



University of Ghent  
English Linguistics  
Master Dissertation 2007 - 2008

# Hillary Clinton vs. Barack Obama

A linguistic study of appraisal in political speeches

Promoted by

Prof. Dr. Anne-Marie Simon-Vandenbergen

Sylvie Opstaele  
Master Linguistics and Literature English - German

## Content

### Preface

<b>1. Introduction</b>	<b>3</b>
1.1. Aim	3
1.2. Data	4
<b>2. Presidential Election 2008</b>	<b>5</b>
2.1. The Road to the White House	5
2.2. Main Issues	8
2.3. Hillary Clinton and Barack Obama	10
2.3.1. Hillary Clinton	11
2.3.2. Barack Obama	13
<b>3. Political Language</b>	<b>16</b>
3.1. Institutional Discourse	16
3.2. Political Language	18
3.3. Political Speech	21
<b>4. Language of Evaluation</b>	<b>27</b>
4.1. Language of Evaluation	27
4.2. Stance in Biber and Finegan (1989)	28
4.3. Attitude in Martin and White (2005)	31
4.4. Indirect Realisation of Attitude	33
<b>5. Analysis</b>	<b>33</b>
5.1. Method	33
5.2. Speeches: Overview	34
5.2.1. Hillary Clinton; Health Care: Remarks on American Health Choices Plan	34
5.2.2. Hillary Clinton on government reform	35
5.2.3. Hillary Clinton on Iraq	36
5.2.4. Barack Obama on urban America	36
5.2.5. Barack Obama: speech at Labor Day Rally	37
5.2.6. Barack Obama on tax fairness for the Middle Class	37

5.2.7. Barack Obama on Iraq .....	38
5.3. Results Hillary Clinton .....	39
5.3.1. Text 1 .....	39
5.3.1.1. <i>Affect</i> .....	39
5.3.1.2. <i>Judgement</i> .....	40
5.3.1.3. <i>Appreciation</i> .....	42
5.3.2. Text 2 .....	44
5.3.2.1. <i>Affect</i> .....	44
5.3.2.2. <i>Judgement</i> .....	45
5.3.2.3. <i>Appreciation</i> .....	46
5.3.3. Text 3 .....	47
5.3.3.1. <i>Affect</i> .....	47
5.3.3.2. <i>Judgement</i> .....	48
5.3.3.3. <i>Appreciation</i> .....	49
5.3.4. Token of Attitude.....	51
5.3.4.1. <i>Text 1</i> .....	51
5.3.4.2. <i>Text 2</i> .....	54
5.3.4.3. <i>Text 3</i> .....	56
5.3.5. Discussion Clinton.....	57
5.4. Results Barack Obama .....	63
5.4.1. Text 4 .....	63
5.4.1.1. <i>Affect</i> .....	63
5.4.1.2. <i>Judgement</i> .....	64
5.4.1.3. <i>Appreciation</i> .....	66
5.4.2. Text 5 .....	67
5.4.2.1. <i>Affect</i> .....	67
5.4.2.2. <i>Judgement</i> .....	68
5.4.2.3. <i>Appreciation</i> .....	70
5.4.3. Text 6 .....	71
5.4.3.1. <i>Affect</i> .....	71
5.4.3.2. <i>Judgement</i> .....	72
5.4.3.3. <i>Appreciation</i> .....	73

5.4.4. Text 7 .....	74
5.4.4.1. <i>Affect</i> .....	74
5.4.4.2. <i>Judgement</i> .....	75
5.4.4.3. <i>Appreciation</i> .....	77
5.4.5. Token of Attitude.....	78
5.4.5.1. <i>Text 4</i> .....	78
5.4.5.2. <i>Text 5</i> .....	79
5.4.5.3. <i>Text 6</i> .....	80
5.4.5.4. <i>Text 7</i> .....	81
5.4.6. Discussion Obama .....	81
5.4.7. Final Discussion: Comparison .....	90
5.4.7.1. <i>Affect</i> .....	91
5.4.7.2. <i>Judgement</i> .....	92
5.4.7.3. <i>Appreciation</i> .....	92
5.4.7.4. <i>Attitude Markers</i> .....	93
5.4.7.5. <i>Remarks</i> .....	93
<b>6. Conclusion</b> .....	<b>96</b>
<b>Bibliography</b> .....	<b>99</b>

## **Preface**

Having reached the end of my dissertation, I am glad to say that I do not regret the choice of my topic, because it enabled me to combine my interest in politics (four years ago I seriously considered studying political sciences) and my linguistic studies.

Further, I would just like to thank everyone who supported me, not only during the realisation process of my dissertation, but also throughout the past four years. First of all I would like to thank Professor Anne-Marie Simon-Vandenberghe. After having guided me through the process of writing my bachelor paper, which proved to be an excellent dress rehearsal for the real job, she supervised my master dissertation by advising me, helping me when I was having doubts and reading the first draft. Her experience was a great help to me.

Special thanks go to my family. I am grateful to my parents because they gave me the opportunity to go to university; to my father because he always knew how to cheer me up when I needed it; to my mother because she cooked my favourite meals in the exam period and because she knew exactly when to call me, and, maybe more importantly, when not to; to my late grandfather with whom I share my interest in politics; to my grandmother who picked me up at the bus stop when I came home on Fridays and who always shows great interest in what I do, just like my great-grandmother who has always believed that I would do well, especially when I was not sure of that myself. I know that university life is a world she is not familiar with, but that did not stop her from asking about my work, exams, friends.

Another member of the family I must not forget is our cat, Musti aka Moesje (friends only), because she always kept me company when I was studying at home. When I was sitting behind my desk, she was lying next to me, snoozing. Who knows what knowledge she gathered when I was studying aloud.

A final thank you goes to my friends; the ones in Ghent, with whom I shared the joys, but also the sorrows, of student life; and the ones at home with whom I was able to forget everything.

I am going to end this preface right now before it completely turns into some kind of farewell address. I am going to leave that to President George W. Bush, who had better start preparing one, because in a couple of months' time a brand new President will take his seat. After having spent this much time on my dissertation I will certainly follow the elections with increased attention, maybe the reader will too, after having read it.

Sylvie Opstaele

10 May 2008



# 1. Introduction

## 1.1. Aim

This dissertation is concerned with the language use of two Democratic politicians who are candidates for the United States presidential election of November 4<sup>th</sup> 2008, namely Hillary Clinton, senator for New York and Barack Obama, senator for Illinois. The emphasis is on how they depict themselves and others in an attempt to persuade the American voters. This dissertation focuses on how they evaluate certain events and how they evaluate themselves and others. In order to find this out I shall study the language of evaluation, more precisely attitude. The data are analysed to see which and how many attitude markers Clinton and Obama use and what this implies for the subjective meanings contained in their speeches. Their language in general and, in this dissertation, their language of evaluation contributes to the achievement of their goal, namely becoming the 44th president of the United States.

Eventually, only one of these two Democrats can actually run for president. One of them will get nominated during the national party convention, following the results of primary elections, to take up the gloves against the Republican nominee and against opponents from minor parties or independent candidates. After 8 years of Republican power, there is a lot at stake for the Democratic party. The first signs, namely the Congress election in 2006, seem to be positive, since the Democrats gained a majority there (van Minnen 2006). Still, this is only a positive indication for the Democrats, nothing is sure until all votes are counted. So they can only hope that the candidate who gets nominated is able to convince the American people to vote for him/her and to choose for the Democrats following the 2006 Congress election.

The pressure is high for the candidates themselves. Clinton and Obama are only two of the eight original Democratic candidates. When elected, both of them can create a unique event in American history. When becoming president, Hillary Clinton will be the first female president ever and Barack Obama the first black president ever. On top of that, pressure is raised because Clinton has a history as a former first lady and Obama is often described as being inexperienced. Until it is decided who is going to run for president, Clinton and Obama are rivals, although they are members of the same party.



In preparation of the elections Clinton and Obama participate in debates, are frequently interviewed and give speeches across the country. This dissertation takes a closer look at a few of their speeches, which are provided on their campaign websites. In these speeches they give the public their point of view on the main election issues, such as Iraq, health care, etc. It is very important that they give the people a clear profile, in order to do so they mark off this profile by referring to others (Republicans, present government/president, historic figures) and referring to certain events in the past (historic events, personal experience, anecdotes) and their objectives for the future. The goal is to create a positive image of themselves and hopefully a negative image of the opponents in order to persuade the American voters.

