse, Rhetoric and Persuasion

1.0. Introduction	11
1.1. Discourse	11
1.1.1. Definition of Discourse.....	11
1.1.2. Discourse Types	15
1.1.3. Discourse and Rhetoric	15
1.2. Discourse Analysis	16
1.3. Political Discourse	18
1.4. Political Speech	21
1.5. Persuasion	22
1.6. Rhetoric	24
1.7. Rhetorical Criticism and Analysis	28
1.8. Conclusion	29

Chapter Two: Rhetorical Theories and Methods

2.0. Introduction	32
2.1. Classical Rhetoric	33
2.1.1. Rhetoric in Ancient Greek.....	33
2.1.1.1. The Sophists	33
2.1.1.2. Plato.....	34
2.1.1.3. Aristotle	34
2.1.2. Rhetoric in Ancient Rome	38

2.1.2.1. Cicero.....	38
2.1.2.2. Quintilian.....	41
2.2.Rhetoric in the Middle Ages	41
2.3.Rhetoric in the Renaissance and Early Modern Periods.....	43
2.4. Contemporary Rhetoric.....	44
2.4.1. The Social Movement Approach.....	45
2.4.2. The Identification Approach.....	46
2.4.3. The New Rhetoric Approach.....	47
2.4.4. Toulmin's Approach.....	49
2.4.5. The metaphoric Approach.....	51
2.4.6. The Fantasy Theme Approach.....	53
2.4.7. The Narrative Approach.....	54
2.4.8. A Revised Version of Cluster Analysis.....	55
2.4.8.1. The Theory.....	56
2.4.8.2. The Analysis steps.....	57
2.4.8.3. Criticism.....	59
2.5.Conclusion.....	60

Chapter three: Methodology and Analysis

3.0.Introduction.....	62
3.1. Methodology.....	62
3.1.1. Research Design.....	62
3.1.2. Research Tool.....	63
3.1.3. Procedure.....	63
3.1.4. Data	63
3.1.5. Triangulation.....	66
3.2. The Analysis of the Rhetorical Situation.....	66
3.2.1. Context.....	66
3.2.2. Audience.....	67
3.2.3. The Orator Barack Obama.....	68
3.3. Data Analysis.....	69
3.3.1. The Identification of the Key Terms.....	69
3.3.1.1. The frequency Criterion.....	69
i. Speech (A)	69
ii. Speech (B)	70
iii. Speech (C)	71
3.3.1.2. The Intensity Criterion.....	71

3.3.2. The Analysis of the Speeches.....	73
3.3.2.1. The Analysis of Speech (A)	73
i. The Key Term ‘job’.....	73
ii. The Key Term ‘manufacturing’	74
iii. The Key Term ‘American’	77
iv. The Key Term ‘future’	77
3.3.2.2. The Analysis of Speech (B)	78
i. The Key Term ‘tax(es)’	78
ii. The Key Term ‘plan’	80
iii. The Key Term ‘grow’	82
iv. The Key Term ‘voices’	82
v. The Key Term ‘middle class’	83
vi. The key Term ‘nation’	84
3.3.2.3. The Analysis of Speech (C)	85
i. The Key Term ‘fight’	85
ii. The Key Term ‘country’	87
iii. The Key Term ‘change’	88
iv. The Key Term ‘storm’	90
v. The Key Term ‘opportunity’	91
3.4. Conclusion.....	91

Chapter four: Discussion and Interpretation of the Results

4.0. Introduction.....	94
4.1. The Rhetorical Strategies Effects.....	94
4.1.1. Arguments.....	95
4.1.1.1. <i>Cause-and-Effect Reasoning</i>	95
4.1.1.2. Reasoning from Analogy.....	97
4.1.1.3. Appeal to Authorities.....	98
4.1.1.4. Statistics	98
4.1.2. Emotional Appeals.....	99
4.1.2.1. Hope.....	99
4.1.2.2. Appeal to needs.....	99
4.1.2.3. Fear.....	100
4.1.2.4. Humour.....	101
4.1.2.5. Values and Ideals.....	101
i. values	102
ii. ideals	104

4.1.3. Credibility	106
4.1.4. Scapegoating.....	108
4.2.5. Attack.....	109
4.2.6. Metaphor.....	111
4.1.6.1. Game Metaphor.....	111
4.1.6.2. Regenerative Metaphor.....	112
4.1.6.3. Personification.....	112
4.1.6.4. Construction Metaphor.....	113
4.1.6.5. The Journey Metaphor	113
4.1.6.6. The War Metaphor.....	114
4.2. General Discussion.....	114
4.3. Implications.....	119
4.4. Limitations of the Study.....	121
4.5. Suggestions for Future Research.....	122
4.6. Conclusion.....	123
General Conclusion.....	125
Bibliography.....	129
Appendices	
Appendix 1: Speech (A)	143
Appendix 2: Speech (B)	150
Appendix 3: Speech (C)	169
Abstract in Arabic.....	179

List of Tables

Table 3.1. The frequency of the most repeated words in speech (A)	69
Table 3.2. The frequency of the most repeated words in speech (B)	70
Table 3.3. The frequency of the most repeated words in speech (C)	71

General Introduction



General Introduction

Oratory depends upon more than making a collection of statements worthy of belief, because speech is directed to listeners whose minds are different from the mind of the speaker and who are already flooded daily with thousands of statements demanding assent. If one's speech is to get through to them – or to be listened to at all – it must be interesting and persuasive. To fulfill these requirements successfully, a rhetor's address must contain some strategies; these so-called persuasive strategies are the subject matter of rhetoric.

So, it is the task of the rhetorical theory to pave the way for a successful persuasive endeavor. The most common use of the rhetorical theory is within political speeches. The study of persuasion has a long and illustrious history in the rhetorical tradition. Born of the need to educate for citizenship, rhetoric traditionally has been concerned with the techniques of persuasion.

In point of fact, political scientists, linguists and discourse analysts focus on different aspects when they discuss the relationship between language and politics; in doing so, they apply different theories and methods (Schaffner & Kelly-Holmes, eds., 1996). When speaking of methodologies, linguists have, until fairly recently, focused in their analyses of discourse on the way discourse is structured, style is employed, and semantic meanings are used. They were not very much interested in how language is utilized for effective communication only after rhetorical analysis has seen a sort of revival, after a long period of disuse. Now political oratory has been – and is being – investigated by rhetoricians who have analyzed the argumentation and the other different strategies used by political figures from Cicero to Martin Luther King Jr. (Leibold, 1993).

Following their model, the current thesis will analyse a sample of the US 2012 campaign speeches delivered by Obama applying the cluster analysis method. I will investigate Obama's use of rhetorical strategies as part of his struggle to gain and maintain his position in the White House.

Rationale

The current enterprise is an analysis of political persuasive discourse carried out within the framework of the cluster analysis rhetorical method. In fact, this topic reveals my deep interest in rhetoric and politics. This is attributed to some factors. First, recently, there has been a revival in rhetorical studies which has focused attention on communication and discourse. As LaCapra (1985) puts it: “The study of rhetoric is once again on the agenda of humanistic studies” (as cited in Moberg, 1990: 15). This renewed interest in rhetoric is evident through its inclusion in English Departments in American universities because of its importance in writing. Internationally, “scholars in English and communication are making serious efforts to include and study the rhetorical theories and practices of Europe, Africa, and Asia” (Lunsford et al. eds, 2009: xii). All this means that the rhetorical theory and practice are becoming ‘fashionable’ and it is not uncommon for me to get attracted to new trends and approaches. Yet, not anything new is attractive. My decision to carry out this research is based on the belief that a discourse analysis using a rhetorical frame is a step towards understanding how language is used not only correctly and appropriately but, equally important, effectively. Enkvist (1985) describes rhetoric as “existing across word, sentence, and discourse level which ignores the borders that are created by grammar and syntax which linguists are used to” (14).

Moreover, I deemed rhetoric important for its association with persuasion – since rhetoric is defined as the art of persuasion. For me, persuasive skills are valuable because they are highly employed in social and work situations; persuasive discourse can be found in various disciplines: media, advertising, and politics; it also goes on in courtrooms, universities, and the business world. LaCapra (1985 as cited in Moberg, 1990: 15) notes that rhetoric is “not a ‘skill,’ like carpentry, but the motor for engaging in social life.” Raymond (1982: 781), on his part, remarks: “Rhetoric, applied to the humanities or any other field is even less certain than science, but also more useful.” Therefore, we, as language learners, need to know these persuasive strategies and how they are used in order then to benefit from them in writing effectively, getting empowered

for rigorous and constructive debates, and even protecting ourselves from intellectual despotism. In other terms, rhetoric equips us with the ability to transform our thoughts and ideas into words so as to efficiently persuade others to adopt them.

It is my contention that in order to know how various persuasive strategies are used, we need to extract them from and examine their use in a discourse. It is not enough to highlight only one rhetorical technique such as Saarikangas (2010) who concentrated only on argumentation using Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteka in her study of recession rhetoric in Finnish budget presentations and Smith and Voth (2002) who studied just the role of humor in political campaigns.

Although persuasive discourse is encountered in diverse disciplines, I have opted for the discipline of politics. This choice is not made randomly. First, I have always been interested in the field of politics and wondered about how politicians use language to fulfil their ends and win public consensus. Second, political discourse is primarily focused on persuading people to take specified political actions, to make crucial political decisions, or to convince the potential electorate. Third, though persuasion is one of the major aims of a political discourse, rhetorical analyses have received scant attention; most of the previous studies on political discourse have been done with the application of Critical Discourse Analysis to analyze ideology and power (e.g. Fairclough, 1989 and van Dijk, 1993), and frames (e.g. Rhee, 1997). I think, politicians, and specialists in other fields, need to be provided with descriptions of the persuasive tools necessary to succeed in their job, a task to be assigned to linguists especially that we know that the study of language in use is the principal concern of applied linguistics, indeed its *raison d'être*.

Another motive behind my choice to conduct this research is that I came across rhetorical analyses which turn to be mere descriptions or summaries of a text but they do not tell of the effects of each rhetorical factor in the passage. In this work, I am going to avoid such a deficiency by analyzing the speeches, identifying the rhetorical strategies and say how they are used to create an impact on the audience. To be sure, it

will not be a psychological analysis. That is to say, there is no interest in the writer's psychology, neither his thoughts nor in his feelings when he was jotting them down. Instead, I will be interested in how the writer strategically used the language to affect the reader in some way. Emphasis will be placed on how the text is trying to control, influence, or affect the reader.

What pushed me to work on this topic, moreover, is the belief that such an analysis may attract the language teachers' and students' attention to the persuasive strategies. On the one hand, this research might help teachers become more aware of and make use of them in teaching writing and analyzing written texts. On the other hand, students may, via practice, learn how to use them in their writings.

Last but not least, I opted for campaign speeches for: (a) they are rarely analysed in the English departments and (b) the rhetor is in a situation where he has all the motives to make use of diverse techniques to gain the maximum of electorate votes. The selection of Obama's speeches is due to the fact that media has ranked him among the world best orators in the modern era – a black of Muslim roots who managed to persuade his countrymen to vote for him.

Research Question

Considering the above motives, the present research has addressed the following set of questions:

- i.** What persuasive strategies are used in Barack Obama's 2012 electoral campaign speeches?
- ii.** How does he use them?
- iii.** What are the possible effects of these rhetorical persuasive strategies on the audience?

Aims of the Study

Hence, this research has been carried out with the aim to:

- i.** identify and analyse specific rhetorical persuasive devices of a political discourse-in our case, the 2012 US electoral campaign speeches of Barack Obama;
- ii.** describe how the identified strategies are used;
- iii.** discuss the possible effects the identified persuasive strategies may have on the audience;
- iv.** show how various rhetorical strategies are revealed in the most innocent-seeming terms and expressions; and
- v.** look for those persuasive strategies using, for the first time in rhetorical theory, an inductive approach.

Corpus

The corpus of analysis is made up of three speeches on economy from Barack Obama's 2012 electoral campaign. It is crystal clear that these addresses belong to the same speaker, period, event and issue. This is just for the sake of keeping the analysis focused. If I had chosen other candidates in other periods, I would have ended up with a superficial work. I would like to call attention to the fact that the speeches have the characteristics of a written text. They were prepared and rehearsed for delivery.

Method of Analysis

To undertake a discourse analysis, I undoubtedly need a framework, a method. Foss (1989) gives three possibilities when selecting a method: use of an existing method, creation of a method from an existing concept, or creation of a new method. In this dissertation, I decided on the second option in that I draw on Burke's cluster analysis to provide a framework for this research.

Cluster analysis was initially formulated by Burke (1969) to study a writer's motives. Later on, it was used to discern a rhetor's ideology and to detect a text type

but I redirected its use towards the identification of a writer's persuasive strategies. With this completely novel use of Burke's cluster analysis, I will supply a new approach to analysing persuasive discourse, an approach which will help identify a speaker's persuasive strategies on the grounds of key linguistic items and items surrounding them. One can wonder if there is really a need to a new perspective of analysis. It is true that rhetoricians have provided different approaches to the analysis of persuasive texts such as the traditional theory of Aristotle (1991), the identification theory of Burke (1969), and the argumentation theory of Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca (1969); nonetheless, most such work, if not all of it, can be considered top-down in orientation (this will be proved through the survey about the most prominent rhetorical theories in the second chapter of the thesis). Thus, any analysis will be confined to the lenses of the selected rhetorical theories. Such approaches to rhetorical criticism risks imposing theoretical structures on a text that may resist them. The ready-made framework permits looking for elements discussed in the theories and present within the texts whilst ignoring other devices that might be missing from the theories yet existent in the texts. However, an inductive approach to research, where one lets the texts guide the findings, would rather prevent predetermined results and could help achieve a thorough investigation of a variety of the persuasive devices included in a discourse.

Additionally, within the deductive paradigm, the same results are most likely to emerge from the analysis of any texts that falls under the persuasive category; however, not all texts are similar in their linguistic forms. Such approaches must, therefore, be complemented by bottom-up approaches whereby analyses depart from features internal to the language of the texts.

Furthermore, the use of the traditional deductive rationale have customarily necessitated searching an artifact before deciding on a method so as to consider suitable methodological approaches to reduce the likelihood that an artifact will be 'forced to fit' into a method that is inappropriate for that discourse. A bottom-up procedure will open room for either choosing a method first or an artifact first because,

surely, such a perspective is capable of closely capturing the persuasive elements embedded in a text.

In sum, what I will bring to the field of Discourse Analysis is an alternative inductive systematic method for analyzing persuasive strategies in a discourse. I will, besides, demonstrate the utility of this method by applying it for the ultimate goal of identifying the rhetorical strategies deployed in Barack Obama's 2012 campaign rhetoric.

Significance of the Study

The high significance of the current research is displayed via the invaluable theoretical and practical contributions it is supposed to bring. Theoretically, this thesis will, on the one hand, demonstrate that cluster analysis, a method generated just to identify a rhetor's motives, can be used as a tool to analyse persuasive strategies. On the other hand, this deeply implies that it is an occasion to integrate theory and practice since we need theory to do analysis and analysis to contribute to the modification and application of theory (Campbell, 1996). In other terms, a broadened application of cluster analysis, which is a bottom-top approach, can permit to see gaps in the already laid rhetorical theories. The information my analysis generates, together with other information by more future similar analyses, could be exploited to lay out a rhetorical theory informed by practice. By so doing, I am following Hart (1986) who claims that critics do not have to choose between studying texts and contributing to theory; productive criticism can do both, regardless of the critic's intention.

The thesis findings, besides, are expected to be a source in discourse studies; they would give insights on how persuasive choices are made in the political speech genre and tell what effects these choices could have on the receivers. Through this work, it would be apparent that not only word choice and sentence form can combine to create an effective discourse but rhetorical strategies also contribute to doing so.

Practically, this dissertation is expected to be an additional material for teachers who deliver discourse analysis courses. It is also supposed to offer students a step-by-step procedure on how to conduct a discourse analysis with the application of the cluster method. Thus, they would learn how to analyze discourse, how to read texts and understand them thoroughly, how to reflect on their readings, and how to expand their critical thinking abilities. Students, in addition, will be in a better position to develop and put into practice tools and techniques to communicate more clearly and effectively. Undeniably, developing one's rhetorical abilities aids to enhance intellectual abilities. Moreover, this research results could constitute a contribution to future researchers who are interested in conducting research on similar topics. More affirmatively, they possess practical applicability in the sense that they are expected to be a reference for students who might become speech writers as they may guide them in how to use language artfully to persuade the intended audience. Furthermore, the study of key symbols and their clusters could offer an effective working vocabulary for those would-be speech writers.

Organization of the Dissertation

Now, it is time to present the skeleton of the current dissertation. It is a total of four chapters. The first chapter spells out the meanings of key terms in the thesis. In so doing, I would illuminate these concepts and avoid confusion as well. Chapter two sketches the rhetorical heritage in the classical and modern periods. It traces also the development of the rhetorical theory and rhetorical methods of analysis in the contemporary era. This chapter ends with an adapted version of the cluster analysis method, borrowed from Burke to be the theoretical premise that has guided my analysis. As it would be too ambitious, and maybe irrelevant, an enterprise to include all the theories ever since the rise of rhetoric, I have considered but those that can be used to study a persuasive discourse. Using the previous material as a backdrop, the third chapter is dedicated to the analysis of the corpus. Its results are presented and discussed in the final chapter so as to answer the research questions. It is to be noted that persuasion is omnipresent throughout the whole research.

Chapter One:

On Discourse, Rhetoric and

Persuasion

Chapter One: On Discourse, Rhetoric and Persuasion

1.0. Introduction

The present thesis is concerned with the analysis of the rhetorical persuasive strategies in Barack Obama's discourse. The key terms in this endeavour are discourse, discourse analysis, rhetoric and persuasion. Undoubtedly, we cannot proceed without shedding some light on them. Besides, it is common for one concept to have slightly different definitions and interpretations. Inconsistency in the use of concepts may cause problems; therefore, one should aim at precision via this chapter which is divided into six sections. It commences with an exploration of the term discourse, briefly maps out its history and discusses some of its major definitions. Then, it throws light on particular issues which are of interest to discourse analysis such as the relationship between language and social context. In the third and fourth sections, it addresses the notions of political discourse and political speech as they are, respectively, a type and a genre of persuasive discourse. The fifth section incorporates a definition of persuasion and some of the previous studies dealing with persuasive strategies and rhetoric. Lastly, the concept of rhetoric will be dealt with in the sixth section where the definitional and historical debate vis-à-vis the extension of the term is highlighted. The section also provides an explanation of the sameness, in terms of purpose and uses, of rhetorical analysis and rhetorical criticism.

1.1. Discourse

For several decades, 'discourse' has been a fashionable term. It is often used in various debates without being defined. The concept has become vague and acquired different meanings in different contexts (Jørgensen & Phillips, 2002). I will try, in what follows, to delimit its meaning in this dissertation along with outlining its types and discussing its relationship with rhetoric.

1.1.1. Definition of Discourse

The notion of discourse is employed across a range of disciplines, including linguistics, to mean “something as specific as spoken language, or something as general as the social process of communication” (Lemke, 1995: 6). As a matter of fact, there is no precise succinct and all-embracing definition of discourse. The multiplicity of disciplines and approaches that study written or spoken communication makes any attempt to define discourse a difficult task; it is not my aim, here, to provide a comprehensive overview of all the approaches. The objective is to present central ideas that have influenced the development of the concept of *discourse* and its most significant definitions in linguistics.

In fact, I found it inconvenient not to allude to Harris (1952), the first linguist to introduce the term discourse analysis. After that traditional linguistics had concentrated on sentence-centered analysis (Paltridge, 2012), Harris investigated the connectedness of sentences and noted that the most complete unit of language is discourse, not a sentence. He claimed explicitly that discourse is the next level in a hierarchy of morphemes, clauses and sentences. Structuralism was so central to Harris’s view of discourse in that he opposed discourse to a random sequence of sentences on the basis that the former has structure: a pattern by which its segments occur (and recur) relative to each other.

It appeared that many properties of the sentence, not only morphophonological and syntactical, but above all semantic and pragmatic, cannot adequately account for language use without taking into account structures of other sentences in the discourse and other features as context and culture i.e. the unit of analysis has to be more embracing: discourse as a whole. It was shown that sentence sequences have important linguistic characteristics of their own, such as connection, coherence, topics and changes of topics, turn taking systems in conversation, and so forth. So, not all dimensions of discourse belong solely to linguistics or grammar, they should be described in terms of theories of narrative, style, conversation, rhetoric, to name but

these. This is because the true meaning of a sentence cannot be assigned only by its linguistic construction but it largely depends on the internal context, the situational context and the exterior world as a whole, that is the sociopolitical and historical contexts (Reisigl & Wodak, 2001: 41). Chomsky (2002: 103-104) states it this way,

To understand a sentence we must know more than the analysis of this sentence on each linguistic level naturally, grammar cannot be expected to be of much help here.

The totality of these ideas pushed linguists to be much more concerned with the way language is used than what its components are.

Once discourse has been developed as an object of investigation, research in this area has started to flow from different academic fields and the term discourse has begun to be conceptualized in quite different ways depending on the theoretical affiliations of and views adopted by the analyst. Schiffrin (1994) contends that all the definitions of discourse fall into three main categories. To start with, discourse is regarded as a unit of language beyond the sentence, a definition derived from the formalist paradigm whose focus is on the way different units function in relation to each other (van Dijk, 1985). The functional paradigm, by contrast, defines discourse as language use; functionalists observe the relationship discourse has with context and they give much importance to the purposes and functions of language. They are interested in the way in which people use language to achieve certain communicative goals. An attempt to bridge the formalist-functionalist dichotomy resulted in viewing discourse as utterances where the relationship between form (structure) and function is an important issue. Utterances, here, are the smaller units of which discourse is comprised and discourse “arises as a collection of inherently contextualized units of language use” Schiffrin (1994: 39). As a whole, there is now a shift of focus from sentences in isolation to utterances in context: to study language in use is to study it as discourse. In this connection, Nunan (1993) says that discourse forms a complete meaningful unit conveying a complete message. In the light of this, larger units such as conversations, interviews and speeches all seem to fall under the rubric of discourse

since they are linguistic performances complete in themselves. In a nutshell, discourse cannot be confined to sentential boundaries. Any series of speech events or any combination of sentences wherein successive sentences or utterances hang together is discourse.

Before closing this subsection, I want to shed some light on different points. Matthews (2005: 100) defines discourse as “any coherent succession of sentences, spoken or written.” Such a definition implies that the term discourse might refer only to the spoken and written forms of language. This is obvious. What is not that obvious is that this is a narrow definition of discourse. A broader sense of the term draws more on the shared ways in which people make sense of things within a given culture or context. Such a view is grounded on Crystal’s (1997) conceptualization of discourse as a stretch of language, spoken or written, in context. It is the definition I shall follow in this thesis for though there are features which characterize written language in contrast with the spoken language (like absence of incomplete sentences) (Brown and Yule 1983), I do not want to make a distinction between spoken and written discourse since I intend to analyse campaign speeches and we know that most of them are written, either prior to – or following – delivery.

I will, further, consider the term text in its broad sense that could place it on a par with the term discourse. For, Nunan (1993) these two terms are sometimes used interchangeably. Certain discussions among linguists about the issue of substituting one term with another have occurred, yet most of them do not pay any attention to the difference. Chafe, for instance, claims, “Both terms may refer to a unit of language larger than the sentence: one may speak of ‘a discourse’ or ‘a text’” (1992 as cited in Widdowson, 2007: 86). He admits that placing the term ‘discourse’ and the term ‘text’ on the same level is common in linguistics and in no case is perceived to be a mistake.

1.1.2. Discourse types

Purpose, genre, form, or subject are all criteria upon which the categorization of discourse is based. The peculiarities of a given discourse type can govern the typicalities of language (as form and strategies) used and determine a text's success or failure (Beal, 1987), hence the importance of the identification of text types. Since “purpose is the strongest of the defining features” (95), a taxonomy of discourse according to its aims bears inclusion in this dissertation as we are dealing with discourse whose aim is to persuade. Beal (1987) suggests four types of discourse whose definitions follow.

a. *Instrumental Discourse*: it is a discourse whose aim is to govern, guide, control order or even execute; it is an instrumental discourse. Examples of such a type include: contracts, constitutions, laws, reports, recipes, and manuals of operation.

b. *Scientific Discourse*: its purpose is the discovery, construction, and organization of knowledge. Reports of investigations and theoretical treatises are genres within the scientific discourse.

c. *Poetic Discourse*: its primary aim is to instill enjoyment and reflection, through poems, stories and novels, and the like, in the spirits of its recipients.

d. *Rhetorical Discourse*: it aims at influencing the understanding and behaviour of the human being. It includes a wide range of types from commercial promotions, to trials, to public addresses. From the meaning assigned to rhetorical discourse, we understand that Beal was certainly speaking of persuasive discourse.

1.1.3. Discourse and Rhetoric

Traditional rhetorical theory defines rhetoric as art: “the art of discovering the means of persuasion” (Aristotle, 1991). At the same time, Aristotle, Cicero and Quintilian, view rhetoric as “a kind of discourse, a particular sphere of discourse activity defined... on topics that are generally subject to diversities of opinion, and on

occasion such as those provided by legislative assemblies , law courts, and public ceremonies” (Beal, 1987: 31).

What has traditionally been called rhetoric, that is, the practice and study of good public speaking and writing in parliament, in court, or literature, is often referred to in contemporary times as discourse studies. Today sometimes the new rhetoric is defined as a subdiscipline in the humanities that overlaps with discourse studies. Rhetoric, in this case, is associated with the study of discourse in general.

A more precise explanation of what makes rhetoric a subdiscipline of discourse studies relies on the fact that special rhetorical structures can be used in any discourse to convey or produce specific effects, persuasion for instance. Their role is to emphasize or deemphasize meaning to influence the recipients. A study of such a discourse could involve an analysis of these rhetorical structures. Strictly speaking, such analyses cannot be limited to those structures only, they also deal with the cognitive effects of language use on listeners or readers as well as on the whole communicative context.

1.2. Discourse Analysis

Discourse analysis is both an old and a new discipline. Its origins can be traced back to classical rhetoric (van Dijk, 1985). Indeed, the emergence of discourse analysis can be rendered to the decline of rhetoric as an independent academic discipline paralleled with the emergence of historical and comparative linguistics and the birth of the structural analysis of language along with new developments in other disciplines.

At the outset, Harris (1952) viewed discourse analysis procedurally as a formal methodology, derived from structural methods of linguistic analysis: such a methodology could break a text down into relationships (such as equivalence, substitution) among its lower-level constituents.

Discourse analysis has been defined in multiple ways. In Brown and Yule's (1983) terms, discourse analysis is committed to an investigation of what and how language is used for. Put another way, discourse analysis is concerned with the language used for communication, how the language user employs texts to convey their intended meaning and how the addressee works on linguistic messages in order to interpret them (Brown & Yule, 1983: 1). Trudgill (1992) notes that discourse analysis investigates linguistic units at levels above the sentence. It follows that discourse analysis shifts the focus from the intra-sentential relations and takes it one step further to examine the interplay of language items and the way they merge with the external world to get their real communicative intent. In the same vein, Stubbs (1983: 131) contends that: "Any study which is not dealing with (a) single sentences, (b) contrived by the linguist, (c) out of context, may be called discourse analysis." Nunan (1993) specifies the components of extra-linguistic context as follows: (1) the type of the communicative event (joke, story, lecture, greeting, conversation, etc); (2) the topic; (3) the purpose of the event; (4) the setting including both location and time; (5) the participants and the relationships between them; and (6) the background knowledge and assumption underlying the communicative event.

We understand that the objective of discourse analysis has become to examine and explain how stretches of language considered in their full contextual, social, and psychological factors become meaningful and unified for their users (Cook, 1989). Along the same line of thought, Schiffrin (1994: 419) says that:

To understand the language of discourse, then, we need to understand the world in which it resides: and to understand the world in which language resides, we need to go outside of linguistics.

This provides the most basic reason for the interdisciplinary basis of discourse analysis. The construction of discourse itself involves several processes that operate simultaneously. Probing into this construction requires analytical tools that derive from linguistics, sociology, psychology, anthropology, philosophy, communication,

semiotics and rhetoric. The selection of one of these tools depends on the aspect of language being emphasized.

As for the object of study, discourse analysis has been used to understand a wide range of texts including natural speech, conversations, written stories, description of medical procedures, sermons, professional documentation, political speeches, interview or focus group material, internet communication, journals and news reports, TV advertisements, broadcast media, etc. Discourse analysts, in their study of this wide range of objects, notice patterns of language in use and the circumstances (participants, situations, purposes, outcomes) with which these are typically associated. The discourse analyst's particular contribution to this otherwise mundane activity is to do the task consciously, deliberately, systematically, and, as far as possible, objectively, and to produce their investigations results in the form of descriptions, interpretations, and explanations.

Finally, a distinction is to be made between analysing discourse as an end in itself and analysing it as a means to some other end. The first is the purpose of those whose disciplinary affiliation is to linguistics – they are primarily concerned with the description and understanding of the complex structures and mechanisms of socially situated language-use. Here, discourse analysis is an area of study relevant to linguistics. The second one, however, is the case where discourse analysis is a methodology of research; many of the researchers in other fields – including linguists – “are more interested in this idea that ‘life is in many ways a series of conversations’, which implies that people’s talk can be a source of evidence about other aspects of their lives” (Cameron, 2001: 8-9).

1.3. Political Discourse

To begin with, political discourse, a sub-category of discourse in general, can be based on two criteria: functional and thematic (Schaffner, 1996). Its function varies according to the nature of political activities and its topics are primarily related to

politics such as political activities, political ideas and political relations. Perhaps a more accurate definition will be that of van Dijk (1995). He is away from such a simplification that names any discourse about politics or by politicians a political discourse; rather, he identifies political discourse by its participants (actors, recipients), nature of the activities or practices, and context. The following example fulfills the requirements of this definition and illustrates it: a speech delivered in an electoral campaign by a candidate trying to persuade the audience to vote for them in a place appropriate for such a meeting and during the period dedicated for the electoral campaign. For van Dijk (1995), politicians talk politically only if they themselves and their talk are contextualized¹ in such political communicative events like parliamentary sessions or interviews with the media, that take place mostly in institutional settings. Examples of political discourse include: cabinet meetings, government deliberations, election campaigns, bills and laws, party programs, bureaucratic documents, media interviews, protests by opposition parties and organizations, and political speeches. We notice that political discourse is not a genre, but a class of genres defined by the domain of politics (van Dijk, 1998).

Drawing on van Dijk's definition, we can understand that the integration of political texts and contexts in political events may result in accomplishing specific political goals such as making or influencing political decisions, distributing social resources, enacting regulations and laws, and the like. To reach these goals, every participant would attempt to persuade the others in the direction of his/her own views, values or plans (van Dijk, 1995). This brings us to conclude that political discourse is, by nature, persuasive.

Once political discourse is confined to the institutionally bound text and talk of politicians and its function is delimited by persuasion, our next task is to

1- The distinguishing properties of political discourse are largely contextual; otherwise, private talks on political issues, the use of lexical and stylistic linguistic instruments characterizing discussions about political matters, and political media language would be part of political discourse but they are not. The phrase 'political language' has been proposed as the generic term to comprise all of those types including institutional discourse.

systematically describe the genres that belong to that domain. First, any description of political discourse should not privilege text and neglect context since this latter is a defining factor. Second, on the whole, political discourse is characterized by a general formality at the levels of lexis, syntax, topics, rhetoric, strategies, and so on. The sides that can be studied include: topics, coherence, arguments, lexical choices, style, disclaimers and many rhetorical features (metaphors, euphemisms, hyperboles, etc.). An analysis of a political discourse may of course reveal much about the unique character of such a type, and also allows inferences about its cognitive, social and especially linguistic functions (Dedaic', 2005).

According to Jones and Peccei (2004), the success of politicians throughout ages has been attributed to their skilful use of rhetoric by which they aim to persuade their audience of the validity of their views. Historically, the study of political discourse has been motivated by an interest in improving discourse and maximizing its societal effects. For this sake, its investigation has long been carried out from a rhetorical perspective.

Rhetorical scholars have been interested in studying the internal dynamics of political discourse not via summarizing it but by describing how a speech works as a rhetorical appeal. This process permits the examination of the content, strategies and effects of the discourse, which in turn allows the comprehension of how the speaker seeks to influence an audience. It also aids to evaluate both the effectiveness of the speech as a rhetorical appeal and its and political implications. Rhetorical approaches to political discourse usually highlight the dynamic relationships among speaker, text and audience which are considered to be elements of the rhetorical situation. Speeches by world leaders especially American political leaders have usually been subjected to rhetorical criticism. For instance, Calderwood (2012) analysed rhetorically President Barack Obama's speeches on climate change using Bitzer's rhetorical situation and Burke's cluster analysis to determine the motives and ideologies of the rhetor.

1.4. Political Speech

Political speeches are a genre of political discourse produced orally by politicians in front of an audience; they are usually carefully crafted by professional speechwriters, the fact that leaves no room for improvisations on the part of the speaker. Their purpose is primarily persuasion rather than information or entertainment. So, such a speech is produced with the aim to convince the audience to decide according to the orator's proposal or, at least, to persuade them that the orator's opinions, advice or decisions are correct or plausible (Dedaic', 2005). This is because politics involves concepts and contexts that are often essentially contested (Freeden, 1998). It goes without saying that each party in the contest seeks to convince the other of the merits of its policies by means of, among others, language. In this case, the political speech becomes an argument of some kind. It represents an attempt: to provide others with reasons for thinking, feeling or acting in some particular way; to motivate them; to invite them to trust one in uncertain conditions; and to get them to see situations in a certain light. Such speeches must, in some measure, adapt to audiences, confirming their expectations and respecting their boundaries, even when they try to transform them. They must develop images of the situation that is intrinsically persuasive.

As a matter of fact, public speeches are a vital pan of political campaigns because they are used to introduce politicians to the public, to present issue positions, and to motivate their audience to take action to their advantage. Shaw (1999) stresses the fact that speeches by candidates and presidents can influence the public opinion. He lists a number of studies showing that campaign speeches do influence voters and the conclusion of his own research does confirm this belief. In an extensive literature review, Rottinghaus (2006) finds evidence that presidents use rhetoric as a governing mechanism to arouse public support for their policies. While in office, politicians continually utilize campaign-like speechmaking tactics to keep the public focused on issues they judge important and to maintain a positive image in the media. Since presidents' and candidates' speeches aim mostly at maintaining or altering opinions and attitudes, they are rich in persuasive techniques and they are worth examining in academic studies.

As for the approaches to analyzing political speeches, they generally look at the ways to relate the details of linguistic behavior to political behavior. Linguists are interested in the linguistic structures used to get politically relevant messages across to the addressees to achieve a specific function or goal. This can be done from two perspectives. The first one implies starting from the linguistic micro-level and asking which strategic functions word choice or specific structures help to fulfill. With regard to word choice one can investigate: vague or imprecise words and phrases, euphemisms, metaphors, and pronominal choices. Specific syntactic structure of the sort of rhetorical questions, speech acts, textual complexity, and validity claims (Dedaic', 2005) can also be dealt with. The second perspective suggests starting from a macro-level (the communicative situation and the function of a text) and asking which linguistic structures have been chosen to fulfill this function (Dedaic', 2005).

To end this discussion, a word should be said about the types of political speeches. They can be categorized by occasion (commemorative, inaugural, farewell, victory, proposing a bill, disputing a bill), speaker (national leader, parliamentarian, political candidate, leader of a national or international political organization), and audience (local, national, international; immediate, TV, or a mixture of some of them). Among these, presidential along with parliamentary and campaign speeches have attracted the most attention from linguists (Dedaic', 2005).

1.5. Persuasion

Persuasion is a form of influence that achieves its goal by guiding people toward the adoption of an idea, attitude, belief, viewpoint, behavior, intention, feeling and/or action through appeals to reason, emotions, or some other means rather than force (Seiter & Gass, 2004). Persuasion is defined as a process in which listeners change their opinions under the influence of some discourse (van Dijk, 1998). The very fact that this discourse can influence listeners and their reasoning means that the speaker can influence their subsequent activities and participation in society (van Dijk, 2003). O'Keefe (2002) argues that there are requirements for the sender, the means, and the recipient to consider something persuasive. First, a persuasive message must involve a

goal and the intent to achieve that goal on the part of the message sender. Second, communication is the means to achieve that goal. Third, the message recipient must have free will (i.e., threatening or physical harm if the recipient doesn't comply are usually considered force, not persuasion). Accordingly, persuasion is not accidental, nor is it coercive. It is inherently communicational. As a last note in this defining paragraph, Lakoff (1981) considers unidirectionality in communication as a sufficient requisite for a discourse to be regarded persuasive.

Advertising, propaganda, political rhetoric, campaigns and religious sermons are obvious examples of persuasive discourse; however, persuasion may also occur in conversation. In the classical tradition, only two types of persuasive discourse have been identified: political or deliberative discourse and forensic or judicial discourse.

Sometimes persuasion is defined as an art of speaking or writing. The idea of *art* is connected to rhetorical studies in that rhetoric is the art of persuasion. Indeed, the idea of art entails also the mastery of complex skills because it is not that facile to provoke an adequate reaction – acceptance by the audience. Aristotle (2010) claims that persuasion requires three fundamental techniques: appeal to logic, emotion and to the speakers' character. Many subsequent rhetoricians have drawn on Aristotle in identifying the strategies employed when persuading others; Makau (1990), for example, listed: logical explanations, emotional appeals, truthful statements and manipulative strategies.

