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Abstract—Critical Discourse Analysis mainly focuses on the way certain ideologies are used and attitudes are produced, disseminated, inculcated, and naturalized through discourse. One significant way of creation and neutralization of ideologies and personal opinions is through the dichotomous categorization of positive or negative self representation and negative other representation. Different linguistic techniques are at the disposal of speakers and writers to bring about their own ideas, values, aspirations, and feelings. Techniques such as consensus, generalization, national self-glorification or merely self glorification, self-congratulations, self-aggrandizement, number game, populism and presupposition are maybe employed to persuade people about certain view and even prompt them to take the desired action. The amalgamation of such techniques can be an effective way utilized by the speaker or writer to most dramatically gain his or her historical existence, to present, between tendencies, schools, and circles from the present and the past. At any given moment of it existence of socio-ideological contradictions between the present and the past, between different epochs of the past, between different socio-ideological groups in the present, between tendencies, schools, circles and so forth, all given a bodily form. These ‘languages’ of heteroglossia intersect each other in a variety of ways, forming new socially typifying languages.’ (Bakhtin, 1981: 291) (cited in Li, 2009)
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I. INTRODUCTION (HEADING 1)
This article provides a discursive analysis of Obama’s Victory Speech given after 2012 elections in the USA. Drawing on Norman Fairclough’s paradigm of Critical Discourse Analysis, this study examines how specifically chosen words express and reflect the ideology and point of view of the writer or the speaker and the potential effects that either a writer or a speaker wants to achieve on the readers or the listeners. Context is a very powerful tool to express the intended meanings through the use of language.

As Aristotle wrote about rhetoric: ‘if someone who misuses this sort of verbal capacity might do the greatest possible damage, this is a problem common to all good things . . . if one used these well one might do the greatest possible good and if badly the greatest possible harm’ (The Art of Rhetoric 1.1.1355b) (cited in Fairclough, 2008).

The notion of ‘nation’ and what it exactly is has been the interest of many studies and researchers. As stated in Li (2009), Stuart Hall defines it as ‘[a] national culture is a discourse – a way of constructing meanings which influences and organizes both our actions and our conception of ourselves’ (1996: 613). It means societies are not fixed bodies any more as a traditional understanding would suggest. Billig (1995) explains that nationalism is an ideological way of making nations seem natural which requires the reproduction of certain ideological habits of thought every single day, and Billig (1995) calls it as ‘banal nationalism’ (cited in Li, 2009). The concept of ‘nation’ makes people identify themselves socially, culturally and politically. It is also given that “Political discourse is intrinsically persuasive and always informs a power relation” (Ferrari, 2007). Persuasive processes are analyzed to see how certain ideologies are constructed and transmitted. This study shows how the national feelings of the citizens can be touched upon through persuasive processes, the selection of right words, phrases and linguistic plays through which the people can be led into patriotism.

Studying the language of the writer or the speaker, one can find out how ideology is constructed in a certain context.
Language is stratified so that language departs from being unitary and fixed, and language undertakes the roles of redefining and reorganizing a new stratum of itself, and the stratification is a result of “the interaction between different features of language in different context” (Li, 2009). The intentional dimension of language stratification is a result of the desire for expressing certain views, purposes, approaches and ways of thinking. Li (2009) also claims that “it is in the process of stratification and recontextualization that the original languages, power relations, and belief systems are redefined and new forms of discourses are formed”, and adds “heteroglossia, therefore, is the competition of different voices, identities and positions to maintain, adopt, or abandon power and control”. Owing to the reality that texts are formed with certain intentions underlying them, it is necessary to examine the texts in detail to get the intended meaning.