Past works have studied the language use of presidential candidates to determine certain aspects of their personality and psychological state (Chung, Pennebaker et al.; 2006) or have studied the effects of metaphor on the presidential leadership and charisma with US presidents in inaugural speeches (Levin, Mio et al. 2005). Other aspects of language in political speeches that have been focussed on in the past are personal pronouns, grammatical and lexical repetition (Hillier 2004). Simon-Vandenberghe has concentrated on, for instance, modality in political interviews (1996), modal uncertainty in political discourse (1997) and, with White and Aijmer (2007), presupposition in mass communicated argument.

In the present study the focus lies on the language of evaluation. The aspect of attitude has been studied and described by for instance Biber and Finegan, who actually prefer the term 'stance' (1989: 93-124), and by Martin and White (2005).

## **1.2. Data**

The data used for this dissertation are speeches that Obama and Clinton gave in the run up to the primary elections. The transcriptions of these speeches are made available on the campaign website<sup>1</sup> of the candidates. The speeches that are selected, handle some of the main election issues.

---

<sup>1</sup> <http://www.hillaryclinton.com/news/speech/> and <http://www.barackobama.com/speeches/index.php>

In total seven speeches are selected, which can be found in the appendix (1-57), three of which are Clinton's and four of which are Obama's. The speeches of Barack Obama are generally somewhat shorter in length in comparison to Clinton's, which is why four instead of three speeches are chosen here. The total number of words in these seven speeches is 30,296. Together, the three speeches of Hillary Clinton contain 15,567 words and the four of Barack Obama have 14,189 words. So there is still a dissimilarity, but it is negligible for this research. The seven speeches are referred to as Text 1, Text 2, ... Text 7, also in the Appendix. Further information on these data and the method of analysis is provided in sections 5.1. and 5.2.

This dissertation does not have the intention to sympathise with or react against any of the speakers. The statements and conclusions about their speeches are purely based on the results of the linguistic analysis.

It has to be taken into account that the corpus collected here is limited. Moreover it only contains speeches by two different candidates. This means that in the end no general conclusions can be drawn about the speeches of presidential candidates. This dissertation deals with two individuals. When taking two other candidates the results could turn out differently. Even choosing other speeches of Hillary Clinton and Barack Obama could affect the results. Therefore the conclusions drawn at the end are considered to be relative.

## 2. Presidential Election 2008

During the months in which this dissertation was written primaries and caucuses were held and Clinton and Obama worked on their campaign. It is however impossible to give a detailed account of the latest news on the presidential elections, because the focus of this dissertation is a linguistic analysis. Still, it is useful to depict an image of the background and the larger context of the speeches discussed in this dissertation.

### 2.1. The road to the White House

4 November 2008 is the day on which the American people choose a new President. Having served two terms the current president George W. Bush is not able to apply for the function again. As said in the introduction, only one candidate of each party is able to

run for President. At the time these speeches were given (July-September 2007, except for Text 2 Hillary Clinton: April 2007) several candidates were still in the running. Before the first series of primaries and caucuses had weeded out the first drop-outs, these were the official, i.e. filed with the FEC (Federal Election Commission), candidates for the two major parties:

<u>Democrats:</u>	<u>Republicans:</u>
- Hillary Clinton	- Rudy Giuliani
- Barack Obama	- Mike Huckabee
- John Edwards	- Mitt Romney
- Joe Biden	- John McCain
- Bill Richardson	- Fred Thompson
- Chris Dodd	- Ron Paul
- Dennis Kucinich	- Duncan Hunter
- Mike Gravel	

(website CNN candidates election 2008<sup>2</sup>)

Eventually only one candidate can get nominated by his/her party to be the official presidential candidate representing his/her party. This decision is taken at the national party's convention and is based on the results from the primary elections and caucuses held in different states. The first primary elections and caucuses take place in January and February 2008. A lot of states have chosen 5 February 2008 to hold a primary election. Therefore this day is called "Super Tuesday". On these days people can express their support for a certain candidate to become the party's ultimate candidate in the battle for the White House. (website CNN path to presidency<sup>3</sup>)

The next step is the national party convention where the most popular candidate is delegated to represent the party in the general election period. The Democrats hold their party convention from August 25-28 in Denver and the Republican party convention takes place in Minneapolis-St. Paul from September 1-4. (website CNN path to presidency<sup>4</sup>)

So at the end of August it will be officially known whether it is Hillary Clinton who is going to rally for President or Barack Obama. Of course the results of the primaries and caucuses will be decisive in all of this. The national party convention is also an ideal occasion to close the ranks and unify all party members to support this ultimate

<sup>2</sup> <http://edition.cnn.com/ELECTION/2008/candidates/>

<sup>3</sup> <http://edition.cnn.com/ELECTION/2008/path.presidency/>

<sup>4</sup> <http://edition.cnn.com/ELECTION/2008/path.presidency/>

candidate. This is necessary because in the preceding months the different candidates within the same party were actually each other's adversaries. This is also something which has to be taken into account in this dissertation. Hillary Clinton and Barack Obama do not only have the candidates of other parties as opponents, but also each other and the other Democratic candidates. This can play a role in the way that they evaluate each other.

On election day, 4 November 2008, polls are opened all across the country. The election cannot be called a national poll, because the voters do not directly vote for a particular candidate. They vote however to compose the Electoral College that will eventually choose the new President. Each member of this college represents a particular candidate and will vote for this candidate when the Electoral College comes together (December 2008). When there is no majority, it is the House of Representatives that has to appoint the new President. (website CNN path to presidency<sup>5</sup>)

In anticipation of the primaries and caucuses and eventually the national party convention, debates are held, candidates are interviewed and conventions are organised in different places across the United States. On two occasions CNN cooperated with the popular video sharing website YouTube to set up a debate. On July 23, 2007 a CNN/YouTube debate between the Democratic candidates was held in Charleston, South Carolina and on November 28, 2007 a debate between the Republicans in St. Petersburg, Florida took place. People could ask questions via YouTube and the candidates were asked to answer a selection of these questions. The debates were aired on CNN and are also available on YouTube (website YouTube democratic and republican debates<sup>6</sup>).

This is a first indication of the major role of the internet in the 2008 election campaign. There is an enormous amount of information on the elections on the world wide web. Each candidate has his/her own official campaign website and newspapers and television stations keep their website up to date with the latest election news. And then there is YouTube. When typing in the names of the different candidates a whole range of videos appear. Not only videos made by citizens to support one of the candidates or videos of

---

<sup>5</sup> <http://edition.cnn.com/ELECTION/2008/path.presidency/>

<sup>6</sup> [http://nl.youtube.com/democraticdebate#qa\\_H7Dz0jc1mUs;](http://nl.youtube.com/democraticdebate#qa_H7Dz0jc1mUs;)  
[http://nl.youtube.com/republicandebate#qa\\_H7Dz0jc1mUs](http://nl.youtube.com/republicandebate#qa_H7Dz0jc1mUs)

debates that have been on television, but also videos that are uploaded under the account of the candidates themselves. Barack Obama and Hillary Clinton both have an account on YouTube (BarackObamadotcom and hillaryclintondotcom<sup>7</sup>). Under this account several videos about them and their campaign are uploaded. This varies from videos about a particular debate to more personal videos such as the Obama Family Holiday Greeting video. It is particularly fascinating to see how the candidates themselves use the internet as a forum to campaign and to influence the electorate.

## 2.2. Main Issues

In his political blog (January 2007) *Proving Ground. Inside the Issues for 2008* on the Boston Globe website<sup>8</sup> James Pindell sheds light on the main issues for the upcoming presidential election and the difference in focus between the Republicans and Democrats. According to him the Democrats will mainly focus on Iraq and health care: “Each Democrat running for president will be expected to offer his or her own health care plan.” (Pindell, 2007). The differences between the various plans will probably be minimal, says Pindell, but they will be magnified and criticised among the candidates. The Republicans in their turn will have to explain why the number of people without health insurance is growing and they will not be able to avoid the Iraq issue, they are going to have to account for their position on Iraq, but they will try to shift the focus to the budget deficit and immigration. During the Bush Administration the national debt was lowered, and the spending on entitlement programs, education and homeland security was raised. So the Republicans will make the federal budget deficit a central theme. While every Democrat has to have a health care plan, every Republican has to take a position on immigration. Romney, for example, wants to place a fence on the Mexican border, while McCain eventually wants to naturalise illegal immigrants. Finally, even though they are Republicans some of them will probably distance themselves from President Bush according to Pindell. (2007)

---

<sup>7</sup><http://nl.youtube.com/profile?user=BarackObamadotcom;>

<http://nl.youtube.com/profile?user=hillaryclintondotcom>

<sup>8</sup> <http://www.boston.com/news/local/politics/primarysource/>

The CNN website on the 2008 elections<sup>9</sup> mentions eight main issues, namely abortion, Iraq, gun control, same - sex marriage, health care, social security, immigration and taxes. On abortion, opinions are divided evenly along the party lines. All Democrats support abortion rights and all Republicans object, except for one Republican candidate, Rudy Giuliani, who supports abortion rights.