Studies on persuasive speaking within the frame of rhetoric have received much interest in the recent decades. Lauritzen (2009), for instance, combines old rhetoric, new rhetoric and Critical Discourse Analysis to analyse the 2008 presidential debates between Obama and Clinton. Furthermore, persuasive strategies have been studied using, most of the time, the traditional Aristotelian method; Metsämäki (2012), for example, applied it in his investigation of EFL debates.

One final remark must be made prior to wrapping up this talk. It concerns the analysis of persuasive discourse which has been impeded by confusion that has existed since the nineteenth century over the nature of persuasive discourse in relation to argumentative discourse due to the classification of discourse into only description, narration, exposition and argumentation discarding persuasion as a discourse type by American text writers such as Genung (1894). Ever since, argumentation has substituted, subsumed or equalled persuasion. This confounding of argumentation and persuasion has been challenged by rhetoricians like Kinneavy (1971) who argues that such a confusion reduces persuasion to the logical appeal. Following Kinneavy, whose approach is similar to that of Aristotle (2010), I will consider, in this research, persuasive discourse to be that which integrates the rational, credibility, and affective appeals. I will also consider argumentation to be restricted to reason.

1.6. Rhetoric

The English word *rhetoric* originally stems from the classical Greek phrase *rhêtorikê* which is usually translated as ‘the art of rhetoric’. One of the central most debated components of rhetoric has been its definition. Over the course of 2500 years, there has been a wide range of uses of and numerous definitions for the term rhetoric. It has long been used in the context of public speech and “especially legal and civic speech Spoken words attempt to convert listeners to a particular opinion, usually one that will influence direct and immediate action...” (Bogost, 2007: 15). Bearing in mind Bogost’s words, we can say that rhetoric has been utilized to mean public speech designed for persuasion. This meaning was first adopted by Aristotle and has been widespread ever since. Aristotle defines rhetoric as “the art of discovering all the available means of persuasion in any given case” (Bizzell & Herzberg eds. 1990: 160). Following Aristotle, several subsequent rhetoricians have associated rhetoric with persuasion. The neo-Aristotelianism (cf. 2.4.1.) also emphasizes the rhetoric’s concern with effect i.e. persuasion, rather than with permanence or beauty i.e. literature.

As articulated above, rhetoric is often seen as the art of persuasion but sometimes it is understood as the abuse of language to exploit specious arguments, diffuse half-

truths, insinuate wrong ideas, move the passions, and thereby mislead the judgment and deceive audience. Pieper (2000: 8) feared that rhetoric would be used to mislead people because of his “conviction that everything can be justified if we look hard enough for reasons.”

Besides associating it with persuasion and fraud, some rhetoricians combine rhetoric with oratory. Mack (1993: 339) contends that: “rhetoric is the art of speaking well, not about this or that, but about all subjects”. In general usage, rhetoric and oratory are virtually synonymous. However, a distinction can be made: rhetoric is taken to denote the theoretical art of speaking, and oratory is its practical application. At Athens, a rhetor was originally, a public speaker in the *ecclesia*¹, what we would call a politician. Later, at Athens and Rome, a rhetor was a teacher of public speaking, a rhetorician; rhetoric was the art they taught.

According to this latter definition that equates rhetoric to oratory, rhetoric is an art. Hill (1877 as cited in Bizzell & Herzberg eds., 1990), presents it as an art: “It is an art, not a science” (881). Day (in Bizzell & Herzberg eds. 1990), however, advocates two uses for the term: rhetoric as an art and as a science. He differentiates between them as follows:

Rhetoric has been correctly defined to be the Art of Discourse.... An art directly and immediately concerns itself with the faculty of discoursing as its proper subject....A science, on the other hand, regards rather the product of this faculty; and, keeping its view directly upon that, proceeds to unfold its nature and proper characteristics....the method of Art is synthetic, constructive; while that of Science is analytic and critical (864).

The term rhetoric has, moreover, been used to mean the theory of rhetoric. Kennedy proposes the following general definition:

1 - The *ecclesia* was the assembly and sovereign body at Athens, comprising all the adult male citizens over the age of eighteen, all equally entitled to address the assembly and to vote.

[Classical rhetoric] is that theory of discourse developed by the Greeks and Romans of the classical period, applied in both oratory and in literary genres, and taught in schools in antiquity, in the Greek and western Middle Ages, and throughout the Renaissance and early modern period (Kennedy, 1999: 3).

This definition appears clear but Kennedy notes that problems do arise when we try to define the characteristic contents of such a theory (Kennedy, 1999). Indeed, Kennedy attempts to “define classical rhetoric and its tradition by examining the various strands of thought which are woven together in different ways in different times” (Kennedy, 1999: 3).

The connotations of the term rhetoric have started to widen with the coming of the ‘new rhetoric’ in the 1960’s as philosophers and theorists declared that rhetoric did not just refer to oratory or speeches; many other forms of communication have become part of the rhetorical realm. It was argued that all acts whose intent or function is persuasion are regarded as rhetorical acts. Usually, speeches have a clear persuasive intent; so, they were easily conceived as rhetoric. Other actions or phenomena may have a persuasive intent, but that intent is carried out through means other than oratory, such as a stop light that influences motorists to stop or go. Still other phenomena were not created to be persuasive but end up persuading: they have a rhetorical function. They function as if their objective is to persuade in spite of the fact that this was not the intent of their creators just like a reader who becomes motivated by the main characters in a novel and acts as they did. According to the contemporary understanding, both the stop light and the novel are rhetorical objects.

Foss (1989: 4) claims that rhetoric is “the use of symbols to influence thought and action; it is simply an old term for what is now commonly called communication.” The word symbols here does not refer only to a system of linguistic signs, but would also incorporate virtually any humanly created symbols from which audiences derive meaning “sources including architecture, painting, performances, films, advertisements, conversations, debates, speeches, books” (Foss et al., 1999). Booth

(1978) also expands rhetoric to include novels, plays, editorials, songs and even non verbal gestures. Nowadays web sites are reckoned as rhetorical artifacts. Of the more recent critics who support such claims is Cathcart (1991) who says “rhetoric is used ... to refer to a communicator’s intentional use of language and other symbols to influence or persuade selected receivers to act, believe, or feel the way the communicator desires in problematic situations” (2). So, any symbol deployed to influence people has become a legitimate subject for rhetorical criticism.

Bryant (1973), arguing against some of the overly broad extensions of the scope of rhetoric that have been advanced in his day, maintains that rhetoric should not be identified with *anything* that persuades – such as guns, gold, pictures, colors, traffic lights, elephants, donkeys, illuminated bottles of whiskey, or animated packs of cigarettes –but rather limited to this traditional province of (spoken) discourse. Despite Bryant's resistance, the field today addresses all contexts in which symbol use occurs and includes almost any form of verbal or nonverbal communication but it still maintains its interest in persuasion.

Another turning point in the development of rhetoric has been its liberation from the classical definition that confines it to the art of persuasion and oratory. The contemporary rhetoricians have extended it to include changing reality. In this sense, Bitzer(1968,p.4) contends that rhetoric is “a mode of altering reality by the creation of discourse which changes reality through the mediation of thought and action.” More recent perspectives have gone beyond this and assumed that rhetoric constructs, through interaction, a shared understanding of the world, by which individuals can come to truth (Foss et al., 1999). According to this conceptualization, exchanges in the form of dialogues can be the object of rhetoric. Broadly defined in this way, rhetoric would seem to comprehend every kind of verbal expression that people engage in. In other terms, the concept of rhetoric has been expanded by claiming that everyday-conversation is a form of rhetoric – not only composition in prose. All the same, rhetoricians customarily have excluded from their province such informal modes of speech as “small talk”, jokes, greetings, exclamations, gossip, simple explanations and

directions albeit they express informative, directive and persuasive objectives (Corbett & Connors, 1999). So, rhetoric is, as it has always been, concerned mostly with those instances of formal, premeditated, sustained monologue in which a person seeks to exert an effect on an audience (Corbett & Connors, 1999).

To cut the long story short, definitions of rhetoric are abundant and varied; Scott (1972) rightly argues that “any fixing definition of rhetoric will be inadequate to the wide range of uses of the term.” Therefore, for the purposes of the present dissertation, I would opt for one operational definition, that of Aristotle: “[rhetoric is]the art of discovering all the available means of persuasion in any given case” (Bizzell, and Herzberg eds. 1990: 160).

1.7. Rhetorical Criticism and Analysis

The terms ‘critic’ and ‘analyst’ will be used interchangeably in this research. This is justified as follows. To begin with, Collins English Dictionary (2003) defines the word criticism as “the analysis or evaluation of a work of art, literature, etc.” In much the same way, the Concise Oxford English Dictionary (2006) states that ‘criticism’ is “the analysis and judgment of the merits and faults of a literary or artistic work successfully”. If, on the basis of these two definitions someone opposes my idea of equating ‘rhetorical analysis’ to ‘rhetorical criticism’ claiming that *criticism* entails *analysis* and/or *evaluation*, I would admit it. However, the purpose of the present thesis is far from evaluating Obama’s speeches, it is just an investigation of them. For this reason, the term criticism, in our context, does not entail the meaning of judgment – in the sense of giving praise or condemnation – but is confined to that of breaking down a text into pieces and studying how those parts work to create a certain effect. In addition, Foss (2004: 3) determines a critic’s task as “ask[ing] a question about a rhetorical process or phenomenon and how it works.” This is also the task of a rhetorical analyst. In the same vein, Morgan (1982: 15) states that “theory, analysis and criticism....would be joined together under the encompassing heading of *criticism* and those working in the field would be critics whether their concern were primarily

theoretical, analytical or evaluative...the three areas are inseparable, that one cannot pursue one without . . . pursuing the others.”

Above all, in the literature, the two phrases ‘rhetorical criticism’ and ‘rhetorical analysis’ are generally employed to mean almost the same thing. Maybe this is due to the fact that since the 1960’s and beyond the critical purpose has been expanded in several ways so critics no longer need to evaluate the quality of rhetoric. Now, one purpose of criticism or analysis is to illuminate the rhetoric, or provide insight about it (Zarefsky, 1980). When people encounter rhetoric, they usually do so quickly and superficially, giving it some thought but not much reflection. The illuminating critic or analyst is able to examine the rhetoric to discover what is not obvious to the casual observer and what properties used to achieve a particular effect. Through the process of rhetorical criticism, “we can understand and explain why we like (get influenced) why we don’t like (don’t get influenced by) something” (Foss, 2004: 7).

I should also make a hint to the fact that the objects of study of either rhetorical analysis or criticism are symbolic acts and artifacts. An act is executed in the presence of a rhetor’s intended audience – the delivery of a speech. Because “an act tends to be fleeting and ephemeral, making its analysis difficult” (Foss, 2004: 7), rhetorical critics study almost just “the artifact of an act – the text, trace, or tangible evidence of the act” (Foss). When a rhetorical act is transcribed, printed and preserved, it becomes a rhetorical artifact that then is accessible to an audience wider than the one that witnessed the rhetorical act. So, the term artifact, along with the terms text and discourse, will be used to refer to the corpus, the object of analysis in the present dissertation.

1.8.Conclusion

We notice that all the terms dealt with all throughout the entire chapter integrate a whole palette of meanings and have generated a lot of debate among scholars about what they mean and how they should be used (excepted from this generalization are

the *political speech* and *persuasion*). We have seen that the meanings of some terms like discourse, discourse analysis and rhetoric tend to vary quite significantly depending on the theoretical preferences of those who use them. I have, therefore, specified the meaning each term has in this academic enterprise.

To sum up, discourse is a combination of sentences in context. Discourse analysis has different views from which I discarded the “more textually-oriented views which concentrate mostly on language features of texts” (Paltridge, 2012: 1) and I adopted the “more socially-oriented views which consider what the text is doing in the social and cultural setting in which it occurs” (Paltridge, 2012: 1). A political discourse, furthermore, is a one held by a politician in an institutional context whereas a political speech is a speech presented to a live audience. Concerning persuasion, it is the art of influencing others. With regard to the term rhetoric, I endorsed the idea that it is the art of persuasion.

Chapter Two:

Rhetorical Theories and Methods

Chapter Two: Rhetorical Theories and Methods

Introduction

Rhetoric is the art of persuasion. The rhetorical theory offers a method for discovering the means of persuasion in discourse. Since the classical period up to the introduction of the new rhetoric, the views and perceptions have altered immensely in a myriad of ways. Consequently, I suggest, in order to overcome the complexity of understanding the rhetorical theory and its application, to go through the rhetoric's history with special focus on the areas pertinent to persuasion.

The practice of rhetoric began in the Greek period. The main theories, practices and teachings of the art of the Greeks (500-400 BCE)¹ and the Romans (507 BC - 476 AD)² all constitute the classical rhetoric. In the Middle Ages (500-1400), rhetoric was devalued in Europe but was flourishing in the Arab world. The Renaissance and Early Modern scholarships (1500-1750), though contributed little to the rhetorical theory, have a share, here, to trace the continuity of the traditional work. In the turn of the twentieth century, the new rhetoric broke down with the old tradition that confines rhetoric to persuasion. New theories have promulgated in a quantity and audacity unprecedented in the history of rhetoric. Brock et al. (1990), for instance, identify twelve methods of rhetorical criticism. However, I will give snapshots only on the ones germane to the analysis of a persuasive discourse. This chapter will end up by a revised version of Burke's cluster analysis method by which the analysis of the corpus is informed.

1- Solway, A. (2001).

2- Mackay, C.S. (2004).

2.1. Rhetoric in Ancient Times

Dixon (1971) claimed that “Presumably the oldest reference to rhetoric can be found in Homer’s epic poem”. Undeniably, several Greek and Roman philosophers contributed to the classical rhetoric.

2.1.1. Rhetoric in Ancient Greek

Though the practice of rhetoric began much earlier, many historians credit the ancient city state of Athens as the birthplace of classical rhetoric arose in 5th century BC. Because of the rise of democracy, every free man had to speak in the Assembly and persuade his countrymen to vote for or against a particular piece of legislation; they were also expected to speak on their own courts of law (Kennedy, 1994). The ability to do this successfully depended on one’s rhetorical skills. With time rhetoric became essential to gain success in public life and schools began to be established by the sophists to teach this art. We will begin our tour in Ancient Greece with the Sophists, Plato, and Aristotle—who have come to be regarded as the forefathers of rhetoric.

2.1.1.1. The Sophists

The Sophists were itinerant groups of teachers who traveled from polis to polis and taught young men in public places how to go through communication effectively. As Hunt (1965 as cited in Hogan, 2013: 4) notes, “the original sophists were professional teachers who helped meet the need for rhetorical training in Athens.” Their paid services included: public performance, speech writing, instruction in argumentation and style, and clever word play even at the expense of truth. Thus, to become a persuasive public speaker necessitated training in the manipulation of language, because, for them, language could never be objective since it was too culturally symbolic and emotionally charged. Over time, however, the sophists acquired a negative reputation as greedy, deceiving and arrogant instructors.

2.1.1.2. Plato

Plato was very critical of the Sophists for they used fallacious reasoning concealed in decorated language to deceive others. He did not regard rhetoric as an art but as a form of flattery because some people used it to escape punishment in trials. Indeed, Plato's central argument against rhetoric is "hinged on his conviction that the emotions are irrational in the sense that they undermine the rule of reason . . ." (Carroll, 1998: 250).

Later in his life, Plato realized that he had always made use of rhetorical techniques; therefore, he wrote *Phaedrus* (360 BC) in which he showed a positive role of rhetoric and laid down a fairly complete system for a proper, perhaps ideal, rhetoric. Plato's model stressed the role of audience when creating a rhetorical discourse. He did so by calling rhetoricians to understand the souls of all men, of those of one's audience, and know what would move those souls toward the acceptance of what would a rhetorician bring.

2.1.1.3. Aristotle

If I went quickly through the Greek contributions to rhetoric, the case will be different with Aristotle. I will present his theory with some explicitness because Aristotle "provided the first comprehensive theory of rhetorical discourse" (Dillard & Pfau, 2002: ix) in the fifth century BC and persuasion was central to his theory. Gross & Walzer (2000, p. ix) note that "all subsequent rhetorical theory is but a series of responses to issues raised" by Aristotle's *rhetoric*.

Aristotle defined rhetoric within a persuasive framework: "[rhetoric is] the faculty of discovering the possible means of persuasion in reference to any subject whatever" (Aristotle, 1991, para. 1355 b). Persuasion, for him, can be achieved via a trichotomy of appeals: ethos (the character of the speaker), pathos (the emotional state of the hearer), and logos (the argument) (Covino & Jolliffe, 1995). It seems that these elements are respectively relevant to the three components of a speech: the speaker,

the listener to whom the speech is addressed, and the subject that is treated in the speech (Aristotle, 1991).

One mode of persuasion is *ethos*, a Greek word meaning ‘character’. According to Aristotle, speakers must establish *ethos* through: (1) practical intelligence, (2) virtuous character, and (3) good will (Aristotle, 1991). The concept includes also morals, expertise and knowledge. To influence the audience, it is not necessary to be actually virtuous nor does a preexisting good character be part of the technical means of persuasion. Aristotle stresses the idea that appeal to *ethos* comes from a person's use of language i.e. any speaker who is well versed in his or her subject and well spoken about it can gain credibility.

The Greek word *pathos* stands for suffering and experience. It represents an appeal to the audience's emotions. The success of any persuasive effort depends on the emotional dispositions of the audience for we do not react in the same way when we grieve or rejoice. Thus, the orator arouses emotions because they have the power to modify the people’s reactions (Aristotle, 1991).

Logos is also “a Greek term which means word or reason” (Ramage & John, 1998: 81). It refers to persuasion by logical reasoning. Aristotle was the first to analyze an argument in a systematic manner. He did this by dividing arguments into two types: inductions and deductions. Induction is defined as the move “from one or more similar cases, [to] arrive at a general proposition” (Aristotle, 2010: 147). The inductive argument in rhetoric is the example. Unlike other inductive arguments, the example does not proceed from many particular cases to one universal case, but from one particular to a similar particular to form a general proposition. A deduction is an argument which departs from one or more general premises to reach logical certain conclusion. For instance, human beings are mortal (major premise); Plato is a human being (minor premise); so, Plato is mortal (conclusion). The deductive argument in rhetoric is called the enthymeme. An enthymeme has the function of a proof. More precisely, it is a rhetorical syllogism whose premises are based either on “probabilities

or signs” (Aristotle, 1991, para. 1357b). Signs “... are propositions that are necessarily ... true” (para. 1357b). An example of sign-enthymemes could be: “Though unexperienced, he always manages crises successfully; so, he must be gifted.” Here, the person’s success in managing crises is a sign of his giftedness. Regarding probabilities, they “... are propositions that are generally ... true” (para. 1357b). For instance, “Most migrant workers on the Estate were unemployed. We met David who had lived on the Estate for two years. David was Unemployed.”

We notice, however, that the concept of enthymeme is problematic at two levels: form and influence on the audience. Concerning form, Aristotle fails to give a clear definition to this concept; he states: “an enthymeme is a rhetorical syllogism” (1991, para. 1356b). A syllogism, by definition, comprises three divisions: major premise, secondary premise and a conclusion. In modern times, there exist three conventional orders of enthymemes. The first-order enthymeme suppresses the major premise. The second-order enthymeme suppresses the minor premise. The third-order enthymeme suppresses the conclusion. Other orders of enthymemes, in which two elements of the syllogism are suppressed, could be postulated (Edward & Robert, 1999). The question that I pose here concerns whether there is always an implicit premise or a conclusion. If yes, a pragmatic level must be distinguished for the unsaid is estimated to be so obvious but it may also be open to different interpretations on the part of the audience. For instance, a politician may say: “we are witnessing a terrible economic crisis” and stops or moves to something else. The implied conclusion from this premise could be: “we must keep united”, “we will suffer from hunger”, or “we have taken the necessary steps to rise as soon as possible”, etc.

Still with form, the other point I wonder about is whether all enthymemes take the form of a syllogism. Unfortunately, a clear-cut answer in the literature is not available.

Following Aristotle’s model of an argument structure, the premise(s) of an enthymeme can be wrong; nevertheless, they can lead to a wrong, albeit logical, conclusion as in this example: wise men are just, since Socrates is just. Thus, this

model helps us to analyze only the internal consistency of arguments and to be on the lookout for errors in reasoning. It appears that Aristotle's attention was directed toward types of substantial relations between premises and conclusions.

Generally speaking, Aristotle's approach to the enthymeme seems to shift from argumentation to logic, and it has a limited capacity in the analysis of arguments. The term argument, here, is taken to mean a reason given in support or dismissal of an idea. This reason could be given in the form of statistics, comparisons, laws, etc. These do not always suit the structured argument i.e. a conclusion deduced from premises. Even in everyday life, real arguments tend to be so messy and complicated that it is difficult, if not impossible, to analyse all of them according to the structure of a syllogism. Finally, Aristotle tends to focus almost exclusively on the form(s) arguments take, and this often requires the abstraction of context and content. Yet, context and content are deemed crucial when one comes to analyse arguments used in a discourse.

With regard to the enthymeme's impact on the audience, in an enthymeme whose one or two elements are omitted, the rhetor assumes that they are self-evident and that the listeners are active participants since they supply the missing part. Aristotle (2010) suggests that the enthymeme is particularly interesting given its relationship to its audience. He remarks: "enthymemes excite more favorable audience reaction" (p. 40). However, it seems that Aristotle is talking solely about the case when a speech is perfectly tailored to obtain a specific reaction from a particular audience. What he may not have accounted for is the possibility that an unintended audience encounters the rhetorical piece especially in the age of mass media now. As a result, enthymemes can undergo a variety of interpretations because of shift in their original context. I think, in this case, the use of an enthymeme can turn away from its original purpose of persuasion. The other point regarding enthymemes is that the audience of a public speech is generally characterized by an intellectual insufficiency; therefore, enthymemes must not be as precise as a scientific demonstration and should be shorter than ordinary dialectical arguments.

All in all, Aristotle restricts logos to enthymemes and examples. The concept of enthymeme is obscure and problematic which makes it hard and fruitless to engage in identifying and analysing them. Because of these limitations, it becomes difficult for one to give a comprehensive analysis of arguments with the sole reliance on Aristotle's theory. The advantage of Aristotle's rhetoric is that it covers non-argumentative tools of persuasion. He makes orators aware of the need to stimulate emotions and make themselves credible.

2.1.2. Rhetoric in Ancient Rome

After the decline of the Greek Empire, the Romans inherited the rhetorical flavor but added just little to the Greeks' repertoire of persuasive techniques. For the Roman rhetoricians, the ideal orator was not merely one with exceptional gifts of speech, but also a "good man" with "all the excellences of character" (Butler, 1969: 9 – 11). They considered the principles of moral conduct an integral part of the rhetorical art, not something to be left to the ethicists or philosophers. It was only about 300 years after Aristotle that the Roman rhetoricians started contributing works on the art of rhetoric. Among the most famous ones were Cicero and Quintilian.

2.1.2.1. Cicero

Cicero defines rhetoric as "speech designed to persuade" (Bizzell & Herzberg eds., 1990: 203). For him, to be persuasive, a man needs knowledge in all fields: philosophy, politics, literature, ethics, law, medicines, and so on. He emphasizes the notion of 'audience analysis' by which he means that the speaker must adjust the speech to the social background and the intellectual level of the audience. Cicero's *De Inventione* (2004) provides a tripartite division of public speech: deliberative, forensic and epideictic.

Deliberative rhetoric refers to speeches or pieces of writing that attempt to persuade an audience to take (or not to take) some action. A speech taking place in the legislative assembly or political debates in general falls under the category of

deliberative rhetoric. This kind of rhetoric is usually associated with politics and is concerned with decisions about future actions. Deliberative topics might include: taxes, education, legislation, health insurance, personal wellness, war and peace, and the defense of the country. Deliberative speakers would first raise interest in these topics; once interest is peaked, they might find that listeners have become more prone to being persuaded.

Forensic or judicial rhetoric is the type of rhetoric relevant to legal arguments advanced before a court; it requires decisions about whether a past event was according or contrary to the law. The purpose of the speaker is to accuse somebody or defend oneself or someone else. In the modern era, judicial discourse is primarily employed by lawyers in trials, in courtrooms.

The Epideictic oratory is also called ceremonial discourse; it is used to praise or blame during ceremonies. While the deliberative and judicial species have their context in a controversial situation in which the listener has to decide in favor of one of two opposing parties, ceremonial speaking does not aim at such a decision: it relates somebody's ideals and values to those of a diverse audience so as to praise or blame them for their deeds as being honorable or shameful. Ben Witherington (2006) contends that, in general, epideictic rhetoric is highly emotional and meant to inspire the audience to appreciate something or someone, or at the other end of the spectrum, despise something or someone. This type of rhetoric includes funeral orations, eulogies, letters of recommendation, the language of openings and closings in addresses, speeches delivered in retirement or graduation occasions, in festivals, or in state visits, and the like. Interpreted more broadly, epideictic rhetoric may also include works of literature.

There is little doubt that these three categories do not exhaust the kinds of discourse possible. These three have persisted and still prove useful in rhetorical analysis, partly because they focus on common social situations where persuasion is important and on broad categories of intention. It might seem like these kinds are based upon where they

take place, but it is rather a matter of what arguments are being used and whether the audience must take a stand or not. It is not uncommon to find two of the three types utilized in one single speech.

Another major contribution of Cicero is his establishment of the five canons of rhetoric: invention, arrangement, style, memory and delivery (Cicero, 2001). Elucidated from the perspective of a practicing orator, these categories supply a systematized way of analysis of rhetoric. They serve both analytical and generative purposes. That is to say, they provide a template for the criticism of discourse (and orations in particular), and they give a pattern for rhetorical education.

The first canon is invention (*inventio*). It is concerned with finding arguments and amassing materials. So, the critic would analyze a speech to examine how the speaker established his ethos, how he stimulated the passions and whether or not his arguments were strong. Succinctly, in invention, elements that might have affected the speaker's choice of material are examined to identify the available means of persuasion.

The second classical canon of rhetoric is disposition (*dispositio*) which is concerned with the arrangement and organization of the material gathered. In the analysis of the speech, the task is to explain how the appeals within each part were organized and why that organization was genius for the purposes of the discourse.

Elocution (*elocutio*), also referred to as style, is the third classical canon of rhetoric. This canon permits the investigation of the use of language in discourse. The question is how the speaker made stylistic choices to achieve his/her purpose and how he/she adapted his language style to particular audience and subject. Cicero divided style into three types: the plain style for arguments, the middle style for charm and the passionate style for persuasion. Under the canon of style the critic ought to consider the orator's use of tropes and figures. The basic question for the critic is how well the style fits the audience and the occasion.

The other rhetorical canon is memory (*memoria*) by which is meant the study of the devices used to aid remember the speech during its delivery.

Delivery (*pronuntiatio*) is the fifth canon and is relevant to vocal utterances and body movements. Critics may want to know how the speaker presented the message, addressing both the effective use of voice and physical dynamics. It should be noted that memory and delivery have always been the least important of the five as they are not often addressed in rhetorical criticisms.

Although these categories have lost their specific labels and the boundaries have been blurred somewhat, they still form the basis for contemporary discussions that can be termed “neo-Aristotelian” (Baird, 1965: 16).

2.1.2.2. Quintilian

Oratory for Quintilian is the art of speaking well with the purpose of persuasion (Bizzell & Herzberg, eds., 1990). He claims that rhetoric is an amoral activity but engagement in it needs to be done in a proper way which necessitates men of virtues so that they use rhetoric to tell but the truth. He embraced Cicero’s classification of rhetorical discourse into forensic, deliberative, and epideictic.

In much the same way as Cicero who laid forth the five canons which have been used in education, Quintilian also was mostly interested in training, a fact which is demonstrated by his monumental four-volume work, *Institutio Oratoria*, the “most ambitious single treatise on education produced by the ancient world” (Murphy, 1965 as cited in Hogan, 2013: 5). It was more than a mere handbook of rhetoric; rather, it set out a program for educating the citizen-orator.

2.2. Rhetoric in the Middle Ages

Europe did not make significant contributions to the art of rhetoric during the dark ages and medieval works were mere compilations of the Greeko-Roman tradition.

However, at the same period, rhetoric was evolving in other parts in the world namely in the Middle East.

To begin with, the Arab rhetoric is rooted in the pagan era that preceded the advent of Islam, termed Aldjahiliyyah. Outstanding poems and speeches stood as the preeminent forms of rhetoric. The more eloquent¹ a poet or an orator was, the higher their social status became. Interestingly, the ultimate purpose of those practitioners and recipients of rhetoric was to guarantee and examine the smooth and harmonious aesthetic dimension of the rhetorical text which used to come loaded with diverse rhetorical figures (not clearly delimited nor categorized at the time).

In short, pre-Islamic Arab rhetoric necessitated the development of taste, critical acumen and beautiful style with the goal of pursuing personal grace, leisure enjoyment and social advancement.

With the coming of Islam, people, astonished at the unsurpassable beauty of the Qur'an, embarked on studying the miracle of Muhammed's prophethood by looking for elements of beauty, then, describing, classifying and codifying them. As a matter of fact, the compilation of those aesthetic aspects was based on not only the Qur'anic text but also the pre-Islamic poems which both embody far-fetched rhetorical devices that adorn language.

As such rhetoric continued to evolve until it reached its peak in the Abbasid period (750-1258) when Abdu Allah Ibnu Almu'tazz and Aldjurdjani wrote, respectively, *Albadi'* and *The Secrets of Rhetoric*, two books which laid, among others, the foundations for the Arab rhetoric.

Regarding the definition of rhetoric, the Muslim rhetoricians generally agreed that it is the transmission of meaning utilizing correct, clear, appropriate utterances in

1- The terms eloquence and rhetoric were synonymous.

a way to leave an impact on the audience. Al-Jāhiz (2008) stated that “A speech cannot be said to be rhetorical only if its meaning outruns its linguistic items” (115).

Undoubtedly, the most distinguished contribution of the Arabs is their division of rhetoric into three branches: (1) word order or *Ilm Almaani* which embodies repetition, propositions (*Alkhabar*), non-propositions (*Alinchaah*), etc; (2) figures of speech or *Ilm Albayan* that includes devices such as metaphor and analogy; and (3) embellishment or *Ilm Albadi'* which covers elements like metonymy and alliteration.

Up until the twentieth century, the Arab rhetoric has not been influenced by the persuasion-based Aristotelian heritage and kept focused on taste, style decorum and clarity. Yet, we can assume that a beautiful and comprehensible text is meant to affect readers or listeners, thus, can also participate in a persuasive endeavor. It is this idea that made me think the present section on the Arab rhetoric is not irrelevant in this thesis.

Furthermore, the theoretical and practical Western views that rhetoric should be adapted to an audience, responsive to a situation and persuasion seeking barely exist in the Arab rhetorical studies. Still, the latter stress, more or less, the appropriateness (a hint to the audience and the situation) of a piece of rhetoric.

2.3. Rhetoric in the Renaissance and Early Modern Periods

The early modern period has been characterized by what Garsten (2006) calls “attack on rhetoric” (10). The beginnings of this attack can be traced to the rise of political and religious fanaticism in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Fearing the effects of demagoguery on public opinion, the classical tradition was undermined to downplay the role of persuasion. Such an attack contributed to an aestheticization of rhetoric that transformed it into “a literary enterprise rather than a political one” (11-12).

The shift of emphasis in rhetorical theory from persuasion to the aesthetic was most obvious in the belletristic movement led by Hugh Blair and George Campbell in the

late eighteenth century. That movement represented the first real alternative to the classical tradition as it radically expanded the scope of the discipline by combining the study of rhetoric, other arts (poetry, drama, and even biography and history), and literature into a common discipline, with an emphasis on taste, style, culture, and critical analysis of the most distinguished compositions. Put differently, rhetoric started to include the written forms while classically it was confined to oratory (Blair, 1965). The belletristic rhetoricians did, then, appreciate “the potentialities of persuasion as a force in a democracy and in a Christian society” (Golden & Corbett, 1968 as cited in Hogan, 2013: 6). In this area, they emphasized emotion over reason, distinguishing between “conviction” and “persuasion” and associating the latter with the human passions.

In all of these developments there was, clearly, something “new”, hence, called “new rhetorics.” They were not the only novel changes, yet. A new theory of rhetoric, another more “scientific” alternative paradigm to the classical emphasis on persuasion, was elaborated by George Campbell on the basis of the eighteenth century theory of psychology and the classical rules of discourse. His Resemblance Theory of rhetoric implies that the audience belief in a rhetor’s claim is dependent on the extent to which the audience’s response to the verbal stimuli of the rhetor “*resembles* the mind’s ordinary response to actual experience” (Walzer, 1999: 79). In order to achieve this, the speakers must consider appeal to emotions. For Campbell, emotions are also stirred using flourished style (Walzer, 2003).

2.4. Rhetoric in Contemporary Times

In the twentieth century, the rhetorical theory has undertaken paths other than the ornamental conceptions of the late Middle Ages. The shift in rhetorical studies is attributed to the renewed importance of language and persuasion in an age that was witnessing a proliferation of mass media and advertising. It is also due to the rise of cultural studies. The resurrection of rhetoric gave birth to diverse theories, only seven of them will be treated for they serve the purposes of the present thesis i.e. they are applicable to persuasive discourse. All in all, I will a snapshot of the theoretical bases

of each perspective followed, when possible, by a procedural part in which I lay out steps for the application of the method, ending by the criticism(s) that approach has received.

2.4.1. The Social Movement Approach

A social movement is an organized collectivity that promotes or opposes changes in societal norms and values. Since their aim is to shape society, persuasion is pervasive in the rhetoric of social movements' actors.

By launching the investigation of social movement criticism, Griffin (1952) has shifted the purview of rhetorical criticism away from the study of single pieces of oratory and attempted to lay out questions about how to study a mass of discourses of orators belonging to the same movement to discover the rhetorical structures peculiar to that movement. Griffin does not provide a method with which to analyze social movements' rhetoric: he simply presents a series of questions to be considered by the analyst like "what rhetorical criteria should the student use in evaluating the public address of the movement?" and "how should the student go about the process of synthesis involved in reporting the movement?" (Griffin, 1952: 187), and the like. His answers to such questions incorporate three imprecise steps to criticism: (a) an overview of the historical background of a movement, (b) a summary of the studies describing, analysing, or criticizing several periods of the movement, and (c) an attempt to set a matrix of the history of the movement that will summarize the rhetorical pattern (Griffin, 1952).

In contrast with Griffin, Simons (1970) regards movement studies as a separate genre that requires a separate treatment. He thinks that the uniqueness of the rhetorical situation of movement discourse calls for the necessity of a new theory of persuasion apart from the "standard tools of rhetorical criticism" (2). Yet, Simons does not set out a specific methodology for movement discourse criticism except his proposition of a "leader-centered concept of persuasion" (2), which outlines the rhetorical

requirements, problems and strategies faced by leaders. Simons admits that approaches to social movement rhetoric do not yet have enough theory to draw on.

While Griffin and Simons consider social movement discourse as “a distinct domain of rhetorical behavior” (Zarefsky, 2006: 137), Zarefsky argues that it cannot be recognized as a genre because he does not believe in its distinctiveness since the “propositions which describe or explain social movements might easily apply to other rhetorical behavior as well” (129). The rhetorical forms of social discourse, for example, resemble those of campaigns. For this reason Zarefsky says that the study of social movement texts contributes neither to rhetorical theory nor to the identification of a new genre of rhetorical studies.

Obviously, social movement criticism is still facing theoretical hurdles: there is no single method appropriate only to the rhetorical analyses of social movement discourse. It is noteworthy that generic criticism (Gustainis, 1982) and fantasy theme analysis (Foss, 1977) are among the methods that have been used to study this kind of rhetoric.

2.4.2. The Identification Approach

According to Burke’s philosophy, rhetoric is viewed as the use of words by human agents to form attitudes or to induce actions in human agents (Burke, 1969). Whereas the key term in old rhetoric is *persuasion*, Burke’s new rhetoric emphasizes *identification*, which he regarded both as a means and an end of rhetoric. Identification, a Latin term meaning ‘the same’, is used by Burke to refer to that strategy when the speaker uses linguistic signs to show that his properties (interests, values, beliefs, views, perspectives, attitudes, etc.) are similar to or identical with the listeners’ properties, so as to achieve persuasion. Identification occurs via emphasis on the margin of overlap between the rhetor’s and the audience’s experiences (Heath, 2001). It is essential to know how one can identify with the other. Burke provides an explanation of this by noting: “You persuade a man only insofar as you can talk his language by speech, gesture, tonality, order, image, attitude, idea, identifying your

ways with his” (1969, p. 55). Cheney (1983: 145) mentions two less direct types of identification strategies discussed by Burke:

identification by antithesis, whereby a speaker promotes identification with a listener by virtue of an ‘enemy’ both speaker and listener have in common; and identification by an ‘assumed we’ whereby a speaker uses references such as ‘we,’ in a way that is largely unnoticed but allows the speaker to group together parties who have little in common.

A Burkian example on deliberate attempts at identification would be a politician who, when speaking to farmers says, “I was a farm boy myself” (Burke, 1969: xiv).

In fact, what worried me about Burke’s theory is that he perhaps fails to mention if the similarities between the rhetor and the audience are real or fake. In case of using ‘fake identification’ (for instance, when politicians on the campaign trail tend to downplay their wealth and privilege to claim a common-man identity), I may wonder whether or not it would increase the persuasiveness of an address. My other concern is with Burke’s emphasis that a rhetor can identify with his listeners semi-consciously. A speaker, for example, may use symbols associated with wealth or class to identify with such nuances without being fully aware of doing so i.e. he/she does so not wholly deliberately yet not unconsciously (Burke, 1969). In such cases, an analyst of this speaker’s message might mistakingly consider some processes as strategies for persuasion while they are genuinely unintended messages but mere unconscious processes of the human mind (Day, 1960).