One of the effective techniques of CDA is presented as the dichotomous categorization of ‘euphemistic’ and ‘derogatory’ terms by Hodge and Kress (1993). Hornby (2004) gives the definition of derogatory as “showing a critical attitude towards others, or insulting” and euphemism as “an indirect word or phrase that people often use to refer to something embarrassing or unpleasant, sometimes to make it seem more acceptable that what it really is” (cited in Rahimi & Sahragard, 2007). In this study, Obama’s Victory Speech in 2012 was analyzed in terms of euphemisation and derogation; more specifically positive self-representation and negative self-representation are the two discursive strategies utilized to analyze the spoken text.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

Critical Discourse Analysis is an approach reflecting a certain ideology and voicing an overt political commitment (Bucholtz, 2001). It is “the uncovering of implicit ideologies in texts” (Widdowson, 2000) (cited in Rahimi & Sahragard, 2007). As Resende (2009) defines CDA is “a theoretical framework for language in modernity”. Its main focus is to look into the ways in which language works in social life. Billig (2008) explains that “typically discourse analysts examine the discursive and linguistic features of given texts, rather than examining the processes of producing and consuming texts”. CDA deals with sociocultural contexts, and works on the situated use of language and their aim at crystallization of a certain ideology (Taki, 2008). CDA analyzes the content and social relations in a text, and this way CDA reveals the underlining ideologies and power relations in a context. Content in a given text explains, as Fairclough (1989) states, one’s experience of the natural or social world. In other words, it is the reflection of the writer’s ideology and perception of the world, and social relations display the relations of people in a certain context which in the end is a clue to show the power relations between people. CDA tries to “reveal the sources of dominance and inequality observed in the society by analyzing texts” (Rahimi & Sahragard, 2007). Discourses, according to Fairclough (2003: 124), are “ways of representing aspects of the world,” and ‘different discourses are different perspectives on the world . . . associated with the different relations people have to the world . . . ’ (cited in Li, 2009). The text gives an insight into the relationships between different identities and also social positions presented. A text is a reflection of the society it finds the basis, the events happening at the time and people involved in it. However, analyzing what is written in a text is not the only way of coming up with the ideology represented in a text, but the absence of some materials is also an effective way of revealing the ideology in a certain context (Fairclough, 1989). Wodak (2006) puts forward the idea that “if belief systems are cognitively and emotionally deeply embedded and also have historical roots a change of frames – should this be more than a superficial change of language– turns out to be very difficult” which means that ideologies and belief systems must be reconstructed and formulated by others.

There are some factors that are widely employed in CDA. One of them is the researcher’s explicit positioning. CDA focuses on linguistic factors as they give clues about the social issues. CDA is explained as a way to make connections between the social actors and the social context in a given text by Resende (2009). CDA is a way to investigate the language used to reflect ideologies. Identities and social relations are constructed through discourses, and linguistic structures are intentionally used to express political ideologies.

Verschueren (cited in Bucholtz, 2001) claims that “findings in critical discourse analysis are often merely unremarkable consequences of what we know about how language and society work.” He also states that meaning is not made but discovered. This shows that even though CDA might seem to be reflecting the viewpoint of the analysts, it is actually a systematic way of approaching a discourse which more or less leads every analyst to the same findings. It is also emphasized in the article that ‘the fundamental negotiability of language in the process of meaning generation (taking place with real language users in real contexts of use)’ is one of the fundamental factors of CDA. Here the indispensable part of CDA comes out, and that is the interpretations made by the analysts. The interpretations, or critics, are a result of close analysis of the discourse. Not having one specific interpretation for a context is quite possible because there is not only one authoritative meaning in a text but there is an openness for multiple readings. Any implicit knowledge in a text can be made explicit through Critical Discourse Analysis.

A. Derogatory and Euphemistic Terms

Ideological manipulations in texts are revealed through many techniques and one of which is the classification of derogatory and euphemistic terms. Rahimi and Sahragard (2007) define euphemism as “the words and expressions used to soften or mitigate the reality of the ideas transmitted to an audience”, and in the same article the definition for derogatory as “showing a critical attitude towards others, or insulting”.