Iraq is a very important issue and all candidates have elaborated opinions on this topic. What is remarkable with the Democrats is that four candidates, Hillary Clinton is one of them, initially voted in favour of the use of military force in Iraq.

Considering gun control, the general tendency is that Democrats want to limit gun ownership and the Republicans do not. Moreover, most Republican candidates are a member of the NRA (National Rifle Association). This theme has been an issue for many years and is an important one, because the Second Amendment to the Constitution says that a person has the right to bear and keep arms.

Stands on the next issue, same-sex marriage, seem to be less clear cut along party lines than most of the other issues. Only two candidates, the Democrats Mike Gravel and Dennis Kucinich, fully support same-sex marriage. Most other Democrats oppose a constitutional amendment banning same-sex marriage, so in a way they do not totally disapprove of same-sex marriage. On the Republican side the tendency is that they oppose same-sex marriage, but some candidates (e.g. John McCain, Rudy Giuliani) nuance their opinion, so as to not totally reject those kind of relationships.

As pointed out by Pindell, health care is a major issue in this election campaign. Candidates have different points of view on this theme and most of them, especially Democrats, have developed a plan to tackle the problem. The overall difference between Democrats and Republicans is that Democrats want to implement universal health care, i.e. health care for every American, and that the Republicans oppose universal coverage mandated by the federal government.

To give an idea of the candidates' opinions regarding social security, the CNN website gives their position on Bush's plan to allow workers to divert some Social Security payroll

---

<sup>9</sup> <http://edition.cnn.com/ELECTION/2008/issues/issues.abortion.html>

taxes into private retirement accounts. All Democrats oppose this plan and the Republicans generally support it, except for Ron Paul.

On the issue of immigration there is a wide variety of stances; every candidate has a different opinion on illegal immigration, but in general the candidates, Republican and Democratic, look for ways to limit immigration.

The last issue, taxes, shows a clear-cut distinction between the Republican and the Democratic candidates. All Democrats oppose 2001 and 2003 Bush tax cuts and the Republicans support them. (website CNN issues election 2008<sup>10</sup>)

### **2.3. Hillary Clinton and Barack Obama**

This dissertation focuses on speeches delivered by two of the Democratic presidential candidates, Hillary Clinton and Barack Obama. The reason why these two candidates are selected is that these two candidates are the most remarkable candidates among the Democrats. Remarkable because, for example, they can both create a unique event in American history, as mentioned in the introduction. There are some important differences between the two and still they both seem to appeal to the American public. Hillary Clinton is an experienced woman, as her biographical facts prove, who has been known to the public for quite some time while Barack Obama is a rather inexperienced black man who is relatively new on the political scene. The factor of experience plays a major role in their respective speeches (see section 5), so apparently they both attach great importance to this. Hillary Clinton has been a public figure for several years. The American public knew her when she was first lady. In all those years people have had the chance to get to know her and what she stands for. Barack Obama has far less time to win people over. However, not having the same amount of experience to fall back upon can possibly be turned into a positive element. Obama's freshness can be interpreted as a relief by those who are tired of the established order. This is actually something he exploits in his speeches (see 5.2.).

---

<sup>10</sup> <http://edition.cnn.com/ELECTION/2008/issues/issues.abortion.html>

### 2.3.1. Hillary Clinton

On the official campaign website of Hillary Clinton her life and career are described. Also the main issues she is concerned with in general and for the upcoming election in particular are listed.

Hillary Clinton stems from a middle-class family from Illinois. She is the daughter of Dorothy and Hugh Rodham, who trained Navy sailors during World War II and afterwards started a drapery business. During her childhood, Hillary was, for example, a Brownie scout and a Girl Scout; and she was actively involved in her church community. She studied at Wellesley College and next, went to Yale Law School. After her graduation she worked as an attorney. She was especially involved with children's rights and family welfare in general.

Then, in 1975, she married Bill Clinton and she moved to Arkansas. Five years later they had a daughter, Chelsea. In Arkansas, Hillary continued to dedicate herself to children's welfare. Meanwhile she was also a partner in a law firm. Twice she was named one of the hundred most influential lawyers in America. As a first lady she gave lectures on women rights, travelling around the world. Her book *It Takes A Village*, about the responsibility adults have towards children and their welfare, was published in 1995 and it became a bestseller just like her autobiography *Living History* (2004).

In 2000, Hillary Clinton was elected Senator for the state New York. In the aftermath of 9/11 she worked for compensations, health care and grants for all those who got affected by the attacks. Furthermore she visited troops in Iraq and Afghanistan. As a senator she helped to pass laws concerning her pet subjects like health care for everyone, children's and women's rights and the fight against poverty. In 2006 she got re-elected Senator for New York. (campaign website Hillary Clinton<sup>11</sup>)

The above information has been taken from Clinton's campaign website. Of course, this cannot be seen as an objective source. It very much highlights her dedication to the subjects she has concentrated on during her political and legal career. These subjects also provide the main issues for her election campaign, which are briefly listed further below.

---

<sup>11</sup> <http://www.hillaryclinton.com/about/>



Moreover, the description of her youth serves to depict an image of the perfect, but still average American family: middle class, living in the suburbs, actively engaged in community (Girl Scout, church) and a hard working father with a small business. The idea of the American Dream is never far away, which is also shown in the following excerpt:

The promise of America was very real as Hillary was growing up. She learned that no matter who you are or where you're from, if you worked hard and played by the rules, you could provide a good life for your family. (Hillary Clinton Campaign Website<sup>12</sup>)

The biography on the campaign website sketches a rather one-sided positive image of the life and work of Hillary Clinton. Issues like the Whitewater affair, Monica Lewinsky and the failure of the health care task force are not mentioned (van Minnen 2006).

On the CNN website, the point of view of Clinton on the main election issues (see 2.2.) is described. Two of the most important themes, which are also the subject of two of her speeches selected for this dissertation, are Iraq and Health Care, as Pindell mentions in his article (also see 2.2.). What is remarkable about the Iraq issue is that Hillary, as a senator, initially voted in favour of the use of military force in Iraq. So, at first, in the aftermath of 9/11, she supported Bush and the war in Iraq. Now, Clinton wants to move the troops out of Iraq (see speeches section 5 and issues mentioned above). According to the CNN website Hillary Clinton 'now says she would have voted differently "if we knew then what we know now"'(website CNN issues election 2008<sup>13</sup>).

Her health care plan, which she explains herself in the first speech studied in this dissertation (see section 5 and Text 1, Appendix), is a plan which provides health care for all Americans, that is universal health care.

Cost estimated at \$110 billion annually, to be paid for by eliminating the Bush tax cuts for those earning over \$250,000, as well as by reducing waste and inefficiencies in the current system. Also limits the amount employers can exclude from taxes for health care benefits for those making over \$250,000. (website CNN issues election 2008<sup>14</sup>)

---

<sup>12</sup> <http://www.hillaryclinton.com/about/>

<sup>13</sup> <http://edition.cnn.com/ELECTION/2008/issues/issues.abortion.html>

<sup>14</sup> <http://edition.cnn.com/ELECTION/2008/issues/issues.abortion.html>

The table below briefly summarises Clinton’s point of view about the other main issues.

Abortion	Supports abortion rights.
Gun Control	Voted for a 10-year extension of the assault weapons ban. [...] Supports licensing and registration of handguns, [...] raising the youth handgun ban from age 18 to 21, limiting gun sales to one per month [...]
Same – Sex Marriage	Opposes same-sex marriage but supports civil unions. Says states should ultimately decide the issue.
Social Security	Opposes Bush plan allowing workers to divert some Social Security payroll taxes into private retirement accounts.
Immigration	Supported Bush-backed immigration reform legislation [...]. Voted to authorize construction of a 700-mile fence along the U.S.-Mexican border.
Taxes	Opposed 2001 and 2003 Bush tax cuts. Opposed extending tax cuts through 2010.

**Table 1: Hillary Clinton on main issues (CNN website issues election 2008<sup>15</sup>)**

A more elaborated version of the issues Clinton wants to focus on during her campaign and as President can be found on her campaign website<sup>16</sup>.

### 2.3.2. Barack Obama

The campaign website of Barack Obama mentions that he was born in Hawaii on August 4th, 1961. His father, Barack Obama Sr., was born and raised in a small village in Kenya and his mother, Ann Dunham, comes from Kansas. It is also mentioned that, during World War II, his maternal grandfather enlisted in the American army after Pearl Harbor.