2.4.3. The New Rhetoric Approach

Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca’s argumentation theory (1969) connects rhetoric to the traditional Aristotelian works on public addresses; therefore, it is called the New Rhetoric theory – a name that was also given to the Renaissance rhetoric. In this theory, the term rhetoric covers argumentation on all levels from personal deliberations to public discourse (Hairston, 1976).

This theory does not focus on rhetoric as having one particular audience; instead, it is concerned with any kind of audience regardless of its size or level of knowledge (Hairston, 1976). Perelman defines audience as: “the gathering of those whom the speaker wants to influence by his or her argument” (Perelman, 1982: 14). When tackling a controversial point, the speaker should begin with an argument¹ that is built on a premise that the audience already adheres to, in order not to falter. Perelman puts it this way: “To adapt to an audience is, above all, to choose as premises of argumentation theses the audience already holds” (23).

As mentioned above, at the start of the activity of argumentation, the orator should choose propositions the audience already accepts (Perelman, 1982). In case of absence of any shared values between the speaker and the listeners, the former must establish a presence with the latter in order to make the arguments seem closer to them. This rhetor’s effort to connect the starting point of the argument to the desired conclusion is the effort to create *liaison*. *Liaison* is a type of argument that forms an association between the accepted premise and the conclusion that the speaker wishes to gain adherence to (Perelman). An example on *liaison* could be the use of quasi-logical arguments which look logical but with closer examination, they become distinguishable from logical reasoning although they are based on a premise that the audience supposedly adheres to. There are numerous types of argumentation that fall under the subcategory of quasi-logical arguments like reciprocity, transitivity, and probabilities, etc. (c.f. Perelman, 1969).

Perelman’s theory has also been subject to criticism on the basis that it does not include all the different modes of persuasion. It centers entirely on the structures of arguments; it seems to be too preoccupied with *logos*; and it neglects the *apathetic* and *ethical* appeals. However, in a reply to this criticism, Perelman (1982) states that since rhetoric addresses man in his entirety, he must necessarily utilize all three modes of

1- The word ‘argument’ is used here to imply more than just the way a point is arrived at logically or the steps by which the reader is persuaded to agree with it. It means something more like how the material is organised rhetorically.

persuasion. To conclude in a positive note, Frank (2003) considers that the positive reception of New Rhetoric far outweighs its criticism.

2.3.4. Toulmin's Approach

As articulated previously, a persuasive discourse is, without doubt, about convincing others of one's views; consequently, the ability to form an argument is a critical factor for a discourse builder. A widely used model for analysing the validity and form of an argument is that of Toulmin. At the outset, Toulmin's model was purely a theory of argumentation. His objective was "to criticize the assumption . . . that any significant argument can be put in formal terms" (Toulmin, 2003: 3). He aimed at setting forth a practical structure of arguments that is composed of a claim followed by the justification for that claim. In fact, Toulmin's work opposed the theoretical arguments which arrive at a claim by making inferences from a set of principles. Later on, this model was adopted by scholars of rhetoric as a tool for developing and analysing arguments. It allows us to break an argument into its diverse parts so as to make judgment about how well the parts work together, and how they influence us to respond in the way we do.

To analyse an argument, Toulmin (2003) proposes a schema of six interrelated components: the claim, the evidence, the warrant, the backing, the rebuttal, and the qualifier.

The claim is the main point of the argument; it is the conclusion whose merit must be established, be it explicitly stated or implied. For example, if a lawyer tries to convince the judges that his client, Jones, is the president of a committee in a company, the claim would be "Mr. Jones is the president of the committee" (1).

As its name suggests, the evidence is what the writer/speaker uses to back up their claim. It takes the form of causal reasoning, definitions, examples, factual examples, comparisons, opinions of authorities, appeal to audience needs and values, addressing

the counterargument, to name but these. For instance, the lawyer introduced in (1) can support his claim with the data “the committee members elected Mr. Jones” (2).

The implicit understanding that relates (1) to (2) is called the warrant; it is not stated in most arguments. In our example the warrant would be “If a committee elected Mr. Jones, the elected man will be the president of that committee”.

The fourth component is the backing which is designed to certify and support the warrant so that to make it more acceptable to the audience. The backing is introduced when the warrant itself is not convincing enough to the recipients. If the judges do not deem (3) credible, the lawyer will supply additional information like “If a committee elects a man by the majority, that man will be the president of that committee” (4).

Words or phrases that modify the argument such as ‘probably’, ‘certainly’, ‘presumably’ or ‘always’ are the qualifiers as in “Mr. Jones is necessarily the president of the committee as he is elected by the majority”(5).

The final component is the rebuttal which is a statement(s) that recognize(s) the restrictions that may be applied to the claim. They may even stand for new arguments which represent different points of view or possible objections to strengthen the claim. The rebuttal can be exemplified as follows: “Mr. Jones is necessarily the president of the committee as he is elected by the majority unless he has betrayed and has become a spy for another committee in the rival company” (6).

It goes without saying that the first three elements claim, evidence and warrant are essential in a practical argument, whereas the second triad (qualifier, backing and rebuttal) is not necessary.

Since it is a theory of argumentation, Toulmin’s work lacks the perspective of audience, an essential feature of contemporary rhetoric. Despite that, I think that the audience is not completely ignored because the rebuttal component takes into

consideration the adversaries in the argumentation which implies that the listeners are not really regarded as passive spectators. In addition, this theory, like that of Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteka, is too focused on logos and must be used jointly with other theories to account for the various modes of persuasion.

2.3.5. The Metaphoric Approach

First and foremost, a definition of metaphor is necessary. Wilkinson (2008) defines metaphor as “a means of expressing one thing in terms of something else” (ix). Two parts form the basic structure of a metaphor: the tenor which designates the compared entity and the vehicle which: (a) represents the entity to which the tenor is compared, (b) acts as the lens through which the tenor is viewed, and (c) gives the metaphor its figurative power (Ullmann, 1972). For instance, in ‘time is life’, *time* is the tenor and *life* is the vehicle.

To speak of metaphoric criticism is to speak of a form of rhetorical analysis which allows the location and evaluation of metaphors within texts in an effort to better understand ways in which authors appeal to their audiences. In fact, metaphors are not used only as ornamental tools but also as part of the argumentation process and a means to arouse audience’s emotions as well.

Burghardt (2010) notes that metaphors are: “[a] means by which arguments are expressed” (305). This is inevitably true because “metaphors are capable of both highlighting and hiding aspects of a phenomenon” (Lakoff & Johnson, 2003: 10). As such, rhetors use metaphors to emphasize and further their own take on the issue so that to move the audience to be in line with the thoughts they seek to inculcate. For example, a politician trying to persuade parliament members of voting for a bill to protect the environment may say: “Once problems are recognized ahead of time, they can be easily cured. If, by contrast, we wait their appearance, the medicine we will prescribe, will come too late for the disease will have been incurable.” The use of the

medicine metaphor here shows that it is better to react sooner than later against this issue but masks, at the same time, the economic losses this suggestion might cost.

In addition to its use in argumentation, the metaphor's persuasive power may rely in its ability to evoke emotion. To explicate this point we resort to Aristotle's ideas. He states that: "Men feel toward language as they feel toward strangers (xenouns) and fellow citizens, and we must introduce an element of strangeness into our diction because people marvel at what is far away and to marvel is pleasant" (Aristotle, 1991, para. 1404 b). So, the metaphor, by comparing two seemingly unrelated entities, can arouse astonishment and create pleasure and an audience who is pleased is one who is more open to persuasion.

As for the way of conducting metaphoric criticism, Foss (1995) outlines a four-step procedure: (a) reading the artifact as a whole with particular attention to its context, (b) looking for metaphors with an attempt to examine ways in which the tenor and vehicle share similar features, (c) classifying metaphors according to the tenors or vehicles, and (d) revealing their possible effects on the intended audience. These steps could be applied to carry out analyses whose aim is to answer various types of questions as: how does a rhetor use metaphors as persuasive tools in a given text? how familiar and recurring metaphors create persuasive appeal across time and/or across cultures? and do metaphors which are adapted to local culture and values have more persuasive power than those which are not?

In fact, studies of metaphor are rooted deeply in history and they "... have multiplied astronomically in the past 50 years" (Booth, 1978: 49). However, there is no rhetorical theory of metaphor which is grounded in rhetorical studies; it is really needful to (i) provide an explanation of how the rhetorical metaphor can serve as a device for persuading the audience of the speaker's or writer's argument and (ii) identify the qualities of a metaphor that help it achieve its function of persuasion successfully.

2.3.6. The Fantasy Theme Approach

The phrase fantasy theme was first coined by Bales (1970) to refer to the stories and talk exchanged by group members. Bormann (1972) borrows the concept and defines a fantasy theme as a telling of an incident with plot and characters. Fantasy, here, does not mean unreal but it refers to the dramatization of genuine or fictional events. Put another way, it is a term that refers to the way we see our world and cast it into dramatic form. Bormann also utilizes Bale's concept of 'chaining out' to explain that a fantasy theme is widely accepted when it signifies group values. As Bormann (1972) puts it, "when group members respond emotionally to the dramatic situation, they publically proclaim some commitment to an attitude" (397). This is to say that studying fantasy themes enables learning about a group's values, the values which can be exploited to persuade them. Indeed, when a group shares a fantasy theme, its members come to symbolic convergence on the matter and they envision that part of their world in similar ways. Thus, they create some symbolic common ground and others can, then, use that shared basis to convince them.

Fantasy theme analysis is applicable to subject matters ranging from television programs to political speeches. In order to apply this method, the analyst must identify the fantasies, the elements within them (values presented by a story line, characters, setting, resolution of a plot), and the themes which chain out as they represent the shared individual experiences, dreams and meanings. Since we assume that listeners would not accept a narration only if it implies their values, the detection of the fantasies will permit revealing particular values in a drama that have motivated the audience to accept it, to do some action, or to hold certain beliefs. That is, we can deduce what motivates the recipients and we can, in this case, predict what will move them i.e. predict persuasive factors which we can insert in a discourse aimed at persuading that particular audience as in campaign speeches, for example.

We know also that the audience would accept a given dramatic narrative if it contains a character with whom the message receivers identify (a protagonist) and other characters whom they oppose (a negative persona). The fact of identifying with

some elements in the drama may push the audience to do certain actions or embrace certain beliefs in their own lives. The dreams embodied in the fantasizing can have a persuasive power in that they may drive the audience toward particular actions to realize them. So we can say that fantasies are accompanied by emotional arousal.

Fantasy analysis, though largely influential, has been a subject for many critics among them Mohrmann. He charges Bormann with providing a new and confusing language “a hierarchy extending from fantasy themes to fantasy types of rhetorical visions is far from inviting” (Mohrmann, 1982: 119) for doing rhetorical criticism. Mohrmann vehemently argues that “basic definitions lack precision”; for example, what Bormann means by ‘motivation’ in “sharing fantasies is closely connected with motivation” (Bormann, 1982: 289) is unclear. Thus, ambiguity of basic terms “invites mechanical application” (Mohrmann, 1982: 119) of the theory. All that fantasy theme analysis seems to achieve, claims Mohrmann, is “the discovery of themes, types, and visions” as a “self-contained exercise, not signaling that life is drama, only that it can be described in dramatic terms” (Mohrmann, 1982: 119-120). Therefore, criticism, within the fantasy theme framework, turns to a descriptive enterprise that goes nowhere. For him, knowing and being able to describe a fantasy does not mean that one can predict behaviors or divine motives (119); these could not be discerned on the basis of surface texts and apparent fantasies.

2.3.7. The Narrative Approach

To begin with, narration, the key concept in this paradigm, includes any verbal or nonverbal account with a sequence of events to which listeners assign a meaning Fisher (1987). This paradigm is based on the assumption that human beings are naturally story tellers and that story telling is an effective means of persuasion (Fisher, 1987). The most persuasive messages are generally void of rational facts; they are rather based on stories which express “ideas that cannot be verified or proved in any absolute way” (19). Narratives are loaded in “metaphor, values” (19) and they boost

persuasion by tapping into the listeners' values, emotions, aesthetic preferences and by awakening dormant experiences and feelings.

Individuals need a way to judge which stories are believable and which are not. For this reason Fisher (1987) proposes narrative rationality as a logical method of reasoning by which to evaluate the quality of a story. Narrative rationality operates on the basis of two different principles: coherence and fidelity. First, coherence refers to the internal consistency of a narrative in terms of its structure, the amount of important detail, reliability of characters (do they behave or think consistently?). Second, fidelity is a principle judging the credibility of a story. Stories with fidelity are reliable: they ring true to a listener, provide good reasons to guide the listeners' future actions, and are imbued with values.

The narrative paradigm has been criticized on the basis that the concept of narrative as encompassing all communication seems to be too broad. Moreover, almost anyone can see the point of a good story and judge its merits; thus, anyone, not only analysts, can evaluate the quality of a narrative or rhetoric. The paradigm does not also specify how values are recognized in narratives by an audience. Furthermore, it is not clear that it leaves room for texts that attempt to lead rather than reflect audience values.

2.3.8. A Revised Version of Cluster Analysis

Originally, cluster analysis is a method developed by Burke (1969) to help disclose the motives of a rhetor. In analyzing a persuasive discourse, the motive is already known, persuasion; so no need to use this method to know the motive. In the current dissertation, I suggest using it as a tool to investigate the persuasive strategies in a persuasive discourse. In what follows, I will first argue that this method is suitable to uncover persuasive strategies in a discourse; then, I will outline steps on how to use it to conduct a discourse analysis wrapping up my talk with criticism.

2.3.8.1. The Theory

According to Burke (1969), the first two steps in cluster analysis involve spotting the key symbols (or their synonyms) and the symbols that cluster around them in an artifact. In the third and fourth steps, the clusters are grouped into patterns from which the motives are deduced. It goes without saying that since this method is based on key symbols, they have sets of meanings in the mind of the rhetor. The discovery of these meanings allows the recognition of the rhetor's motives.

To start with, a writer, especially one whose purpose is persuasion, is normally conscious of the act of writing and conscious of selecting specific kinds of images to reinforce a certain kind of mood, feeling or reaction. Rhetoric requires primarily an awareness of the language choices we make. It would be illogical to say that a speaker, while trying to persuade others, would randomly choose key linguistic items (or their synonyms) and their clusters (also called equations). It is my belief that since keywords are generated non-arbitrarily, we have in turn a non-arbitrary basis for claiming that they form part of the writer's strategy to achieve his/her objective. Because the aim is to persuade, the options for particular items in a discourse represent a strategy to reach that aim. Furthermore, I consider the linguistic selections of a rhetor as part of his/her persuasive strategies as he/she would, purposefully, I think, associate some acts, images, colors, personalities or situations with specific notions and beliefs so as to direct the audience attention towards a specific way of perceiving something; of thinking, positively or negatively, about something; of seeing a way of doing things; and/ or of appreciating something. For these reasons, the whole endeavour of selecting key terms and their equations in a discourse is done for the sake of persuasion. Certainly, then, the whole endeavour of extracting key terms and the clusters of terms around them by an analyst could be a means to denote a writer's persuasive strategies. For instance, a cluster analysis of a speech encouraging people to get insurance on their houses otherwise they will remain unsheltered in case of a disaster, may reveal that the speech is based on such terms as 'whole life', 'family', 'best' and 'disaster' and their associated clusters of terms. The study of those key terms and their clusters will probably end up by suggesting that the persuasive strategies here are fear and

desire: instilling fear from sudden threats and tapping into one's desire for protecting family and leading a decent life.

To signal a final point, one would probably rush to compare this innovative application of cluster analysis to an analysis of the use of diction in a discourse and conclude that both processes are akin. I would say, here, that an analysis of diction is an examination of the choice of *vocabulary* items (whether or not appropriate, ambitious, strong, etc.); however, my suggestion involves noting what subjects cluster around other subjects to transmit particular meanings to and effects on the audience.

2.3.8.2. The Analysis Steps

First, let it be noted that four steps form the essence of a cluster analysis: identification of key terms, charting the clusters around the key terms, discovering the patterns in the clusters, and naming the rhetor's persuasive strategies. The four of them will be explained separately below, but this does not mean that they must always be made explicit during an analysis.

a. Identification of the key terms

The first step in the cluster analysis method is to select key terms in the rhetorical discourse. They are about four, five or six terms that appear to be the most significant for the rhetor. The significance of the terms is determined on the basis of frequency and intensity.

Repetition of a term is taken as a criterion for selection of key terms because it, undoubtedly, has effects on cognitive and emotional responses. If a term is used over and over, this signifies that a speaker wants to transmit and anchor that symbol into the listeners' memories more deeply, and to make it so familiar to them that it becomes difficult for their minds to resist it. Thus, repetition turns to an instrument of changing attitudes or of keeping an idea – which is of interest and concern for the audience – in the forefront of the listeners' minds. Repetition also increases the persuasiveness and

the validity of weak and strong arguments when little processing of message content occurs (Moons & Mackie, 2009).

The second criterion on which to base the selection of key terms is intensity. A term may not be consistently repeated but it may be extreme in degree, size, strength or depth of feeling conveyed. It may be, for example, a term that is used as the starting point for some of the rhetor's arguments and/ or the focus of some conclusions. They are naturally charged or particularly significant in the works being studied. Those strong words can describe an effective action or a state of being. The intensity of a term suggests that the speaker wants to influence his audience using the meanings associated with that term.

b. Charting the clusters around the key terms

After the identification of the key terms in a discourse, it is time to chart the terms that cluster around those key terms. A close reading of the discourse would facilitate the detection of the clustering terms in diverse contexts. They simply appear in close proximity to the term, or a conjunction such as 'and' may connect a term to a key term. In some cases, the rhetor may show a cause-and-effect relationship between the key term and other terms suggesting that one depends on the other or that one is the cause of the other.

c. Discovering patterns in the clusters

In this step, the analyst will discover patterns in the clusters. All clusters which seem to have a shared purpose or theme form one pattern from which a persuasive technique could be inferred after a process of close reading and interpretation of the whole pattern. When a key term 'industry', for instance, usually appears with a cluster of terms such as 'employment', 'development', and 'trade' in a leader's speech; those three terms form a pattern in that they all show the benefits of industry and that this latter is the basis on which the three outcomes rest. In short, this step helps demonstrate how the rhetor associates certain linguistic items with others to convey

specific meanings that he judges will be welcomed by the audience. The analyst ought also not to neglect any terms in the surrounding context that seem to oppose or contradict the key terms; this could also help in finding out more strategies.

d. Naming the rhetor's persuasive strategies

The final step entails making use of the patterns that have emerged from the analysis to give names to the possible persuasive strategies. In the previous example about industry, we can understand that the leader wants to convince his people that the major concern of his agenda is industrial development, the means to guarantee the nation's prosperity. The strategies utilized here are: appeal to people's needs to win their adherence and causal reasoning for industry leads to economic flourishing. The persuasive strategies, obviously, will not pop out and make themselves known for the analyst; rather, he/she will embark on a process of speculation and interpretation before deducing the persuasive strategies used in a text. The analyst could consider the context, events and circumstances in which the artifact was delivered to help explain the possible reasons behind the associations and the techniques, the way they are used and the way they function.

2.3.8.3. Criticism

Cluster analysis is a method that shows how, in a persuasive discourse, appeals to interests, feelings, rational thinking and the like are revealed in perhaps the most innocent-seeming terms and their clusters. It fails, however, to account for the role of the aesthetic dimension of language in persuasion. It cannot examine the ordinariness or elegance of style as an element that has its effect on the audience. Aristotle claimed that a writer's ethos is created largely by word choice and style (Bruss & Graff, 2005). By style here is meant correctness, clarity, propriety and ornateness. Organization of ideas is also a way to affect the persuasiveness of a piece of writing but untreated by cluster analysis. Last but in no way least, the analyst needs some background knowledge of diverse persuasive strategies without which he/she remains paralyzed in front of the clusters he/she charts from a discourse.

2.4. Conclusion

By way of concluding this chapter, the great Greek and Roman rhetoricians no doubt, contributed a lot to the rhetorical tradition. It is important to recognize that no single paradigm defines the classical rhetorical tradition. Rather, that tradition consists of ongoing debates over the best methods of rhetorical practices and training, and the aims, scope, and power of rhetoric – indeed, over the very definition of ‘rhetoric’ itself. Yet, we can identify two emphases in the classical rhetoric that have distinguished the rhetorical perspective ever since: (1) an emphasis on the interconnectedness between rhetoric and persuasion and (2) an overriding concern with the optimum techniques that persuasive efforts to be crowned with success.

Whilst the rhetorical tradition emphasized on persuasion, the modern scholarship brought several new perspectives to the field that ranged from an embellishment of rhetoric to inclusion of the written acts, to a more scientific perspective under the name of the Resemblance Theory.

During the contemporary era, theories of rhetoric applicable to persuasive discourse have multiplied. From the supplied overview, we notice that all theories have yielded deductive methods of analysis and that none is perfect: the debate over rhetoric is still to continue.

Strikingly, the classical tradition, however, has never been supplanted entirely by the new rhetoric of the twentieth century. Most of the modern rhetoricians continue to acknowledge their debt to the ancients, and most still embrace the ancient three appeals of rhetoric.

Chapter three.

Methodology and Analysis

Chapter three: Methodology and Analysis

3.0. Introduction

This chapter is devoted to the practical part of the current thesis. The methodology section describes in some detail the type of this research, the research tool, the way this tool was put into practice, and the data on which it was applied. As far as the second section is concerned, it provides a description of the rhetorical situation. The analysis and the results obtained from the substance of the third section.

3.1. Methodology

Methodology implies more than simply the method and considerations used to collect data. It also offers the systematic theoretical underpinning for understanding which best practices have been applied in this research so as to end up with the most adequate results.

3.1.1. Research Design

The present research seems to be essentially descriptive, qualitative and interpretive. On the one hand, it is descriptive because it describes, analyses and interprets the persuasive strategies deployed in political discourse, in our case Obama's political speeches. On the other hand, it can be deemed qualitative for it aims at understanding what strategies are employed for what reasons and it generates ideas for later research. I do not think that reliance on numbers and statistics in identifying the key terms, on which the analysis is based, would make it quasi-qualitative for the whole work is centered on terms, not numbers. The descriptions, explanations and interpretations were conducted personally; therefore, this analysis is going to be subjective: another researcher may interpret the data differently. Given the nature of the method adopted, the research was carried out inductively i.e. supporting arguments precede the standpoints.

3.1.2. Research Tool

Cluster analysis method was applied to provide the central framework for the analysis of Obama's discourse. I decided on it because of its ability to conduct an analysis inductively and to reveal as a wide range of persuasive techniques as possible.

3.1.3. Procedure

First, discourse analysis required data whose choice was a time consuming process followed by a period during which the researcher immersed in the materials via thorough reading and rereading – a process that has never ended until the termination of the whole enterprise. Very soon, the frequencies of the most repeated words were counted; then, those terms were ranked to select the most recurrent ones. Counting on close readings, background knowledge and broader sociopolitical context helped determine the rest of the *intense* key terms. After that, I commenced charting the terms neighbouring each key term and tried to group them into patterns. It is the examination of these patterns that enabled me to identify the persuasive strategies. In the presentation of the patterns, some words or phrases are written in bold type; they are the words which show perfectly how I deduced the persuasive tactics. When extracting the patterns, quotes from the corpus illustrating each pattern are supplied. To facilitate the referencing of the quotes, I assigned the letters A, B, and C to the first, second and third speeches, respectively. Furthermore, every fifth line in each speech is numbered. As a result, a quote followed by such a parenthesis (A: 15-16) means that the quote is taken from speech (A) in the appendix, and is situated in lines fifteen and line sixteen; obviously, the example whose parenthesis is (A: 15) implies that it is located in line fifteen.

3.1.4. Data

In order to find out what persuasive strategies are employed in campaign speeches, I have chosen as a sample for analysis transcripts of three speeches delivered by Barack Obama during the 2012 presidential elections campaign. The three speeches focus on the issue of economy. I preferred to relate all of them to a single event and topic because every period has its specifications. In addition, the theme itself can be used to

the advantage of the speaker; hence, the choice of this particular issue is not made randomly. Because of the economic recession America has undergone since 2008, the sluggish growth and the high unemployment, the *economy* has emerged as the central issue of the 2012 presidential campaign. Consequently, getting the economy growing again was many voters' top priority. So, the candidates would exploit their rhetorical skills to the fullest so as to persuade the potential electorate of the efficiency of their economic plans. For this reason, I deem this selection appropriate for the purposes of the present enterprise.

I also strongly believe that the speeches embody a number of persuasive techniques for they were crowned with success which could be visible through the polls, the media and the elections results.

Polls results conducted just before and after a speech delivery are, I suppose, a major witness on the effectiveness of a speech. The rasmussen poll conducted on 11 June 2012 (one day before the delivery of speech (B) showed that only 48% of the Americans support Barack Obama while 49% of them are with Mitt Romney. Two days after the broadcast of speech (B) the results reversed in favor of Obama who outran Romney with a margin of 1% (46% for Obama against 45% for Romney).

Actually, media did not supply but mere summaries of the speeches with few descriptions of their impact on the audience. Paul Harris, for instance, a journalist from The Guardian who assisted the campaign event of 05 November 2012, noted:

“The crowd seemed fired up and ready to go It was a reminder of how good a campaigner Obama can be There was also a lot of anger at Romney (I heard one member of the crowd shout ‘traitor’ when his name was mentioned” (Williams).

Finally, The results of the general elections prove the efficiency of Obama’s addresses in the swing states in that he won the close race in Ohio (50.67% for Obama vs. 47.69% for Rmney) and Virginia (51.16% for Obama vs. 47.28% for Romney).

3.1.4.1. Sample Speech (A): Remarks by the President on Manufacturing and the Economy

On March 09, 2012, this typically economic speech was delivered by Obama in Petersburg, Virginia. In fact, after having gone through Obama's campaign speeches, I found that this one is full of numerous persuasive techniques. This is also due to the fact that Virginia was a swing state¹ of fundamental importance. Obama said: "if we win Virginia we win the elections" (cbsnews, 2012).

3.1.4.2. Sample Speech (B): Obama's Speech on The Economy in Cleveland, Ohio

The candidate Obama delivered this speech on the economy on 14 June, 2012 in Cleveland. It was selected particularly because Ohio was a battlefield state where Obama would logically exploit all his persuasive strategies to win the elections. Thus, it is a speech in which I would find the maximum use of persuasive devices.

3.1.4.3. Sample Speech (C): Remarks by the President at a Campaign Event in Columbus, Ohio

This is Obama's final campaign speech that was delivered in Ohio on November 05, 2012, the elections eve. It is mostly the place and time of this speech that pushed me to select it for the analysis. First, Ohio, as mentioned above, is a key swing state. Second, I thought the eve of the elections day was so crucial that he would maximize his persuasive efforts in a last chance to maintain his supporters consent and gain that of those undecided yet.

3.1.4.4. Data Source

The full transcripts of the speeches are provided in the appendix. They have been downloaded from this site: <http://www.whitehouse.gov>. Though the source is credible, since it is the white house official website, I have compared the transcripts with other ones from other several sites to verify texts authenticity.

1- In the United States politics, a *swing state* can also be referred to as *battleground state* or *purple state*. It is a state in which no single candidate has an overwhelming support in securing that state's electoral college votes.

3.1.5. Triangulation

This research is dependent on insights from three speeches by the candidate Obama. This is to say that I will consider triangulation of data for the sake of getting more valid credible results that would deepen our understanding of the persuasive strategies utilized in Obama's speeches in particular and in persuasive discourse in general.

3.2. The Analysis of the Rhetorical Situation

Up until now, I have not yet accounted for the rhetorical situation which is quite illuminating for the analysis. The section at hand will, I hope, do this satisfactorily. The rhetorical situation refers to any set of circumstances that involves at least one person using some sort of communication to modify the perspective of at least one other person. Being aware of the rhetorical situation elements helps understand the rhetorical choices a rhetor makes and guides the interpretations an analyst gives. Bitzer (1968) highlights the importance of the context within which rhetoric arises as a major factor in shaping it claiming that, "it is the situation which calls the discourse into existence" (2). In order to analyse the rhetorical situation, I used the rhetorical triangle (Aristotle, 2010). It is composed of: the rhetor (their background help identify their attitudes), subject or issue (i.e. evidence or proofs), and audience (their knowledge and expectations with regard to the subject). The triangle, however, needs to be modified so as to reflect the vital element of context – a convergence of time, place where the writing or reading occurs (Roskelly & Jolliffe, 2009). All in all, the rhetorical situation will be analysed in terms of the context, the audience, and the orator while the subject is suppressed for it forms the content of section (c.f.3.3.2.).

3.2.1. Context

The speeches are part of 2012 general elections campaign in which President Obama ran against the candidate Mitt Romney from the Republican Party. Obama's speeches (A), (B) and (C) took place respectively on March 09, June 14 and November 05, 2012 with the intent to persuade audiences to vote for him. Throughout this period, the US was experiencing a terrible economic crisis that had started back in 2008.

As we will explain, the venues chosen for the speeches are of particular interest. The venue of speech (A) was located at the Rolls–Royce Crosspoint plant in Prince George County, Virginia. The rhetor chose speaking from the floor of a new aircraft engine-parts factory, in this election battleground state, because this latter stands as an exemplar of a manufacturing jobs source. Speech (B) took place at Cuyahoga Community College, Cleveland, Ohio. The venue chosen in Cleveland has a potential influence on discourse because it is a manufacturing center and to deliver an economic speech in such a place entails that the audience are likely to be familiar with what the speaker would say and be interested in that. Besides, the Cuyahoga Community College offers classes in dozens of disciplines relevant to technology and business; so, the listeners are supposed to easily grasp the message. As for speech (C), it was delivered in a Nationwide Arena at Columbus, Ohio. Columbus has a generally strong and diverse economy based on education, insurance, banking, fashion, defense, aviation, steel, energy, medical research, health care, retail, and technology. It could not be a coincidence that this was the venue of Obama’s final rally in which he emphasized the various economic activities on which his plan is grounded to aid his country prosper again. Perhaps an audience which is accustomed to a diversified economy would be more open to the addressor’s vision.

3.2.2. Audience

Certainly, the candidate’s communication is directed at an audience. The term audience implies both the specific audience, the spectators who are physically present or watching the speeches on TV, and the general audience, whom the speaker wants to reach later on via YouTube, websites, media i.e. the ‘mass-mediated’ audience by the technology of electronic communication. The rhetorical audience, here, is one consisting of every American – legal or otherwise. Although the estimated specific audience is about 200 in speech (A), few thousands in speech (B) and more than 20000 in speech (C), the candidate seems to address the nation as a whole.

An audience as wide as the American nation varies definitely in knowledge, values, age, gender, intellectual capacity, social status, ethnic group, party affiliation – among

other qualities. The effectiveness of a discourse could be influenced by any or all of these variables; for example, a speaker, in front of non-experts, might just pitch their comments avoiding details that can be reckoned necessary when facing intellectual recipients. In addition, audiences carry different expectations to a speaking occasion. Americans, in 2012, were expecting a candidate that would resolve their economic problems. These expectations did, I assume, shape the speeches.

3.2.3. The Orator Barack Obama

Barack Hussein Obama (August 4, 1961) was born to a black Kenyan father and a white Kansasian mother to become the current forty fourth President of the United States. Obama is a graduate of Colombia University, in political science, in 1983, and of Harvard Law School in 1992. He worked as a civil rights attorney in Chicago and taught constitutional law at Chicago University from 1992 to 2004 before serving three terms in the Illinois State Senate from 1997 to 2004. In 2008, he defeated the Republican John McCain and was nominated as the first African American President on January 20, 2009. In the same year he was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize. Three years later, he ran against Romney for the general elections and beat him to hold the office for a second term.

It is noteworthy that Barack Obama splashed onto the political scene with an inspirational, rousing speech at the Democratic National Convention in July 2004 (Price, 2008). In fact, Obama has not written all of his own speeches by himself. Some of his best speeches during his political career as a senator were his creations; but he has not written them all exclusively any more since. From 2008 until early 2013, Mr. Obama's chief speechwriter was a young man named Jon Favreau. Throughout his political career, the President has virtually always collaborated with his speechwriter, offered his own revisions, made changes where necessary and provided considerable input.

3.3. Data Analysis

As stated before, the framework of the analysis is the cluster analysis method. Accordingly, the analysis passed by four stages. The identification of the key terms formed the first stage. After that, the clusters that emerged around the key terms were charted, a process that was done on draft and is excluded from this part just for the sake of not sounding repetitive. Then, the clusters were examined in turn and grouped into patterns in a way that each pattern stands for a persuasive strategy. That is, steps three and four overlap in the section entitled ‘the analysis of the speeches’. Each inferred persuasive strategy appears in bold type.

3.3.1. The Identification of the Key Terms

In an attempt to understand the persuasive strategies in political discourse, I examined three samples of Obama’s 2012 campaign speeches employing cluster analysis method. I looked for terms that cluster around fifteen key terms in the whole corpus. Before going any further, I have to detail how the key terms were identified even if we already know that this is done on the basis of their repetition rate and intensity.

3.3.1.1. The Frequency Criterion

As necessitated by the cluster analysis method, I identified the key terms in each speech according to their frequency of appearance in a speech.

i. Speech (A)

Key terms	Frequency
job	24
manufacturing	18
American	17

Table 3.1. The frequency of the most repeated words in speech (A)

The words that appear at the top list in speech (A) are: jobs, manufacturing and American with a frequency of 24, 18, and 17 respectively.

ii. Speech (B)

Key terms	Frequency
tax(es)	40
job	37
plan	36
grow	33
middle class	23

Table 3.2. The frequency of the most repeated words in speech (B)

Clearly the terms ‘task’, ‘job’, ‘plan’ ‘grow’, and ‘middle class’ seize the first ranks. What is striking, here, is that the term ‘job’ already exists in the list of the key terms in speech (A). It goes without saying that in an electoral campaign the candidate has one sole plan to present in different places in the country, so the same themes are likely to reoccur in various occasions. Bearing in mind this fact, I expect that my results of the analysis built around the key term ‘job’ in speech (B) could be identical to those around the same key term in speech (A). As a consequence, the term ‘job’ is discarded from the list of the key terms relevant to speech (B) for I wanted to end up with richer results based on a variety of key terms. One may claim that the analysis of the word ‘job’ in the different artifacts can illustrate the way Obama uses it differently in two separate contexts. My answer is that I had tried to see the terms clustering around the term ‘job’ in both speeches (A) and (B), approximately the meanings of the clusters cropped up were alike. Hence, I decided on the subsequent term in the list, ‘middle class’, which could aid in revealing more persuasive techniques. In sum, four key terms from speech (B) are selected on the basis of the frequency criterion. They are: ‘tax’, ‘plan’, ‘grow’ and ‘middle class’.

iii. Speech (C)

Key terms	frequency
fight	18
change	17
country	13

Table 3.3. The frequency of the most repeated words in speech (C)

From table 3.3., it is apparent that ‘fight’, ‘change’ and ‘country’ are the most recurrent ones in speech (C).

3.3.1.2. The Intensity Criterion

With regard to the intensity criterion, I selected as key terms: ‘future’ in speech (A), ‘voices’ and ‘nation’ in speech (B) and ‘opportunity’ and ‘storm’ in speech (C). These selections were made on the grounds stated hereafter.

For the term ‘future’, it seems to suggest hope, something that people, normally, aspire for while expecting a new head of the state and after experiencing a terrible economic crisis. The term ‘voices’ can have some persuasive effectiveness in the sense that it is surrounded by terms that are likely to portray Obama as a man of the people who understands their needs and is prepared to work hard for them. As far as the term ‘nation’ is concerned, it appears to transmit a sense of unity and evoke patriotic feelings. Regarding the term ‘storm’, it was chosen as a key term because the speech was given a week after hurricane Sandy, one of the strongest tempests that have ever hit America. At this moment, people were still affected by the storm and I wanted to see how the candidate seized the incident to appeal in some way to the audience especially that personalities like Bill Clinton declared that the hurricane and its aftermath ended up helping Obama in that it affected the voter turnout for the Democratic Party (Camia, 2012). Finally, the term ‘opportunity’ brings to our minds the ideal of the American Dream which makes success available for Americans as long

as they work hard. It was my belief that this word is loaded in meaning and emotion as long as all Americans long for prosperity (especially after a crisis) and endorse this ideal. Of course, appeal to something shared, rather than something new, facilitates the persuasion process.

If the frequency criterion leads to an objective identification of the key terms, the intensity criterion does not seem so. The reason behind choosing some terms as *intense* instead of others is just my sense or, say, my estimations. After several close readings of the speeches accompanied by some hesitation, I deemed that those particular words, their meanings and the ways they were used could have an impact on the audience. At any rate, I tried to make my judgments as reasoned as possible. The above explanation is a proof of this and the fact that these terms helped reach the persuasive strategies beneath them is also an evidence on the appropriateness of those choices.

It is to be noted that the intensity-based selections are fewer in number in comparison with repetition-based ones. This is partly because the nowadays American speeches tend to be plain, void of strong charged words and rather full of ordinary ones. It is also due to the fact that repetition is more telling in that the reappearance of a term indicates that that particular term was the focus of the speaker.