Merriam Webster dictionary defines Euphemism as “the substitution of an agreeable or inoffensive expression for one that may offend or suggest something unpleasant; also: the expression so substituted”. Some examples are provided:

- using “eliminate” as a euphemism for “kill”

• If you are “let go,” “separated,” “terminated” or whatever euphemism the company uses for “clean-out-your-desk-and-be-gone” —Elsie Maclay, *First for Women*, July 1989

Oxford dictionaries define the same term as “a mild or indirect word or expression substituted for one considered to be too harsh or blunt when referring to something unpleasant or embarrassing” and provides the following example:

• the jargon has given us ‘downsizing’ as a euphemism for ‘cuts’


(Taken by Holder, 2003)

• We are experiencing heavy casualties (many soldiers are being killed)

• There is a logjam in the river (constipation)

• Downsizing, rightsizing or laying off (getting rid of employees)

• Praying to the porcelain altar (vomiting into the toilet)

• If something happens to me (if I die)

• Sanitation Worker (trash collector)

• Unplanned landing (plane crash)

Derogation is defined as “to cause to seem inferior, etc; disparage” by World English Dictionary, and as “a communication that belittles somebody or something” by Free Dictionary. Some examples are:

• condescension, disdain, patronage - a communication that indicates lack of respect by patronizing the recipient

• darkey, darkie, darky - (ethnic slur) offensive term for Black people

• paleface - (slang) a derogatory term for a white person (supposedly used by North American Indians)

• Oriental, oriental person - a member of an Oriental race; the term is regarded as offensive by Asians (especially by Asian Americans)

More examples are given in the book ‘Critical Discourse Analysis’ by Rahimi&Safragard (2007):

(Taken from Kelner, 1992)

• “penetrate”, “thrust deeply”, “engaged”, “softened”, “cutting off the Iraqi army” and “castration themes”

III. RESEARCH QUESTIONS

This study tries to answer the following questions:

1. How can we detect national glorification and self-glification in speech by means of the dichotomy of euphemization and derogation?

2. Are there instances of manipulative discourse in victory speeches? And how are they represented through the euphemization and derogation?

A. Significance of the Study

Widdowson (1979) states that “Knowing a language does not mean to understand, speak, read and write sentences, it means to know how sentences are used to communicate effect.” It can be inferred that language use should serve the aim of communication which requires a diversion from syllabi based on teaching language rules to syllabi focusing on using language for communication purposes. Such a syllabus would require to include four competences as offered by Canals (1983): *grammatical grammar* “the knowledge and skill required to understand and express the literal meaning of utterances”. *sociolinguistic sociolinguistic* “both appropriateness of meaning and appropriateness of form”, *discourse competence discourse competence* “composed of verbal and non-verbal communication strategies”. To provide learners with those competences to achieve communication role of language learning, critical discourse analysis is a key term. CDA establishes a basis for language awareness which serves the aim to provide learners with all competences required to achieve communication in the target language.

Cots (2004) gives the aims of education purposed by van Lier (1996:91) in a list; “(a) deal with the unexpected, (b) make informed choices, (c) develop sharp observational skills, (d) construct useful knowledge in one's interaction with the world, and (e) be guided by internal values, convictions, and reasons”. They all go in line with the expectations of critical approach, and Cots (2004) summarizes the process as follows “…in order to deal with the unexpected you have to be able to examine it and this can only be done if you have developed sharp observational skills and are capable of constructing useful knowledge through the examination; once you have examined and conceptualized the object, you can pass judgement on it, provided you are equipped with internal values, convictions, and reasons; this judgement will then allow you to make an informed choice on your response.”

The significance of CDA is presented as follows:

• “a form of ‘social practice’ in which language use is seen as [simultaneously] socially *influenced and influential* … consistent with a view of education which prioritizes the development of the learners’ capacities to examine and judge the world carefully, and if necessary to change it” Cots (2006, p.336) (cited in Hadidi, 2009).

• “educational researchers increasingly have turned to CDA to answer a set of questions about the relationship between language and society” (Rogers *et al.*., 2005, p.365) (cited in Hadidi, 2009).

The findings of this research have been used in the areas of Applied Linguistics including pedagogy, teaching methods, curriculum and material development and testing. The findings of this study are supposed to develop critical thinking skills of students as well as the improvements in self-actualization and creativity.