Obama’s parents met at the University of Hawaii. After his birth, Barack Obama’s father returned to Kenya, leaving Barack and his mother in Hawaii. Obama studied at Columbia University in New York and after his studies he became a community organiser in Chicago. He worked to improve living conditions in poor neighbourhoods. Afterwards he went to

<sup>15</sup> <http://edition.cnn.com/ELECTION/2008/issues/issues.abortion.html>

<sup>16</sup> <http://www.hillaryclinton.com/issues/>

Harvard and got his law degree. Then he returned to Chicago and worked as a civil rights lawyer and as a constitutional law teacher. He became a senator in the Illinois State Senate and in 2004 he got elected to the U.S. Senate. Over the years he has dedicated himself to improve life for the poor and for working families and to make sure that the Illinois veterans get a disability pay. He visited Russia to support non-proliferation efforts to find and secure weapons of mass destruction around the world. He also promotes alternative fuels. Barack Obama has a wife, Michelle, and two daughters. (Obama campaign website biography<sup>17</sup>)

In comparison with Clinton's biography, it becomes clear that Obama cannot fall back on the same amount of experience as Clinton. He has been a community worker and he has worked as a civil rights lawyer, but his political career has only just begun.

Although Obama did not live in a model family like Hillary Clinton did, he and his family represent the American idea that you can come to America and make your dreams come true, pursue your happiness just like the first American settlers did (van Minnen 2006). Here, there is also a reference to the idea of the American dream:

his father had won a scholarship that allowed him to leave Kenya and pursue his dreams in America. (biography Obama campaign site<sup>18</sup>)

His father was an immigrant who came to America and got the opportunity to study at university or to "pursue his dreams in America". Also the reference to his grandfather who joined the army in World War II is used to prove that he stems from a truly American family.

On his campaign website (Obama campaign website issues<sup>19</sup>) the issues which Obama is mainly concerned with are presented. Significant is the attention he pays to the environment, including ideas for alternative energy sources and of course Obama also has a health care plan and an opinion about Iraq. What is important is that he opposes the use of military force in Iraq, but it has to be taken into account that Obama was not in the

---

<sup>17</sup> <http://www.barackobama.com/about/>

<sup>18</sup> <http://www.barackobama.com/about/>

<sup>19</sup> <http://www.barackobama.com/issues/>

U.S. Senate during the initial debate and votes on Iraq, whereas Clinton was (Pindell, 2007).

The table below gives an overview of the point of views of Obama on the main issues, except for Iraq and health care, mentioned in section 2.2.

Abortion	Supports abortion rights.
Gun Control	Supports extending the assault weapons ban. Supports national law against carrying concealed weapons, with exceptions for retired police and military personnel. Supports limiting gun sales to one per month.
Same – Sex Marriage	Opposes same-sex marriage, but also opposes a constitutional ban. Supports civil unions.
Social Security	Opposes Bush plan allowing workers to divert some Social Security payroll taxes into private retirement accounts.
Immigration	Supported Bush-backed immigration reform legislation, [...]. Voted to authorize construction of a 700-mile fence along the U.S.-Mexican border.
Taxes	Opposed extending 2003 Bush tax cut law through 2010. Supports eliminating marriage penalty and extending child tax credit. Supports scaling back capital gains and dividends tax cuts and re-examining tax benefits for the top one percent of earners.

**Table 2: Barack Obama on main issues**

(CNN website issues election 2008<sup>20</sup>)

Considering that Hillary Clinton and Barack Obama both belong to the same party, it is to be expected that they share certain viewpoints and that the differences will be entailed in details. To create a clear profile, different from their opponent, it is probable that they will differ in the way they try to appeal to a wider audience. Their speeches are a significant factor in all of this. It is one way to present themselves to the public. Therefore their language use is crucial.

<sup>20</sup> <http://edition.cnn.com/ELECTION/2008/issues/issues.abortion.html>

### 3. Political Language

The language used by Hillary Clinton and Barack Obama in their speeches is different from what is generally considered to be everyday language. It is political language, which is formal and which can be classified under institutional discourse (see 3.1.). Generally, public opinion is often rather negative towards politicians. This is partly due to the language use of politicians which is not always straightforward. Especially in the case of the data used here, speeches, the language, how things are said, is very significant, because a speech is even less connected to natural, conversational language than for example an interview on television or a political debate. It is not at all spontaneous.

The context that is dealt with here is a professional context. In this section the genre of the political speech is characterized and also the language of politicians in general is looked at because the context should be taken into account before making any statements about the analysed data. In an article about modality, Simon – Vandenberg points out the importance of the context.

It is clear that any context must be interpreted within a particular context-of-situation, within the larger context of culture. The linking element is register as a configuration of meanings that are typically associated with a particular configuration of field (i.e. What is taking place?), tenor (i.e. Who is taking part?) and mode (i.e. What part is the language playing?) (cf. Halliday and Hassan 1989: 38) (1996a: 163)

The aspect of tenor has already been discussed in sections 2.3.1. and 2.3.2. The two other aspects of mode and field are treated in what follows below (3.1., 3.2. and 3.3.).

#### **3.1. Institutional discourse**

Political discourse in general and political speeches in particular are examples of institutional discourse as opposed to natural, spontaneous language or conversational language.

In the introduction to her book *Power Talk* Thornborrow (2002) describes what is to be understood under institutional discourse. At one point she refers to Habermas (1984) who, according to Thornborrow, sees institutional discourse:

[a]s an example of ‘strategic discourse’, which he [Habermas] distinguished from another form of talk, ‘communicative discourse’. Strategic discourse is, he claims, power laden and

goal directed, while communicative discourse in its ideal manifestation is about speakers symmetrically engaging in achieving mutual understanding. (Thornborrow, 2002: 2)

Habermas opposes institutional discourse against ordinary, conversational discourse (“communicative discourse”) by saying that, in contrast with communicative discourse, it is used to achieve a specific goal. This is actually applicable to the data used in this dissertation. Clinton and Obama deliver these speeches in order to promote themselves as presidential candidates and to convince people to vote for them. Their speeches are typical examples of “strategic discourse”.

Thornborrow draws on Drew and Heritage (1992: 19) when she says that the majority of research done about institutional discourse can be situated in the field of discourse analysis and in this field it is traditionally assumed that ordinary conversation is the most common kind of talk. Institutional discourse is then seen as a type of talk that “involves systematic variation and restriction of activities” (2002: 2). What is also part of this restriction of activities is the inequality between participants. A political speech for example, is actually a kind of monologue. The people the speaker is talking to do not really participate in conversation; they normally remain passive and just listen. This is a very asymmetrical situation.

Next to Habermas, Thornborrow also refers to Levinson (1992) who also characterised institutional discourse by describing how it differs from conversational language. He does this in somewhat similar terms as Habermas:

Firstly, it is goal or task oriented; secondly it involves constraints on what counts as legitimate contributions to that goal or task, and, thirdly it produces particular kinds of inferences in the way speakers interpret, or orient to, utterances. (Thornborrow, 2002: 2)

Thornborrow (2002: 4) herself prefers not to define institutional language only in contrast with conversational language. She gives a list with some characteristics which she thinks are typical of institutional discourse:

1. Talk that has differentiated, pre-inscribed and conventional participant roles, or identities [...].
2. Talk in which there is a structurally asymmetrical distribution of turn types between the participants such that the speakers with different institutional identities typically occupy different discursive identities; [...]
3. Talk in which there is also an asymmetrical relationship between participants in terms of speaker rights and obligations. [...]

4. Talk in which the discursive resources and identities available to participants to accomplish specific actions are either weakened or strengthened in relation to their current institutional identities (2002: 4).

These characteristics are certainly applicable to political speeches. They refer to the asymmetrical relation between the different participants. The speaker is a politician and the listeners, the receivers, are citizens, the electorate. These participant roles can be seen as examples of “different institutional identities”. They both have a specific function, the speaker delivers a monologue and the receiver listens.

### **3.2. Political language**

At times public opinion about the image of politicians and politics in general is rather negative. In her article ‘Evasive Action: How Politicians Respond to Questions in Political Interviews’ Harris mentions the concept of “politicians as a generic breed” (1991: 76). This is a good way of describing how people generally look at politicians. Certain traits, often negative ones, are generalized and are seen as typical of the whole group. This is partly due to the way in which politicians use language. This is also the opinion of Werner Holly in his article *Credibility and political language* (1989: 115), in which he focuses on the credibility of politicians, on their trustworthiness and the link with their language use. According to him politicians have the reputation of being rather untrustworthy. It is important though, to make a distinction between “saying something wrong” and “lying” (1989: 116). The decisive factor in this matter is volition, says Holly. “That is why we have to distinguish ‘credibility’ or ‘authenticity’ of propositions on the one hand, and ‘trustworthiness’ of persons on the other.” (1989: 116). In what follows, Holly describes two ways of speaking covertly. He also calls this “non-communicating”, “different techniques of concealing intentions and conveying meanings at the same time” (1989: 123).