All in all, the analysis is concerned with a totality of fifteen terms. In speech (A), three terms were selected on the basis of repetition ('jobs', 'infrastructure', and 'American') and one on the grounds of intensity ('future'). Four of the most recurrent terms in speech (B) have been identified ('tax', 'plan', 'grow', and 'middle class') along with two *intense* terms ('voice' and 'nation'). The selection in speech (C) rested on three of the most repeated words ('fight', 'change', and 'country') and two other terms whose identification was built on the intensity condition ('opportunity' and 'storm').

3.3.2. The Analysis of the Speeches

In fact, I did not proceed in the analysis of the three speeches together in one block; rather, I analysed them one by one.

3.3.2.1. The Analysis of Speech (A)

The key terms ‘job’, ‘manufacturing’, ‘American’ and ‘future’ were the ones which along with their clusters, were analysed.

i. The Key Term ‘job’

‘Job’ is the most prominent term throughout the whole speech. The first cluster of words around this term reflects the **loss of jobs** in America: “economy was already shedding jobs” (A: 21-22), “jobs had vanished” (A: 23), “We were losing 700.000 to 800.000 jobs a month” (A: 24). Obama’s mention of the loss in jobs is to approach a reality from which Americans suffer.

The second major group of terms surrounding ‘job’ is concerned with the creation of jobs as a **response to the existing problem**. This group comprises terms such as ‘added’ (A: 31), ‘adding’ (A: 34, 36) and ‘bringing jobs back’ (A: 33). Such terms indicate that Obama has already started to solve the problem of unemployment in his first term in presidency, an achievement that promotes his **credibility**.

Closely connected with the second cluster entailing the meaning of ‘adding jobs’ is a cluster of terms referring to ‘manufacturing’. **Manufacturing is the route to adding jobs**. Just for the sake of illustration from the text, we find: “it will create jobs and it will keep America in the manufacturing game” (A: 147-148), “you’re creating jobs here, manufacturing components for jet engines” (A: 91-92).

Another cluster of terms through which Obama seeks to provide a **solution to joblessness** emphasizes the importance of **bringing jobs from abroad** by encouraging

investment in America. Such an idea is found in “invest in America and bring jobs back from overseas” (A: 152), “stop rewarding businesses that ship jobs overseas” (A: 160-161), and “reward companies that create good jobs right here in the USA” (A: 161-162).

Also closely associated with the idea of supplying **solutions for the problem** of unemployment is the proposition of **training** so that to get workers who are “qualified for the jobs of tomorrow” (A: 180-181) and “train 2 million Americans with the skills that will lead directly to a job” (A: 185-186).

We notice in these extracts (A: 91-92, A: 88-89, A: 64-65 and A: 61-62), the use of the present tense and past tense markers (last year, the past two and a half years) which all illustrate Obama’s hints to his accomplishments in the first term. Again this raises his **credibility**.

Obama sustains the correlation between manufacturing and job by relying on factual **numbers**: last year “Boeing had to hire 13,000 workers” (A: 88-89), “over the past two and a half years, the entire auto industry has added more than 200,000 jobs” (A: 64-65) and “American manufacturing was at stake and so were more than a million jobs” (A: 61-62).

The previous analysis shows that Obama tried to give solutions to the problem of jobs through manufacturing, taxing businesses that transfer jobs to foreign countries, and training. The cause and effect technique comes into light, here, since the three solutions cause the problem to disappear. Thus, the persuasive strategies, that we could identify so far, are the cause and effect technique, credibility and statistics.

ii. The Key Term ‘manufacturing’

We have already found that ‘manufacturing’ is a term that clusters around the key term ‘job’. In much a similar way, ‘job’ is a term that appears nearby the key term ‘manufacturing’ to show that this latter is the resort to **create jobs**. A sample of

examples on this would be: “manufacturing is adding jobs” (A: 34) and “Boeing had to hire 13.000 workers” (A: 88-89).

If manufacturing can create jobs, it can also involve America in a thriving business cycle: “we build it..., the entire world adapts it” (A: 102-103) and “manufacturing ... to send all around the world” (A: 92-93). Hence, the **connection between** the term ‘**manufacturing**’ and **economic prosperity**.

In order for manufacturing to perform its tasks of creating jobs, perpetuating business and paving the way for a better future; it needs to be “advanced” (A: 110) and requires “renaissance” (A: 110), “excellence” (A: 113) and “innovation” (A: 112). Such an advancement is to be reached through the establishment of “institutes of manufacturing”(A:113). This cluster of terms illustrates Obama’s attempt to emphasize education and training as two conditions (**solutions**) to develop manufacturing.

Another cluster that is directly linked to the previously mentioned one includes terms dealing with worker **training**. For Obama, some of those who are “in manufacturing” (A: 176) “are constantly upgrading their skills and retraining” (A: 176-177), they “gone back to school” (A: 178), they need to “go back to community college”, (A: 179-180) so that “they are qualified for the jobs of tomorrow” (A: 180-181). To carry on fulfilling these ends, Obama wanted manufacturing companies to make partnerships with universities; he gave the example “this plant has [partnership] with John Tyler Community College” (A: 187-188).

The other cluster of terms around the key term ‘manufacturing’ is one pointing to the importance of this latter for a better future. The excerpts “an economy that’s built to last and that starts with American manufacturing” (A: 44-45), and “if we had given up on the auto industry... a lesser future” (A: 98-99) are an illustration of Obama’s **futuristic vision**.

An allusion to the American **work orientation**, a course to superiority, is felt via a cluster around ‘manufacturing’. In what follows is the cluster of terms Obama utilized

to tap into the American workaholic syndrome for persuasive purposes: “to make stuff here and sell it over there” (A:74) and “inventing things and building things”(A:94- 95).

The other cluster of terms around the key term manufacturing is one praising the United States and **its superiority** to instill pride in the souls of the audience. Bellow are chunks from the speech illustrating appeal to **the ideal of American exceptionalism** “the stuff we made -- steel and cars and jet engines -- that was the stuff that made America what it is”(A: 50-51), “we were building more than just products” (A: 55-56), “America thrives when we build things better than the rest of the world” (A: 73), “the largest Rolls-Royce facility in the world” (A: 76), “building the key components of newer, faster, more fuel-efficient jet engines” (A: 76-77), “three proud words: ‘Made in America’ ”(A: 95-96), “We are builders” (A: 100), “We invent stuff, we build it” (A: 102), “invented and manufactured here in the United States of America” (A: 105), “the Advanced Manufacturing Partnership” (A: 111), “institutes of manufacturing excellence” (A: 113), “our most innovative manufacturers” (A: 114), “for manufacturing innovation” (A:141), and “making the best products” (A:144-145).

When Obama joined the key term ‘manufacturing’ to the term ‘game’ in “it will keep America in the manufacturing game” (A: 148), he, in fact, used a **game metaphor** which reflects a traditional American view of the world of economics, a view that embodies a positive evaluation of the competition between America and the rest of the world. Nearby the key term ‘manufacturing’ is found this cluster “manufacturing is adding jobs” (A: 34). It has the aim of convincing the American people that manufacturing is the solution to the economic depression. Manufacturing, thanks to this image, turned to a **person** who is capable of bringing jobs.

The analysis of the clusters around the key term manufacturing makes apparent the persuasive tactics deployed in the speech. They are the cause and effect technique (manufacturing and training are two factors that may result in economic affluence), the values of future and hard work orientations, the ideal of American superiority and metaphor (game metaphor and personification).

iii. The Key Term ‘American’

The key term ‘American’ is an adjective. Embedded in it are, inter alia, the shared values and uniqueness which wrap up any word taking this adjective. By examining the surroundings of the key term ‘American’, we notice that it is the term ‘manufacturing’ which crops up most. It bears emphasis, then, that I will not reanalyse the term ‘manufacturing’; this is already done. Rather, I should interpret the extracted chunks in the light of the connotations or nuances the key term ‘American’ might bring. The study of this term along with the clusters around it has given rise to three patterns.

As for the first pattern, it seems to be an implicit reference to the American **value of hard work**: “[an economy]... starts with American manufacturing” (A: 44-45), “American workers and American know-how”... (A: 41), “American workers are manufacturing...” (A: 84), “with one big goal: a renaissance in American manufacturing” (A: 110), and “to take part in this new renaissance of American inventiveness” (A: 135) are said to convey the principle of hard work because I consider that a renaissance in manufacturing and inventiveness cannot be realized without working hard.

The second pattern evokes a sense of pride and **superiority**. This sense is transmitted via the cluster quoted hereafter: “make this another American century” (A: 213).

Finally, the remaining clusters carry a spark of **hope**. It is felt in: “the American auto industry is coming back” (A: 62) and “Ford is investing billions in American plants [to add jobs]” (A: 63).

For a second time values (hard work) and ideals (superiority) emerge as persuasive techniques along with appeal to hope.

iv. The Key Term ‘future’

Obama placed a cluster of terms around the key term ‘future’ to denote efforts directed towards realizing a better future. The cluster is composed of the following

elements: "...the next decade, the cars that are built in America will average nearly 55 miles to the gallon" (A: 68-69) and "foreign oil doesn't have to be our future" (A: 71). The **futuristic vision** is also displayed in the form of a supposition were the speaker means to describe what the future of the USA is not: "imagine if the plan of the future was being built someplace else" (A: 97-98).

3.3.2.2. The Analysis of Speech (B)

The analysis of speech (B) was conducted on the basis of the key terms 'taxes', 'plan', 'grow', middle class', 'voices', and 'nation'.

i. The Key Term 'Tax(es)'

Examination of the key term 'tax' and its surroundings reveals the existence of two separate clusters and other three pairs of clusters.

A cluster of terms around the key term 'tax' reflects **the value of equal opportunity** in that the rhetor wants taxing to be given on an equal footing: the rich should not get richer at the expense of the poor. These ideas are implied in the following excerpts: "I've cut taxes for small businesses 18 times" (B: 246), "our tax code has to ask the wealthiest Americans to pay a little bit more" (B: 384-385), "Neither of them will endorse any policy that asks the wealthiest Americans to pay even a nickel more in taxes. It's the reason we haven't reached a grand bargain to bring down our deficit" (B: 412-413), "they won't work with us on any plan that would increase taxes on our wealthiest Americans" (B: 415-416), and "for a tax code that creates jobs in America and pays down our debt in a way that's balanced" (B: 449-450).

A very worrying image around 'tax' is built up by words such as "without those tax benefits, tens of millions of middle class families will end up paying higher taxes" (B: 170-171) and that the elimination of tax benefits would "raise middle class taxes even more" (B: 175). Via these images, the speaker transfers a sense of **fear** from the negative results in case of choosing Romney's plan, one that dedicates a decrease in taxes.

In the first pair of clusters we find two groups of terms: one referring to cutting taxes: “tax cuts” (B: 56, B: 59, B: 68), “tax breaks and deductions” (B: 168, B: 165-166, B: 168), and “tax breaks” (B: 377) and the other one connects this idea of **tax cuts (Romney’s vision) with negative consequences** such as “the power of businesses to create jobs and prosperity will be unleashed” (B: 122-123), “students would lose an average of 1.000 each in financial aid” (B: 144), “children would lose the chance to get an early education” (B: 145), “fewer medical research grants” (B: 146), “fewer scientific research grants” (B: 147), “cut things like financial aid or education” (B: 151), “eliminate health insurance” (B: 153), “you would end up paying lighter taxes to pay for this other tax cut” (B: 171-172), “deficit left by the Bush tax cuts” (B: 174), “I don’t believe that tax cut is more likely to create jobs” (B: 397), nor is it “more likely to spur economic growth” (B: 399).

Obama tried to shape the above probable failures of Romney’s plan with some credibility by citing **evidence from past events**. He reminded his audience that the policy of tax cuts had been tried in the past decade but was unfruitful. He said that the claims that tax cuts would “faster job growth” (B: 57), lead to “deficits” (B: 69) under the Bush administration.

The second pair of clusters around the key term ‘taxes’ connects Obama’s plan that sustains raising taxes “pay a little bit more” (B: 385), “raised taxes” (B: 280), “increase taxes on our wealthiest”, (B: 416) “tax dollars” (B: 350-351) with positive images. Barack Obama **proved** the ability of his plan to reach desirable consequences using **past events** when an identical plan had been adopted. The following statements from the cluster illustrates the point: “research that we funded together through our tax dollars” (B: 350-351), “tax dollars helped lay the foundation for the internet, and GPS and Google” (B: 350-351), and Reagan “raised taxes to help pay down an exploding deficit” (B: 280).

The last pair of elements neighbouring ‘taxes’ is made of the term ‘code’ – meaning tax code – (B: 168, B: 231, B: 384-385, B: 449) and the other terms such as “job creation” (B: 231), “creates jobs” (B: 444), “pays down our debt” (B: 449). Close

examination of these chunks highlights the candidate's attempt to explain thoroughly to his people the necessity of a **tax code whose priority is job creation**, an aim which could be reached via a tax code supporting raising taxes and eliminating tax cuts. For him, it was this that would benefit all Americans.

The afore-mentioned analysis gave rise to four persuasive strategies: the value of equal opportunity, the fear appeal¹, attack, analogy (comparing possible future consequences to similar past events) and the cause effect technique (job growth can be a consequence of Obama's tax code).

ii. The Key Term 'plan'

Around the key term 'plan' clustered several **negative terms mostly associated with Romney's plans**: "their plan eliminate health insurance for 33 million American" (B: 153), analysts do not believe that "my opponent's economic plan would actually reduce the deficit" (B: 194-195), neither would it "create more jobs" (B: 196) nor would it "help folks looking for work" (B: 197). The speaker, further, said that "it is not a plan to create jobs...to grow the economy... to pay down the debt to revive the middle class and secure our future" (B: 437-439).

Ironically, Obama, after proving the impossibility of successfully implementing Romney's plan, said that: "Mr. Romney is qualified to deliver on that plan" (B: 188) meaning the contrary.

Conversely to the first cluster where Obama associated a series of potential failures to Romney's vision, he presented his own plans **as the source of** a series of benefits which **the audience was in need to**. The positive remarks and details about his plans are interspersed here and there in the speech: "strengthen Medicare and Medicaid" (B: 255), "reduce our yearly domestic spending to its lowest level as a share of the

1- An appeal is the motive to which a message is directed.

economy” (B: 257-258), “give 2 million more Americans the chance to go to community colleges” (B: 313-314), “make it easier for people to afford a higher education” (B: 315-316), “end government subsidies to oil companies that have rarely been more profitable” (B: 334-335), “encourage innovation” (B: 345), “supporting the work of our most promising scientists, our most promising researchers and entrepreneurs” (B: 344-345), “do some nation-building” (B: 364), “get rid of pet projects and government boondoggles” (B: 366), and it is “a plan for better education and training, and for energy independence, and for new research and innovation, for rebuilding our infrastructure, for a tax code that creates jobs in America and pays down our debt” (B: 447-449).

Obama also tends to **personify** his plan in positive terms to portray it as the one that can realize a lot of aspired dreams and hopes. This is evidenced in “plan would strengthen Medicare ...” (B: 255), “my plan would reduce ... spending” (B: 257), “My plan for energy doesn’t ignore” (B: 325) “my plan would end the government subsidies” (B: 334), “My plan would make the R&D tax credit permanent” (B: 348), among others.

Finally, I came across a cluster of terms around the key term ‘plan’ referring to **authorities** (an expert and a study) deployed by Obama to bolster his point that Romney’s plans are fruitless. The authorities are found in: “[no] single independent analysis that says my opponent’s economic plan would actually reduce the deficit” (B: 194-195), “Even analysts who may agree with parts of his economic theory don’t believe that his plan would create more jobs” (B: 195-196), “just the other week, one economist from Moody’s said the following about Mr. Romney’s plan ... ‘On net, all of these policies would do more harm in the short term...’” (B: 197-199).

Clearly, the persuasive tactics that come out are: attack, humour (irony), causal reasoning, appeal to audience needs, personification and evidence from authorities.

iii. The Key Term ‘Grow’

The clusters that point to the **urgent issue of creating jobs** do not appear only around the key terms ‘manufacturing’, ‘tax’, and ‘plan’, the key term ‘grow’ is also surrounded by clusters emphasizing the same issue: ‘job growth’ (B:57, 67, 97).

The major terms that are found around the key term ‘grow’ are those of ‘economy’, ‘economies’, ‘economic’. In fact, interest in **growing the economy** is very much linked to that of increasing jobs in that the first leads necessarily to the second.

Lastly, the key term ‘grow’ is frequently accompanied by the term middle class: “grow the middle class” (B: 206), “growing middle class” (B: 212, 214) and “a growing, thriving middle class” (B: 488). This insistence on a **growing middle class is part of Obama’s plan to grow the economy and to ‘add’ jobs.**

Once more, it seems that emphasis on people’s needs (jobs and a flourishing economy) and cause and effect reasoning (a strong middle class to grow the economy) are basic strategies on which Obama relies to maintain his position as president.

iv. The Key Term ‘voices’

‘Voices’ is a key term utilized in a way to show that the rhetor meets laymen, listens to their complaints, and is always preoccupied by their concerns: “in the morning” (B: 472) and “when I lay down to sleep” (B: 472). Their “voices” remind him of similar experiences his family, his wife’s family and his grandparents went through: “my family’s struggles” (B: 473), “Michelle’s family’s struggles” (B: 474), “fears and dashed hopes our parents and grandparents had to confront” (B: 474-475). The rhetor, here, seems to speak with sincerity; he might be trying to **gain trust**. So, appeal to **credibility** is another strategy discovered via this cluster. Moreover, the **value of hard work** and **the ideal of social and economic mobility** resonate with this cluster in which President Obama reminds the audience of his modest upbringing.

Obviously, the persuasive strategies that can be extracted from the above cluster are appeal to: credibility and values and ideals.

v. The Key Term ‘middle class’

The first group of terms located around the key term ‘middle class’ describes the **relationship between a strong economy and a strong middle class**. Evidence on this is “you can’t have a strong and growing economy without a strong and growing middle class” (B: 211-212), a healthy economy is reached by reversing the “profound erosion of middle class jobs” (B: 108), the economy is built “from a growing middle class” (B: 214), and “a strong economy is built from a growing, thriving middle class” (B: 487-488). Now, how a strong middle class purports the economy? The answer is “– this shared vision – led to the strongest economic growth and the largest middle class” (B: 288-289). By “shared vision”, the orator means, inter alia, “consumer protection” (B: 286). So, **causal reasoning** comes into light: the better people are paid, the abler they are to buy American goods, the more American factories produce, the healthier the economy becomes.

The second cluster connects rather negative factors with the key term ‘middle class’. It is a cluster which is relevant to Romney’s policy which is not, for Obama, a panacea for the middle class: “middle class families will end up paying higher taxes” (B: 171), “raise middle class taxes” (B: 175), “placing the entire burden on the middle class” (B: 226-227), “not a plan to revive the middle class” (B: 439). Obama, here, is **attacking Romney** and at the same time **frightening** people of the sufferings that they may endure in case Romney wins the elections.

The speaker **evidenced** the above claims building on **past experience** in that his opponent’s policies had already been tried but they “did not grow the middle class” (B: 206) and “prosperity never trickled down to the middle class” (B: 66).

Obama rendered the current state of the middle class which “fell further and further behind” (B: 104-105) to the policy of his **predecessor** Bush.

If truth be told, **analogy to past events** is not supplied only to support the idea of Romney's visions probable failure but also to back the claim that Obama's plans will be successful on the grounds that they were beneficial for America at a given time: "it is a vision that has worked for the American middle class" (B: 298).

Talking of the 'middle class' gave Obama the opportunity to raise explicitly the issue of **social mobility**. I could reach this understanding by means of this cluster of terms: "a growing middle class, that provides ladders of opportunity for folks who aren't yet in the middle class" (B: 214-215) and "everybody who's striving to get into the middle class" (B: 298-299).

In "growing middle class, that provides ladders of opportunity for folks who aren't yet in the middle class" (B: 214-215), it is noticeable that the rhetor borrowed from the building and construction domain the term *ladder* to paint a vivid image about the possibilities of ascending that could appeal to the people who long for moving from lower social ranks to higher classes. In addition to this **construction metaphor**, the **regenerative metaphor** appears in "how to generate good, middle class jobs" (B: 31), "revive the middle class" (B: 439) and "growing, thriving middle class" (B: 488).

Four persuasive devices pop out, here: causal and analogical reasoning, appeal to fear and to the ideal of American exceptionalism of which social mobility is an ingredient, and construction and regenerative metaphors.

vi. The Key Term 'nation'

First and foremost, the following words "our" (B: 359), "let's" (B: 363), "as a nation" (B: 424), "as one nation" (B: 459) constitute a cluster of terms around the key term 'nation'. This cluster demonstrates **togetherness with the audience**, that the speaker and the listeners are under the umbrella of one pursuit, one political policy and one set of beliefs and values. This cluster can be reckoned as a strategy by Obama to relate to his audience and **build a bond with them**. This same cluster can also be a means utilized by Obama to urge his opponents to see that members of the same

society, and citizens of the same nation, with a common history and common values, will have the shared goal of nation-building however their visions might differ. It is a call upon **patriotism** “you can move this nation forward” (B: 493).

In addition, the rhetor boasted of his country’s **superiority**: “the wealthiest nation” (B: 479) and “the greatest nation” (B: 494).

The key term ‘nation’ is not only surrounded by the language of ideals, but also by the failures of the American previous experiences: “to put two wars on the nation’s credit card” (B: 59) and “so much deferred maintenance on our nation’s infrastructure” (B: 359). Those two quotes are an appeal to past events to show the mistakes of the economic theory adopted a decade before; it is, above all, a way to **blame** Bush for his wrong decisions.

Besides, when saying “the path that we take as a nation” (B: 424) and “you can move this nation forward” (B: 492-493) Obama, is using a **journey metaphor**. He draws parallels between traveling toward a destination and the journey of his nation toward better economic conditions and better life. ‘Forward’ suggests that the journey’s success depends on the collaboration, probably between Obama his people, and the other political parties.

Appeals to unity, American superiority, scapegoating and metaphor are the persuasive strategies that appear from the analysis of the clusters around the term ‘nation’.

3.3.2.3. The Analysis of Speech (C)

Speech (C) was analysed in the light of the clusters surrounding the key terms ‘fight’, ‘country’, ‘change’, ‘storm’ and ‘opportunity’.

i. The Key Term ‘fight’

Around ‘fight’ is found a cluster of terms entailing what Obama and his assistants are and will be fighting for: “a growing thriving middle class” (C: 68-69), children

“languishing in poverty” (C: 67), children “barred from opportunity” (C: 67), “a fair shot” for everybody (C: 69), “you and your family” (C: 142), “real change” (C: 145), “train 2 million Americans...with the skills that businesses are looking for now” (C: 159-160), “tax breaks to companies that are investing ...in US” (C: 173-174), “job” for veterans (C: 181), “you” (C: 210), and for “the future” (C: 249). It is noteworthy that it is the words ‘what’ and ‘that’ which come near the term ‘fight’ but in the cited examples I substituted the two pronouns with the phrases they refer to for the sake of clarity. This cluster embodies most, if not all, the issues the candidate deemed of highest priority in his plan. The fight for these issues evokes the scene of a battlefield in which the fighters are Obama and his aids in the government, the weapon is his plan and the enemy is the circumstances that led or would lead to poverty, lack of equal opportunities, or a lesser future. It seems that **war metaphor** is one of the speaker’s strategies to persuade the addressees of his own agenda. Moreover, when he said “Our fight goes on” (C: 67), he was depicting life as progression and political life, in particular, as a journey; hence, the **journey metaphor**.

Here is another cluster around the key term ‘fight’: “what we need to fight for.” (C: 32), “our fight goes on.” (C: 67, 68, 70), “what we’re fighting for” (C: 161), “what we’re fighting for.” (C: 154) and “things that we’ve got to fight for” (C: 219). Without doubt, the cluster is an echo of the idea of **unity**. In fact, it is the appearance of the pronoun ‘we’ and ‘our’ that led to such a conclusion.

The idea of **togetherness with the audience** crops up again through this cluster: “wehave”(C:144), “wecan’tgiveup”(C:148), “that’s what we are fighting for”(C: 161).

Obama, further, mentioned some of his physical features to launch a **laughter** among the audience: “the scares” (C: 146) and “the gray hair” (C: 146). This is to prove to his people that he has made his best to tackle the aforementioned issues, to fight for change.

The final cluster around the key term ‘fight’ is really inspiring, full of **hope** and determination. We feel that in it Obama’s unwillingness “to give up on the fight” (C:

228), his possession of “a whole lot of fight left in” him (C: 128) and his wish that his people have that “lot of fight” in them when he said “I hope you do, too”, (C: 229). Because of ellipsis, the term fight is implicit: instead of repeating “I hope you have a whole lot of fight too”, the rhetor used the auxiliary” ‘do’.

The persuasive strategies deduced from all I said above are: war and journey metaphors, unity, humour and hope.

ii. The Key Term ‘country’

While addressing his people, Obama shows his care of the nation thinking about its **future** and about taking it in the direction to attain the goals. Undoubtedly, anybody can see this in the light of the terms clustered around the key term ‘country’ (or around the pronoun *it* referring to ‘country’: “what it should be” (C: 29-30), “what it can be” (C: 32), “the future I see for this country” (C: 175) and “to move this country forward” (C: 215), “That’s the future I see for this country” (C: 175).

Upon scrutiny of the surroundings of the key term ‘country’, I could also extract the American **value of hard work orientation**. It could be figured out from these sets of words: “families ... working harder” (C: 65) and “workers here in Ohio and across the country building long-lasting batteries, building wind turbines.” (C: 168-169).

Another value, that of **equal opportunity**, sprang from this cluster of terms neighbouring ‘country’: “As long as there’s a child anywhere in this country who’s languishing in poverty, and barred from opportunity, our fight goes on” (C: 67), “a country where every American has a shot at a great education” (C: 151), “if you fought for this country you shouldn't have to fight for a job when you come home” (C: 181-182) and “in this country ... you can make it if you try” (C: 258-259).

“This spirit has guided this country along its improbable journey” (C: 52) and “to move this country forward” (C: 215) are two instances directly quoted from Obama’s speech. The main idea conveyed, through them, is that political activity and political

life, in general, are conceived **as a journey** in which long distances have already been walked and other distances will be marched. In addition, as the orator **personified** the term ‘country’ in “I spoke for the country” (C: 45), he thought of ‘country’ as standing for the whole American people. The **regenerative metaphor** is also present in the surroundings of the key term ‘country’. An evidence of this would be: “this country’s legacy of innovation” (C: 162).

Here is another cluster around the key term country: “I spoke for the country” (C: 47), “that spirit has guided this country along” (C: 52), “families anywhere in Ohio, anywhere in the country” (C: 65), “workers... across the country” (C: 168). Assuredly, the essence of such a cluster is Obama’s care to **address everyone in the nation**, not only a narrow group.

The last cluster around this key term is one denoting **unity**, a dear ideal for the Americans. The rhetor could make a hint to such an ideal when he spoke of anti-partisan politics in “I spoke for the country -- is that we will be with them every step of the way on the hard road to recovery” (C: 47-48) and “I will work with anybody of any party to move this country forward” (C: 215).

Drawing on the cluster analysis of ‘country’, it is found that Obama exploited the values of future orientation, hard work orientation, and equal opportunity, as well as the ideal of unity and metaphor (the journey metaphor, the regeneration metaphor and personification) so that his fellow citizens become inspired to adopt his plan.

iii. The Key Term ‘change’

America, for Barack Obama, and perhaps for the audience also, needs change. Obama, in a kind of an **attack**, depicts Romney’s plans as not representing change. Around the key term ‘change’ is spotted a number of clauses which illustrate this: “more power to the biggest banks is not change” (C: 126), “tax cutting favoring the wealthy not change” (C: 127), “rubber stamp the sea party’s agenda in Congress not change” (C: 129-130).

Near the key term change are located also the pronouns ‘them’ and ‘that’ which alone do not give a clear meaning. Thus, I preferred to write explicitly between brackets what each pronoun refers to so that the ideas around the clusters are clearer. The clusters are stated hereafter: “Giving them [old ideas] as change” (C: 123) and “that’s [refuting to answer questions about the details of your policies until after the election] definitely not change” (C: 128). When examining all those clusters, we easily notice that Obama is describing Romney’s plans and ideas as reflecting no change. This **attack**, whether justified or not, is reiterated in this sentence implicitly: “we know what change looks like” (C: 125).

After accusing Romney of not making any change, Obama turned to presenting his own plans as the ones which embody the real **needed change**. Such an idea is noted through some words located in close proximity with the term ‘change’: “every American has a shot at a great education” (C: 151), “train 2 million Americans” (C: 154) “innovation” (C: 162), “do some nation building” (C: 176) and “reduce our deficit” (C: 184).

The orator, besides, tried to **gain the audience confidence** by relying on his first term **deeds**: “you’ve seen me fight for it [i.e. for change]” (C: 146) and “you may be frustrated at the pace of change. So, am I” (C: 136) in which he exhibits his honesty.

Again **personification** crops up when the rhetor associated the key term ‘change’ with other terms as in “what real change looks like” (C: 145) and “change comes when..” (C: 162) in which he compares change to a person whose traits are, perhaps, not clear and whose arrival is expected and, more than that, needed. However, this person is walking slowly “you may be frustrated sometimes at the pace of change” (C: 135-136). In this last quote, we come, once more, across the **journey metaphor** by which Obama describes change as movement, or say travel, towards a destination.

The **value of equal opportunity** surfaces upon studying this cluster around the key term ‘change’: “Giving more power to the biggest banks is not change” (C: 126), “tax cut favoring the wealthy -- not change” (C: 127), “change we’re going to... – a country

where every American has a shot at a great education” (C: 151) and “Change is a future where we have to reduce our deficit, but do it in a balanced way” (C: 184).

Equal opportunity is not the only value stemmed from words surrounding the key term ‘change’, there is another **value**, that of **honesty**, which is conveyed through these items: “You may be frustrated sometimes at the pace of change. I promise you, so am I” (C: 136).

All in all, the strategies we have inferred are: attack, appeal to needs, credibility, the journey metaphor and personification, the values of equal opportunity and honesty, and unity.

iv. The Key Term ‘storm’

Two clusters appear nearby the key term ‘storm’. The first one contains words like “worst” (C: 42) and “bad” (C: 50), just for the sake of introducing the issue and **recognizing** the enormity of the storm.

As far as the second cluster is concerned, it conveys a sense of solidarity with and reassurance of the victims on the part of the speaker: “we will be with them” (C: 47), “we will help them rebuild” (C: 49) and “We are all in this together” (C: 50-51). It is to be noted that the term ‘storm’ is implicitly referred to in examples (C: 47) and (C: 49). These clusters may also be an allusion to **unity** as Obama took a bipartisan position and his attitude was presidential vis-à-vis providing help to all the victims during and after the storm. I also notice the presence of the pronoun ‘we’ in the three extracts above. Fairclough (1989) describes pronouns as encoding certain values. In this case, ‘we’ might be used to spread responsibility and attempt to involve all the audience (government, political parties, other people, etc.) in the process of aiding people in storm damaged areas. In its entirety, Obama’s message about a current issue helped him probably to grab attention, **establish trust, evoke emotion, and promote unity**, a value highly appreciated by the American people.

Going through the clusters around the key term ‘storm’ permits the understanding that Obama tried to gain credibility and boost unity to expand his peoples’ support.

v. The Key Term ‘opportunity’

Through the key term ‘opportunity’ and the cluster around it, Obama conveys the message that he wants to promote the value of **equal opportunity** and to guarantee a life without barriers for education, prosperity, and success. The speaker relied on the following fragments to reflect his belief in and pursuit to enhance equal opportunity: “As long as there’s a child anywhere in this country who’s languishing in poverty, and barred from opportunity, our fight goes on” (C: 64-65), “paths of opportunity for everybody” (C: 69), “everybody gets a fair shot” (C: 71), “everybody does their fair share” (C: 71-72), “everybody plays by the same rules”(C: 72), “opportunity for everybody” (C: 80-81), “everybody has a chance to get a great education”, (C: 86), and “everybody has chance to learn the skills...” (C: 86-87) and “broaden opportunity” (C: 256). It bears drawing attention to my consideration of *chance* as a synonym to the term ‘opportunity’.

3.4. Conclusion

Applying the Cluster Analysis method to the corpus, I have tried, thus far, to discern the key terms and organize the clusters of terms around them according to patterns that permit the identification of the persuasive strategies in the speeches. The techniques the analysis uncovered are grouped into six categories: arguments using logical reasoning (analogical and causal reasoning) and evidence (statistics and authorities), emotional arousals (hope; needs; fear; humour; values like future orientation, hard work orientation, equal opportunity and honesty; and ideals such as unity and American exceptionalism whose components are American superiority and social mobility), metaphor (game, construction, regeneration, journey and war metaphors as well as personification), credibility, scapegoating, and attack. How and why they were used? What were their probable effects? Was their use effective? The answers to these questions will make up the content of the next chapter. Before that I would like to

emphasize the dynamic relationships among speaker, text, audience, and context. For instance, Obama would not have made appeals to, among others, needs, fear or hope if recipients were not experiencing an economic turmoil. His economic speeches, as another example, were delivered in a manufacturing plant and a manufacturing state, Ohio, two avenues that manifest the importance he bestows on economy.

Chapter four:

**Discussion and Interpretation of
the Results**

Chapter four: Discussion and Interpretation of the Results

4.0. Introduction

The research question concerning what rhetorical devices were used to win the favour of the listening audience has already been answered. A few questions have yet to be answered; they are pertinent to the effects of those strategies on the listeners, the rational lying behind their use, and their effectiveness, if any. The present discussion is primarily structured around those left research questions. We will explain how the identified persuasive strategies were used, how they can influence the listeners, and their efficiency. Each device is taken alone and dealt with in the light of these points. A general discussion will follow up to draw broader conclusions on the use of these tactics and the success of the method of cluster analysis. Prior to wrapping up the whole talk, it is necessary to explain how the results of this thesis can be applied, and what its restrictions are so as future research may fill the gaps and take other avenues within this area.

4.1. The Rhetorical Strategies Effects

Unfortunately, throughout the rhetorical history there has never been a method whereby to identify the effects of a rhetorical device nor a tool to measure its effectiveness. Ewbank (1931 in Kuypers & King, 2001) tried to fill this gap by performing "case studies" where the critic wrote from personal experience derived from witnessing a speech. He looked at the audience's immediate reactions and the effect of the speech on them. By all means, this method is impossible in our case; besides, it involves a great deal of subjectivity and the critic may be influenced by performance not by the language. Given that this is so, I attempted to discuss the effects relying mainly on recent research in psychology drawing on Ullmann (1972) who maintains that words may have a strong psychological impact on the audience.

4.1.1. Arguments

Given that the term argument has a variety of meanings and can cause confusion, I have to determine its meaning in our context. By argument is meant the points or the reasons presented to support or oppose a proposition.

4.1.1.1. Cause-and-Effect Reasoning

To start with, in speech (A), the first cluster around the key term ‘job’ indicates that America was witnessing a loss in jobs. The other clusters neighbouring the key terms ‘manufacturing’, ‘tax’ and ‘change’ offer ways by which to solve the problem of joblessness: (a) revitalizing manufacturing, (c) taxing businesses investing in the overseas, and (c) training millions of Americans in skills needed in manufacturing. The verification of other clusters around key terms in speeches (B) and (C) revealed the presence of this pattern i.e. the pattern of presenting solutions to the problem of unemployment. A cluster around the key term ‘middle class’ suggests that a strong middle class is the base on which a strong economy rests. Two other solutions also emerge from the clusters around the key term ‘plan’; accordingly, supporting education, research and innovation can sustain the economy.

The examination of the above pattern allowed the deduction of one of Obama’s persuasive strategies. He first presented the challenges people face; then, provided reasoned logical solutions as to how America will overcome them. The logic of these solutions can be clearly seen in the causal relationships between the problems and the suggested solutions.

By definition, causal reasoning involves “an event that happens first and has the means, power, facilities, and/or desire to produce a second event” (Hube & Smider 2006: 136). This process can be explained by the following diagram.

Event 1 → Event 2

Diagram 4.1. A Diagram Explaining the Causal Reasoning Technique

Adapted from Huber and Smider (2005)

Causal reasoning is the theoretical explanation of the powerful forces represented by the arrow in the diagram.

Building on that, we will give a rather detailed account of Obama's causal reasoning. First, the decline in manufacturing results automatically in vaporization of huge numbers of jobs. That is, to create the desired effect, that of generating jobs, Obama needs just to spur the cause. Put differently, Americans will get rid of unemployment once manufacturing is rescued. Second, training people in skills needed then could permit their recruitment in the short term. Third, to tax businesses shipping jobs overseas means to encourage those businesses to invest inside America. Fourth, a strong middle class can provide a stable consumer base which, in turn, may drive new investments, i.e. a source for more jobs. The last solution in which causal reasoning is apparent is the one that crops up from a cluster surrounding the key term 'plan' where Obama addresses a counterargument of Romney. Romney proposed that cutting taxes instead of raising them would be the key solution to America's economic troubles. Obama, by contrast, contends that tax cuts would lead to students' loss of financial aid and an inability to finance research. These would, on the one side, affect middle class families and the poor and, on the other side, place crippling restrictions on innovation, thus on future business and investment – again a loss in jobs. To elaborate on this point, Obama gave an overview of the potential negative results of a plan opposite to his to persuade the listeners to adopt his own plan and turn away from the adversary's policy.