First of all, in the area of pedagogy, teaching methodologies and techniques can be revised for a better learning and teaching process. CDA requires deep analysis of certain texts which results with a qualitative learning
process which brings the implication that all materials need changes
Secondly, regarding curriculum and material development, the study leads the penologist to learner based and cognitively stimulating approaches as stated by Rahimi and Sahragard (2007). Authentic materials are used for this research, and they are a part of functional and communicative syllabi which requires critical thinking, evaluation and self-actualization.

In general, students are rote-learners who do not think and question what they are studying; they only memorize the materials without deeply getting the meaning. However, through close analysis of the text, they realize an actual learning. In other words, they start to learn in a deep learning styles and attitudes leading them to critical thinking and creativity.

Discourse analysis means the analysis of the language in use, and it provides a ground for process oriented language teaching (Ivanov, 2009). CDA is defined as examination of “how stretches of language, considered in their full textual, social, and psychological context, become meaningful and unified for their users” by Cook (1989) as cited in Ivanov (2009). Therefore, CDA provides a deep understand of the language used in a context in all many aspects like processing grammar and understanding lexis. Analyzing the language in use helps students gain language awareness which is defined as “the development in learners of an enhanced consciousness of and sensitivity to the forms and functions of language” by Carter (2003) as cited in Ivanoc (2009). In short, CDA is an important ground for interactive process gone into with a given context.

B. Ideologically laden terms
Perfecting, union, more than 200 years, a nation of 300 million, triumph, move forward, grateful president, determination, pride, patriotism, lift, America family, one nation, one people, the best, lifelong appreciation, global leader, safe, respected, admired, the strongest, best troops, best military, freedom, dignity, generous, compassionate, tolerant, better president, determined, inspired, envy of the World, the most diverse nation, bright, greatest nation, hopeful.

IV. THE SPEECH
"OBAMA: Thank you. Thank you. Thank you so much.

Tonight, more than 200 years after a former colony won the right to determine its own destiny, the task of perfecting our union moves forward.

OBAMA: It moves forward because of you. It moves forward because you reaffirmed the spirit that has triumphed over war and depression, the spirit that has lifted this country from the depths of despair to the great heights of hope, the belief that while each of us will pursue our own individual dreams, we are an American family and we rise or fall together as one nation and as one people.

Tonight, in this election, you, the American people, reminded us that while our road has been hard, while our journey has been long, we have picked ourselves up, we have fought our way back, and we know in our hearts that for the United States of America the best is yet to come.

OBAMA: I want to thank every American who participated in this election...
... whether you voted for the very first time or waited in line for a very long time.
By the way, we have to fix that.
Whether you pounded the pavement or picked up the phone...
... whether you held an Obama sign or a Romney sign, you made your voice heard and you made a difference.
I just spoke with Governor Romney and I congratulated him and Paul Ryan on a hard-fought campaign.

We may have battled fiercely, but it’s only because we love this country deeply and we care so strongly about its future. From George to Lenore to their son Mitt, the Romney family has chosen to give back to America through public service and that is the legacy that we honor and applaud tonight.

In the weeks ahead, I also look forward to sitting down with Governor Romney to talk about where we can work together to move this country forward.

I want to thank my friend and partner of the last four years, America’s happy warrior, the best vice president anybody could ever hope for, Joe Biden.

OBAMA: And I wouldn’t be the man I am today without the woman who agreed to marry me 20 years ago.

Let me say this publicly: Michelle, I have never loved you more. I have never been prouder to watch the rest of America fall in love with you, too, as our nation’s first lady.

Sasha and Malia, before our very eyes you’re growing up to become two strong, smart beautiful young women, just like your mom.

OBAMA: And I’m so proud of you guys. But I will say that for now one dog’s probably enough.

To the best campaign team and volunteers in the history of politics...

The best. The best ever. Some of you were new this time around, and some of you have been at my side since the very beginning.