The first technique is what Holly calls the “running-board technique”; “the interesting part of the meaning complex gets to its destination, but isn’t allowed to sit in the car”(1989: 123). With this technique, a certain message is conveyed, overtly, but it is formulated in such a way that it carries an additional, covert, meaning. The purpose is that of propaganda.

Nearly all political language in the public is two-fold [...] There is, in many cases, an official, uncontroversial version, and behind that, a more 'touchy' one which should remain, as far as possible, without consequences for the responsibility of the speaker. (1989: 125)

Because the additional, propaganda meaning is covered, there is no real rational control; When it is necessary, it is possible for the speaker to deny or reform this interpretation of the underlying meaning by giving it another less controversial explanation afterwards. Holly states that politicians do not do it consciously all the time, sometimes it is a result of routine, but still, he concludes, it is a way of non-communicating which creates suspicion about the politician's trustworthiness with the public (1989: 126).

The other technique of non-communicating that Holly focuses on is "The phantom-meaning technique" (1989: 126). Holly gives the example of Brandt (German Social-Democratic party leader) who once called Geißler (secretary general of the Christian-Democrats) "the biggest instigator since Goebbels" (1989: 126). It is obvious that he compares this man with Goebbels, but when asked about it he could say that he meant it literally, in a temporal way. The speaker can play with the literal and figurative meaning of the utterance. This technique is less common according to Holly, but can be more harmful for the politician's image than the *running board technique* (1989: 126-127).

In her article 'Evasive Action: How Politicians Respond to Questions in Political Interviews' Harris starts by posing that the public generally believes that politicians are evasive, according to Harris evasiveness is "one of the most prevalent qualities which the public at large attribute to politicians as a generic breed" (1991: 76). In her article Harris wants to study whether the common knowledge that politicians are evasive is correct. Her article has to be seen in the context of the political interview. She takes into account the role of the interviewer: can an interviewer force a politician to answer a question correctly; especially by the kind of questions he asks (1991: 78). Of course the data that are studied in this dissertation are speeches and not political interviews where adversarial questions are asked, but, as Harris mentions herself, the public at large generally believes politicians to be evasive and in the light of the discussion of political language it can be significant to at least mention evasiveness as a characteristic of political language, because this belief contributes to the negative image that people often have of politicians in general, "as a generic breed" (Harris, 1991: 76).



After the study of her data Harris concludes that there is evidence that politicians often answer in an evasive way. In comparison with other groups their indirection is much higher. She also notes that politicians cannot answer freely; they are in a way restricted by the questions, but they seem to anticipate this by giving elaborate answers (1991: 92-94). It has to be noticed that being evasive is not the only thing politicians do when asked a question. According to Harris:

Evasiveness is most likely to emerge in response to questions which seek to expose contradictions in a position, draw attention to intra-party conflicts or the deficiencies of unpopular policies (1991: 93).

Presumably, a politician will be less evasive, if at all, in a speech, because the speakers decide themselves about what they want to say and this cannot be questioned directly since a speech has the form of a monologue; there is no interviewer present. In this way the speaker can, for example, choose to remain silent about certain mistakes from the past or about certain “unpopular policies”, as Harris calls them, and he/she can focus on items that put him/herself in a positive light.

Not all researchers focus on the idea of politicians being evasive, untrustworthy, etc. Evasiveness is only one aspect of the language of politicians. In her article ‘Image-building through modality: the case of political interviews’ Simon-Vandenberg (1996b: 389-415) expresses agreement with statements from Harris and Jucker that sometimes, when confronted with adversarial questions, politicians are evasive and show a lack of commitment. She emphasizes however that politicians also express certainty and commitment, because they need to create an image of trustworthiness, humaneness and a sense of responsibility. (1996b: 390)

People would not put faith in politicians who are evasive or who are uncertain and remain vague all the time. According to Simon-Vandenberg:

Politicians do not only use the ‘negative’ strategy of avoidance of commitment, they also employ the ‘positive’ strategy of inspiring confidence by sounding fully committed to the truth of their claims. This type of cognitive commitment is expressed by modality. (1996b: 390)

The rest of the article focuses on how cognitive certainty and emotional and social commitment are expressed.

In the article 'Modal (Un)certainty in Political Discourse: A functional account' Simon-Vandenberg (1997: 341-356) also describes how modality is used to build an image of a "confident politician" (1997: 344).

### **3.3. Political speech**

As mentioned in the introduction to this section and in the previous point, a speech cannot be seen as an example of spontaneous, natural language. Rather than natural language it is institutional language (see 3.1.) and rather than spontaneous it is well prepared. In the majority of the cases a political speech is prepared carefully, especially on the level of the American presidential elections. They are written by a team of professionals, so-called ghost writers, who think through thoroughly how the message should be conveyed in order to convince people (Schneider 2008). They use rhetorical instruments, certain strategies to do so. This preparedness is also a characteristic described by Hilary Hillier in her study of political speeches, concentrating on personal pronouns and lexical and grammatical repetitions (2004: 120). Chilton in his turn refers to political parties which hire people to prepare texts of all kind, which emphasizes the importance of language in politics:

employ publicists of various kinds, whose role is not only to control the flow of, and access to information, but also to design and monitor wordings and phrasings [...]. The terms 'spin', 'put a spin on' and 'spin doctor' are terms that reflect the public belief in the existence of and significance of discourse management by hired rhetoricians. (2004: 8)

The audience consists not only of the people present in the place where the speech is given. The speeches are made available to a much larger audience through the internet, radio and television. This is also a point that was made by Hillier when she described the aspect of tenor (2004: 121). This fact increases the importance of the speech. The speaker always has to take into account that his/her words and the impact they have, will probably reach more people than just the ones they are speaking to directly.

The main purpose of Obama's and Clinton's speeches is to persuade people to vote for them. They talk about the main issues (which are described in 2.2. and 2.3.) and try to convince the audience that their solution, their point of view on the matter is the right one. In his article *Some Remarks on linguistic strategies of persuasion*, Karl Sornig (1989:

95-109) elaborates on the rhetorical use of language and its persuasive behaviour.

According to him:

It is not the verifiable truth of a message which is relevant and likely to impress an audience and make it act upon a certain impulse; it is the way things are said (or done), irrespective of the amount of genuine information carried by an utterance. (1989: 95)

Sornig says that with regard to rhetoric and persuasion the form of the message is not to be neglected, it is even more important than whether or not the content is correct, and contributes to the effect the message has on the audience. Persuasion is realised by style. Sornig believes that the “credibility and trustworthiness of the rhetorician’s communicative behaviour” lies in his/her style. (1989: 96)

The form of the message is certainly an important aspect. For example in a political speech a clear structure and the avoidance of terms that are too technical can help politicians to convey a rather complicated political issue in a more convincing and comprehensible way to their audience who are not part of that professional, political context and therefore need a certain clarity, which can be contained in the form. This is also the case with the data used for this dissertation. Both politicians have paid attention to the form and clarity of their speeches.

Nevertheless, the content cannot be neglected. In the twenty-first century it is to be expected that at least some part of the audience has a critical attitude towards what is being said, no matter how persuasive the form of the message is.

Sornig continues his article by referring to some of the most important elements which contribute to persuasion. First he emphasizes the significance of intelligibility. It is a “prerequisite of persuasion” (1989: 97). It is of great importance that the audience understands everything, also the things that are to be understood through association or figuratively. He says that “persuasion works best among people who speak the same language” (1989: 98). In the context of a political speech in front of citizens, this is not the case. As mentioned above there is a difference between the politician who is familiar with the field of politics and all its technicalities and his/her audience. Therefore the speaker certainly has to pay attention to the aspect of intelligibility.

Argumentation is another important aspect of persuasive language use according to Sornig (1989: 99-101). When the speaker explicitly announces the different steps in his/her argumentation, a persuasive effect is created. This is certainly a rhetorical device that is used in the political speeches discussed in this dissertation. When presenting her health care plan, Clinton clearly indicates the different steps in her argumentation to explain her plan: “now here’s how this plan would work” (App. 4). There are four major points in her plan. After presenting these she asks the question: “how will all of this be possible?” (A-7) and she continues by answering this question. So, actually she anticipates to a possible question that the audience may have in order to convince them that she has thought things through and has an answer to that. She does this a second time when she asks: “Now, how will I pay for this plan?”(A-9), again she anticipates to a possible question and provides the audience with an answer.