All in all, the orator utilized effective causal reasoning when he talked about the introduction of new and the healing of the current causal forces (manufacturing, training, taxes, a strong middle class, education, research and innovation) to improve conditions. More precisely, whenever he presented a solution he used causal reasoning (cause to effect or effect to cause) to show that the solution is capable of removing the existing evils. Huber and Smider (2005) note: “whenever you are developing a problem solution speech, causal reasoning may be the basic kind of argument that you are rising” (136). In addition, causal reasoning worked well to develop the proposition

that dangerous consequences would rise should the new opposing plan be adopted. On the whole, Obama's reasoning is so cogent and logical that can affect people's cognition, thus persuade them he is the best candidate.

4.1.1.2. Reasoning from Analogy

When suggesting that a shredded middle class can cause a slow economic growth, Barack Obama drew on historical facts to demonstrate the truth of his proposition. He compared a past American experience when the middle class saw periods of decay and those periods were accompanied with slow economic growth to Romney's plan which advocated a careless vision towards the middle class. After making an analogy with this past event, Obama induced that Romney's proposal would negatively affect the economy because an identical vision did so before. The rhetor tried to turn opinion against his adversary's proposal by evidencing its deficiencies. Exactly the same kind of reasoning was used when he said that tax cuts can lead to a disastrous economy and that poor manufacturing could engender a decline in jobs because these policies were tried by the Bush administration but yielded the worst results.

The technique utilized in the three aforementioned cases is reasoning from analogy¹. Via this form, it can be demonstrated that "what occurred in one situation will occur in a similar situation" (Hube & Smider, 2006: 150). In other terms, it is an argumentation in which the speaker compares one event, idea, object, person, or situation against another one to reach a generalization or an inference about them. The most important characteristic of this technique is that the two items being compared must be similar; otherwise, the argument sounds weak. If we study Obama's reasoning, we find that Romney's and Bush's plans are sufficiently comparable: both are similar in premise; so, they are supposed to be akin in results. The conclusion is that Obama's reasoning is so sound that it can fulfil its persuasive task because people do not get persuaded by irrational promises or ill-conceived ideas.

1- The term analogy, here, does not carry the figurative connotation but the literal one.

4.1.1.3. Appeal to Authorities

At the outset, it should be noted that “authorities in any field are individuals who are trained in research, have made studies, are free from prejudice and exaggeration, and are consistent” (Huber and Snider, 2005: 73). The authorities Obama mentioned are two: analysts in general and an expert opinion. Each of them constitutes an evidence in that it is supposed to be based on research. Furthermore, the audience would not hesitate to accept such evidence especially that the prestige of the second authority was increased by stating the novelty of the study (“just the other week”) and uttering its source: an economist from the corporate Moody’s which is a leading provider of economic data, research, and analytical tools – a fact that is normally known to many Americans.

4.1.1.4. Statistics

To boost his claims, Obama deploys numbers which are found in clusters around the key terms ‘job’, ‘tax’ and ‘plan’. No doubt, statistics are powerful pieces of evidence that can effectively strengthen the argument because they give clear, precise criterion on which to base decisions. Huber and Smider (2005) say: “statistics constitute evidence because they are a summary of things that did occur” (72).

The speaker chiefly gave statistics in terms of total number of cases, neither ratios nor averages were utilized. Interestingly, although he used numbers, he did not overawe the people with mathematics so as not to overwork the power of statistics. Even though he gave them in a clear and an unambiguous way, the audience ignored everything about their freshness and sources reliability. Still people generally accept numbers as a Holy book without questioning them. They are interesting and believable, hence their overwhelming effect.

It is true that logic is one of the constituent parts of persuasion; however, “those who depend on logic alone will be disappointed in their results” (Hube & Smider, 2005: 177) which means that appeal to pathetic proofs is inescapable.

4.1.2. Emotional Appeals

The three speeches exhibit a unique way of arousing the emotional force of the audience in favour of the speaker. The positive emotions are enthused by employing carefully crafted appeals.

4.1.2.1. Hope

The other strategy that has come to light after close examination of the clusters is that of appeal to hope which is embodied in two clusters around the key terms ‘American’, ‘future’ and ‘fight’. Casting hope on the speeches was Obama’s way to convince listeners that he can restore the United State to greatness; besides, it promotes confidence in him and improves morale among the listeners. He embodied the political myth of hope and projected a sense of an optimizer that was incredibly persuasive.

4.1.2.2. Appeal to needs

One of the patterns that popped out from the close study of the clusters around the key terms ‘tax’, ‘plan’ and ‘grow’ is that which points to the rhetor’s exploitation of the audience needs to win it by his side. In these clusters, Barack Obama stresses the economic and social aspects he intends to address once elected; they are those specific aspects people need and regard urgent. He responded to the people’s needs to reduce the deficit, pay down debt, revive the middle class, diminish taxes, obtain jobs, get education, and benefit from a health care program.

The speaker was aware that his speeches were targeted at an audience made up of people suffering of many deficiencies and aspiring to get rid of that situation. Because need is the precipitating factor for all persuasion the speaker tailored his message according to the audience needs, wants and desires. Chaiken (1999) says that people

analyze the persuasion information for significance and pertinence to their need. Obama created a vision that shows listeners that their needs and wants are going to be met once he is in office for another term. By allowing them to feel a focus on their needs, he captures their interest and sustains their attention throughout the message, and drives them to think he is their rescuer. That's how he influences their thinking and motivates them to accept his ideas. The listeners are involved in and concerned by the issue, so they would carefully consider the message and are likely to be more influenced by it.

Concisely, common persuasion techniques include tapping into the audience needs, wants and wishes and painting a detailed picture on how they will be satisfied. Undoubtedly, the best persuasive messages are those aligned with the most important needs of every audience member.

4.1.2.3. Fear

A fear appeal is “a persuasive message that attempts to arouse fear in order to divert behavior through the threat of impending danger or harm” (Maddux & Rogers, 1983: 469). Obama invoked fear in the audience by identifying the negative results of voting for Romney whose plan adopted a careless attitude toward the middle class and could lead to imposing more taxes on both poor and middle class families. It is said that the fear appeal overrides reason; so, even if Obama's words are not true, they are still effective especially when they contain a meaningful threat. Since this fear appeal focuses on the welfare of the message recipients, it motivates them towards an action which can reduce the threat depicted in the message. That action is to vote for Obama. In general, fear appeals are effective in increasing interest, involvement and persuasiveness (Latour et al., 1996). However, this appeal has been criticized as being unethical, manipulative, and exploitive. Still, I don't think so in case the threat is real.

4.1.2.4. Humour

The word “scars” and the phrase “the gray hair”(C:146) which are utilized by Obama to prove he was fighting for change in the first term stand as a cluster that evokes humour. The same is true for a cluster around the key term ‘plan’ which displays a wry sense.

Whilst not seeming flippant about serious issues, humour can win over the listeners as it can increase their happiness and “people who are in good mood are less likely to disagree with a persuasive message” (Freedman, et al. 1978, as cited in Lyttle, 2001: 207). Obama exploited humour also to show how likable he is, to create a bond with the addressees, to gain attention, to enhance receptivity, and most importantly to further arguments. For instance, Obama’s humouristic style around the key term ‘fight’ appears after a series of factual examples¹ in an attempt to back the argument about his fulfilment of his promises of the first campaign. This, besides, let it be noted, contributes to his credibility. Humour, in addition, has the capacity to divert listeners from producing counterarguments. Lyttle (2011) suggests that humour may be capable of “block[ing] systematic central processing by distracting receivers from constructing counterarguments” (27). This is especially facilitated with the type of humour that requires greater processing, such as irony – it occurs when the actual meaning of words turn out to be the opposite. So, the cluster around the key term ‘plan’ (“Mr. Romney is qualified to deliver on that plan” [B: 188]) is a manifestation of irony whose recipients may overlook holes in arguments since they are busy processing it.

It is noticeable that the rhetor did not overuse humour; otherwise, people would find it irrelevant. The rhetorical value of his arguments, moreover, is weakened when the entertainment value is strengthened.

4.1.2.5. Values and Ideals

Through values and ideals Barack Obama awakes emotions since he, on the one hand, stirs something dear laid deep in the addressees and, on the other hand, he shows

1- Events or things that actually have happened or existed.

his craving to protect the current and next generations by maintaining the nations keys to prosperity, that is its values and ideals.

i. Values

Values are broad, general, and conclusive beliefs about the way people should behave. They may not be based on reason. Values involve subjective preferences; they refer to standards of good and bad, right and wrong, desirable and undesirable” (McClosky & Zaller, 1984: 322). Kohls (1984) throws light on what he believed were the thirteen core American values; four of them appear in Obama’s addresses: future orientation, work orientation, equal opportunity, and honesty.

a. Future Orientation

Three clusters relevant to the key terms ‘manufacturing’, ‘future’, and ‘country’ paint a picture of the future where the promise of a coming thriving term is realized through a desirable plan that addresses the concerns of the people: economic recession, jobs, research, education, health, taxes, etc. The current while is seen as preparatory for greater events.

b. Work Orientation

Some clusters around the key terms ‘manufacturing’, ‘American’, and ‘country’ encode an action and a work orientation attitudes toward life. In his persuasive endeavour, the orator raised this value for he was conscious that the majority of his listeners highly regard labour. A belief that shapes Americans’ lives is that if they work hard, they can get ahead however the circumstances they were born into (Gingrich, 2011).

c. Equal Opportunity

People in the US do not care of equity of condition as their concern about equality in opportunity. This means that society should provide everyone with the opportunity to get ahead. People with varying talents and efforts should end up achieving success. Obama made a hint to this value through clusters around the key terms ‘tax’, ‘country’ ‘change’ and ‘opportunity’.

d. Honesty

The presence of the value of honesty in expressing the frustration of people and of Obama himself at the pace of change adds, undoubtedly, to the persuasiveness of the speech. This is because Americans have always preferred the approach of honesty and directness in transmitting unpleasant information or delivering negative uncomplimentary evaluations. Directness is not a matter of losing face. Anything other than the direct and open way is considered to be a sort of dishonesty, manipulation and ends in untrustworthiness.

e. Discussion

Like any people, Americans have a number of values to live by. Therefore, loading a message with their values is more likely to render it attractive and persuasive. Values stem their persuasive power from the fact of being criteria for many for selecting the attitudes, actions, goals, and methods they adopt. Values trigger some specific behaviour and constrain behaviour that contravenes preset ones. In fact, the results of a study by Nelson and Garst (2005) indicated that: “value matching promotes close attention to the message” (489). Besides, Seiter and Gass (2004) describe the “similarity and liking” (209) compliance tactic. They suggest that a simple mention of a shared similarity to the target recipient may increase the likeability of the message sender and therefore increase their influence. Similarities can point to a range of shared characteristics among which are values. While none acts according to their values at all times and in all places, people nonetheless feel uncomfortable when their values are touched or not accounted for in a given message.

Appealing to core values is also used as an effective form of argumentation. Obama did incorporate them when framing solutions to particular issues. No heavy taxing on the poor and encouraging invention are appeals to equal opportunity and hard work, respectively. Even Obama’s presentation of his deeds in the first term shows his commitment to the value of hard work. I argue that these values guarantee persuasiveness because they are shared with the recipients; they are not merely newly constructed ones. Americans would like their prospective leader to share their values

with them. So, for the speaker to have a greater influence, it is primordial that he is seen acting in accordance with and for the promotion of the people's values. Moreover, people tend to trust someone who maintains their values.

ii. Ideals

To gain people's support, Obama raised two ideals the Americans hold strongly: their sense of being exceptional and their unity. In what follows, I will first discern their meanings then explain their effect.

a. American Exceptionalism

American superiority is tied into the ideal of America's Exceptionalism. Lipset (1997) contends that: "Although the term [Exceptionalism] does not necessarily imply superiority, many neoconservative and American conservative writers have promoted its rise in that sense" (174). At the heart of American Exceptionalism also lies the concept of social mobility. Tocqueville (2003) invoked the term "American Exceptionalism" to describe what has been thought of as Exceptionally high rates of social mobility in the United States.

- Superiority

Clusters around the three key terms 'manufacturing', 'American', and 'nation' are an approval of Obama's appeal to American glory and superiority. The strategy of amplifying American supremacy arouses positive feelings on the part of the recipients. It is a common human desire to believe and define oneself as special and unique. The superiority strategy honours the audience. Lim (2002) says that Presidential rhetoric has become more people-oriented in the past century and especially in the past three decades.

- Social mobility

Nearby the key terms 'voices' and 'middle class' is a cluster visibly alluding to the American value of social mobility. This latter is a term that refers to the movement of individuals from one social class or economic level to another, in most of the cases, a

superior one, often due to high education or job change. It is either intergenerational (change in socio-economic status between children and parents) or intragenerational (over the course of an individual's life time).

b. Unity

American political culture contains a number of core ideals. Not all Americans share the same views, of course, but the vast majority subscribes to these general ideals among which is their unity. Obama projected his unifying messages by way of clusters of terms around the key terms: nation, fight, country, change and storm.

c. Discussion

Faith in their own exceptionalism, helps the one who mentions this ideal to inspire Americans and convince them they can achieve whatever they work for, and can make initiatives toward realizing great things (innovation, for example). The affirmation of such an ideal helped Obama establish a separation between the old regime and his new leadership under which restoring America back to its glory days is of high probability. Barack Obama was accused of denying the heart and soul of the nation because of running, not explicitly, on an anti-exceptionalism platform. His adversary Romney framed his campaign as a defence of America's exceptional character against an unpatriotic President who thinks that America is not a special country. The fact that I found clusters appealing to the American exceptionalism is Obama's dignified way to defend himself; it is a less direct way to show people he is proud of and is ready to preserve their creed.

Besides, the Americans have an unwavering belief in the chance to rise from humble origins to higher positions as a reward for their efforts. Several recent opinion polls show that this belief has been stronger in the U.S. than in the past. It was wise of Obama to draw on people's strong desire to move to upper social ranks in order to persuade them that he is the one who will pave the way for their dreams to come true. At the same time, a numerous studies have revealed that mobility has been witnessing

low rates and may need to be reinvigorated. Erosion in mobility makes it needed and more demanded on the part of people.

Unity was Obama's tactic to rally the country by appealing to common feeling of patriotism. Unity is a guarantee of cooperation and prosperity which are highly sought by any people especially at moments of national crisis. I would like to emphasize the point that unity does not mean uniformity; all citizens cannot agree on everything but they should be able to agree on the most fundamental aspects of life. Unity refers also to the cooperation between the republicans and the democrats even if they disagree with one another about policies. Politicians and leaders frequently appeal to this sense of unity especially when the country faces challenges bigger than parties' disagreements. It is this pace of politicians that Obama followed when he launched calls for bipartisan.

The effectiveness of an ideal is contingent on the context and the predispositions of the audience. The context here is a country wrecked in a mess and its people desire to restore its old prosperous state, an aim that could be reached by virtue of, among others, unity. Those people are likely to vote for someone who would defend and preserve their unity.

Last but in no way least, the rhetor draws on shared ideals for he knows that people get moved and change attitude when they find something in common with the other side. Perhaps this helps them find familiar images, find commonality, build rapport, enhance natural understanding, create connectedness, build interest and most of all give the impression of the ability of the speaker to fulfil their expectations.

4.1.3. Credibility

Several clusters around a number of key terms display Obama's search for the transmission of his image as an ethical and trustworthy person. In so doing, he

consolidates his influence for people are more inclined to listen, accept and believe someone they trust than a person whose credentials are not lofty.

The credibility pattern is particularly established when he recognized past occurrences notably the failure of the tax cut policy in the previous decade. This demonstrates his deep knowledge of the awful circumstances through which his people had gone. The audience also received evidence that the rhetor understood full well their present concerns by tackling the social and economic issues pervading the nation and by showing his will to address them once elected to office. All this is visible via clusters surrounding the key terms ‘job’, ‘manufacturing’, and ‘tax’.

Obama counted also on his achievements as a president for one term to elevate his trustworthiness since they function as an evidence of his sincerity. His deeds are grouped around the key terms ‘grow’ and ‘change’ when he spoke of the beginning of an economic affluence and job growth in his term and when he indirectly turned his listeners into witnesses of his fight for change. Indeed, he was in need of several factors into play to signal his accomplishments: Obama is no longer a blank screen with little to defend as in 2008. Spending more than three years in office, he had to defend his record on jobs and the economy.

The speaker, in addition, established his credibility by the use of credible and reliable sources as the appeal to authorities and statistics (c.f. 4.1.1.3. and 4.1.1.4.) in building arguments, the thing which shows his utmost respect for the audience. Within the same line of thought, another proof of not attempting to fool the audience by raising weak or silly arguments – as some speakers do – is the provision of logical arguments namely those based on causal and analogical reasoning (c.f.4.1.1.1 and 4.1.1.2.).

The development of Obama’s account of credibility is also ascribed to his establishment of a common ground with the audience. Most of the time he could do so when he acknowledged their values and ideals: equal opportunity, future orientation, hard work, honesty, superiority, upward social mobility, and unity. Evidently, it is

easier to persuade a person with whom you share something than an individual who is completely alien with already established firm beliefs.

To extend my discussion of the credibility appeal, I should call attention to the political candidates' tendency to frame their lives' stories as struggles against poverty. Appeal to populist instincts is meant to augment credibility. This is because recipients believe that someone who has once endured what they are experiencing would be more likely capable to feel their pains and would have a genuine interest in their well-being. Obama's speeches embody such an appeal in that he reminded his people via a cluster around the term 'voices' that he, along with his family and grandparents, had gone through the same hard circumstances the Americans were undergoing in 2012. This technique of identifying with the audience does not only enhance credibility but it also emphasizes commonality and fosters connection with the listeners. So, personal experiences are a double-edged sword: they establish trust and trigger feelings.

Undeniably, it is not the speeches alone that help promote credibility but also the speaker's entire background. It is my contention that the majority of the audience was prepared to believe Obama for his reputation, normally, had already been built as an Illinois Senator, a US Senator, a US President, and a graduate from among the most distinguished institutions in the world: Columbia University and Harvard Law School. This can be a proof of his intelligence, knowledge, and talent. What I want to say is that the perceived credibility of a source can greatly affect a message's persuasiveness in the sense that message scrutiny is low when the source is assumed to be honest.

4.1.4. Scapegoating

A quick look at clusters around the key term 'nation' allows anyone to realize that the speaker was indirectly blaming his predecessor Bush for the mistakes of the previous regime that led to a financial crisis. This technique is called scapegoating. It is the practice of placing unwarranted blames on a group or an individual for existing problems, negative experiences or misconducts. As a matter of fact, the scapegoat can be either innocent or guilty.

We notice that Obama did not choose as scapegoat someone who is beyond suspicion or prejudice; he settled on Bush who is popularly accused for the economic recession. The Gallup poll¹ estimated that after three and a half years of George Bush's departure, 68 percent of Americans still point fingers at their ex-President blaming him for the lousy economy (Newport, 2012). Therefore, the "blame Bush" strategy worked in 2012 campaign. However, many Americans still hold Obama partially responsible for the economy and think he has not done enough to fix the mess he inherited; as a consequence, a man with limited achievements is unlikely to persuade the electorate to vote for him again. In this case, Obama had to divert attention from him and convince people that it was not his incompetence nor his plans that led to such a situation, rather the deficit created by eight years of Republican policies was so giant that they were facing unprecedented long-term unemployment at unparalleled levels. As such, he could polish his image, govern trust, and project feelings of hostility and frustration onto his predecessor. Girard René (1989) assumes that scapegoating serves as a psychological relief for groups of people. Once blames are thrown on Bush, the citizens become contented that they have solved the cause of their problems by getting rid of that cause and start aspiring for better times to come with a new presidential portrait.

4.1.5. Attack

After close examination of clusters around the key terms 'tax', 'plan', and 'change', we could spot a pattern pointing to Obama's attacks on Romney. The following discussion will not be that facile to understand unless an explanation of the term attack is offered. Attack is a technique used in negative campaigning or smear campaigns whereby a candidate tries to win advantage by referring to the negative aspects of an opponent's opinion or policy rather than emphasising one's positive attributes.

1- The Gallup is an organization with a global extension that delivers research and analytics to leaders in various fields.

The attack technique is spotted in a cluster around the key term ‘tax’ which highlights the negative results (less jobs, fewer research grants, elimination of health care insurance and tax burdens on middle class and poor families) of the tax cut policy Romney sought to establish. What is interesting is that his attack is backed with evidence. The causal and analogical reasoning we discussed previously are the same devices at hand to block Romney’s influence. The cause and effect technique becomes visible when we understand that Romney’s suggestion of reducing taxes (cause) means shrinkage of tax payers (consequence), thus less money to afford research and health insurance programs and more taxes on middle class and vulnerable families. Second, attack is launched using reasoning from analogy when Obama announced that the tax reduction policy had been tried previously but proved unsuccessful.

In addition to logical reasoning, statistics and authorities were Obama’s tools to sustain his attack. The speaker, through a cluster located around the key term ‘plan’, pointed out flaws with his opponent’s policy using the power of numbers “eliminate health insurance for 33 million Americans” (B: 153) and appeal to the authority of analysts “analysts ... don’t believe that his plan would create more jobs in the short term” (B: 196). By inserting “in the short term” Obama might not have denied completely the validity of Romney’s argument. He just minimized it and demonstrated the minuscule worth of his propositions.

Another cluster of terms around the key term ‘plan’ “it’s not a plan to create jobs. It’s not a plan to grow the economy. It’s not a plan to pay down the debt. And it’s sure not a plan to revive the middle class and secure our future” (B: 437-439) is a manifestation of Obama’s attack on Romney. In this context, however, there is no evidence to boost what he was saying; those propositions are mere conclusions (may be based on the proofs Obama already advanced to weaken his opponent’s position).

In sum, the orator tried to make his attacks as reasoned as possible to gain persuasive power, otherwise recipients will not consider his message. Generally speaking, if attacks are not built on solid grounds, they can jeopardize one’s image.

The attack technique helps divert attention away from inherent flaws in the speaker's policies to issues with an opponent's policies. Digging more in this device, we discover that Obama's depiction of Romney's plan as an impede to health care promotion, economic growth and middle class thrive, etc. implies a hint to its incompatibility with the American value of equal opportunity. People are never ready to surrender values deeply clinched in their creed. By and large, we notice that Obama led rather a low intensity attack. It is interesting to note that such a kind of attacks has a maximized net effect on vote choice.

4.1.6. Metaphor

Persuasive strategies in political rhetoric are found in literal meanings as well as, often, in figurative. The use of metaphor is abundant in political discourse especially in discourses produced when a country is experiencing a climate of crisis such as an economic decline, changes in political system, or a natural disaster (Carver & Picalo, 2008). In such circumstances, rhetors attempt to rely on metaphors as a way to connect to the audience and push their own agendas to end that crisis situation. When it comes to Obama's discourse, it is not an exception; metaphor usage is pervasive.

It should be clarified that, in the analysis, the identification of the metaphorical expressions was not grounded on any method. The only means I had were previous knowledge of the language and a close scrutiny of the clusters which, both, enabled the classification of the detected metaphors into six types.

4.1.6.1. Game metaphor

Lakoff and Johnson (2003) argue that through metaphor we make abstract concepts easier to understand by thinking of them in terms of situations or concepts from our experience. At first glance, game metaphor in the corpus appears to fit this description because most people, if not all, have experienced game in their lives. If we compare manufacturing to game, we find the following. Both are guided by rules. In each there is a winner and a loser. However, manufacturing is a serious matter while game is

entertaining. Moreover, the first requires dedication in terms of time, effort and mental processing whereas the second is a choice made in leisure time.

Probably, when Obama associated manufacturing to game, something with which the audience is familiar, he managed to create a metaphor that obscures the complexity or the grandiose of ‘manufacturing’ and trivializes its importance. This simplification is rewarding in that recipients feel relief from the tension created by the perception that something is difficult to reach (Stone, 1988). It is this feeling of pleasure that paves the way to persuasion. So, metaphor might be designed to stir emotions (Stone).

At the same time, game metaphor intensifies the salient and interesting characteristics of manufacturing that are shared with game (enjoyment, winning, in case of losing it is not the end of world) and ignores others (sacrifice with time money and effort), thereby helps listeners concentrate on the desired aspects that appeal to them.

4.1.6.2. Regenerative metaphor

Regenerative metaphors are signifiers of profound change in diverse political visions. They provide the frame of the argument that the candidate will bring something new. The idea of the renewal of the country and the economy would normally appeal to Americans who were struggling. That is, politicians seek to conform to the emotions, desires and needs of the audience to make their messages persuasive. We should also call attention to the fact that the regeneration metaphor embodies the political myth of hope.

4.1.6.3. Personification

The 2012 electoral campaign was held in a period when the US was fighting one of the worst economic crises in its history. Obama brought hope and inspired trust in the American citizens by portraying his solutions (manufacturing, change, his plan) as persons that will bring refuge. The term ‘country’ also underwent a process of personification which might result in a captivating metaphor because of its affectionate

tone. Obama's address depicts the country as a human being to highlight the need for a good relationship and cooperation with his people. This is a powerful metaphor for stressing the need for unity and collaborative effort. The phrase "I spoke for the country"(C: 46) also emphasizes the role of the would-be president as a strong decision taking leader which is likely to appeal to the audience. It has, furthermore, the aim to get people identify with his beliefs, intentions and actions.

4.1.6.4. Construction metaphor

Charteris-Black (2005) notices that the construction metaphor is quite common in the American political discourse. In "ladders of opportunity", the construction metaphor refers to upward mobility; so, it resonates to underlying values and ideals which are usually deeply desired by the listeners (Stone, 1988). Moreover, the metaphor "nation building" (B: 364) taps into people's beliefs in that it highlights an essential theme of the American mythology of creation as it is related to the Frontier myth of building a civilization out of the wilderness (Marienstras, 1996).

4.1.6.5. Journey Metaphor

The journey metaphor is potent in the political arena because it presents policies as powerful activities which require time and patience so as to persuade people that getting to their destinations (purposes) necessitates more than one term in presidency. Time is needed to see concrete achievements. Charteris- Black (2005) maintains that journey metaphors "conceptualize long-term purposes". Additionally, when the candidate thinks of politics as a journey having destinations and paths towards those destinations, it means that he thinks of political action as purposeful. People are more persuaded to elect one with purposes than someone who moves aimlessly. To analyse it from another angle, the journey metaphor also evokes freedom of movement despite the presence of potential obstacles on the path – for example, one of the obstacles Obama faced is the Congress.

Charters- Black (2005), further, argues that the journey metaphor has a particular secondary meaning in the American political discourse because it is rooted in the

American historical experience of people undertaking voyages across the sea and then by people undertaking overland journeys Westland. Indeed, the journey metaphor is abundant in Obama's addresses and in political speech in general.

4.1.6.6. War metaphor

Due to the frequent use of the war metaphor, I can say that the speaker has the habit of imagining politics as a battle. Although there is no physical battle, there exist an abstract one in which the targets are the hardships and the attackers are the president and his assistants. In reality, aggressive metaphors are common in political discourse (Charteris-Black, 2005), especially in the American one. Perhaps this is because the Americans see it as a means of self-defence and of guaranteeing a secured life. Thus, violence in discourse is something the Americans are probably familiar and comfortable with. For this reason, politicians use it as a tool of persuasion because it is viewed positively by a large part of the audience. As Aitchison (1997: 92) puts it: "Metaphor is often adapted to the culture in which it is uttered in order to be persuasively effective". Besides, deeply rooted in the American society is the value of unity and we should not forget that war metaphor mostly seeks "bonds of union". In other terms, Obama did not assume he would fight problems alone but claimed, indirectly, his people's cooperation.

Taken as a whole, metaphors play at the emotional and cognitive levels and increase credibility.

4.3. General Discussion

So far, I have tried to uncover Obama's basic principles and elements involved in influencing the electorate in the American 2012 elections. After discussing their possible effects, we can conclude that the full power of persuasion is derived from the successful combination of several tactics.

Of the discovered strategies is the use of reasoning in presenting the candidate's solutions to current economic challenges, incorporated in his plan. Besides being

logical, his solutions constitute an appeal to audience needs, hopes, and fears. In other terms, his reasoning instigates emotion. Sometimes the strongest arguments are based on strong feelings. At the same time, the kinds of proofs provided are so solid that they increase the credibility of the speaker for people do not tend to believe illogical ideas.

Reasoning, on the other hand, is utilized in attacking Romney. The attacks themselves, in addition to being reasoned ones, resonate with values in that Obama's message implies that his opponent's plan does not reflect the American values and ideals. Not only attack was build on logical pillars but scapegoating also. More precisely, approximately, the type of evidence employed to defend his own plan is the same that is used in blaming Bush for all the damage the American economy underwent.

In a nutshell, the rhetor's arguments constitute at once an appeal to reason, emotion, and trust and form a basis for scapegoating and attack. I may argue, now, that few persuasive appeals are purely logical or purely emotional.

Turning to values, it has been demonstrated that their inclusion in a speech do not only play on the emotional side of the recipients but they also take part in the argumentation process. To cause emotion to surge, Obama complied with the audience's values. This is to say that such an appeal permits Obama to gain people's trust as he could be a preserver of their values, the fact that promotes his credibility. In short, emotional appeals may sometimes work in conjunction with credibility appeals. Up to now, we have seen that credibility stands on, inter alia, the merits of arguments and emotional appeals.

This interplay between the various appeals is also witnessed in metaphoric influence. We have demonstrated that metaphor is an efficient element to simplify concepts, relief tension, raise interest, intrigue hope and foster unity. That is, metaphorical instances help a speaker to connect psychologically with the audience. This work has also revealed that one reason for Obama's success is that his linguistic choices are conveyed in captivating metaphors which often emerge from the American

values and vice versa. We can say that there is an interrelationship between metaphor, rhetoric and politics.

The orator recognized that a purely logical speech would help gain agreement but will not be so interesting to the audience, and that some pathos – in fact there is a heavy reliance on pathos – is needed to keep the audience's attention and to excite them enough to act. At the same time, he also understood that a speech which only engages emotions may not bring the desired results for people tend to accept things when they are demonstrated. Additionally, voters are more open to some strategies than others; thus, Obama's use of varied kinds is justified by his willingness to follow the audience.

In sharp contrast to those who commend the practice of appealing to pathos, proponents of deliberative democracy oppose introducing passions into political speeches arguing that rhetoric, thus imbued with emotions, would manipulate people into an irrational consensus. More recently, however, postmodernists posit that reason itself is not neutral but a means of control and a form of coercion. Yet, for many other postmodernists, political speeches and persuasive argumentation coercion-free is possible within discourse.

Actually, the emotional appeal can aid to persuade listeners with limited mental capacities. A lay man, for example, will not have the ability to follow the complexities of detailed scientific proofs. So, pathos should be used to strengthen logical argumentation. Humour is an instance in this area. Making the listeners pleased and friendly is preparing them to receive a message.

The fact that Obama's reasoning was not that complicated and that his proofs were mere numbers and quotations reflects his care of the listeners' distinct intellectual capacities. Therefore, we can also say that he realized the importance of audience analysis by which is meant that the addressor must adjust the speech to audience expectations and level of comprehension, that different things appeal to different people and that listeners are not all the same. In reality, avoidance of sophistication is

also a requirement of the speaking situation. The spoken word differs from the written. Given that public audiences do not have the benefit of being able to go back and re-read sentences, they have a more limited capacity to comprehend complicated ideas and to take in difficult or dense language. The speaker had, therefore, to compensate for these limits by using simplified arguments.

In the same line of thought, it is widely believed that the Democratic Party usually targets a series of smaller groups, notably low-income minority populations and college-age youth – by contrast to the Republican Party which generally addresses middle and upper-middle class individuals. The analysis shows that the democratic candidate Obama directed his discourse at the middle, the low-income classes and the students, discarding the wealthiest people who are a minority. The two targeted classes form a large part of the electorate. Not only does this mean he sought to be as broadly appealing as possible, but also the contrast between these demographics is high, so it is not hard to see why a variety of appeals would occur.

Surprisingly, Obama, the first president of the United States of African heritage, does not explicitly, nor implicitly, try to limit his audience by sending specific messages to the blacks. He does not highlight, for example, the special impact of the recession on the blacks. The last Democratic president, Bill Clinton spoke often of the special concerns of African Americans. Obama, in his attempt to appeal to the whole nation, tells African Americans that the positive programs the government is working on will benefit equally all social groups (wide audience). This could be attributed to his determination to be a social *climber* and to his search for gain by “taking a cautious stance on America's race issues in an attempt to appeal to white voters” Al Sharpton¹, a black US politician. His “betrayal” of the blacks is due, perhaps, also to being half-white and/or to his upbringing outside the country away from the African American culture privilege, the fact which did not allow him to share their everyday experiences and struggles.

1-Panorama program on BBC

Embedded in Obama's speeches are the American ideals (exceptionalism which comprises superiority and social mobility) and values (hard work, honesty, future orientation and equal opportunity). They are a proof of Obama's attention of contextual adjustment in language choice. In fact, any discourse with the purpose of persuasion requires the account for the cultural values of the society in which it is produced. Clark (1984: 23) said that, "The most fundamental requirement in constructing a persuasive message is to select arguments that are consistent with the beliefs and values of the audience."

The previous idea is concomitant with the contention of Jowett and O'Donnel (1992: 22-23) that: "people are reluctant to change, thus, in order to convince them to do so, the persuader has to relate change to something in which the listener already believes." It seems that the orator followed this advice (1) by incorporating his people's values and ideals and (2) by basing the scapegoating technique on the Americans' belief that Bush was responsible of the economic deficit they were suffering from. Obama maximized this last point to his advantage.

As articulated in chapter three, the rhetorical situation is made up of: context, audience and rhetor. We have already tackled the influence of the context and the audience on the message. Now concerning the orator's life course impact on his oratory, we have found that some of his ideas are relevant to his background. His care of the middle class, strong belief in social mobility, recurrence of equal opportunity and commitment to hard work all reflect his life path and strive to move from the middle class to a popular successful leader.

Prior to concluding this discussion, I would like to state that with the application of the cluster analysis method, I could reliably infer a macroscopic picture about Obama's rhetorical mechanics to convince the American people of his capability to handle the country's affairs. The analysis, which is centered on key terms, permitted the identification of the persuasive strategies and gave example(s) on how they were used in the discourse but it failed to sort out all the instances in which a given tactic is

deployed for the simple reason that that particular tactic might appear in other contexts in the same speech but not in the surroundings of the chosen key term.

Finally, the analysis of the political rhetoric of Obama revealed that he is quite adept and mature at using various persuasive tools and that he succumbs to the exigencies of the situation and the audience. President Obama is possibly one of the greatest most polished orators. His ability to communicate well and excite audiences was illustrated throughout his campaigns.

4.4. Implications

The following points will tell the benefits of this analysis and its results. It is worth noting that these points are grounded on the claim that the cluster analysis method, like most rhetorical theories and methods, is both analytic and generative.

a. English teachers may rely on this work to show students how to conduct a rhetorical discourse analysis.

b. Most importantly, teachers, on the basis of this thesis, might equip students with a critical awareness of how persuasive writing works, and a better understanding of how persuasive devices can be deployed in their own writings. A weakness of much of the students in writing is that they engage one appeal too heavily and ignore the others. They might focus strongly on logical appeals and leave feelings or trust to chance. So, learners, when raising their awareness about those rhetorical strategies, will consciously build argumentative compositions in ways that will most effectively persuade. This analysis and its results may well show them how to construct cogent arguments through reasoning, how to back an argument with evidence in the form of statistics or quotations from authorities, how to attract the target audience, how to establish a common ground with them, how to acknowledge values and beliefs shared by them, how to stimulate feelings by focus on their needs and/or by raising their

hope, and how to use metaphor to produce particular effects, and most of all how to consider audience and context when crafting messages.

c. English learners can become more aware of the multitude of communicative and persuasive possibilities that exist in the language. They could utilize them not only in writing but also in speaking situations requiring their use.

d. Students who consult this thesis can learn how to listen to and read a persuasive discourse with in-depth understanding.

e. Some English students may go onto careers in journalism or in speech writing and campaign design on behalf of political candidates. In such cases, the current work can perfectly benefit them in the sense that rhetoric makes them more aware of (i) persuasive techniques to be deployed and (ii) of factors as context, audience, and purpose – why do they write? to whom? and what are the particularities of the moment? – which all help them decide on the linguistic choices to be made.

f. This dissertation constitutes, arguably, a first step towards considering teaching rhetoric in the written expression and/or literature classes for advanced levels.

g. The present research is probably beneficial for those attending American Civilization classes in that they could gain an understanding of the strategies used by a US president to be re-elected to office. It might also be useful for Literature students to analyse rhetorical devices in diverse literary works.

h. This thesis can give directions in the area of language training of politicians. World events are triggered by the words and actions of national leaders and politicians. So, political figures need to learn to pay careful attention to political speeches in order to gain clues about their implications. At the same time, the work of politicians is largely based on their ability to use language well – to convince and persuade. Thus, the

results of this research could be used by rhetoricians and politicians so as to write effective persuasive speeches and be aware and in control of the power and effect of their words.