But all of you are family. No matter what you do or where you go from here, you will carry the memory of the history we made together and you will have the life-long appreciation of a grateful president. Thank you for believing all the way, through every hill, through every valley.
You lifted me up the whole way and I will always be grateful for everything that you've done and all the incredible work that you put in.

I know that political campaigns can sometimes seem small, even silly. And that provides plenty of fodder for the cynics that tell us that politics is nothing more than a contest of egos or the domain of special interests. But if you ever get the chance to talk to folks who turned out at our rallies and crowded along a rope line in a high school gym, or saw folks working late in a campaign office in some tiny county far away from home, you'll discover something else.

OBAMA: You'll hear the determination in the voice of a young field organizer who's working his way through college and wants to make sure every child has that same opportunity.

You'll hear the pride in the voice of a volunteer who's going door to door because her brother was finally hired when the local auto plant added another shift.

You'll hear the deep patriotism in the voice of a military spouse whose working the phones late at night to make sure that no one who fights for this country ever has to fight for a job or a roof over their head when they come home.

That's why we do this. That's what politics can be. That's why elections matter. It's not small, it's big. It's important. Democracy in a nation of 300 million can be noisy and messy and complicated. We have our own opinions. Each of us has deeply held beliefs. And when we go through tough times, when we make big decisions as a country, it necessarily stirs passions, stirs up controversy.

That won't change after tonight, and it shouldn't. These arguments we have are a mark of our liberty. We can never go in his way without any obstacles. He has the aim of winning everyone round something else. He puts away any handicaps that will block his move forward. Invaluable helps to make the USA a better state, Obama also signifies the importance of being one nation and one people, in a condition which is a way of raising the feeling of patriotism so that he can achieve the desire of unity. By mentioning Governor Romney and his possible effort to win the presidency of Washim, Obama clearly states that it is only possible if both parties work together and all people together to make their country even better than today. He also warmly welcomes all people, not only Americans, as long as they hold American flag, and consider themselves as a part of the USA. Obama has tried to promote the patriotic feelings of the citizens by putting the USA in a superior and dominant country in the World. In this way, he also indicates that they, as the USA, are more powerful, richer and shortly more advantageous than other nations. What is more, he uplifts people stating his hopefulness about a bright future for all Americans. Throughout the whole speech, the ideologies of unity, nationalism, national-glorification and self-glorification are clearly displayed.

B. Analysis of the Speech

At the beginning of his speech, Obama underlines that he achieved something really big using the discursive strategy titled “Number Game”. He says that “Tonight, more than 200 years after a former colony won the right to determine its own destiny, the task of perfecting our union moves forward.” In addition, he presupposes that their union is good enough, but they will make it perfect. The use of the terms ‘move forward’ over and over again can be a sign for their ongoing development which attributes positivity to him as a president and to the country he works for. It is a way of both national-glorification and a display of self-glorification and self-congratulations. He also uses the word ‘triumph’ with strong euphemistic connotations as compared with words such as ‘victory’ or ‘success’.

Obama is also in pursuit of emphasizing the unity of the nation. He uses ideologically laden words for this: “an American family, one nation and one people”. It is a strategy to create sympathy, harmony and a shared feeling. The discursive strategy of ‘Consensus’ is used to raise the feeling of togetherness and agreement. He also tries to empathize and establish a bond with the people referring to difficulties they have gone through: “…the American people, reminded us that while our road has been hard, while our journey has been long, we have picked ourselves up, we have fought our way back, and we know in our hearts that for the United States of America the best is yet to come” and “And tonight, despite all the hardship we’ve been through, despite all the frustrations of Washington, I’ve never been more hopeful about our future.” His words about his wife any family might be showing that he has also a family like all other people have, so that he is one of them. Again, the aim is sympathizing with all people. However the empathy is towards the American people or people who feel themselves American, so it is a kind of ingroup empathy which creates polarization, US-THEM dichotomy.

He also shows himself as the president of all people not only a group of them. Here, he tries to gain the sympathy of all people, in a condition which is a way of raising the feeling of patriotism so that he can achieve the desire of unity. By mentioning Governor Romney and his possible invaluable helps to make the USA a better state, Obama puts away any handicaps that will block his move forward. He has the aim of winning everyone round so that he can go in his way without any obstacles.