Further on Sornig also mentions the persuasive force of “name-giving” and “quotational language” (1989: 100). Using another, prestigious, person’s words can be convincing. In Obama’s and Clinton’s speeches the latter can be found under the form of references to statements or quotes of former presidents and other historical figures. In Text 7, for instance, Obama quotes Martin Luther King:

Martin Luther King once stood up at Riverside Church and said, “In this unfolding conundrum of life and history, there is such a thing as being to late.’ We are too late to stop a war that should never have been fought; too late to undo the pain of battle, the anguish of so many families, or the price of the fight; too late to redo they years of division and distraction at home and abroad. (A-57)

Obama again refers to Martin Luther King in two other instances in Text 4 (A-33 and 34). Some of the other historical figures he mentions are Bobby Kennedy (A-30, 36) and Abraham Lincoln (A-49). Also in Hillary Clinton speeches there are some cases of name-dropping: Teddy Roosevelt, President Truman, President Johnson (A-2), and Madeline Albright (A-20, 26), who she says is a good friend of hers, etc.

Other aspects that contribute to the persuasiveness of language are for instance persuasive grammar (grammatical structures that are different from everyday structures, i.e. that are marked) and lexis. Examples that Sornig gives are the “present tense of topicality which is quite popular in journalese” 1989: 101), alliteration, rhyme, assonance,

lexical elements like tautology and euphemism, puns and neologisms. (Sornig 1989: 101 – 108).

One last thing that Sornig mentions and that can be connected to the difference between the speaker and the audience in the case of a political interview, which has already been mentioned above, is the importance of “equality of codes” (1989: 109). If the politician wants to give the impression that he/she and his/her audience share certain values and thoughts, that there is a connection between them, that they live in comparable worlds, it is crucial to “trigger off the impression of equality” (1989: 109). Sornig expresses this as follows:

Language, especially group-language, is the badge *par excellence* of belonging: nothing anyone could say (or mean) is more convincing of in-group identity than the familiar ring of *how* somebody says what he need not really mean. (1989: 109)

At the end of his article Sornig returns to what he stated at the beginning, namely that it is not that important that the speaker actually believes what he/she says, as long as the way in which it is said can persuade his/her audience that they are one the same side.

Hillary Hillier (2004: 126-127) studied speeches of Tony Blair and John Major. In order to find out what exactly makes a political speech persuasive, she asked ten adult students (attending a course on persuasive language) to read two extracts from Blair’s and Major’s speeches. The outcome of this inquiry influenced her choice of three specific aspects to focus on in her research, namely personal pronouns, lexical and grammatical repetition.

The use of personal pronouns is an aspect that has been analysed quite frequently in previous studies on political language. In the article ‘Pronouns for Strategic Purposes’ (1987: 261-269) Simon-Vandenberg studies the frequency of the use of personal pronouns in a political debate between Reagan and Mondale. The results show that Reagan and Mondale both have a high frequency of *we*, followed by *I*. The other personal pronouns occur clearly less frequently (1987: 262). Reagan used relatively more first person singular pronouns than Mondale (1987: 263). The use of the first person singular is seen as a characteristic of “personal speech”. In combination with the results this means that Reagan has a more personal style of speaking than Mondale (1987: 264). According to Simon Vandenberg the first person plural is “an important strategic tool” (1987: 265). It can refer to different people. Mostly, however, *we* refers to the American

people and can therefore be seen as a way of expressing solidarity, “we Americans” (1987: 266). Also the other, less frequent, personal pronouns are briefly discussed in the article (1987: 267-268).

Hillier (2004: 127) refers to, for example, Fairclough (2000: 95-105 and 2001: 148-150). He studied the political discourse of both Thatcher (2001) and Blair. With regard to the use of personal pronouns he discovered that Thatcher used *we* and *you* in order to construct a feeling of solidarity with the general public and that Blair frequently used the pronoun *I* to create a strong personal identity. Hillier herself also used a speech given by Blair and, in addition, one of John Major.

Under personal pronouns she groups personal, possessive and reflexive pronouns (2004: 127). What strikes her most is the difference in usage of the first person pronoun and the third person pronoun. When considering the first person pronoun, the findings of Fairclough are confirmed in that Blair uses *I* frequently, more than Major who prefers *we* and *our*. This difference in pronoun use is interesting because it tells something more about the way in which the politicians profile themselves. The use of *I* puts the central focus on the politician as an individual. The politician emphasizes his personality. The personal pronoun *we* has a different effect. As mentioned above it creates an atmosphere of solidarity instead of individualism. The speaker wants to give the impression that he/she is not any different from the public at large. Hillier mentions that the meaning of *we* is rather ambiguous “since it can mean either inclusive or exclusive of addressee/s” (2004: 131). For example with regard to Hillary Clinton and Barack Obama, *we* could mean, *we* the Democratic Party, *we* the opposition or *we* the American people. Also Chilton refers to the first person plural as a way of conceptualising “group identity, coalitions, parties, and the like, either as insiders or as outsiders.” (2004: 56).

In combination with the third person pronouns *them* and *they* the use of *we* certainly contributes to the establishment of the “Us vs. Them dichotomy”, a phenomenon mentioned by Simon-Vandenberg in the context of modal (un)certainly in political discourse (1997: 353). According to her the speaker wants to create alliances and she also refers to the solidarity which the speaker wants to establish, in particular between

him/her and the audience. In doing so the speaker tries to make “the Us-group as large as possible and the Them-group as small as possible.” (1997: 353).

This is certainly something that Clinton and Obama use as a strategy. On the one hand they use the personal pronoun *I* to set up a personal profile, which is necessary when running for president, and on the other hand they also use *we* in order to establish a sense of solidarity between them and the public at large; to give them the feeling that they are actually “one of them”.

The next aspect Hillier focuses on is that of lexical repetition: “three or more uses of the same lexical item” (2004: 127). These lexical repetitions underline to which issues the speaker attaches great importance. Barack Obama and Hillary Clinton clearly repeat certain lexical items in their speeches. Clinton for instance repeats the image that certain people are *invisible* to President Bush. She uses the word *invisible* several times (11 instances). With regard to Barack Obama’s speech on tax fairness for the middle class (Text 6), the words *simple/simplicity* (5), *fair/fairness* (5) and *complicated/complex* (5) are recurrent.

The final element that Hillier looked for is the repetition of certain grammatical structures, preferably more extensive structures, e.g. phrase or clause (2004: 128). The effect of repeating certain grammatical structures is that the speech is given a clear outline and “an impression of carefully constructed ‘balance’” (2004: 140). This is an element that can be found in the data used for this dissertation. In Text 1, Clinton gives several reasons to create a universal health care system. She begins every argument with *we should do it because* and *we should do it* (7 times) (A-2). Other examples in Clinton’s speeches are: *then there is* (A-22) and *that is why I* (A-23). Instances of grammatical repetition in Obama’s speeches are, for example: *it makes a difference* (A-33) *do we continue ...?* (A-38) and *we’ve had enough* (A-51). In *The Inaugural Address. President Clinton’s 1993 address* Anna Trosborg also pays attention to the rhetorical feature of repetition in political speeches (2000, 127).

## 4. Language of Evaluation

Hillary Clinton and Barack Obama try to create a distinct profile for themselves in order to persuade people to vote for them. In their speeches they do this by presenting their own ideas, their point of view on the main issues, but also by referring to others, for example their adversaries, to point out their weak points and how they would handle things differently themselves. In trying to win the sympathy of the American people they also refer to typical American values like liberty, individuality, the pursuit of the American dream and the greatness of America in history. Referring to historic figures, often former presidents, is a way of doing so. The use of anecdotes (references to personal stories which people they met, or in Obama's case his own family, told them) on the other hand is a way of showing that they, as members of the political class, maintain contact with the people in the street and listen to their problems. These anecdotes are also often an instrument to play the emotional card.

This dissertation focuses on the language of evaluation, more precisely attitude markers and their meaning in the process of sketching an image of themselves, which can also be attained by reacting against one's opponents.

### 4.1. Language of evaluation

In their book *The Language of Evaluation: Appraisal in English* Martin and White (2005) take a closer look at the interpersonal mode of meaning within the Systemic Functional Linguistic Paradigm (SFL) of Halliday and others. Next to the interpersonal component, functional grammar distinguishes two other modes, namely textual and ideational. They describe the interpersonal as follows:

[T]he subjective presence of writers/speakers in texts as they adopt stances towards both the material they present and those with whom they communicate. It is concerned with how writers/speakers approve and disapprove, enthuse and abhor, applaud and criticise, and how they position their readers/listeners to do likewise. (2005: 1)

Interpersonal resources are concerned with negotiating social relations: how people are interacting, including the feelings they try to share. (2005: 7)

This explanation comprises effectively what this dissertation is concerned with in the analysis of the speeches.