4.5. Limitations of the Study

The current thesis is not void of some restrictions; they are listed hereafter:

a. The adopted inductive rationale permitted spotting most, but not all, the persuasive devices deployed in the analysed discourses. This is due to the fact that the analysis was confined to the lenses of the key terms I identified. Perhaps the consideration of more terms could have yielded more persuasive strategies. Discovering other techniques in the addresses can be just as important and intriguing as the analysis of the outlined elements; as a result, this research is limited by failing to recognize the missing persuasive strategies within each address. However, I would say that the unidentified devices are not the focus of Obama since they are less recurrent because they would normally appear in the surroundings of the less recurrent and less intense terms in the speeches. By the way, I could have selected *intense* terms other than the ones I did; in this case, strategies different from the identified ones could have cropped up. In short, this analysis is not really exhaustive in its results.

b. Due to space and time constraints only a limited number of speeches has been analysed. This both restricts our understanding of Obama's use of persuasive strategies and prevents drawing generalizations that cover political discourse in general.

c. Paralinguistic features (like body language and facial expressions) and prosody (rhythm, stress, and intonation) contribute also to the persuasiveness of a speech; however, they are excluded from this dissertation.

d. While rhetorical analysis is indeed a malleable tool whose application involves a great deal of subjectivity. Other similar inquiries may validate the results I reached or generate alternative interpretations of the speeches. Foss (1989: 194) notes that "their

[the students'] personal interpretations are inevitably involved in their criticism; objectivity and impartiality are impossible.”

4.6. Suggestions for Future Research

This analysis has created several other avenues for further research into rhetorical analyses, political discourse, persuasive strategies and supplied another method that scholars could use in understanding the rhetorical modes of persuasiveness. Let's begin with filling the hole left by this research endeavour. In this respect, future studies might include a wider set of speeches as a means of gaining a fuller understanding and grasp of how Obama works to develop a speech during presidential elections campaign. An analyst working within the rhetorical domain could also look for clues about existing and changing persuasive strategies throughout time deployed by a particular personality or movement. A comparative study between pre- and post-election speeches could clarify the difference, if any, in the type of the rhetorical techniques Obama resorts to. Similarly, one may choose to study the speeches of both a republican and a democrat; then, draw a comparison between the persuasive strategies each one uses. Another route some could take is to compare the ways in which persuasiveness is accomplished across two or more genres: business negotiations, judicial trials, advertising, and news writing. Sill with respect to comparative studies, one can draw the distinctions in the rhetorical persuasive tools between those of a US president and an Arab leader. Furthermore, it seems interesting to find out any gender differences and preferences when males and females use language for persuasive ends. It is my conviction, moreover, that the application of the inductive cluster analysis to a wide range of persuasive discourse samples can help delineate what persuasive strategies are possible and how they are usually used to guarantee the success of a persuasion endeavour. Then, all the findings are to be organized into patterns for the ultimate goal of building up a comprehensive theory on rhetorical persuasion from which a method can be elicited to analyse persuasive discourse in general. Last but in no sense least, cluster analysis, I suppose, could be utilized to identify, in an elegant piece of writing, rhetorical tropes and figures such as

alliteration, analogy, cliché, connotation, imagery, metaphor, conceit, metonymy, motif, paradox, personification, pun, repetition, etc.

4.7. Conclusion

We can conclude that Obama's persuasive strategies could, to a large extent, perform the task they were meant to. Their efficiency is justified as follows. First, the solid, reasoned and evidenced arguments cannot but exercise an influence on the minds of the recipients. The deployed emotional appeals are capable of enhancing an audience's confidence, morale, interest and attention. For moving the listeners and affecting the direction of their behavior, appeal to shared values and ideals is a requirement. Besides, establishing trust is a strategy that helps create connection and facilitate message transmission. The technique of scapegoating usually brings relief to the receivers as they imagine that the source of all evils is a personality whom they will want to get rid of. To defend oneself does not necessarily entail not to disclose, deliberately or otherwise, one's opponent(s) unheeding feckless ideas, positions or policies. Attacks, especially reasoned ones – whether dishonest or not – generally aid to outpace one's rival(s). As for metaphor, it conveys purposeful underlying messages that are capable of changing people's positions. Needless to say that each of these strategies has more than one effect and, most of the time, is not used in isolation but in conjunction with the others to maximize effect.

As a final point, although I indicated some of this research limitations, I clarified its benefits and left traces for those willing to carry out studies in the areas of rhetoric, persuasion, and political discourse.

General Conclusion

General Conclusion

This thesis stems from a curiosity to know how language is used for persuasive ends. In fact, I have always shared Austin's (1962) view that language is a powerful tool that influences perceptions and behaviors. Willing to investigate this area, I have decided to analyze three of Barack Obama's 2012 general elections campaign speeches. To do so, I have deemed a rhetorical framework appropriate in the sense that persuasion has always been the subject matter of rhetoric. However, I have thought of the available deductive methods as unsatisfactory for they open room for indulging in a "cookie-cutter" criticism. Hence, I have attempted to fill in this gap by proposing a new inductive method. It is the Burkean cluster analysis which has, since its birth been utilized for purposes other than the identification of persuasive techniques in a discourse. Practically, this method has allowed the conduction of a descriptive interpretive qualitative research.

Before implementing that method, it has been wiser to garner some theoretical knowledge from the literature that would serve as a background for the entire endeavour. For this reason, I have dedicated a space for illuminating such concepts as discourse, discourse analysis, political speeches, persuasion and rhetoric. I have, then, turned to sketching out a wide array of the prominent practices, theories and methods that have mostly been applicable to investigating persuasive discourse since the Greek period until the present times. This overview has made it clear that, seemingly, all rhetorical analytical tools are deductive and that it is high time we searched for an inductive one. The deductive approaches have been exemplified in, among others, the identification theory, the narrative and fantasy theme paradigms and the argumentative theories. I have, further, ended up this sketch with a rather detailed explanation of the cluster analysis method and the way it should be applied in the analysis of a discourse.

Fortunately, the analysis could make visible the strategies deployed in the corpus, which is a proof of the suitability of the cluster analysis method to carry out similar studies for identical purposes. Those strategies that have come into light are: argumentation using reasoning through analogy and cause and effect and evidence ranging from statistics to opinions of experts, emotional appeals such as hope, fear, needs, humour, shared values and ideals (honesty, hard work, future orientation, unity, American superiority), credibility, scapegoating and attack.

It is the joint effect of these techniques that established Obama as a polarizing incumbent who won a closely fought but decisive re-election. Yet, I call attention to the fact that his campaign has capitalized much on pathos and that values are a key ingredient in his speeches. We have also found that logic works in tandem with emotion and, of course, with the remaining strategies.

The diversity of the tactics deployed shows that: (a) the orator tried to appeal to miscellaneous categories of people, (b) he grasped the rule assuming that public discourse is directed to a heterogeneous audience, and that a thorough knowledge of the listeners is inevitable. Audience adaptation, a fundamental prerequisite of rhetorical writings, is apparent via the rhetor's attempt to adapt his ideas (solutions, for example) to peoples' expectations (needs, hopes, fears) and via his demonstrated awareness of the basic societal and cultural values to which the audience responds.

It is important to note that we should not lend ourselves to the present results blindly. If truth be told, the patterns that emerged from the clusters and their interpretations are the entire effort of the analyst. Put otherwise, they might involve a certain degree of subjectivity. Probably, subsequent identical research could bring about dissimilar interpretations of the clusters. Besides, analyses of extended samples of speeches could reveal more strategies utilized by Obama in his 2012 campaign or in his entire political career. Unfortunately, the cluster analysis method relies totally on the key terms whose selection was partially subjective (the intensity criterion) and

whose clusters turn us away from detecting other persuasive tactics existent in the discourse. In spite of these, and other, limitations the current research is not unbeneficial.

In so far as this thesis is concerned, it can be an exemplar for teachers and students on how to conduct discourse analyses. Besides, its results can be of use to English students to boost their writing abilities. I might be in a position to argue that readers, notably teachers and students, of this work would hopefully become more aware of how diverse rhetorical strategies are employed and what effects they produce in order to make use of them in their teaching and learning. Maybe we are still a long way from demanding the introduction of rhetoric into our written expression or literature programs but perhaps future research will demonstrate their necessity. By the way, this is an area, let it be stressed, that forms an exciting agenda for future research.

Bibliography

Bibliography

Aitchison, J. (1997). *The Language Web: The Power and Problem of Words*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Al-Jāhiz (2008). *Al-Bayān wa-al-Tabyīn* (rev. 7th ed.) Abd al-Salām Hārūn. 1 vols. Cairo: Maktabat al-Khānjī.

Andrews, J. R. (1990). *The practice of rhetorical criticism*. White Plains, NY: Longman.

Aristotle. (1991). *On Rhetoric* (G. Kennedy, trans.). Oxford: Oxford University Press. (Original work published 320 BC).

Aristotle. (2010). *Rhetoric* (W. Roberts, trans.). Pennsylvania: Pennsylvania State University. (Original work published 320 BC).

Austin, J. L. (1962). *How to Do Things with Words*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Baird, A. C. (1965). *Rhetoric: A Philosophical Inquiry*. New York: Ronald Press.

Bales, R.F. (1970). *Personality and interpersonal behavior*. New York: Holt.

Beale, W. H. (1987). *A Pragmatic Theory of Rhetoric*. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.

Bitzer, L. (1968). The Rhetorical Situation. *Philosophy and Rhetoric*, 1, 1-14.

Bizzell, P., & Herzberg, B. (Eds.). (1990). *The Rhetorical Tradition: Readings from Classical Times to the Present*. Boston: Bedford.

Black, E. (1978). *Rhetorical Criticism: A Study in Method*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.

Blair, H. (1965). *Lectures on Rhetoric and Belles Lettres*. Illinois: Southern Illinois University Press. (Original work published 1783).

Bogost, I. (2007). *Persuasive Games*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Booth, W. C. (1978). Metaphor as Rhetoric: The Problem of Evaluation. *Critical Inquiry*, 5(1), 49-72.

Bormann, E.G. (1972). Fantasy and rhetorical vision: The rhetorical criticism of social reality. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 58, 396-407.

Bormann, E.G. (1982). Fantasy and Rhetorical Vision: Ten Years Later. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 68, 288-305.

Brock B. L., Scott R. L., & Chesebro J. W. (Eds.). (1990). *Methods of Rethorical Criticism: A Twentieth Century Perspective* (rev. 2nd ed.). Detroit, MI: Wayne State University Press.

Brown, G and Yule, G. (1983). *Discourse Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bryant, D. C. (1973). *Rhetorical Dimensions in Criticism*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press.

Bruss, K. & Graff, R. (November, 2005). Style, Character, and Persuasion in Aristotle's Rhetoric. *Advances in the History of Rhetoric*, 8, 39.

Burghardt, C. R. (2010). *Readings in rhetorical criticism* (4th ed.). State College, PA: Strata Publishing.

Burke, K. (1969). *A Rhetoric of Motives*. California: University of California Press.

Calderwood, K. J. (2012). *Election to Cancún: A Comparative Rhetorical Criticism of President Barack Obama's Speeches on Climate Change*. (Master's thesis). Southern Illinois University Carbondale.

Cameron, D. (2001). *Working with Spoken Discourse*. London: SAGE Publications.

Campbell, K. K. (1996). *The Rhetorical Act* (2nd ed.). Belmont: Wadsworth.

Carroll, N. (1998). *A Philosophy of Mass Art*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Carver, T., & Pikalo, J. (Eds.) (2008). *Political language and metaphor: interpreting and changing the world*. London: Routledge.

Cathcart, R.S. (1991). *Post-Communication: Rhetorical Analysis and Evaluation*. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill.

Chafe, W. L. (1992). Discourse: An overview. In William Bright (Ed.), *International encyclopedia of linguistics* (Vol. 1, pp. 355-358). New York: Oxford University Press.

Chaiken, S. (1999). *Dual-process theories in social psychology*. New York: The Guilford Press.

Charteris-Black, J. (2005). *Politicians and Rhetoric: The Persuasive Power of Metaphor*. London: Palgrave MacMillan.

Cheney, G. (1983). The rhetoric of identification and the study of organizational communication. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 69, 143-158.

Chomsky, N. (2002). *Syntactic structures*. New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Cicero, M.T. (2001). *Cicero on the Ideal Orator (De Oratore)*. (J.M. May & J. Wisse trans.). Oxford: Oxford University Press. (Original work published 55 BC).

Cicero, M. T. (2004). *De Inventione*. Whitefish, MT: Kessinger Publishing. (Original work published 86 BC).

Clark, R. A. (1984). *Persuasive messages*. New York: Harper & Row.

Cook, G. (1989). *Discourse*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Corbett, E.P., & Connors, R.J. (1999). *Classical Rhetoric for the Modern Student* (4th ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Covino, W. and Jolliffe, D. (1995). *Rhetoric: Concepts, Definitions, Boundaries*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Crystal, D. (1997). *A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Day, D. G. (1960). Persuasion and the Concept of Identification. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 46(3), 270–273.

Day, H. N., (1990). *The Art of Discourse: A System of Rhetoric*. In Bizzell, P., & Herzberg, B. (Eds.). *The Rhetorical Tradition: Readings from Classical Times to the Present* (pp. 864-873). Boston: Bedford.

Dedaic', M. (2005). Political Speeches and Persuasive Argumentation. In R. Wodak, (Ed.). *Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics* (pp. 728-740). On Politics and Language. CT: Elsevier.

Dillard, J. P., & Pfau, M. (2002). *The persuasion handbook: Developments in theory and practice*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

Dixon, P. (1971). *Rhetoric*. London: Methuen and Co.

Edward, P. & Rober, t. J. (1999). *Classical Rhetoric for the Modern Student* (4th ed.). Oxford : Oxford University Press.

Enkvist, N. E. (1985). Text and Discourse Linguistics, Rhetoric, and Stylistics. In T. A. van Dijk, (Ed.) *Discourse and literature: New approaches to the Analysis of Literary Genres* (pp. 11-38). Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Ewbank, H. L. (1931). Four Approaches to the Study of Speech Style. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 18, 458-65.

Fairclough, N. (1989). *Language and Power*. London: Longman.

Fisher, W. R. (1987). *Human Communication as Narration: Toward a Philosophy of Reason, Value, and Action*. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press.

Foss, K. A., Foss, S. K., & Griffin, C. L. (Eds.). (1999). *Feminist Rhetorical Theories*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

Foss, S. K. (1977, November). *The Fantasy Theme Analysis Approach to the Rhetorical Criticism of Social Movements: An Evaluation*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Western Speech Communication Association, Phoenix, Arizona.

Foss, S. K. (1989). *Rethorical Criticism: Exploration and Practice*. Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland.

Foss, S. K. (1995). *Rhetorical Criticism: Exploration and Practice* (2nd ed.) Long Grove, IL: Waveland Press.

Foss, S. J. (2004). *Rhetorical Criticism: Exploration and Practice* (3rd ed.). Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press.

Frank, D. (2003). After the New Rhetoric. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 89(3), 253-66.

Freeden, M. (1998). *Ideologies and Political Theory: A Conceptual Approach*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Freedman, J.L., Sears, D. O., & Carlsmith, J. M. (1978). *Social Psychology* (3rd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Garsten, B. (2006). *Saving persuasion: A defense of rhetoric and judgment*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Gingrich, N. (2011). *A Nation Like No Other: Why American Exceptionalism Matters*. Washington, D.C.: Regnery Publishing.

Girard, R. (1989). *The Scapegoat* (Y. Freccero, Tran.). Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Genung, J. (1894). *Outlines of rhetoric*. Boston: Ginn & Company.

Golden, J. & Corbett, P. J. (Eds.). (1968). *The rhetoric of Blair, Campbell, and Whately*. New York, NY: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

Griffin, L. M. (1952). The Rhetoric of Historical Movements. *The Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 38, 184-188.

Gross, A. G., & Walzer, A. E. (2000). *Rereading Aristotle's Rhetoric*. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.

Gustainis, J. J. (1982). The Generic Criticism of Social Movement Rhetoric. *Rhetoric Society Quarterly*, 12(4), 251-260.

Hairston, M. (1976, March). Carl Rogers' Alternative to Traditional Rhetoric. *Annual Meeting of the Conference on College Composition and Communication*. Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

Hart, R. P. (1986). Contemporary Scholarship in Public Address: A Research Editorial. *Western Journal of Speech Communication*, 50, 282-89.

Harris, Z. S. (1952). Discourse Analysis. *Language*, 28(1), 1-30.

Heath, R. (2001). Identification. In T. O. Sloane (Ed.), *The Encyclopedia of Rhetoric*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hill, D. J. (1877). *The Science of Rhetoric: An Introduction to the Law of Effective Discourse*. New York: Sheldon & Company.

Hogan, J. M. (2013). Persuasion in the Rhetorical Tradition. In J. P. Dillard and L. Shen (Eds), *The SAGE Handbook of Persuasion: Developments in Theory and Practice* (2nd ed., pp. 2-19). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Hube, R. B. & Smider, A. (2006). *Influencing through Argument* (Rev. ed.). New York: Idebate Press Books.

Hunt, E. L. (1965). On the sophists. In J. Schwartz & J. A. Rycenga (Eds.), *The Province of Rhetoric* (pp. 69-84). New York, NY: Ronald Press.

Jones, J. & Peccei, J. S. (2004). Language and politics. In L. Thomas, (Ed.). *Language, Society, and Power*. New York: Routledge.

Jørgensen, M. & Phillips, L. (2002). *Discourse Analysis as Theory and Method*. London, SAGE Publications Inc.

Jowett, G.S., & O'Donnel, V. (1992). *Propaganda and Persuasion*. Londres : Sage publications.

Kinneavy, J. (1971). *A Theory of Discourse: The aims of discourse*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall International.

Kennedy, G. A. (1999). *Classical Rhetoric and its Christian and Secular Tradition from Ancient to Modern Times*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press.

Kohls, L. R. (1984). *The Values Americans Live by Meridian House International*. New York: Meridian House International.

Kuether, J. (2003). *Collins English Dictionary: Complete and Unabridged*. Summers, E., Isaacs, A., Butterfield, J., Holmes, A., & Law, J. (Eds.). London: HarperCollins Publishers Limited.

Kuypers, J. A., & King A. (2001). *Twentieth-century Roots of Rhetorical Studies*. Westport, CT: Praegers Publishers.

LaCapra, D. (1985). *History and Criticism*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Lakoff, G. & Johnson, M. (2003). *Metaphors We Live by* (Rev. ed.). Chicago: Chicago University Press.

Lakoff, R. (1981). *Persuasive discourse and ordinary conversation, with examples from advertising*. Round Table on Languages and Linguistics. Georgetown University 25-42.

LaTour, M. S., Snipes, R. L., & Bliss, S. J. (1996). Don't Be Afraid to Use Fear Appeals: An Experimental Study. *Journal of Advertising Research*, 36(2), 59-68.

Lauritzen, S. (2009). *Power in Discourse* (Magister Thesis). Aalborg University.

Leibold, N. (1993). *Interactive Linguistic Strategies in Campaign Rhetoric: Their Use and Function* (Vols. I and II, Doctoral Dissertation). George Town University.

Lemke, J. (1995). *Textual politics: Discourse and Social Dynamics*. London: Longman.

Lim, E. T. (2002). Five Trends in Presidential Rhetoric: An Analysis of Rhetoric from George Washington to Bill Clinton. *Presidential Studies Quarterly*, 32(2), 328-357.

Lipset, S.M. (1997). *American Exceptionalism: A Double-Edged Sword*. New York: W. W. Norton & Company.

Lunsford, A. A., Wilson, K. H., Eberly, R. A. (2009). *The SAGE Handbook of Rhetorical Studies*. London : SAGE Publications.

Lyttle, J. (2001). The Effectiveness of humor in persuasion: the case of business ethics training. *The Journal of General Psychology*, 128(2), 206-216.

Mack, P. (1993). *Renaissance Argument: Valla and Agricola in the Traditions of Rhetoric and Dialectic*. Leiden: E.J. Brill.

Mackay, C.S. (2004). *Ancient Rome: A Military and Political History*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Maddux, J. E., & Rogers, R. W. (1983). Protection motivation and self-efficacy: A revised theory of fear appeals and attitude change. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 19(5), 469-479.

Makau, J. M. (1990). Reasoning and communication: Thinking critically about arguments. In M. Nippold. (1994). *Persuasive talk in social contexts: Development, assessment and intervention*. *Topics in Language Disorders*, 14(3), 1-12.

Marienstras, É. (1996). *Les mythes fondateurs de la nation américaine*. Paris: Complexe. (Original work published 1976).

Matthews, P. H. (2005). *Oxford Concise Dictionary of Linguistics*. New York: Oxford University Press.

McClosky, H., & Zaller, J. (1984). *The American Ethos: Public Attitudes Toward Capitalism and Democracy*. Boston: Harvard University Press.

Metsämäki, M. (2012, February). Persuasive Discourse in EFL Debate. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 2 (2), 205-213.

Moberg, G. (1990). The Revival of Rhetoric: A Bibliographic Essay. *Journal of Basic Writing*, 9(2), 66-82.

Mohrmann, G. P. (1982). An Essay on Fantasy Theme Criticism. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 68, 109-132.

Moons, W. G., & Mackie, D. M. (2009). The Impact of Repetition-Induced Familiarity on Agreement with Weak and Strong Arguments. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 96(1), 32-44.

Morgan, R.P. (1982). Theory, Analysis, and Criticism. *The Journal of Musicology*, 1 (1), 15-18.

Murphy, J. J. (Ed.). (1965). *On the Early Education of the Citizen-Orator: Institutio Oratoria*. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merril.

Nelson ,T. E., & Garst, J. (2005). Values-Based Political Messages and Persuasion: Relationships among Speaker, Recipient, and Evoked Values. *Political Psychology*, 26(4), 489-515.

Nunan, D. (1993). *Introducing discourse analysis*. London: Penguin English.

O'Keefe, D. J. (2002). *Persuasion: Theory and Research* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

Oxford Dictionaries. (2006). *Concise Oxford English Dictionary* (11th ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Paltridge, B. (2012). *Discourse Analysis: An Introduction* (2nd edition). London: Bloomsbury.

Perelman, C. & Olbrechts-Tyteca, L. (1969). *The New Rhetoric: a Treatise on Argumentation*. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press.

Perelman, C. (1982). *The Realm of Rhetoric*. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press.

Pieper, J. (2000). *Abuse of Language Abuse of Power*. San Francisco, CA: Ignatius Press.

Price, J. F. (2008). *Barack Obama: a Biography*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

Ramage, J. and John, C. (1998). *Writing Arguments* (4th ed.). Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Ramus, P. (1990 [1549]). From *Arguments in Rhetoric* Against Quintilian. In P. Bizzell and B. Herzberg (Eds.). *The Rhetorical Tradition* (pp. 563-583). Boston: Bedford Books.

- Raymond, J. C. (1982). Rhetoric: The Methodology of the Humanities. *College English*, 44, pp. 778-783.
- Rhee, J. W. (1997). Strategy and issue frames in election campaign coverage. *Journal of Communication*, 47, 26-48.
- Reisigl, M. & Wodak, R. (2001). *Discourse and Discrimination: Rhetorics of Racism and Anti-Semitism*. London: Routledge.
- Roskelly, H. S., & Jolliffe, D. A. (2009). *Everyday Use: Rhetoric at Work in Reading and Writing*. New York: Longman.
- Rottinghaus, B. (2006). Rethinking Presidential Responsiveness: The Public Presidency and Rhetorical Congruency, 1953-2001. *Journal of Politics*, 68(3), 720-732.
- Saarikangas, S. (2010). *Recession Rhetoric in Finnish Budget Presentations*. (Masters Thesis). University of Tampere.
- Schäffner, C. & Kelly-Holmes, H. (Eds.). (1996). *Discourse and ideologies*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Schiffrin, D. (1994). *Approaches to Discourse*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- Scott, R. L. (1972). On Not Defining 'Rhetoric'. *Philosophy and Rhetoric*, 6, 81-96.
- Seiter, J. S., & Gass, R. H. (2004). *Perspectives on Persuasion, social influence, and compliance gaining* (2nd ed.). Boston: Pearson Custom Publishing.
- Shaw, D. R. (1999). The Methods behind the Madness: Presidential Electoral College Strategies, 988-1996. *The Journal of Politics*, 61(4), 893-913.
- Simons, H. W. (1970, February). Requirements, Problems, and Strategies: A Theory of Persuasion for Social Movements. *The Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 56, 1-11.
- Smith, C., & Voth, B. (2002). The role of humor in political argument: How "stratergy" and "lockboxes" changed a political campaign. *Argumentation & Advocacy*, 39, 110-129.
- Solway, A. (2001). *Ancient Greece*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Stewart, C. J. (2004). Back to Our Roots: The Library of Presidential Rhetoric. *Rhetoric & Public Affairs*, 7(3), 407-419.

Stone, D. A. (1988). *Policy Paradox and Political Reason*. Boston: Little, Brown.

Stubbs, M. (1983). *Discourse analysis*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Tocqueville, A. de (2003). *Democracy in America* (I. Kramnick ed., G. Bevan, trans.). London: Penguin Books. (Originally published 1863).

Toulmin, S. E. (2003). *The Uses of Argument* (Rev. ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Trudgill, P. (1992). *Introducing language and society*. London: Penguin.

Ullmann, S. (1972). *Semantics: An Introduction of the Science of Meaning*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

van Dijk, T. (1985). Introduction: Discourse as a New Cross-discipline. In T. A. van Dijk (Ed.), *Handbook of Discourse Analysis*, (Vol. 1, pp. 1-10). Disciplines of Discourse. New York: Academic Press.

van Dijk, T. A. (1995, December). What is political discourse analysis? Paper presented at the *Key-note address Congress Political Linguistics*, Antwerp. In Jan Blommaert & Chris Bulcaen (Eds.), *Political linguistics* (pp. 11-52). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Pub.

van Dijk, T. A. (1998). *Ideology: a Multidisciplinary Approach*. London: SAGE publications.

van Dijk, T. A. (2003). Critical discourse analysis. In D. Schiffrin, D. Tannen, & H. E. Hamilton (Eds.), *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis* (Vol. 2, pp. 258-284). London: SAGE Publications.

Walzer, A. E. (1999). Campbell on the Passions: A Rereading of the Philosophy of Rhetoric. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 85, 72–85.

Walzer, A. E. (2003). *George Campbell: Rhetoric in the Age of Enlightenment*. New York: State University of New York Press.

Widdowson, H. G. (2007). *Discourse Analysis*. Oxford: University Press.

Wilkinson, P. R. (2008). *The Concise Thesaurus of Traditional English Metaphors*. Oxon: Routledge.

Witherington, B. (2006). *Paul's Letters to the Thessalonians: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary* (Vol. II). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Zarefsky, D. (1980). A Skeptical View of Movement Studies. *Central States Speech Journal*, 31, 245-254.

Zarefsky, D. A. (2006). Skeptical View of Movement Studies. In Morris, C. E. & Browne, S. H. (Ed.), *Readings on the Rhetoric of Social Protest*, (2nd Ed. pp. 126-137). State College, PA: Strata Press.

Electronic References

Camia, C. (2012, November 15). Romney: Clinton said Hurricane Sandy Helped Obama. *USA Today*. Retrieved July 17, 2013 from <http://www.usatoday.com/story/onpolitics/2012/11/15/romney-clinton-election-sandy/1706831/>

cbsnews. (Internet site). (2012, July 13). *Obama: If We Win Virginia, We Win The Election* [audio-visual media]. Retrieved December 12, 2012 from <http://www.cbsnews.com/video/watch/?id=7414792n>

Newport, F. (2012, June 14). Americans Still Blame Bush More than Obama for Bad Economy. *www.gallup.com*. Retrieved August 13, 2013 from <http://www.gallup.com/poll/155177/americans-blame-bush-obama-bad-economy.aspx>.

Panorama. (TV Program). (2007, December 10). *Is America Ready For A Black President?* Retrieved September 05, 2013 from <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/programmes/panorama/7039523.stm>

Rasmussen. (11/06/2012). *US - 2012 Presidential Election: Mitt Romney 49% - Barack Obama 48%*. Retrieved September 05, 2013 from <http://www.pollheadlines.com/election-polls-11-2012/us-2012-presidential-election-obama-48-romney-49-rasmussen-11032012-11052012.html#sthash.EqmWneka.dpuf>

Williams, M. (2012, May 5). Obama officially launches 2012 re-election campaign - as it happened. *The Guardian*. Retrieved September 5, 2013 from <http://www.theguardian.com/world/2012/may/05/obama-launches-2012-reelection-campaign-economy> .

Appendices

Appendix 1

Speech A: Remarks by the President on Manufacturing and the Economy

Petersburg, Virginia

March 09, 2012

THE PRESIDENT: Hello, Virginia! (Applause.) Thank you so much. Thank you, everybody. Wow, what an unbelievable crowd. Everybody, please have a seat -- if you
5 have one. (Laughter.)

Well, thank you, James, for that rousing introduction and letting me hang out a little bit with your workers. We've got a few other folks I want to acknowledge: The Governor of the great Commonwealth of Virginia, Bob McDonnell, is here. (Applause.) Outstanding Congressman Bobby Scott is in the house. (Applause.)
10 We've got your Mayor, Brian Moore. (Applause.) And I want to very much say thank you to our outstanding Secretary of Commerce, Secretary Bryson, who was here and he is doing great work trying to create jobs and investment and opportunity all across the country. (Applause.)

It is great to be back in Petersburg. (Applause.) Last time I was here was during the
15 campaign. I had my bus pull over so I could get a cheeseburger -- (laughter) -- at Longstreet's Deli. (Applause.) You guys have eaten there. (Laughter.) Some of you may think this violates Michelle's Let's Move program -- (laughter) -- but she gives me a pass when it comes to a good burger -- (laughter) -- and fries.

Now, back then, in 2008, we were talking about how working Americans were already
20 having a tough go of it. Folks were working harder and longer for less. It was getting tougher to afford health care or to send your kids to college. The economy was already shedding jobs, and in less than a decade, nearly one in three manufacturing jobs had vanished. Then the bottom fell out of the economy, and things got that much tougher. We were losing 700,000 to 800,000 jobs a month. The economy was
25 hemorrhaging.

And three and a half years later, we're still recovering from the worst economic crisis in our lifetimes. And we've got a lot of work to do before everybody who wants a good job can find one, before middle-class folks regain that sense of security that had been slipping away even before the recession hit, and before towns like Petersburg get
30 fully back on their feet.

But here's the good news: Over the past two years, our businesses have added nearly 4 million new jobs. (Applause.) We just found out that last month in February we

added 233,000 private sector jobs. (Applause.) More companies are bringing jobs back and investing in America. And manufacturing is adding jobs for the first time since the 1990s. (Applause.) We just had another good month last month in terms of adding manufacturing jobs. And this facility is part of the evidence of what's going on all across the country. This company is about to hire more than 200 new workers -- 140 of them right here in Petersburg, Virginia. (Applause.)

So the economy is getting stronger. And when I come to places like this, and I see the work that's being done, it gives me confidence there are better days ahead. I know it because I would bet on American workers and American know-how any day of the week. (Applause.)

The key now -- our job now is to keep this economic engine churning. We can't go back to the same policies that got us into this mess. We can't go back to an economy that was weakened by outsourcing and bad debt and phony financial profits. We've got to have an economy that's built to last. And that starts with American manufacturing. It starts with you. (Applause.)

For generations of Americans, manufacturing has been the ticket into the middle class. Every day, millions clocked in at foundries and on assembly lines, making things. And the stuff we made -- steel and cars and jet engines -- that was the stuff that made America what it is. It was understood around the world.

The work was hard, but the jobs were good. They paid enough to own a home, and raise kids and send them to college, gave you enough to retire on with dignity and respect. They were jobs that told us something more important than how much we were worth; they told us what we were worth. They told us that we were building more than just products. They told us we were building communities and neighborhoods, we were building a country. It gave people pride about what America was about.

And that's why one of the first decisions I made as President was to stand by manufacturing, to stand by the American auto industry when it was on the brink of collapse. (Applause.) The heartbeat of American manufacturing was at stake -- and so were more than a million jobs. And today, the American auto industry is coming back, and GM is number one in the world again, and Ford is investing billions in American plants and factories. (Applause.) And together, over the past two and a half years, the entire auto industry has added more than 200,000 jobs.

And here's the thing. They're not just building cars again, they're building better cars. For the first time in three decades, we raised fuel standards in this country, so that by the middle of the next decade the cars that are built in America will average nearly 55 miles to the gallon. (Applause.) That will save the typical family about
70 \$8,000 at the pump over time. That's real savings. (Applause.) That's real money.

And it shows that depending on foreign oil doesn't have to be our future. It shows that when we harness our own ingenuity, our technology, then we control our future. See, America thrives when we build things better than the rest of the world. I want us to make stuff here and sell it over there. (Applause.) I don't want stuff made over there
75 and selling it over here. (Applause.) And that's exactly what you're doing here at the largest Rolls-Royce facility in the world. That's what you're doing by building the key components of newer, faster, more fuel-efficient jet engines.

I just took a tour and I learned a bit about how a jet engine comes together. Don't quiz me on it. (Laughter.) I'm a little fuzzy on some of the details. (Laughter.) I did press
80 some buttons back there. (Laughter.)

But a few weeks ago, I actually got to see the finished product. I went to Boeing, in Washington State, and I checked out a new Dreamliner. I even got to sit in the cockpit, which was pretty sweet. I didn't press any buttons there, though -- (laughter) -- because if it had started going it would have been a problem.

85 So this plane, the Dreamliner, is going to keep America at the cutting edge of aerospace technology. American workers are manufacturing various components for it in Ohio, and Oklahoma, and South Carolina, and Kansas, and right here in Petersburg. In fact, the demand for their planes was so high last year that Boeing had to hire 13,000 workers all across America just to keep up. And Boeing is gaining more and
90 more share all the time.

So think about that. Rolls-Royce is choosing to invest in America. You're creating jobs here, manufacturing components for jet engines, for planes that we're going to send all around the world. And that's the kind of business cycle we want to see. Not buying stuff that's made someplace else and racking up debt, but by inventing things
95 and building things and selling them all around the world stamped with three proud words: "Made in America." (Applause.) Made in America.

Think about how important this is. I mean, imagine if the plane of the future was being built someplace else. Imagine if we had given up on the auto industry. Imagine if we had settled for a lesser future.

100 But we didn't. We're Americans. We are inventors. We are builders. We're Thomas
Edison and we're the Wright Brothers and we are Steven Jobs. That's who we are.
That's what we do. We invent stuff, we build it. And pretty soon, the entire world
adapts it. That's who we are. And as long as I'm President, we're going to keep on
doing it. (Applause.) We're going to make sure the next generation of life-changing
105 products are invented and manufactured here in the United States of America.
(Applause.)

So that's why we launched an all-hands-on-deck effort. We brought together the
brightest academic minds, the boldest business leaders, the most dedicated public
servants from our science and our technology agencies all with one big goal: a
110 renaissance in American manufacturing. We called it the Advanced Manufacturing
Partnership. The Advanced Manufacturing Partnership. And today, we're building on it.

I'm laying out my plans for a new National Network of Manufacturing Innovation --
and these are going to be institutes of manufacturing excellence where some of our
most advanced engineering schools and our most innovative manufacturers collaborate
115 on new ideas, new technology, new methods, new processes.

And if this sounds familiar, that's because what you're about to do right here at
Crosspointe. Later this summer, the Commonwealth Center for Advanced
Manufacturing will open its doors. And it's a partnership between manufacturers,
including this one, UVA, Virginia Tech, Virginia State University -- (applause) --
120 VSU is a little overrepresented here, obviously -- (laughter) -- the Commonwealth and
the federal government. So think of this as a place where companies can share access
to cutting-edge capabilities. At the same time, students and workers are picking up
new skills, they're training on state-of-the-art equipment; they're solving some of the
most important challenges facing our manufacturers.

125 You just got all this brain power and skill and experience coming together in this hub,
and that makes the whole greater than the sum of its parts. It allows everybody to
learn from each other and figure out how we're going to do things even better. It's
going to help get that next great idea from a paper or a computer to the lab, to the
factory, to the global marketplace. And that's especially important for the one in three
130 Americans in manufacturing who work for a small business that doesn't always have
access to resources like these.

Obviously, big companies -- the Boeings, the Intels, the Rolls Royces -- they've got
the resources, the capital, to be able to create these platforms. But some of the small to
medium-sized businesses, it's a little bit harder. So this gives them access and allows

135 them to take part in this new renaissance of American inventiveness. And we've got
to build these institutes all across the country -- all across the country. I don't want it
just here at Crosspointe, I want it everywhere.

To do that, we need Congress to act. Hmm. (Laughter and applause.) It's true.
(Laughter.) But that doesn't mean we have to hold our breath. We're not going to
140 wait -- we're going to go ahead on our own. Later this year, we're going to choose the
winner of a competition for a pilot institute for manufacturing innovation -- help them
get started. With that pilot in place, we'll keep on pushing Congress to do the right
thing because this is the kind of approach that can succeed, but we've got to have this
all across the country. I want everybody thinking about how are we making the best
145 products; how are we harnessing the new ideas and making sure they're located here in
the United States.

And sparking this network of innovation across the country -- it will create jobs and it
will keep America in the manufacturing game. Of course, there's more we can do to
seize this moment of opportunity to create new jobs and manufacturing here in
150 America.

We've got to do everything we can to encourage more companies to make the decision
to invest in America and bring jobs back from overseas. And we're starting to see
companies do that. They're starting to realize this is the place with the best workers,
the best ideas, the best universities. This is the place to be. (Applause.) We've got to
155 give them a little more encouragement.

Right now, companies get tax breaks for moving jobs and profits overseas.
Companies that choose to invest in America, they get hit with one of the highest tax
rates in the world. Does that make any sense?

AUDIENCE: No!

160 THE PRESIDENT: It makes no sense. Everybody knows it. So it's time to stop
rewarding businesses that ship jobs overseas; reward companies that create good jobs
right here in the United States of America. That's how our tax code can work.
(Applause.) That's how our tax code should work.