“I want to thank every American who participated in this election...
... whether you voted for the very first time or waited in line for a very long time.
By the way, we have to fix that.

Whether you pounded the pavement or picked up the phone...
...whether you held an Obama sign or a Romney sign, you made your voice heard and you made a difference.”

Obama appraises and cherishes the people saying “To the best campaign team and volunteers in the history of politics...The best. The best ever.” with the aim of invoking the feeling that achievements are acquired all together. He also utters some sentences and words to appraise people like “You lifted me up…” “All the incredible work that you put in”. By doing so, he also congratulates himself. He uses the phrase ‘lift up’ which gives the meaning that one is taken into a better and higher position, so he might be trying to show that he is in a higher position, namely superior position now. The use of the term “grateful president” for himself is also a discursive strategy employed to appeal to people’s feelings of reciprocity and a promise to fulfill their expectations although they might be only pipe dreams.

He might be also trying to create a consensus by giving examples from the people who are a part of them. Hence, he has the purpose of showing what he does as logical and legal. The following sentences clearly show that he is in pursuit of achieving a consensus “I know that political campaigns can sometimes seem small, even silly. And that provides plenty of fodder for the cynics that tell us that politics is nothing more than a contest of egos or the domain of special interests. But if you ever get the chance to talk to folks who turned out at our rallies and crowded along a rope line in a high school gym, or saw folks working late in a campaign office in some tiny county far away from home, you'll discover something else.” In this part, he gives many more examples from people such as ‘young field organiz’ or ‘military spouse’. The discursive ideological function of presupposition has been utilized here. Obama presupposes that the election time was a rough one and he finds grounds for this complicated, noisy and messy situation by using number game as a discursive strategy. He states that “Democracy in a nation of 300 million can be noisy and messy and complicated.”

Obama uses the discursive strategy of US-THEM by referring to other nations as ‘distant nations’. He might be using the term in two ways: one is real physical distance, and the other is being different from their own nations. He is creating the image of discrepancy, difference and exclusion. Viewed more pessimistically, this discourse can be an instance of even confrontation and antagonism.

In the following parts of his speech, it is quite common to come up with the examples of national-glorification as a discursive positive self-representation strategy. His use of expressions such as ‘The best schools, the best teachers, the global leader, safe and respected and admired around the world, the strongest military, generous America, compassionate America, tolerant America, the greatest nation in the earth’ are clear instances of positive self-representations as they all have positive connotations. ‘Democracy, freedom, dignity’ are some other words in the speech to express the superiority of one nation. The overuse of the grammatical structure of superlatives displays the dichotomy of positive self-representation and negative other representation, the distinction between Us and Them. Uplifting of one brings about the lowering of the other or making somebody or something superior entails rendering the others inferior.

Perceived from the analysis of the whole speech, the reader can learn that he focuses on the concept of collectivism. He uses words or phrases that touch upon the collectivist feelings of people such as ‘common hopes and dreams, common bond, consensus.’ Moreover, at the end of his speech, he utters the following sentence “... We are greater than the sum of our individual ambitions, and we remain more than a collection of red states and blue states”. It is a discursive strategy of hyperbole, or shortly exaggeration.

In the following part, there are some examples of the discursive strategy of self-glorification, entailment and presupposition. His choice of comparative structures might indicate that he was already a good president. He utters the following sentences “...you've made me a better president, ... I return to the White House more determined and more inspired than ever...” They might be an appraisal for the people, but they also mean that he has the qualifications of a very strong president.

Obama uses the discursive strategy of nominalization in his speech to signify the togetherness and unity. While not stating the agent, he emphasizes that it is a collectivist action to take: “Reducing our deficit. Reforming our tax code. Fixing our immigration system. Freeing ourselves from foreign oil.”