The interpersonal, ideational and textual are the three metafunctions of language in the functional grammar system (2005: 7-8). Another aspect Martin and White consider to situate the language of evaluation is the aspect of realisation, “the idea that language is a stratified semiotic system involving three cycles of coding at different levels of abstraction” (2005: 8). The three different levels are: phonology (spoken language) or graphology (written language), lexicogrammar and discourse semantics. The third level of discourse semantics is “concerned with meaning beyond the clause” (2005: 9) and it is here that appraisal can be situated (2005: 8-10).

Appraisal is one of three major discourse semantic resources construing interpersonal meaning (alongside involvement and negotiation). Appraisal itself is regionalised as three interacting domains – ‘attitude’, ‘engagement’ and ‘graduation’. (2005: 34-35)

In this dissertation the focus lies on the domain of ‘attitude’. This domain can again be subdivided into “three regions of feeling”: ‘affect’, ‘judgement’ and ‘appreciation’. (2005: 35)

The next two sections look at this domain in somewhat greater detail. With regard to ‘engagement’ and ‘graduation’ it can be mentioned that Martin and White briefly define those domains as follows:

**Engagement** deals with sourcing attitudes and the play of voices around opinions in discourse. **Graduation** attends to grading phenomena whereby feelings are amplified and categories blurred. (2005: 35)

#### 4.2. Stance in Biber and Finegan (1989)

Biber and Finegan prefer to use the term ‘stance’ instead of ‘attitude’ in their article on *Styles of Stance in English* (1989: 93-123). They explain the concept as follows:

By stance we mean the lexical and grammatical expression of attitudes, feelings, judgements, or commitment concerning the propositional content of a message. (1989: 93)

In their research article (1989) they distinguish 12 groups of stance markers: affect markers, certainty adverbs, certainty adjectives, doubt adverbs, doubt verbs, doubt adjectives, hedges, emphatics, possibility modals, necessity modals and predictive modals. This distinction is based on a combination of grammatical and semantic criteria,

which means that their stance markers include both form and meaning (1989: 93). They studied various genres of texts and by statistical means they classed every genre under a particular stance style or cluster.

They subdivide stance in 'evidentiality' and 'affect' (1989: 94).

Evidentiality refers to the speaker's expressed attitudes towards knowledge: towards its reliability, the mode of knowing, and the adequacy of its linguistic expression (Chafe, 1986). (1989: 94)

Affect, on the other hand, involves the expression of a broad range of personal attitudes, including emotions, feelings, moods, and general dispositions (Ochs and Schlegel, this issue). (1989: 94)

Moreover, 'evidentiality' and 'affect' are, again, divided into two semantic subcategories, respectively certainty and doubt and positive and negative. This is with regard to semantics, but as mentioned above they also distinguish form: adjectives, verbs, adverbs and modals. (1989: 95-96)

Biber and Finegan also take into account 'amplifiers' and 'emphatics' which can mark both evidentiality and affect (1989: 94).

They were able to distinguish six stance styles or clusters and one remarkable finding was that affect was only represented in one cluster (1989: 95), namely 'Emphatic Expression of Affect'. The text types that fall under this cluster are, for example, personal letters, face-to-face conversations and romance fiction (1989: 103). According to Biber and Finegan this means that "evidentiality in English is more commonly marked by lexical and grammatical means than is affect" (1989: 95).

One of the text types that Biber and Finegan studied, was a prepared speech (they also looked at spontaneous speeches) which is exactly what this dissertation is concerned with. To be precise, they analysed 14 prepared speeches (on a total of 500 texts), which were not all political speeches. After the analysis the majority of the speeches (86% or 12/14) were classified under the cluster named 'Faceless Stance'. This stance type is characterised by the "relative absence of all affective and evidential stance features considered here" (1989: 108). What is remarkable is that this cluster is the largest one (it contains 65% of all texts in the corpus) (1989: 108). According to Biber and Finegan this means that:

such expression of stance (affective or evidential) is a 'marked' choice in English, and that the prevailing norm is to leave stance lexically and grammatically unmarked, thus putting the burden on addressees to infer a speaker's stance. (1989: 108)

It is certainly a marked choice to express a certain stance; it is subjective rather than objective, but with regard to a political speech in general and Clinton's and Obama's speeches in particular this seems to be a good reason to express stance, because they need to distinguish themselves from the other candidates. They need to convince and appeal to the public and it seems difficult to achieve that without expressing a certain stance, i.e. criticising an opponent and put themselves in a positive light. In these speeches in the build-up to the election it is essential that the candidates present their personal, and also that of the party, point of view on certain issues. Therefore it seems to be unlikely that the speeches analysed in this dissertation will show the same faceless stance characteristics.

What is also interesting is that they say that in a case of faceless stance it is up to the addressee to find out what exactly is the stance of the speaker. On the one hand it is hard to imagine that Hillary Clinton and Barack Obama would leave the interpretation of their personal opinion up to their audience, this is more or less leaving it up to coincidence, because it is not sure how people will interpret their speeches. On the other hand, it is also possible that in certain situations the speakers are less explicit, situations in which a certain stance is implied rather than explicitly expressed by, for instance, a negative affect adjective. This can be partly related to what Holly (1989) mentioned about the techniques of non-communicating (see section 3.2.).

With regard to the results of Biber and Finegan it should be taken into account that only 14 texts were prepared speeches. This is not many on a total of 500, especially if it is considered that the corpus contains, for instance, 44 press reportages or 80 instances of academic prose (1989: 96).

A second element to keep in mind is that there is no specified description of the kind of prepared speeches their corpus contains. What is known is that they are not all political speeches, there are also some sermons and academic lectures (1989: 109) and in the case of the political speeches it is not clear who gave them and what the context was. This

indicates that it is not possible to just apply their findings to the political speeches used here.

### 4.3. Attitude in Martin and White (2005)

Martin and White describe attitude as “a framework for mapping feelings” (2005: 42) and they state that “Attitude is concerned with our feelings, including emotional reactions, judgements of behaviour and evaluation of things” (2005: 35).

It is subdivided in three semantic categories, namely ‘affect’ which covers the field of emotions, ‘judgement’ which covers ethics and, finally, ‘appreciation’, the semantic category that is to be associated with the fields of aesthetics (2005: 42-43).

#### *Affect*

Martin and White define ‘affect’ and the semantic field it covers as follows: “Affect deals with resources for construing emotional reactions” (2005: 35) and “Affect is concerned with registering positive and negative feelings” (2005: 42).

With regard to form they state that affect, actually attitude in general, can be constituted by various grammatical forms and realisations (2005: 46-47):

- |                              |                                |  |                     |
|------------------------------|--------------------------------|--|---------------------|
| • affect as ‘quality’        |                                |  |                     |
| - describing participants    | a <b>sad</b> captain           |  | Epithet             |
| - attributed to participants | the captain was <b>sad</b>     |  | Attribute           |
| - manner of processes        | the captain left <b>sadly</b>  |  | Circumstance        |
| • affect as ‘process’        |                                |  |                     |
| - affective mental           | his departure <b>upset</b> him |  | Process (effective) |
|                              | he <b>missed</b> them          |  | Process (middle)    |
| - affective behavioural      | the captain <b>wept</b>        |  | Process             |
| • affect as ‘comment’        |                                |  |                     |
| - desiderative<br>(2005: 46) | <b>sadly</b> , he had to go    |  | Modal Adjunct       |

Next to form, Martin and White pay attention to semantics. A first distinction in semantics is that between positive and negative affect (2005: 46). Next, Martin and White see three subcategories where semantics are regarded, namely un/happiness, in/security and dis/satisfaction (2005: 49).

## *Judgement*

“Judgement is concerned with resources for assessing behaviour according to various normative principles” (2005: 35) and “Judgement deals with attitudes towards behaviour, which we admire or criticise, praise or condemn” (2005: 42). This is how Martin and White describe the second attitude category. They further divide it in judgements regarding social esteem and the ones regarding social sanction.