At the same time, we've got to do everything we can to make sure our kids get an
165 education that gives them every chance to succeed. (Applause.) I've been told that
last year's valedictorian at Petersburg High, whose name is Kenneisha Edmonds, she
had a pretty good statement. She said her cap and gown was "the best gown that

anybody can hang in their closet." (Laughter.) I like that. So let's make sure students like Kenneisha have teachers who bring out the best in them. Let's make sure if they
170 want to go to college, their families can afford them to go to college. (Applause.)

And let's make sure all our workers have the skills that companies like this one are looking for -- because we've got to have folks engaged in lifelong learning. The days when you started out at 20 at one company and you just kept on doing the same thing for 40 years -- that's not going to happen anymore.

175 So even if -- as I was meeting some of the folks here, they had been in the industry, they'd been machinists, they'd been in manufacturing for years. But they're constantly upgrading their skills and retraining. And some of them had been laid off and had gone back to school before they came to this company. And so we've got to make sure those opportunities for people mid-career and onward, that they can constantly go back
180 to a community college and retool so that they can make sure they're qualified for the jobs of tomorrow.

At a time when so many Americans are looking for work, no job opening should go unfilled just because people didn't have an opportunity to get the training they needed. And that's why I've asked Congress -- (applause) -- I've asked Congress, join
185 me in a national commitment to train 2 million Americans with the skills that will lead directly to a job -- right now. (Applause.)

We need to create more partnerships like the one this plant has with John Tyler Community College. (Applause.) We should give more community colleges the resources they need. I want them to be community career centers -- places that teach
190 people skills that companies are looking for right now, from data management to the kind of high-tech manufacturing that's being done at this facility.

So day by day, we're restoring this economy from crisis. But we can't stop there. We've got to make this economy ready for tomorrow. Day by day, we're creating new jobs, but we can't stop there -- not until everybody who's out there pounding the
195 pavement, sending out their résumés has a chance to land one of those jobs.

Every day we're producing more oil and gas than we have in years, but we can't stop there. I want our businesses to lead the world in clean energy, too. (Applause.) We've got the best colleges and universities in the world, but we can't stop there. I want to make sure more of our students can afford to go to those colleges and
200 universities. (Applause.) Everybody knows we've got the best workers on Earth, but we can't stop there. We've got to make sure the middle class doesn't just survive

these times, we want them to thrive. We want them to dream big dreams and to feel confident about the future.

205 I did not run for this office just to get back to where we were. I ran for this office to
get us to where we need to be. (Applause.) And I promise you we will get there.
(Applause.) Some of these challenges may take a year; some may take one term;
some may take a decade -- but we're going to get there. Because when we work
together, we know what we're capable of. We've got the tools, we've got the know-
210 how, we've got the toughness to overcome any obstacle. And when we come together
and combine our creativity and our optimism and our willingness to work hard, and if
we're harnessing our brainpower and our manpower, our horsepower, I promise you
we will thrive again. We will get to where we need to go. And we will leave behind
an economy that is built to last. We will make this another American century.

215 Thank you. (Applause.) God bless you. God bless the United States of America.
(Applause.)

END

Appendix 2

Speech B: Remarks by the President on the Economy -- Cleveland, OH

Cuyahoga Community College
Cleveland, Ohio

14 June, 2012

5 THE PRESIDENT: Thank you! (Applause.) Thank you, everybody. Good afternoon, everybody. (Applause.) It is great to be back in Cleveland. (Applause.) It is great to be back here at Cuyahoga Community College. (Applause.)

I want to, first of all, thank Angela for her introduction and sharing her story. I know her daughter is very proud of her -- I know her daughter is here today. So give her a
10 big round of applause. (Applause.) I want to thank your president, Dr. Jerry-Sue Thornton. (Applause.) And I want to thank some members of Congress who made the trip today -- Representative Marcia Fudge, Representative Betty Sutton, and Representative Marcy Kaptur. (Applause.)

Now, those of you who have a seat, feel free to sit down. (Laughter and applause.)

15 AUDIENCE MEMBER: We love you! (Applause.)

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you.

AUDIENCE: Four more years! Four more years! Four more years! Four more years!

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you.

So, Ohio, over the next five months, this election will take many twists and many
20 turns. Polls will go up and polls will go down. There will be no shortage of gaffes and controversies that keep both campaigns busy and give the press something to write about. You may have heard I recently made my own unique contribution to that process. (Laughter.) It wasn't the first time; it won't be the last. (Laughter.)

And in the coming weeks, Governor Romney and I will spend time debating our
25 records and our experience -- as we should. But though we will have many differences
over the course of this campaign, there's one place where I stand in complete
agreement with my opponent: This election is about our economic future. (Applause.)

Yes, foreign policy matters. Social issues matter. But more than anything else, this
election presents a choice between two fundamentally different visions of how to
30 create strong, sustained growth; how to pay down our long-term debt; and most of all,
how to generate good, middle-class jobs so people can have confidence that if they
work hard, they can get ahead. (Applause.)

Now, this isn't some abstract debate. This is not another trivial Washington
argument. I have said that this is the defining issue of our time -- and I mean it. I said
35 that this is a make-or-break moment for America's middle class -- and I believe it.
The decisions we make in the next few years on everything from debt and taxes to
energy and education will have an enormous impact on this country and on the country
we pass on to our children.

Now, these challenges are not new. We've been wrestling with these issues for a long
40 time. The problems we're facing right now have been more than a decade in the
making. And what is holding us back is not a lack of big ideas. It isn't a matter of
finding the right technical solution. Both parties have laid out their policies on the
table for all to see. What's holding us back is a stalemate in Washington between two
fundamentally different views of which direction America should take.

45 And this election is your chance to break that stalemate. (Applause.)

At stake is not simply a choice between two candidates or two political parties, but
between two paths for our country. And while there are many things to discuss in this
campaign, nothing is more important than an honest debate about where these two
paths would lead us.

50 Now, that debate starts with an understanding of where we are and how we got here.

Long before the economic crisis of 2008, the basic bargain at the heart of this country had begun to erode. For more than a decade, it had become harder to find a job that paid the bills -- harder to save, harder to retire; harder to keep up with rising costs of gas and health care and college tuitions. You know that; you lived it. (Applause.)

55 During that decade, there was a specific theory in Washington about how to meet this challenge. We were told that huge tax cuts -- especially for the wealthiest Americans -
- would lead to faster job growth. We were told that fewer regulations -- especially for big financial institutions and corporations -- would bring about widespread prosperity. We were told that it was okay to put two wars on the nation's credit card; that tax cuts
60 would create enough growth to pay for themselves. That's what we were told. So how did this economic theory work out?

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Terrible. (Laughter.)

THE PRESIDENT: For the wealthiest Americans, it worked out pretty well. Over the last few decades, the income of the top 1 percent grew by more than 275 percent -- to
65 an average of \$1.3 million a year. Big financial institutions, corporations saw their profits soar. But prosperity never trickled down to the middle class.

From 2001 to 2008, we had the slowest job growth in half a century. The typical family saw their incomes fall. The failure to pay for the tax cuts and the wars took us from record surpluses under President Bill Clinton to record deficits. And it left us
70 unprepared to deal with the retirement of an aging population that's placing a greater strain on programs like Medicare and Social Security.

Without strong enough regulations, families were enticed, and sometimes tricked, into buying homes they couldn't afford. Banks and investors were allowed to package and sell risky mortgages. Huge, reckless bets were made with other people's money on the
75 line. And too many from Wall Street to Washington simply looked the other way.

For a while, credit cards and home equity loans papered over the reality of this new economy -- people borrowed money to keep up. But the growth that took place during

this time period turned out to be a house of cards. And in the fall of 2008, it all came
tumbling down -- with a financial crisis that plunged the world into the worst
80 economic crisis since the Great Depression.

Here in America, families' wealth declined at a rate nearly seven times faster than
when the market crashed in 1929. Millions of homes were foreclosed. Our deficit
soared. And nine million of our citizens lost their jobs -- 9 million hardworking
Americans who had met their responsibilities, but were forced to pay for the
85 irresponsibility of others.

In other words, this was not your normal recession. Throughout history, it has
typically taken countries up to 10 years to recover from financial crises of this
magnitude. Today, the economies of many European countries still aren't growing.
And their unemployment rate averages around 11 percent.

90 But here in the United States, Americans showed their grit and showed their
determination. We acted fast. Our economy started growing again six months after I
took office and it has continued to grow for the last three years. (Applause.)

Our businesses have gone back to basics and created over 4 million jobs in the last 27
months -- (applause) -- more private sector jobs than were created during the entire
95 seven years before this crisis -- in a little over two years. (Applause.)

Manufacturers have started investing in America again -- including right here in Ohio.
(Applause.) And across America, we've seen them create almost 500,000 jobs in the last
27 months -- the strongest period of manufacturing job growth since 1995. (Applause.)

100 And when my opponent and others were arguing that we should let Detroit go
bankrupt, we made a bet on American workers and the ingenuity of American
companies -- and today our auto industry is back on top of the world. (Applause.)

But let's be clear: Not only are we digging out of a hole that is 9 million jobs deep,
we're digging out from an entire decade where 6 million manufacturing jobs left our

shores; where costs rose but incomes and wages didn't; and where the middle class fell
105 further and further behind.

So recovering from the crisis of 2008 has always been the first and most urgent order
of business -- but it's not enough. Our economy won't be truly healthy until we reverse
that much longer and profound erosion of middle-class jobs and middle-class incomes.

So the debate in this election is not about whether we need to grow faster, or whether
110 we need to create more jobs, or whether we need to pay down our debt. Of course the
economy isn't where it needs to be. Of course we have a lot more work to do.
Everybody knows that. The debate in this election is about how we grow faster, and
how we create more jobs, and how we pay down our debt. (Applause.) That's the
question facing the American voter. And in this election, you have two very different
115 visions to choose from.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: No, we don't! (Laughter.)

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Obama! (Applause.)

THE PRESIDENT: Governor Romney and his allies in Congress believe deeply in the
theory that we tried during the last decade -- the theory that the best way to grow the
120 economy is from the top down. So they maintain that if we eliminate most
regulations, if we cut taxes by trillions of dollars, if we strip down government to
national security and a few other basic functions, then the power of businesses to
create jobs and prosperity will be unleashed, and that will automatically benefit us all.

That's what they believe. This is their economic plan. It has been placed before
125 Congress. Governor Romney has given speeches about it, and it's on his website. So
if they win the election, their agenda will be simple and straightforward. They have
spelled it out: They promise to roll back regulations on banks and polluters, on
insurance companies and oil companies. They'll roll back regulations designed to
protect consumers and workers. They promise to not only keep all of the Bush tax
130 cuts in place, but add another \$5 trillion in tax cuts on top of that.

Now, an independent study says that about 70 percent of this new, \$5 trillion tax cut would go to folks making over \$200,000 a year. And folks making over a million dollars a year would get an average tax cut of about 25 percent.

Now, this is not my opinion. This is not political spin. This is precisely what they
135 have proposed.

Now, your next question may be, how do you spend \$5 trillion on a tax cut and still bring down the deficit? Well, they tell us they'll start by cutting nearly a trillion dollars from the part of our budget that includes everything from education and job training to medical research and clean energy.

140 AUDIENCE: Boo --

THE PRESIDENT: Now, I want to be very fair here. I want to be clear. They haven't specified exactly where the knife would fall. But here's some of what would happen if that cut that they've proposed was spread evenly across the budget: 10 million college students would lose an average of \$1,000 each in financial aid;
145 200,000 children would lose the chance to get an early education in the Head Start program. There would be 1,600 fewer medical research grants for things like Alzheimer's and cancer and AIDS; 4,000 fewer scientific research grants, eliminating support for 48,000 researchers, students and teachers.

Now, again, they have not specified which of these cuts they choose from. But if they
150 want to make smaller cuts to areas like science or medical research, then they'd have to cut things like financial aid or education even further. But either way, the cuts to this part of the budget would be deeper than anything we've ever seen in modern times.

Not only does their plan eliminate health insurance for 33 million Americans by repealing the Affordable Care Act --

155 AUDIENCE: Boo --

THE PRESIDENT: -- according to the independent Kaiser Family Foundation, it would also take away coverage from another 19 million Americans who rely on Medicaid -- including millions of nursing home patients, and families who have children with autism and other disabilities. And they proposed turning Medicare into a
160 voucher program, which will shift more costs to seniors and eventually end the program as we know it.

But it doesn't stop there. Even if you make all the cuts that they've proposed, the math still doesn't allow you to pay for a new, \$5 trillion tax cut and bring down the deficit at the same time. So Mr. Romney and his allies have told us we can get the rest
165 of the way there by reforming the tax code and taking away certain tax breaks and deductions that, again, they haven't specified. They haven't named them, but they said we can do it.

But here's the problem: The only tax breaks and deductions that get you anywhere close to \$5 trillion are those that help middle-class families afford health care and
170 college and retirement and homeownership. Without those tax benefits, tens of millions of middle-class families will end up paying higher taxes. Many of you would end up paying higher taxes to pay for this other tax cut.

And keep in mind that all of this is just to pay for their new \$5 trillion tax cut. If you want to close the deficit left by the Bush tax cuts, we'd have to make deeper cuts or
175 raise middle-class taxes even more.

This is not spin. This is not my opinion. These are facts. This is what they're presenting as their plan. This is their vision. There is nothing new -- just what Bill Clinton has called the same ideas they've tried before, except on steroids. (Laughter and applause.)

Now, I understand I've got a lot of supporters here, but I want to speak to everybody
180 who's watching who may not be a supporter -- may be undecided, or thinking about voting the other way. If you agree with the approach I just described, if you want to give the policies of the last decade another try, then you should vote for Mr. Romney.

AUDIENCE: Boo --

THE PRESIDENT: Now, like I said, I know I've got supporters here. No, no, you
185 should vote for his allies in Congress.

AUDIENCE: No!

THE PRESIDENT: You should take them at their word, and they will take America
down this path. And Mr. Romney is qualified to deliver on that plan. (Laughter and
applause.) No, he is. (Applause.) I'm giving you an honest presentation of what he's
190 proposing.

Now, I'm looking forward to the press following up and making sure that you know
I'm not exaggerating. (Applause.)

I believe their approach is wrong. And I'm not alone. I have not seen a single
independent analysis that says my opponent's economic plan would actually reduce
195 the deficit. Not one. Even analysts who may agree with parts of his economic theory
don't believe that his plan would create more jobs in the short term. They don't claim
his plan would help folks looking for work right now.

In fact, just the other week, one economist from Moody's said the following about Mr.
Romney's plan -- and I'm quoting here -- "On net, all of these policies would do more
200 harm in the short term. If we implemented all of his policies, it would push us deeper
into recession and make the recovery slower."

That's not my spin. That's not my opinion. That's what independent economic
analysis says.

As for the long term, remember that the economic vision of Mr. Romney and his allies
205 in Congress was tested just a few years ago. We tried this. Their policies did not grow
the economy. They did not grow the middle class. They did not reduce our debt.
Why would we think that they would work better this time? (Applause.)

We can't afford to jeopardize our future by repeating the mistakes of the past -- not now, not when there's so much at stake. (Applause.)

210 I've got a different vision for America. (Applause.) I believe that you can't bring down the debt without a strong and growing economy. And I believe you can't have a strong and growing economy without a strong and growing middle class. (Applause.)

This has to be our North Star -- an economy that's built not from the top down, but from a growing middle class, that provides ladders of opportunity for folks who aren't
215 yet in the middle class.

You see, we'll never be able to compete with some countries when it comes to paying workers lower wages or letting companies do more polluting. That's a race to the bottom that we should not want to win. (Applause.) Because those countries don't have a strong middle class; they don't have our standard of living. (Applause.)

220 The race I want us to win -- the race I know we can win -- is a race to the top. I see an America with the best-educated, best-trained workers in the world; an America with a commitment to research and development that is second to none, especially when it comes to new sources of energy and high-tech manufacturing. I see a country that offers businesses the fastest, most reliable transportation and communication systems
225 of anywhere on Earth. (Applause.)

I see a future where we pay down our deficit in a way that is balanced -- not by placing the entire burden on the middle class and the poor, but by cutting out programs we can't afford, and asking the wealthiest Americans to contribute their fair share. (Applause.)

230 That's my vision for America: Education. Energy. Innovation. Infrastructure. And a tax code focused on American job creation and balanced deficit reduction. (Applause.)

This is the vision behind the jobs plan I sent Congress back in September -- a bill filled with bipartisan ideas that, according to independent economists, would create up to 1
235 million additional jobs if passed today.

This is the vision behind the deficit plan I sent to Congress back in September -- a detailed proposal that would reduce our deficit by \$4 trillion through shared sacrifice and shared responsibility.

This is the vision I intend to pursue in my second term as President -- (applause) --
240 because I believe if we do these things -- if we do these things, more companies will start here, and stay here, and hire here; and more Americans will be able to find jobs that support a middle-class lifestyle.

Understand, despite what you hear from my opponent, this has never been a vision about how government creates jobs or has the answers to all our problems. Over the
245 last three years, I've cut taxes for the typical working family by \$3,600. (Applause.) I've cut taxes for small businesses 18 times. (Applause.) I have approved fewer regulations in the first three years of my presidency than my Republican predecessor did in his. And I'm implementing over 500 reforms to fix regulations that were costing folks too much for no reason.

250 I've asked Congress for the authority to reorganize the federal government that was built for the last century -- I want to make it work for the 21st century. (Applause.) A federal government that is leaner and more efficient, and more responsive to the American people.

I've signed a law that cuts spending and reduces our deficit by \$2 trillion. My own
255 deficit plan would strengthen Medicare and Medicaid for the long haul by slowing the growth of health care costs -- not shifting them to seniors and vulnerable families. (Applause.) And my plan would reduce our yearly domestic spending to its lowest level as a share of the economy in nearly 60 years.

So, no, I don't believe the government is the answer to all our problems. I don't
260 believe every regulation is smart, or that every tax dollar is spent wisely. I don't
believe that we should be in the business of helping people who refuse to help
themselves. (Applause.) But I do share the belief of our first Republican President,
from my home state -- Abraham Lincoln -- that through government, we should do
together what we cannot do as well for ourselves. (Applause.)

265 That's how we built this country -- together. We constructed railroads and highways,
the Hoover Dam and the Golden Gate Bridge. We did those things together. We sent
my grandfather's generation to college on the GI Bill -- together. (Applause.) We
instituted a minimum wage and rules that protected people's bank deposits -- together.
(Applause.)

270 Together, we touched the surface of the moon, unlocked the mystery of the atom,
connected the world through our own science and imagination.

We haven't done these things as Democrats or Republicans. We've done them as
Americans. (Applause.)

As much as we might associate the GI Bill with Franklin Roosevelt, or Medicare with
275 Lyndon Johnson, it was a Republican -- Lincoln -- who launched the Transcontinental
Railroad, the National Academy of Sciences, land-grant colleges. It was a Republican
-- Eisenhower -- who launched the Interstate Highway System and a new era of
scientific research. It was Nixon who created the Environmental Protection Agency;
Reagan who worked with Democrats to save Social Security, -- and who, by the way,
280 raised taxes to help pay down an exploding deficit. (Applause.)

Yes, there have been fierce arguments throughout our history between both parties
about the exact size and role of government -- some honest disagreements. But in the
decades after World War II, there was a general consensus that the market couldn't
solve all of our problems on its own; that we needed certain investments to give
285 hardworking Americans skills they needed to get a good job, and entrepreneurs the

platforms they needed to create good jobs; that we needed consumer protections that made American products safe and American markets sound.

In the last century, this consensus -- this shared vision -- led to the strongest economic growth and the largest middle class that the world has ever known. It led to a shared
290 prosperity.

It is this vision that has guided all my economic policies during my first term as President -- whether in the design of a health care law that relies on private insurance, or an approach to Wall Street reform that encourages financial innovation but guards against reckless risk-taking. It's this vision that Democrats and Republicans used to
295 share that Mr. Romney and the current Republican Congress have rejected -- in favor of a "no holds barred," "government is the enemy," "market is everything" approach.

And it is this shared vision that I intend to carry forward in this century as President -- because it is a vision that has worked for the American middle class and everybody who's striving to get into the middle class. (Applause.)

300 Let me be more specific. Think about it. In an age where we know good jobs depend on high skills, now is not the time to scale back our commitment to education. (Applause.) Now is the time to move forward and make sure we have the best-educated, best-trained workers in the world. (Applause.)

My plan for education doesn't just rely on more money, or more dictates from
305 Washington. We're challenging every state and school district to come up with their own innovative plans to raise student achievement. And they're doing just that. I want to give schools more flexibility so that they don't have to teach to the test, and so they can remove teachers who just aren't helping our kids learn. (Applause.)

But, look, if we want our country to be a magnet for middle-class jobs in the 21st
310 century, we also have to invest more in education and training. I want to recruit an army of new teachers, and pay teachers better -- (applause) -- and train more of them in areas like math and science. (Applause.)

I have a plan to give 2 million more Americans the chance to go to community colleges just like this one and learn the skills that businesses are looking for right now. (Applause.) I have a plan to make it easier for people to afford a higher education that's essential in today's economy.

And if we truly want to make this country a destination for talent and ingenuity from all over the world, we won't deport hardworking, responsible young immigrants who have grown up here or received advanced degrees here. (Applause.) We'll let them earn the chance to become American citizens so they can grow our economy and start new businesses right here instead of someplace else. (Applause.)

Now is not the time to go back to a greater reliance on fossil fuels from foreign countries. Now is the time to invest more in the clean energy that we can make right here in America. (Applause.)

My plan for energy doesn't ignore the vast resources we already have in this country. We're producing more oil than we have in over a decade. But if we truly want to gain control of our energy future, we've got to recognize that pumping more oil isn't enough.

We have to encourage the unprecedented boom in American natural gas. We have to provide safe nuclear energy and the technology to help coal burn cleaner than before. We have to become the global leader in renewable energy -- wind and solar, and the next generation of biofuels, in electric cars and energy-efficient buildings. (Applause.)

So my plan would end the government subsidies to oil companies that have rarely been more profitable -- let's double down on a clean energy industry that has never been more promising. (Applause.)

And I want to put in place a new clean energy standard that creates a market for innovation -- an approach that would make clean energy the profitable kind of energy for every business in America.

340 With growing competition from countries like China and India, now is not the time for
America to walk away from research and development. Now is the time to invest even
more -- (applause) -- so that the great innovations of this century take place in the
United States of America. So that the next Thomas Edison, the next Wright Brothers
is happening here, in Ohio, or Michigan, or California. (Applause.)

345 My plan to encourage innovation isn't about throwing money at just any project or
new idea. It's about supporting the work of our most promising scientists, our most
promising researchers and entrepreneurs.

My plan would make the R&D tax credit permanent. But the private sector can't do it
alone, especially when it comes to basic research. It's not always profitable in the
350 short term. And in the last century, research that we funded together through our tax
dollars helped lay the foundation for the Internet and GPS and Google, and the
countless companies and jobs that followed. The private sector came in and created
these incredible companies, but we, together, made the initial investment to make it
possible.

355 It's given rise to miraculous cures that have reduced suffering and saved lives. This
has always been America's biggest economic advantage -- our science and our
innovation. Why would we reverse that commitment right now when it's never been
more important?

At a time when we have so much deferred maintenance on our nation's infrastructure -
360 - schools that are crumbling, roads that are broken, bridges that are buckling -- now is
not the time to saddle American businesses with crumbling roads and bridges. Now is
the time to rebuild America. (Applause.)

So my plan would take half the money we're no longer spending on war -- let's use it
to do some nation-building here at home. Let's put some folks to work right here at
365 home. (Applause.)

My plan would get rid of pet projects and government boondoggles and bridges to nowhere. (Laughter.) But if we want businesses to come here and to hire here, we have to provide the highways and the runways and the ports and the broadband access, all of which move goods and products and information across the globe.

370 My plan sets up an independent fund to attract private dollars and issue loans for new construction projects based on two criteria: how badly are they needed, and how much good will they do for the economy. (Applause.)

And finally, I think it's time we took on our fiscal problems in an honest, balanced, responsible way. Everybody agrees that our deficits and debt are an issue that we've
375 got to tackle. My plan to reform the tax code recognizes that government can't bring back every job that's been outsourced or every factory that's closed its doors. But we sure can stop giving tax breaks to businesses that ship jobs overseas, and start rewarding companies that create jobs right here in the United States of America -- in Ohio, in Cleveland, in Pennsylvania. (Applause.)

380 And if we want to get the deficit under control -- really, not just pretending to during election time -- (laughter) -- not just saying you really care about it when somebody else is in charge, and then you don't care where you're in charge. (Applause.) If you want to really do something about it, if you really want to get the deficit under control without sacrificing all the investments that I've talked about, our tax code has to ask
385 the wealthiest Americans to pay a little bit more -- (applause) -- just like they did when Bill Clinton was President; just like they did when our economy created 23 million new jobs, the biggest budget surplus in history, and a lot of millionaires to boot. (Applause.)

And here's the good news: There are plenty of patriotic, very successful Americans
390 who'd be willing to make this contribution again. (Applause.)

Look, we have no choice about whether we pay down our deficit. But we do have a choice about how we pay down our deficit. We do have a choice about what we can do without, and where our priorities lie.

I don't believe that giving someone like me a \$250,000 tax cut is more valuable to our
395 future than hiring transformative teachers, or providing financial aid to the children of
a middle-class family. (Applause.)

I don't believe that tax cut is more likely to create jobs than providing loans to new
entrepreneurs or tax credits to small business owners who hire veterans. I don't
believe it's more likely to spur economic growth than investments in clean energy
400 technology and medical research, or in new roads and bridges and runways.

I don't believe that giving someone like Mr. Romney another huge tax cut is worth
ending the guarantee of basic security we've always provided the elderly, and the sick,
and those who are actively looking for work. (Applause.)

Those things don't make our economy weak. What makes our economy weak is when
405 fewer and fewer people can afford to buy the goods and services our businesses sell.
(Applause.) Businesses don't have customers if folks are having such a hard time.

What drags us all down is an economy in which there's an ever-widening gap between
a few folks who are doing extraordinarily well and a growing number of people who,
no matter how hard they work, can barely make ends meet. (Applause.)

410 So, Governor Romney disagrees with my vision. His allies in Congress disagree with
my vision. Neither of them will endorse any policy that asks the wealthiest Americans
to pay even a nickel more in taxes. It's the reason we haven't reached a grand bargain
to bring down our deficit -- not with my plan, not with the Bowles-Simpson plan, not
with the so-called Gang of Six plan.

415 Despite the fact that taxes are lower than they've been in decades, they won't work
with us on any plan that would increase taxes on our wealthiest Americans. It's the
reason a jobs bill that would put 1 million people back to work has been voted down
time and time again. It's the biggest source of gridlock in Washington today.

And the only thing that can break the stalemate is you. (Applause.) You see, in our
420 democracy, this remarkable system of government, you, the people, have the final say.
(Applause.)

This November is your chance to render a verdict on the debate over how to grow the
economy, how to create good jobs, how to pay down our deficit. Your vote will
finally determine the path that we take as a nation -- not just tomorrow, but for years to
425 come. (Applause.)

When you strip everything else away, that's really what this election is about. That's
what is at stake right now. Everything else is just noise. Everything else is just a
distraction. (Applause.)

From now until then, both sides will spend tons of money on TV ads. The other side
430 will spend over a billion dollars on ads that tell you the economy is bad, that it's all my
fault -- (applause) -- that I can't fix it because I think government is always the
answer, or because I didn't make a lot of money in the private sector and don't
understand it, or because I'm in over my head, or because I think everything and
everybody is doing just fine. (Laughter.) That's what the scary voice in the ads will
435 say. (Laughter.) That's what Mr. Romney will say. That's what the Republicans in
Congress will say.

Well, that may be their plan to win the election, but it's not a plan to create jobs.
(Applause.) It's not a plan to grow the economy. It's not a plan to pay down the debt.
And it's sure not a plan to revive the middle class and secure our future.

440 I think you deserve better than that. (Applause.)

At a moment this big -- a moment when so many people are still struggling -- I think
you deserve a real debate about the economic plans we're proposing.

Governor Romney and the Republicans who run Congress believe that if you simply
take away regulations and cut taxes by trillions of dollars, the market will solve all of

445 our problems on its own. If you agree with that, you should vote for them. And I
promise you they will take us in that direction.

I believe we need a plan for better education and training -- (applause) -- and for
energy independence, and for new research and innovation; for rebuilding our
infrastructure; for a tax code that creates jobs in America and pays down our debt in a
450 way that's balanced. I have that plan. They don't. (Applause.)

And if you agree with me -- if you believe this economy grows best when everybody
gets a fair shot, and everybody does their fair share, and everybody plays by the same
set of rules -- then I ask you to stand with me for a second term as President.
(Applause.)

455 In fact, I'll take it a step further. I ask, you vote for anyone else -- whether they're
Democrats, independents, or Republicans -- who share your view about how America
should grow. (Applause.)

I will work with anyone of any party who believes that we're in this together -- who
believes that we rise or fall as one nation and as one people. (Applause.) Because I'm
460 convinced that there are actually a lot of Republicans out there who may not agree
with every one of my policies, but who still believe in a balanced, responsible
approach to economic growth, and who remember the lessons of our history, and who
don't like the direction their leaders are taking them. (Applause.)

And let me leave you with one last thought. As you consider your choice in
465 November -- (applause) -- don't let anybody tell you that the challenges we face right
now are beyond our ability to solve.

It's hard not to get cynical when times are tough. And I'm reminded every day of just
how tough things are for too many Americans. Every day I hear from folks who are
out of work or have lost their home. Across this country, I meet people who are
470 struggling to pay their bills, or older workers worried about retirement, or young
people who are underemployed and burdened with debt. I hear their voices when I

wake up in the morning, and those voices ring in my head when I lay down to sleep. And in those voices, I hear the echo of my own family's struggles as I was growing up, and Michelle's family's struggles when she was growing up, and the fears and the
475 dashed hopes that our parents and grandparents had to confront.

But you know what, in those voices I also hear a stubborn hope, and a fierce pride, and a determination to overcome whatever challenges we face. (Applause.) And in you, the American people, I'm reminded of all the things that tilt the future in our favor.

We remain the wealthiest nation on Earth. We have the best workers and
480 entrepreneurs, the best scientists and researchers, the best colleges and universities. We are a young country with the greatest diversity of talent and ingenuity drawn from every corner of the globe. So, yes, reforming our schools, rebuilding our infrastructure will take time. Yes, paying down our debt will require some tough choices and shared sacrifice. But it can be done. And we'll be stronger for it. (Applause.)

485 And what's lacking is not the capacity to meet our challenges. What is lacking is our politics. And that's something entirely within your power to solve. So this November, you can remind the world how a strong economy is built -- not from the top down, but from a growing, thriving middle class. (Applause.)

This November, you can remind the world how it is that we've traveled this far as a
490 country -- not by telling everybody to fend for themselves, but by coming together as one American family, all of us pitching in, all of us pulling our own weight. (Applause.)

This November, you can provide a mandate for the change we need right now. You can move this nation forward. And you can remind the world once again why the United States of America is still the greatest nation on Earth. (Applause.)

495 Thank you. God bless you. God bless the United States of America. Thank you. (Applause.)

END

Appendix 3

Speech C: Remarks by the President at a Campaign Event in Columbus, Ohio

Columbus, Ohio

November 05, 2012

5

THE PRESIDENT: Hello, Columbus! (Applause.) Hello, Ohio! (Applause.) Are you fired up?

AUDIENCE: Yes!

THE PRESIDENT: Are you ready to go?

10 AUDIENCE: Yes!

THE PRESIDENT: Fired up!

AUDIENCE: Fired up!

THE PRESIDENT: Ready to go!

AUDIENCE: Ready to go!

15 THE PRESIDENT: Fired up!

AUDIENCE: Fired up!

THE PRESIDENT: Ready to go?

AUDIENCE: Ready to go!

THE PRESIDENT: Give it up for Jay-Z. (Applause.)

20 It is an incredible honor to have Jay-Z and Bruce Springsteen on the same bill. (Applause.) And not only are they all on my iPod -- and, yes, the President has an iPod -- (laughter) -- but it's also because both of them tell an American story.

Now, Jay-Z --

AUDIENCE MEMBER: I love you, Obama!

25 THE PRESIDENT: I love you back. (Applause.)

I told Jay-Z the other day our lives are parallel a little bit. Nobody, I think, would expect us to be where we are today when they met us as younger men. Both of us now have daughters and both of us have wives who are more popular than we are. (Laughter and applause.)

30 And Bruce Springsteen, all the work he's done for this campaign. (Applause.) The Boss. He, just like Jay, they tell the story of what our country is, but also what it should be and what it can be and what we need to fight for. And I'm going to be flying with Bruce Springsteen on the last day that I'll ever campaign -- that's not a bad way to bring it home, with The Boss. (Applause.) With The Boss. (Applause.)

35 There are a few other people I want to thank before we get started: One of the toughest fighters on behalf of working families that I know -- your Senator, Sherrod Brown, is in the house. (Applause.) Someone who will follow in his footsteps if you send her to Congress -- Joyce Beatty is here. (Applause.) Your Mayor, Michael Coleman, is here. (Applause.) And give it up for your former Governor and my friend
40 -- Ted Stickland in the house.

Now, for the past week, all of us have been focused on what's been happening on the East Coast and one of the worst storms of our lifetime. And as a nation, we watch the harrowing images and we've been heartbroken by those who have been lost.

And I had a chance to visit New Jersey and talk to some of the families, and every day
45 I'm on the phone with mayors and local officials. And what I've said to them -- and I think, Ohio, you'll agree with me when I say this, because I didn't just speak for me, I spoke for the country -- is that we will be with them every step of the way on the hard road to recovery. (Applause.) Every step of the way, because that's what we do as Americans. We will help them rebuild. And we'll carry on with the spirit that says no

50 matter how bad a storm is, no matter how tough times may get, we're all in this together. We rise or fall as one nation and as one people. (Applause.)

That spirit has guided this country along its improbable journey for more than two centuries. It's carried us through the trials and tribulations of the last four years.

Now, in 2008, we were in the middle of two wars and the worst economic crisis since
55 the Great Depression. Today, our businesses have created nearly 5.5 million new jobs. (Applause.) The American auto industry has come roaring back. Home values are on the rise. We're less dependent on foreign oil than any time in the last 20 years. (Applause.) Because of the service and sacrifice of our brave men and women in uniform, the war in Iraq is over. (Applause.) The war in Afghanistan is ending. Al
60 Qaeda is on the path to defeat. (Applause.) Osama bin Laden is dead. (Applause.) We've made progress these last four years. (Applause.)

We've made real progress, Ohio, but the reason why we're here is because we've got more work to do. Our work is not yet done. As long as there is a single American who wants a job and can't find one, our work is not yet done. As long as there are
65 families anywhere in Ohio, anywhere in the country, working harder but falling behind, we're not finished. As long as there's a child anywhere in this country who's languishing in poverty, and barred from opportunity, our fight goes on. (Applause.)

Our fight goes on, Ohio, because this nation cannot succeed without a growing, thriving middle class and roads -- and paths of opportunity for everybody who is
70 willing to work hard to get into the middle class. (Applause.) Our fight goes on because America always does best when everybody gets a fair shot, and everybody does their fair share, and everybody plays by the same rules. (Applause.) That's what we believe. That's why you elected me in 2008. And that's why I'm running for a second term for President of the United States. (Applause.)

75 Now, Ohio, tomorrow, you've got a choice to make -- although some of you have already made the choice. How many have early voter around here? (Applause.) This is not just a choice between two candidates or two parties. It's a choice between two

different visions of America. It's a choice between a return to the top-down economic policies that crashed our economy, or a vision that says we've got to build a strong
80 foundation based on a strong and growing middle class, and opportunity for everybody, not just some. (Applause.)

As Americans, we honor the strivers and the dreamers and the risk-takers, the businesspeople, the free enterprise system -- the greatest engine of growth and prosperity the world has ever known. That's what we believe in. But we also know
85 that our system, our economy works best when everybody is participating, not just some; when everybody has a chance to get a great education; when everybody has a chance to learn the skills they need to compete. (Applause.) Our economy does best when we invest in the common enterprise of basic research to create new technologies and new industries and new jobs.

90 We believe America is stronger when everybody can count on affordable health insurance -- (applause) -- when everybody can count on Medicare and Social Security in their golden years. (Applause.) We think our markets work best, our economy works best when there are some rules in place to protect our kids from toxic dumping and pollution -- (applause) -- to protect consumers from being taken advantage of by
95 unscrupulous credit card companies or mortgage lenders.

And we also believe, by the way, there are some things Washington should not do. For example, we don't need a bunch of politicians trying to control health care decisions that women are perfectly capable of making themselves. (Applause.)

Now, for four years [sic] we had a President who shared these beliefs -- his name was
100 Bill Clinton. (Applause.) And it's interesting when he first came into office, his economic plan asked the wealthiest Americans to pay a little more so we could reduce our deficit and invest in the skills and ideas of our people. And at the time, the Republican Congress and a certain a Senate candidate by the name of Mitt Romney --

AUDIENCE: Boo --

105 THE PRESIDENT: Don't boo -- vote. Vote. (Applause.) You don't need to boo.
Folks can't hear you boo, but they can hear you vote. (Applause.)

So, anyway, this candidate, Mr. Romney, along with the Republican Congress, they all
said, Bill Clinton's plan is terrible. It will hurt the economy. It's going to kill jobs.
Turns out their math was just as bad then as it is now. (Laughter.) Because by the end
110 of Bill Clinton's second term, America created 23 million new jobs; and incomes were
up and poverty was down; and our deficit had become a surplus.