In the utterance “What makes America exceptional are the bonds that hold together the most diverse nation on earth.”, some discursive strategies can be observed: euphemization, positive self representation and negative other representation, presupposition and consensus. He tries to create a consensus that they hold together so they are ‘one’, and at the same time he presupposes that there is a bond keeping all Americans together and all other nations do not have that bond: the word ‘exceptional’ brings us to this judgment. This also shows that America is on the positive side, but the others are on the negative side.

He uses ideologically laden words to define the America as ‘great’ using the following words: “love and charity and duty and patriotism”. His repetition of some words is a way to raise national feelings of the citizens and to give the energy to fight for a better country He says “...keep reaching, to keep working, to keep fighting”, “new jobs and new opportunity and new security”.

At the end of his speech, the discursive strategy of polarization is employed. Although the effect of togetherness seems to be achieved, the distinction of good and bad is somehow represented “…whether you're black or white or Hispanic or Asian or Native American or young or old or rich or poor, able, disabled, gay or straight,
you can make it here in America…” If it had not been presupposed that there is a polarization among people, there would have been no need for such an utterance.

V. THE POLITICAL SYSTEM IN USA

The United States was declared as an independent political entity in 1776, and with the Constitution (1798), the structure of the federal government was created in the USA. The Constitution contains seven articles and twenty seven amendments. The government structure is divided into three, and namely the Legislative, the Executive and the Judicial branch.

The Federal system means that power is shared between a central, national, government and the States. The National Government is called as the Federal Government. The Federal Goverment does not hold the all control. The States have their powers reserved to them as long as any action they take do not contradict with the Constitution. Most of the States has several parties while the Central Government has only two political parties. The USA exists under Democratic and Republican parties.

A. The Presidency

The president is in charge of the Executive Branch of the Federal government, and he is the head of both the state and the government. The President has a broad power: “The president has the power to manage national affairs and the workings of the federal government and he may issue executive orders to affect internal policies. The President may sign or veto legislation passed by Congress and has the power to recommend measures to Congress. The President has the power to make treaties (with the ‘advice and consent’ of the Senate) and the power to nominate and receive ambassadors. The President may not dissolve Congress or call special elections, but does have the power to pardon criminals convicted of offences against the federal government, enact executive orders, and (with the consent of the Senate) appoint Supreme Court justices and federal judges” (Darlington, 2012). The president can be elected for four years and for two terms.

B. Elections and Candidacy

Elections are held on the first Tuesday of November. The president is elected by an Electoral College which represents each state, and the numbers are assigned according to the number of members in the Senate and the number of members in the House of Representatives.

The number of the total vote is 538 which means a candidate has to get at least 270 votes to be elected.

The constitution states the following necessities to be a candidate for being a president:

- 35 years of age or more.
- 14 years residency.
- Natural born citizen (read: US citizen by birth, rather than by naturalization) OR citizen at the time the Constitution was adopted. The latter was necessary because at the time of the Constitution’s adoption, the United States had only existed for 7 years, meaning that the election of 1812 was the first in which it was mathematically possible for a natural born citizen to meet the 35 years of age requirement, and going for more than 20 years without a President was obviously not an option.

The candidates are not directly elected by the people, but by the committee called Electoral College. Each state decided on their electors and the number of the electors is to be equivalent to population density. Each state has freedom to set their own rules to vote for presidential candidates; however the mostly preferred way is to vote for the one who gets most of the votes in the state.

C. Election Process

In a competition, one of the most important requirements is to keep a strong reputation which is mostly maintained not individualistically but by the help of some organizations or institutions. A strong reputation is to enhance what is there. As Genasi (2002) states “It is like an invisible lens magnifying assets to create an illusion of scale, substance and capability.” This is why, candidates in elections look for the ways to raise their reputation in a society against the other candidates.

Genasi (2002) comes up with five key factors deciding on the reputation management process:

- the death of deference
- more and more media
- me first and foremost
- fast news
- money makes the reputation go round

To shortly define them, ‘the death of deference’ refers that in the past people would accept what the people in authority would say without questioning them, but today with the rise of democracy and human rights many people have a tendency to question everything and everybody surrounding them. That requires that “You need to be highly credible, capable of scrutiny and cross-examination. You will need to demonstrate that you are listening and responsive and, above all, you need to be seen to be trustworthy”. ‘more and more media’ indicates the importance of media in guiding people. As told before, people have started to be more skeptical which leads them to question before they come up with an idea. However, it is not always easy and convenient to search and make a decision on what is bad and what is good. At that point, media shows up as a helper to them, so what is preferable is reliable editors in media to direct people into correct ways. ‘Me first and foremost’ is a kind of treaty between people and the authority. To gain reputation, an authority should learn the demands of people, at least first by listening to them. ‘Fast news’ shows how fast global communication tools in transferring what is going on to people, so it is a significant key for rising reputation. ‘Money makes the reputation go round’ means that people with a higher income can buy more. However, it is not enough to gain the respect of people, along with money, some socially respectable requirements are needed.

Some dependent factors which shape people’s opinions about which party and candidate to elect. They are stated as follows by Cheng (2012):
1. Changes in economic conditions before the election, including the unemployment rate, real personal income, real GDP, and inflation.

2. “Voter fatigue”—the tendency to turn out an incumbent party that has held the White House for two or more terms.

3. The two parties’ share of the popular vote in previous recent elections. This can capture some of the noneconomic factors affecting election results, such as states’ general political leanings.

4. VI. CONCLUSION AND DISCUSSION

On the basis of the analysis of Obama’s Victory Speech, it can be concluded that the words used in the speech are all purposeful. Specifically chosen words serve the aim of reflecting and expressing the desired ideology and point of view of the speaker. Moreover, those words have the intention to lead to potential effects that the speaker wants to achieve on the listeners.

In Obama’s Victory Speech, Obama used a lot of examples of euphemistic and derogatory terms with the purpose of affecting the audience. The application of the words which emphasize the importance of being together and standing as a nation and which also reflects the power of one party shows how national glorification and self-glorification are reflected in a given discourse. The analysis of the words used in the speech makes it clear that words are not used randomly; they have an aim of having an impact on the reader and conveying one’s own ideas and if possible finding necessary ground and support for his ideas. Obama used euphemistic and derogatory terms in his speech just to create the notions ‘US and THEM’, and show how better WE are as compared with THEM.

The insights gained from this study are in line with the findings of the study conducted by Junling Wang (2010) on Barack Obama’s speeches. Wang (2010) commented that “Critical Discourse Analysis can explore the relationships among language, ideology and power”. He concluded that Obama used some strategies to influence the audience. One finding is that “his speeches are trying to arouse the American people’s confidence toward the president and his government in the following four years” as can be found in the analysis in this study. In both studies, it is clear that Obama tries to gain the confidence, acknowledgement and approval of the audience.

The interpretation of the text is also in concert with the ones in the study Martin Luther King “I Have a Dream”: Critical Discourse Analysis by Alfayez (2009). The study concluded that “the language used by a speaker can convey some powerful meaning to the hearer depending on the type of language used and how the speaker communicates with his audience. It has often been associated with politics and struggle”.

This study is also harmonious with the study conducted on Obama’s Speeches by Horvath in terms of the findings. The study concluded that “…Obama’s ideological standpoint is present in the address”, as can be seen in this current study too, meaning can be produced through interpretation.

This study supports the findings of the study “Politics, (con)text and genre: applying CDA and DHA to interpreter training” by Boyd and Monceelli (2010). They stated that “the speakers shift alignments in relation both to the various layers of context and to their strategic discursive practices, creating more or less distance in relation to their audience and text”.

The text analysis of another study on two speeches made on Iraq War by two nominees of the U.S. presidential election is in conformity with the interpretation of the analysis in this study. As in this study, they have concluded that “Although, the topic of their speech is the same, its reasons and results for both American and Iraqi politicians and mass people are the same, McCain and Obama reflect two extremely different viewpoints through the channel of language.” Therefore, it is clear in both studies that the production of a written or spoken text differs from one person to another as a result of personal and impersonal motivations, point of view, political, social attitudes and ideologies.
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