So we've tried our ideas, and they worked. How about the other guys ideas? We tried
those, too. After Bill Clinton left office, the Republicans had a chance to try their
ideas out. And we tried giving big tax cuts to the wealthiest Americans. We tried
115 giving insurance companies and oil companies and Wall Street a free license, do
whatever you please. And we got falling incomes and record deficits and the slowest
job growth in half a century, and it culminated in the worst financial crisis that we've
ever seen in our lifetimes.

So we've tried -- we've tried our ideas and they work. We've tried their ideas, and
120 they don't work. And this means this should be a pretty easy choice. But you got to
give him credit. Governor Romney is a very talented salesman. And so in this
campaign, he's tried to repackage the old ideas that don't work and offer them up as
change. He's tried to pretend that somehow these old ideas that did not work are new
and will work this time.

125 But here's the thing, Ohio: We know what change looks like. (Applause.) And what
he's selling ain't it. Giving more power to the biggest banks is not change. Another
\$5 trillion tax cut favoring the wealthy -- not change. Refusing to answer questions
about the details of your policies until after the election, that's definitely not change.
(Applause.) That's an old trick. Ruling out compromise by pledging to rubber-stamp
130 the tea party's agenda in Congress -- not change. Changing the facts when they're
inconvenient to your campaign, that's definitely not change. (Applause.)

Now, that's why when you're making this choice, Ohio, you have to remember that this isn't just about policy, it's also about trust. Ohio, after four years, you know me by now -- you know me. (Applause.) You may not agree with every single decision
135 I've made -- that's okay because Michelle doesn't either -- (laughter.) You may be frustrated some times at the pace of change. I promise you, so am I. But you know that I mean what I say, and I say what I mean. (Applause.)

I said I'd end the war in Iraq -- I ended it. (Applause.) I said I'd repeal "don't ask, don't tell" -- I repealed it. (Applause.) I said we'd pass health care reform -- we
140 passed it. (Applause.) I said we'd save an auto industry -- we saved it. (Applause.) I do what I say. You know what I believe. You know where I stand. You know I tell the truth. (Applause.) And you know I will fight for you and your family every single day as hard as I know how. (Applause.)

AUDIENCE: Four more years! Four more years! Four more years!

145 THE PRESIDENT: You know that I know what real change looks like because you've seen me fight for it. I've got the scars to prove it. I've got the gray hair to prove it. (Laughter.) And you've had my back in that fight. And after all we've been through together, we can't give up on it now. We've got more work to do. (Applause.)

150 We know what change we're going to be delivering over the next four years -- a country where every American has a shot at a great education. Let me tell you, government can't do it all --parents have to parent; students, you have to study. But don't tell me hiring more teachers will not help this economy grow -- it will. (Applause.) Don't tell me students who can't afford college should just borrow money
155 from their parents. That wasn't an option for me. I'll bet it's not an option for a lot of you. (Applause.)

And that's why I want to cut the growth of tuition so our young people aren't burdened with debt. I want to recruit 100,000 math and science teachers so our kids don't fall behind. I want to train 2 million Americans at our community colleges with the skills

160 that businesses are looking for right now. That's what real change is. That's what's at stake in this election. That's what we're fighting for.

Change comes when we live up to this country's legacy of innovation. I'm proud we saved the auto industry. But I'm even prouder that we're making better cars now than we used to. (Applause.) By the middle of the next decade, American cars will be
165 going twice as far on a gallon of gas. That will save you money. (Applause.) It will help the environment. It will help cut our oil imports. And we can't just stop at oil or we can't just stop at cars.

We've got thousands of workers here in Ohio and across the country building long-lasting batteries, building wind turbines. I don't want to subsidize oil company profits.
170 I want to support new energy, the energy of tomorrow that will cut our oil imports in half. (Applause.) I don't want a tax code that rewards companies for creating jobs overseas. I want to fight with Sherrod Brown to make sure that we are delivering those tax breaks to companies that are investing right here in Ohio, right here in the United States, hiring American workers. That's what we're fighting for. (Applause.)
175 That's the future I see for this country.

Change is turning the page on a decade of war so we can do some nation-building here at home. (Applause.) As long as I'm Commander-in-Chief, I will pursue our enemies with the strongest military the world has ever known. But it's time to use the savings from ending the war in Iraq, from transitioning out of Afghanistan, to pay down our
180 debt, rebuild America -- put people back to work repairing roads, making our schools state of the art, hiring our veterans because if you fought for this country you shouldn't have to fight for a job when you come home. (Applause.)

That's my commitment. That's what's at stake in this election. Change is a future where we have to reduce our deficit, but do it in a balanced way. And I've signed a
185 trillion dollars' worth of spending cuts; I intend to do more. But if we're serious about reducing the deficit, we've got to ask the wealthiest Americans to go back to the tax rates they paid when Bill Clinton was in office. (Applause.) Because, listen, a budget is about priorities, it's about values. And I'm not going to kick some kid off of Head

Start so I can get a tax break. (Applause.) I'm not going to turn Medicare into a
190 voucher just to pay for another millionaire's tax cut. (Applause.) That's not who we
are.

We know what real change is. We know what the future requires. And we also know
it won't be easy. And that's because when I talked about change back in 2008, I
wasn't just talking about changing presidents or changing parties. I was talking about
195 changing our politics. (Applause.)

I ran because the voices of the American people -- your voices -- had been shut out of
our democracy for way too long by lobbyists and special interests and politicians who
will say anything or do anything to protect things just the way they are. Over the last
four years, the status quo in Washington has fought us every step of the way. They
200 spent millions to try to stop us from reforming health care. They spent millions trying
to stop us from reforming Wall Street. They engineered a strategy of gridlock in
Congress, refusing to compromise on ideas that used to be Democrats and Republicans
supported in the past.

And what they're counting on now is that you're going to be so fed up, so worn down
205 by all the arguing, so tired of all the dysfunction that you'll just give up. You'll walk
away.

AUDIENCE: Booo --

THE PRESIDENT: You'll let them go ahead and make all the decisions. In other
words, their bet is on cynicism. Ohio, my bet is on you. (Applause.) My hope is with
210 you. My fight is for you.

And that is not a partisan statement. When the other party has been willing to work
with me to help middle-class families and working families, I love to work with them.
They helped cut middle-class taxes and small business taxes. We came together. We
had Republicans who helped us repeal "don't ask, don't tell." I respect that.
215 (Applause.) I will work with anybody of any party to move this country forward.

And if you want to end the gridlock in Congress, you'll vote for leaders like Sherrod Brown and Joyce Beatty who will put Americans first, not elections first. (Applause.)

But you know what we can't do is give up on our principles. There are some things that we do have to fight for. There are some things that we've got to fight for. We've
220 got to make sure that if the price of peace in Washington is cutting deals that are going to kick students off of financial aid, or get rid of funding for Planned Parenthood, or let insurance companies discriminate against people with preexisting conditions, or eliminate health care for millions on Medicaid who are poor or elderly or disabled, that's not a price I'm willing to pay. (Applause.) That's not bipartisanship. That is not
225 change.

That's surrender to the same status quo that's hurt middle-class families for way too long.

And, Ohio, I'm not ready to give up on the fight. I've got a whole lot of fight left in me, and I hope you do, too. I hope you do, too. (Applause.)

230 The folks at the very top in this country, they don't need another champion in Washington. They'll always have a seat at the table. They'll always have access and influence. That's the way things are. We understand that. The people who need a champion are the Americans whose letters I read late at night; the men and women I meet on the campaign trail every day.

235 The laid-off worker who is having to go back and retrain at the age of 55 at a community college -- she needs a champion. The restaurant owner who has got some great food, but needs a loan to expand after the bank turned him down -- he needs a champion. The cooks and waiters and cleaning staff working overtime at Columbus hotel, trying to save enough to buy a first home or send their kids to college -- they
240 need a champion. (Applause.)

The autoworker who is back on the job, filled with pride and dignity of building a great car -- he needs a champion. (Applause.) The teacher in an overcrowded

classroom, having to dig into her own pocket to buy school supplies, but shows up every day believing in those students -- she needs a champion. (Applause.)

245 All those kids in inner cities and small farm towns, in these Ohio valleys, or the rolling hills of Virginia, somewhere in Jersey, somewhere in Brooklyn, maybe even a kid in Hawaii -- kids dreaming of becoming scientists or doctors, engineers or entrepreneurs, diplomats or musicians, maybe even a President, they need a champion in Washington. Because the future -- (applause) -- the future is what we're fighting for.
250 The future never has lobbyists like the status quo does, but the dreams of those children will be our saving grace.

That's why I need you, Ohio. To make sure their voices are heard; to make sure your voices are heard. We've come too far to turn back now. We've come too far to let our hearts grow faint. Now is the time to keep pushing forward to educate all our kids, to
255 train all our workers, to create new jobs, rebuild our infrastructure, bring our troops home, care for our veterans, broaden opportunity, restore our democracy, build the middle class -- make sure that in this country, no matter who you are, no matter where you come from, no matter how you got started here in America, you can make it if you try. (Applause.)

260 That's why I'm asking for your vote. And if you're willing to work with me again, knock on some doors with me, and make some phone calls, and turn out, we will win Ohio. We'll win this election. We'll finish what we started. We'll renew those ties that bind us together and reaffirm the spirit that makes the United States of America the greatest nation on Earth. (Applause.)

265 God bless you, Ohio. God bless the United States of America. Let's go vote. Let's go do this. (Applause.)

END

تحليل بلاغي لإستراتيجيات الإقناع في الخطاب السياسي

دراسة حالة خطب الحملة الإنتخابية لباراك أوباما

ملخص

يرتكز فن الخطابة على إرسال رسائل صادقة ومشوقة ومقنعة. لهذا لابد للخطيب أن يعتمد على إستراتيجيات الإقناع والتي تستخدم بوفرة في شتى المجالات منها الخطاب السياسي. وعلى ذكر الخطاب السياسي فقد تطرق علماء اللسانيات إلى دراسته من عدة جوانب كالتراكيب والأسلوب والمعاني ... إلخ، وقد أغفلوا كثيرا الجانب الذي يهتم بكيفية استعمال اللغة استعمالا فعالا إلى أن تمت إعادة إحياء علم البلاغة الذي أضحت نظرياته أداة لتحليل تقنيات الإقناع في الخطاب السياسي.

امثالاً لهذا الواقع، أتى هذا البحث الذي من خلاله سنقوم بتحليل ثلاث خطب لباراك أوباما ألقاها خلال حملته الانتخابية لسنة 2012. سنعمد إلى تحليل إستراتيجيات الإقناع البلاغية التي استعملها للوصول إلى البيت الأبيض. كما سنهدف من خلال دراستنا هذه إلى معرفة كيفية استخدام هذه الإستراتيجيات ومناقشة أثرها على المتلقين. إذن سيكون بحثنا هذا بحثاً كيفياً وصفيّاً استقرائياً، يتناول بالتحليل ثلاثة خطب اقتصادية (الخطب "أ" و"ب" و"ج") للرئيس الأمريكي باراك أوباما في حملته الانتخابية لسنة 2012. تم انتقاء الخطب التي تتناول المواضيع الاقتصادية لأن الولايات المتحدة الأمريكية كانت لا تزال تعاني من آثار الأزمة المالية لسنة 2008، وكان لابد للمترشح من استغلال هذا الظرف ووضع خطط اقتصادية في برنامجه لإقناع المواطنين بأنه الأفضل. وحرصاً منا على تثليث المنهجية اخترنا ثلاثة خطب وذلك لبلوغ نتائج تتمتع بالصدق والثبات.

إن ما دفعنا إلى إنجاز هذا البحث بالذات هو الرغبة في فهم كيفية استعمال اللغة استعمالاً فعالاً، وليس الاقتصار فقط على معرفة استعمالها استعمالاً صحيحاً، خصوصاً وأن الاستعمال الفعال للغة هو شأن من شؤون البلاغة التي تهتم بتقنيات الإقناع، حيث تكتسي هذه الأخيرة أهمية بالغة كونها مستعملة في جميع مجالات الحياة كالإعلام والإشهار والسياسة وجلسات المحاكمة والجامعات

وعالم الأعمال. يقول رايموند Raymond في هذا السياق: "البلاغة المطبقة في العلوم الإنسانية أو في أي مجال آخر هي أقل دقة من العلم لكن فائدتها أكبر"¹. ونظرا إلى أهمية هذا العلم فمن غير المنطقي لدارس اللغة الإنجليزية أن يكون غير ملم به كونه لا يشكل جزءا من برنامجه الدراسي.

كما أن اهتمامنا بهذا المجال مرده وجود نقائص في التحليلات البلاغية المنجزة، حيث أن جلها يتحول إلى وصف أو تلخيص للنص دون ذكر أثر التقنيات البلاغية المستخرجة منه. بالإضافة إلى وجود نقص في طرق التحليل البلاغية المتوفرة، حيث تقتصر على الطرق الاستنتاجية ولا يوجد أثر للطرق الاستقرائية. ولذلك ارتأينا اقتراح طريقة جديدة لتحليل تقنيات الإقناع. استنبط هذا المنهج غير المسبوق من طريقة "التحليل بتجميع المفردات" لبورك Burke التي وضعت في الأصل لتحديد دوافع المتحدث.

تفيد هذه الطريقة الجديدة في تحليل عدد كبير من الخطابات الإقناعية بغية وضع نظرية شاملة حول الخطاب الإقناعي من شأنها أن توضح السبيل أمام الكثيرين ممن هم بحاجة إلى إتقان هذا النوع من الخطاب في حياتهم اليومية والعملية. وقد تفيد الأساتذة في تدريسهم لتقنيات التعبير الكتابي أو في حصص تحليل الخطاب. إذن من المتوقع أن يقدم هذا البحث إسهامات نظرية وتطبيقية. في الشق النظري تثبت هذه الدراسة أن طريقة التحليل بتجميع المفردات ناجعة لتحليل الخطاب الإقناعي وقد تساهم في وضع نظرية جديدة حول هذا النوع من الخطاب. كما تعد النتائج المتحصلة عليها وسيلة لفهم كيفية استعمال أساليب الإقناع وماهية أثرها. أما من الناحية التطبيقية، يمكن لهذا البحث أن يكون مرجعا للأساتذة الذين يدرّسون تحليل الخطاب والتعبير الكتابي والأدب. فضلا على ذلك، فإننا ننوه إلى أن المطلع على هذا العمل قد يتعلم كيفية تحليل خطاب ما، وكيفية استعمال استراتيجيات الإقناع في تواصله مع الآخرين.

وكالعادة يجب دوما الحرص قبل إجراء بحث ما على توضيح معاني المصطلحات التي يركز عليها ذلك البحث. لأجل ذلك سنتطرق فيما يأتي إلى الكلمات المفتاحية في دراستنا وهي: تحليل الخطاب والخطاب السياسي والإقناعي والبلاغة.

¹ -Raymond, J.C. Rhetoric the Methodology of the Humanities. *College English*, 44, pp. 778-783. P.781.

بداية، يعنى تحليل الخطاب باللغة المستعملة في الاتصال وكيفية معالجة المتلقي للرسائل اللغوية وتفسيرها. وبما أن تحليل الخطاب يتمحور حول استعمال اللغة فإنه يتجاوز مجال اللسانيات إلى ميادين أخرى كالسياسة، علم الاجتماع، علم النفس، الأدب والاتصال. ويمكن دراسة خطاب ما بالتطرق إلى جوانب عدة منها: المعاني، التراكيب، البلاغة...إلخ.

وفيما يخص الخطاب الإقناعي فهو ذلك الخطاب الذي من خلاله يقوم المتحدث بمحاولة تغيير آراء، مواقف، أفكار، معتقدات أو سلوك المتلقي.

أما الخطاب السياسي فقد عرفه فان ديجم² van Dijk عن طريق وصف المشاركين فيه (المتحدثين والمتلقين) وطبيعة النشاطات التي يلقى في إطارها. بمعنى أن حديث السياسة لا يمكن أن يعتبر خطابا سياسيا إلا إذا قيل في السياق المناسب.

وأخيرا ينبغي تسليط الضوء على مصطلح البلاغة الذي اكتسب العديد من المعاني في الدراسات الغربية. ولنكتفي بذكر أنه يعني: الخطاب الموجه للإقناع، ويعني أيضا الخطابة. خلال النصف الثاني من القرن العشرين توسع مفهوم البلاغة ليشمل جميع أشكال الاتصال التي تهدف إلى الإقناع كالرموز والألوان والرسم والعمارة والمناقشات والأفلام والكتب وإشارات المرور والمواقع الالكترونية....إلخ.

إن تعدد الآراء وتشابكها حول كل ما يخص البلاغة منذ نشأتها في القرن الخامس قبل الميلاد قد أفضى إلى ظهور عدة نظريات بلاغية زودتنا بمختلف الطرق لتحليل النصوص البلاغية. وبطبيعة الحال ليس يهمننا في مقامنا هذا سرد جميع هذه النظريات وإنما سنكتفي بتلك الخاصة بالخطاب الإقناعي دون غيرها.

²- van Dijk, T. A. (1995, December). What is political discourse analysis? Paper presented at the *Key-note address Congress Political Linguistics*, Antwerp. In Jan Blommaert & Chris Bulcaen (Eds.), *Political linguistics* (pp. 11-52). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Pub

سنستهل حديثنا بإسهامات الإغريق وأبرزها تلك التي قدمها أرسطو. هذا الأخير عرف البلاغة على أنها القدرة على الإقناع³، ووضع نظرية لا يزال صيتها ذائعا إلى يومنا هذا مفادها أن عملية الإقناع تتم بواسطة ثلاثة عوامل وهي: العاطفة والعقل، والمصدقية⁴. أما الاستمالات العاطفية فتستهدف التأثير على وجدان المتلقي وانفعالاته، وإثارة حاجاته النفسية والاجتماعية، ومخاطبة حواسه بما يحقق أهداف القائم بالاتصال. وأما الاستمالات العقلانية فتعتمد على مخاطبة عقل المتلقي، وتقديم الحجج والشواهد المنطقية والواقعية والأرقام والإحصائيات وبناء النتائج على المقدمات. وفيما يخص مصداقية الرسالة فإن المتلقي إذا نظر إلى القائم بالاتصال باعتباره غير ملم بالمعلومات الكافية للخوض في موضوع ما فسوف يرفض توقعاته. إذن يتوقف تأثير الرسالة على ما إذا كان المتلقون يعتبرونها صحيحة أو غير صحيحة.

بعد انهيار الإمبراطورية الإغريقية حاول الرومان الحفاظ على الإرث الفكري الذي آل إليهم وتطويره فأدلوها بدلهم فيه. ومن أشهر علماء البلاغة لديهم شيشرون وكينتيليون. رأى شيشرون أن البلاغة هي "الخطاب الذي يهدف إلى الإقناع"⁵. وركز على مفهوم تحليل المستمعين، ويقصد به ضرورة أن يأخذ الخطيب بعين الاعتبار الحالة الاجتماعية والمستوى الثقافي والفكري للمستمعين. قسم شيشرون الخطاب إلى الخطاب الاستشاري والقضائي والاحتفالي. كما أنه وضع خمسة أعمدة للخطاب البلاغي وهي: الإبداع والترتيب والأسلوب والحفظ والإلقاء.

أما كينتيليون فيعرف الخطابة على أنها فن الكلام الحسن الذي يهدف إلى الإقناع⁶. تعد البلاغة بالنسبة له نشاط غير أخلاقي تتطلب ممارسته أشخاصا يتمتعون بالفضيلة كي لا يقولوا غير الحق. ولتدريس البلاغة أصدر كينتيليون كتابا يحوي برنامجا مفصلا.

في القرون التي تلت انهيار الإمبراطورية الرومانية لم يرد أي اهتمام بفن البلاغة. وفي القرنين السادس والسابع عشر ذاع تعصب سياسي وديني نشأ عنه تخوف من الرأي العام وبالتالي مورست ضغوطات على البلاغة وفن الإقناع. وبعد هذا العداء للبلاغة، جاءت عملية تنميتها

³- Aristotle. (1991). *On Rhetoric* (G. Kennedy, trans.). Oxford: Oxford University Press. (Original work published 320 BC).

⁴- نفسه

⁵- Bizzell, P., & Herzberg, B. (Eds.). (1990). *The Rhetorical Tradition: Readings from Classical Times to the Present*. Boston: Bedford. p.203.

⁶- نفسه.

فأصبحت جزءاً من الأدب ولم تعد متعلقة بالسياسة فقط، وهنا بدأت البلاغة تهتم بما هو مكتوب وليس فقط بما هو شفهي (أي بالخطاب الملقى).

وإذا كان من المسلم به أن أرسطو هو أول وأفضل من جاء بنظرية بلاغية فإن الفترة المعاصرة شهدت بروز أفكار جديدة.

مع مطلع القرن العشرين استنبطت الطريقة الريطورية الجديدة من أعمال ويشلينز (1925). عند القيام بتحليل خطاب وفق هذه الطريقة ينبغي التطرق إلى الذاكرة والإلقاء والأفكار والتراكيب، وشخصية الكاتب، والمتلقين وتأثير النص عليهم وعلى الأحداث الزمنية التي تلت صدوره.

وقد رافق نشوء الحركات الاجتماعية وهي جمعيات أو منظمات تسعى إلى معارضة أو تثبيت قيم المجتمعات ظهور طريقة نقد الحركات الاجتماعية بفضل غريفين⁷ Griffin وذلك بغية الوقوف على التراكيب البلاغية التي عادة ما يستعملها الناشطون ضمن حركة معينة في خطاباتهم. إذ يتطلب نشاط الفاعلين في هذه الحركات أن يكونوا على معرفة باستراتيجيات الإقناع.

ودائماً فيما يخص استراتيجيات الإقناع، اعتقد بورك أن لب البلاغة يكمن في الأشياء المتماثلة حيث يستعمل المتحدث رموزاً لغوية قصد إظهار أن ممتلكاته (اهتماماته وقيمه ومعتقداته وآرائه ومواقفه... إلخ) شبيهة بممتلكات المستمع قصد إنجاز عملية إقناع هذا الأخير. وقد صاغ بورك فكرته هذه تحت عنوان نظرية التماثل Identification theory.

بعدها أتى بورمان Bormann بنظرية تحليل مواضيع الفانتازيا. يقصد بورمان بموضوع الفانتازيا قصة لها مكان وزمان وشخصيات. قد تكون هذه القصة واقعية أو خيالية. وعندما يتناقل الناس قصة ما وتشيع بينهم، فهذا دليل على أن هذه القصة تعبر عن قيمهم⁸. إذن فدراسة القصص

⁷ -Griffin, L. M. (1952). The Rhetoric of Historical Movements. *The Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 38, 184-188.

⁸ - Bormann, E.G. (1972). Fantasy and rhetorical vision: The rhetorical criticism of social reality. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 58, 396-407.

تمكن من معرفة قيم مجتمع ما وبالتالي استغلال هذه القيم لإقناعهم بشيء معين لأن عملية الإقناع تتطلب التنبؤ بالدوافع التي قد تحت أشخاصا ما على تغيير أفكارهم أو تصرفاتهم.

ليس بعيدا عن فكرة بورمان اقترح فيشر Fisher نظرية تحليل القصص. ويراد بالقصة هنا أي سرد لفظي أو غير لفظي لسلسلة من الأحداث لها معنى لدى المستمعين⁹. يرى فيشر أن القصص أداة ناجعة للإقناع وأن الرسائل الإقناعية تعتمد على القصص أكثر منها على الحقائق العقلانية لأن القصص تضم القيم والعواطف التي توظف الخبرات السابقة والأحاسيس لدى المستمعين.

في سنة 1969 قام بيرلمان و أولبراشتس تيتيكا Perelman and Olbrechts Tetyka بإصدار كتاب بعنوان البلاغة الجديدة أين عملا على بلورة نظرية حجاجية. وبحسبها يجب أن تنطلق عملية الإقناع من حجة مبنية على أسس يتقبلها المستمع وهذا لخلق رابط بين المتحدث والمستمع¹⁰.

لم يكن بيرلمان وأولبراشتس تيتيكا الوحيدين اللذين قدما نظرة حجاجية، فنظرية تولمين تعد من أبرز الإسهامات في هذا الصدد. تقوم بنية الحجة عند تولمين على ثلاثة عناصر رئيسية: المُعطى (أو الحجة) والنتيجة والضمان، وثلاثة عناصر ثانوية: عنصر النوعية وعنصر الدعم وعنصر الاستثناء.

سمح التنويه بمختلف النظريات البلاغية بملاحظة غياب نظرية تعنى بالمجاز ودوره في الإقناع. فليس من المغالطة قطعا أن نعتبر المجاز كأداة لتنميق الأسلوب وكذا للمحاجة¹¹ وللتأثير على العواطف.

إن هذا السرد للنظريات البلاغية لدليل على عدم وجود طريقة استقرائية لتحليل الخطاب الإقناعي. لأجل ذلك نقترح طريقة التحليل بتجميع المفردات. وضع بورك¹² Burke هذه الطريقة

⁹ - Fisher, W. R. (1987). *Human Communication as Narration: Toward a Philosophy of Reason, Value, and Action*. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press.

¹⁰ - Perelman, C. & Olbrechts-Tyteca, L. (1969). *The New Rhetoric: a Treatise on Argumentation*. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press.

¹¹ - Burghardt, C. R. (2010). *Readings in rhetorical criticism* (4th ed.). State College, PA: Strata Publishing

في الأصل لتحليل دوافع المتحدث، لكن إذا كان غرض النص هو الإقناع فالدافع واضح، لذا سأستعملها لتحليل استراتيجيات الإقناع الموجودة في نص ما وذلك لأن هذه الطريقة تركز على استخراج الكلمات المفتاحية والكلمات المحاطة بها في خطاب معين. فإذا كانت خيارات الكاتب لكلماته أثناء كتابته متعمدة وليست عبثية، وإذا كان غرضه هو الإقناع فإن هذه الخيارات تنطوي على إستراتيجياته لبلوغ هدفه (الإقناع) لأنه سيعتمد على هذه الرموز اللغوية المنتقاة لنقل أفكار أو معتقدات محددة وإيصالها إلى المتلقين. وفيما يخص عملية التحليل فهي تمر بأربعة مراحل:

المرحلة 1: تحديد الكلمات المفتاحية في النص على أساس التكرار والشدة.

المرحلة 2: تحديد مجموع الكلمات التي تتواجد بالقرب من كل كلمة مفتاحية.

المرحلة 3: دراسة المجموعات المستخرجة لتحديد نماذج متكررة.

المرحلة 4: الاعتماد على تلك النماذج لتحديد تقنيات الإقناع.

ويتعين القول بأن هذه الطريقة لا تخلو من النقائص، فهي تقتضي أن يكون المحلل على دراية بمختلف استراتيجيات الإقناع وإلا فإنه لن يستطيع تحديدها وتسميتها. كما أن للأسلوب المنمق وترتيب الأفكار دور في الإقناع إلا أن طريقة تجميع المفردات لا تمكن من استخراج التقنيات المتعلقة بهذين العاملين.

بعد الخوض في الأدبيات التي توفر الإطار النظري لبحثنا، تأتي مرحلة التحليل وهي تتبع الخطوات المحددة سابقاً. إذن كخطوة أولى قمنا بتعيين الكلمات المفتاحية على أساس التكرار في الخطاب (أ) و(ب) و(ج). فوجدنا: job و manufacturing و American في الخطاب (أ)، taxes و plan و grow و middle class في الخطاب (ب)، fight و change و country في الخطاب (ج). ثم اختيرت المفردات التالية على أساس الشدة: future في الخطاب (أ)، voice و nation في الخطاب (ب)، opportunity و storm في الخطاب (ج).

وجرى التحليل على النحو التالي. عند دراسة المفردات المحاطة بالكلمة المفتاحية job، تبين أن أوباما ذكر من خلالها واقعا مرا يعيشه الأمريكيان وهو البطالة. وقدم التصنيع وتكوين العمال وتشجيع الاستثمار داخل البلد كحلول لهذا المشكل كما أنه نوه بالجهود المبذولة في عهده الأولى

¹²- Burke, K. (1969). Arhetoric of Motives. California : University of California Press.

للتخلص من البطالة وذلك من خلال إعطاء أرقام حول إنجازاته. من هذا نستخلص أن استراتيجيات الإقناع المستعملة هي: تقنية السبب والنتيجة (اقتراح الحلول كسبب للتخلص من المشكل)، المصادقية (جهوده في العهدة السابقة)، والإحصاء.

وبخصوص الكلمة المفتاحية manufacturing، فقد قدم التصنيع كحل للأزمة الاقتصادية ولمستقبل أفضل. كما استعمل الرئيس هذه المفردة للإشادة بتفوق بلده على الأمم الأخرى. إذن فالتقنيات التي يمكن استخراجها هي تقنية السبب والنتيجة، واستمالة الشعب بالتنويه بقيمه (قيمة النظرة المستقبلية وقيمة العمل). كما وصف الخطيب "التصنيع" بأنه "العبة" وأنه "يوفر فرص العمل". يتجلى في كلا العبارتين/المجاز وهو من تقنيات الإقناع.

أما الكلمة المفتاحية American فقد ظهرت إلى جانب كلمات أخرى تشيد بقيمة العمل والفوقية الأمريكية وتبث الأمل. إذن فقد لجأ أوباما إلى قيم الشعب وإلى استمالة عاطفتهم (بعث الأمل) كاستراتيجية لإقناعهم بأنه الرجل المناسب لقيادة الأمة.

وعلى نحو مماثل استعملت الكلمة المفتاحية future للإشارة إلى قيمة النظرة المستقبلية التي يشتهر بها الشعب الأمريكي.

بعد تحليل الخطابين (ب) و (ج) بنفس طريقة تحليل الخطاب (أ) توصلنا إلى أن تقنيات الإقناع المستنبطة من النصوص تتلخص فيما يأتي:

1- الحجج باستعمال الاستدلال المنطقي (الاستدلال بالتشبيه، الاستدلال بمبدأ السبب والأثر) والإحصاء وشهادات الخبراء.

2- الاستمالات العاطفية كبعث الأمل والتخويف والدعابة وإثارة حاجات المستمعين وقيمهم ومثلهم العليا كالوحدة الوطنية والاستثناء الأمريكي الذي يتكون من الفوقية الأمريكية والتنقل بين طبقات المجتمع.

3- المجاز

4 - المصادقية

5- كبش الفداء

6- الهجوم على المنافس.

لكل تقنية من هذه التقنيات أثر أو مجموعة من الآثار تتركها لدى المستمعين.

بادئ ذي بدء، دعم الخطيب برنامج الانتخابي بحجج تمثلت في تقديم السبب والنتيجة والاستدلال بالتشبيه (شبه مقترحاته بأخرى جربت أنفا كي يستدل على أن نتائج الثانية ستكون شبيهة بالأولى) واستشهد بأقوال الخبراء ونتائج الدراسات والأرقام والإحصائيات. وتعتبر كلها حججا دامغة لا يمكن للعقل أن يرفضها خصوصا وأنه لم يلجأ إلى المغالطات المنطقية ولا إلى دراسات الخبراء أو الأرقام القديمة.

270

وعلاوة على ذلك، استعمل الكاتب الاستمالات العاطفية. حيث عمل على بعث الأمل في نفوس الناس بأنه سيعيد الولايات المتحدة إلى مكانتها السابقة. كما استغل احتياجاتهم ورغباتهم لأن المستمع عادة ما يرى الرسالة الموجهة إليه بمنظار ما إذا كانت تلبى حاجته، فإذا كانت كذلك ستجلب انتباهه وتحثه على قبول الرسالة. لإستراتيجية الخوف كذلك قدرة على استقطاب الاهتمام والزيادة من درجة القناعة ولها صدى أقوى من المنطق إذ تحث المستمع على القيام بما يجعله يتفادى الخطر المذكور في الخطاب. فضلا عن ذلك، استخدم الكاتب الدعابة ليزيد من شعبيته ويخلق رابطا قويا بينه وبين المستمع ويجلب الانتباه ويدعم الحجة ويلهي المستمع عن التفكير في حجة مضادة. ولجعل الرسالة أكثر تشويقا وجاذبية وإقناعا ضمنها المتحدث مثل وقيم المجتمع الموجهة إليه¹³ لأن الناس عادة ما يختارون تصرفاتهم و يتخذون قراراتهم وفقا لقيم مجتمعهم. فهذا النوع من الرسائل يسهل بناء رابط مشترك بين المتحدث والمستمع ويساعد على فهم الرسالة. كما أن المنتخبين يفضلون اختيار شخص يتبنى قيمهم ويساهم في تعزيزها والحفاظ عليها.

وحاول أوباما الاعتماد على إنجازاته السابقة ومعرفته بالتحديات الراهنة للأمة واشترائه مع شعبه في الماضي والمثل لبناء مصداقيته. بناء المصداقية مهم كي يثق الناس بالمتحدث و يستمعون إلى رسالته ويقبلونها. كما أنه في وجود المصداقية يكف المستمع عن محاولة التدقيق في الرسالة لإيجاد خلل فيها كنقطة مبهمة أو فكرة غير منطقية.

¹³ - Nelson, T. E., & Garst, J. (2005). Values-Based Political Messages and Persuasion: Relationships among Speaker, Recipient, and Evoked Values. *Political Psychology*, 26(4), 489-515.

لكي يقبل الناس كبش الفداء لابد من أن يكون هذا الأخير مصدر قلق لهم وهذا ما فعله أوباما بالرئيس السابق بوش حيث حمله وزر ما يعانیه الشعب، و بهذا وجه غضبهم وإحباطهم إليه. فجاءت استراتيجية كبش الفداء كمنتفس لهم حيث اقتنعوا بأنهم تخلصوا من المتسبب في مشاكلهم الاقتصادية، وتنتظرهم أياما مزدهرة مع الرئيس الجديد.

ليس هذا فحسب، بل إنه هاجم برنامج منافسه رومني Romney وعمد إلى إظهار النقاط السلبية فيه وشرحها للعامة. وهي استراتيجية تساهم في كسب المزيد من التأييد خصوصا إذا كان هذا الهجوم مبنيا على حجج دامغة وليس اعتباطيا كي تقتنع الجماهير. ويستحسن ألا يكون الهجوم مكثفا كاسحا كي لا ينقص من قيمة المتحدث.

وأخيرا، من استراتيجيات الإقناع المستخرجة من الخطب المجاز. يساعد المجاز على تبسيط الرسالة وبعث الأحاسيس المريحة كالإعجاب، السرور، الأمل والثقة وبناء العلاقات الحسنة وبعث رسائل ضمنية كأن يقدم المترشح نفسه بأن له قدرة على اتخاذ القرارات وأنه يتقاسم مع المستمعين نفس القيم والمثل العليا.

وبإيجاز، قدم المتحدث حلولا منطقية تتمتع باستمالات عاطفية (كالأمل والخوف) وبقدرة على كسب ثقة المستمع. اعتمد أوباما على الحجة البالغة ليس في تقديم الحلول فحسب وإنما أيضا في هجومه على منافسه، وفي وضع بوش ككبش الفداء. كما أن استعمال المنطق والاستمالات العاطفية ساعدا على تعزيز مصداقية المتحدث. نستنتج أن الخطاب الإقناعي لا يعتمد حصريا على المنطق وإنما أيضا على الاستمالات العاطفية. لم تكن الاستراتيجيات التي استعان بها أوباما معقدة وذلك لأنه أخذ في الحسبان المستوى الثقافي والمعرفي للمستمعين الذين يمثلون مختلف شرائح المجتمع. أخيرا وليس آخرا، أثبتت النتائج المتحصل عليها أن طريقة "تجميع المفردات" ناجعة لتحليل الخطاب الإقناعي.

وإن كنا نأمل في أن يكون لبحثنا هذا دور في إثراء معلومات الأساتذة والطلبة حول تقنيات الإقناع، إلا أننا لا ندعي الإحاطة التامة بالموضوع. فإن كانت طريقة التحليل بتجميع المفردات صالحة لتحديد استراتيجيات الإقناع، فهي تبقى غير قادرة على استخراج جميع الاستراتيجيات

المتضمنة في نص ما لأنها تستخلص فقط التقنيات الموجودة بمحاذاة المفردات المفتاحية كما أنها تغفل الرموز غير اللغوية (كنبرة الصوت وتعابير الوجه وحركات الجسد) التي قد يكون لها دور كبير في عملية الإقناع. كذلك، لا يصح قطعاً التسليم التام بالنتائج المتحصل عليها كون عدد النصوص المحللة محدود مع الاعتراف بوجود نوع من الذاتية في التحليل نظراً لأن معيار الشدة في تحديد المفردات المفتاحية يتميز بالمرونة. فقد يختار محلل آخر كلمات أخرى غير التي تمحور عملنا حولها وبالتالي قد ينتهي بنتائج تختلف عن تلك التي توصلنا إليها.

ورغم تسجيل هذه النقائص، إلا أننا نطمح أن تفتح هذه الأطروحة آفاقاً لبحوث مستقبلية لتدرس عدداً أكبر من النصوص وتصل إلى وضع نظرية شاملة حول تقنيات الإقناع. كما يمكن لبحوث أخرى أن تستخرج تقنيات الإقناع المستعملة من قبل شخصيتين مختلفتين ثم تقارن بينها. ونرجو أن يتاح البحث حول إمكانية استعمال طريقة التحليل بتجميع المفردات لتحديد مختلف الأساليب البلاغية في نص ما. وكاتجاه مغاير يمكن البحث أيضاً في مدى فائدة إدراج البلاغة في برنامج طلبة الإنجليزية.