Judgements of esteem have to do with ‘normality’ (how unusual someone is), ‘capacity’ (how capable they are) and ‘tenacity’ (how resolute they are); judgements of sanction have to do with ‘veracity’ (how truthful someone is) and ‘propriety’ (how ethical someone is). (2005: 52)

According to Martin and White social esteem is typical of the oral culture, for example through gossips and humour, and that social sanction is more often found in writing, for instance in laws, decrees or regulations. (2005: 52)

Also judgement consists both of negative and positive evaluations. (2005: 52) Considering the form it is significant to mention that certain forms of judgement fall under the category of modalisation (2005: 54):

Modalisations of probability in Mood can be related to lexicalised judgements of veracity: He’s naughty. He’s **certainly** naughty. It’s **certain** he’s naughty. It’s **true** he’s naughty. [...]  
Similarly, modalities of usuality can be related to judgements of normality: He’s naughty. He’s **often** naughty. It’s **usual** for him to be naughty. [...]  
Likewise for ability and capacity: He **can** go. He’s **able** to go. He’s **capable** of going. He’s **strong** enough to go. [...]  
For proposals, modulations of inclination can be related to lexicalised tenacity: I’ll go. I’m **determined** to go. I’m **intent** on going. I’m **resolved**. [...]  
And modulations of obligation can be related to lexicalised judgements of propriety: Go. You **should** go. You’re **supposed** to go. It’s **expected** you’ll go. (2005: 54-55)

## *Appreciation*

The third subcategory of attitude is defined as follows by Martin and White: “Appreciation looks at resources for construing the value of things, including natural phenomena and semiosis” (2005: 36) and “Appreciation involves evaluations of semiotic and natural phenomena, according to ways in which they are valued or not in a given field.” (2005: 43). As with affect and judgement, it is possible to distinguish between positive and negative appreciation. The different types, where meaning is concerned, are:

reaction which consists of impact (did it grab me?) and quality (did I like it?), composition formed by balance (did it hang together?) and complexity (was it hard to follow?), and finally valuation (was it worthwhile?) (2005: 56). Just as with the other two categories appreciation can occur under different grammatical forms.

Finally, it should be mentioned that the distinction between the different types (affect, judgement and appreciation) is not always clear-cut (2005: 58).

#### **4.4. Indirect Realisation of attitude**

What is mentioned above are all examples of direct, explicit realisations of attitude, but attitude can also be realised implicitly, indirect (Martin and White, 2005: 61).

Direct realisations of attitude are inscribed in a text “through the use of attitudinal lexis” (Martin and White, 2005: 61). However, the analysis of attitude in a political speech would be incomplete when only these inscribed occurrences of attitude are taken into account. It often happens that a text contains attitude even when the attitudinal lexis is left out or even when it does not contain direct realisations of attitude:

The general point here is that the selection of ideational meanings is enough to invoke evaluation, even in the absence of attitudinal lexis that tells us directly how to feel. (Martin and White, 2005: 62)

The interpretation of these indirect realisations of attitude relies on the reader’s social, cultural and ideological position (Martin and White, 2005: 62).

## **5. Analysis**

### **5.1. Method**

The seven speeches, three of Hillary Clinton and four of Barack Obama, are analysed for attitude and past tense and future verb forms. Each speech is analysed separately and in the end the results are counted up for each person in order to be able to compare the results of Clinton and Obama with each other. They did not use the same amount of words, therefore the numbers were turned into a result on 10,000 words to be able to compare the two.

For each speech it is counted how many occurrences of positive and negative affect, judgement and appreciation there are. The classification is based on the one used and

described by Martin and White (2005) (see also section 4.3.). To illustrate the result numbers at least two examples pro category, when possible, are given. When elaborating on the examples, more detailed information about the type of attitude will be provided. In the Appendix (73-76), tables on the semantic subcategories of appreciation and judgement can be found. These tables give an overview of the total number (i.e. one table for Clinton's speeches and one for Obama's speeches) of different semantic subcategories used by Hillary Clinton and Barack Obama.

Sections 5.3.4. and 5.4.5., about tokens of attitude, do not contain any tables because it is difficult to count indirect realisations of attitude. These can be realised in the form of a phrase, a sentence or even an entire paragraph.

## **5.2. Speeches: overview**

In this section, the speeches are discussed in some further detail, concentrating on the structure and giving a brief summary in order to be able to understand what these speeches deal with and to highlight certain elements that are not discussed in the actual analysis section.

### 5.2.1. Hillary Clinton; Health Care: Remarks on American Health Choices Plan

(contains 6,033 words)

Text 1 (Appendix 1-11) is a speech on health care, an issue that is of high importance to Clinton, which becomes clear when one reads her biography (see 2.3.1.) and this speech in particular. Moreover health care is also considered to be one of the main themes for the election (see 2.2.). The speech was given on September 17<sup>th</sup> 2007 at the Broadlawns Medical Center to an audience involved with the issue, and is titled *Remarks on American Health Choices Plan*. As the title gives away it is about Clinton's plan to improve the American health care system.

As a way of introduction Hillary Clinton begins by uttering some polite words to the audience by saying that she is honoured to be there and giving a compliment on their work for people who need care. Then she continues the formalities by thanking some people of the medical centre in particular. Next she tells an anecdote about a woman she met who had some problems and was not helped by the health care system. Then, she

continues to underline the problem by giving some very emotional examples. The next step is that she says that she believes it is time for a change and that is why she is running for President. Clinton starts to criticize the current government and President Bush. After that, Hillary Clinton gives several reasons why they should strive for quality, affordable health care. After she has talked about what she has learned throughout the years, she presents her plan, called the American Health Choices plan (App. 5) and she explains how it works. Towards the end, Hillary Clinton uses another anecdote about a family that got in trouble and could not count on the health care system. Next, she tries to mobilise people to support this plan and she ends by thanking the audience and uses the well known phrase: "God bless you".

#### 5.2.2. Hillary Clinton on government reform

(5,142 words)

Text 2 in the Appendix (11-20) is a speech given by Hillary Clinton at the Institute of Politics (April 13<sup>th</sup> 2007) in the state of New Hampshire, again an audience that is familiar with the subject, namely government in general and how Clinton wants to reform it when she is President. She begins again by directing some polite words to the person that introduced her and she praises the Institute. Then she briefly tells what she is going to talk about: the importance of government and how to improve it. Next, Clinton starts to criticise the current government, the Bush Administration. Thereby she especially focuses on the politics of special interests, cronyism and what she describes as incompetence. The following step is to describe what, according to Clinton, the ideal government should look like. After that she presents her ten point agenda to reform government. What is significant is that she emphasizes that she will hire people because of their competence (as opposed to the cronyism she referred to), that all American people will be taken care of (and not only the richest ones) and that she wants to make government more transparent for the American citizens. Her tenth and final point is to reform the voting system; she sees an example in the Indian voting system which she describes towards the end of her speech. She ends by telling a story her friend Madeleine Albright once told her about people in the Czech Republic holding on to American flags.



### 5.2.3. Hillary Clinton on Iraq

(4,392 words)

Text 3 (A-20-29) deals with the subject of Iraq. This speech is given on July 10<sup>th</sup> 2007 at the Temple for the Performing Arts in Des Moines in Iowa. Hillary Clinton was introduced by Tom Vilsack, a former governor of Iowa and a friend of Hillary's. Clinton starts by stating that the war in Iraq must end. In what follows she praises the U.S. soldiers and describes some of the tragic consequences of the war for these soldiers, their families and the Iraqis themselves. Then she mentions the mistakes, according to her, the Bush Administration has made regarding the war in Iraq. Clinton points out that her first and most important mission as President is to end the war and withdraw the troops. She presents her three point plan on how she would achieve this. The first step is to withdraw the troops. Secondly, Clinton wants to secure stability in Iraq. Finally, her plan includes replacing the military force by a diplomatic initiative in the region. Next, she elaborates on the diplomatic relations with Syria and Iran. Also the financial costs of the war are discussed in greater detail. Hillary Clinton finishes her speech with an anecdote Tom Vilsack told her about a heroic act of an American Officer.

### 5.2.4. Barack Obama on urban America

(3,536 words)

Text 4 (A-30-37) is about how Obama would like to improve living conditions for urban America, how he wants to combat poverty in the cities. The speech *Changing the Odds for Urban America* was given in Washington, DC on July 18, 2007. Obama begins by telling about Bobby Kennedy who visited a poor area along the Mississippi Delta. He does this to point out that poverty was an issue then, forty years ago, and still is now. Obama mentions that large amounts of money are spent on several policies and programs, e.g. the war in Iraq. The poverty problem however remains unresolved. He talks about how a great nation as America cannot tolerate this. According to Obama government has let the poor people down in the past. As President he is going to change that. As a former community worker he has already some experience with the issue. He then describes a successful local project, called the Harlem Children's Zone. Next, he presents a plan which

is based on this project and which he would like to execute nationwide. At the end he again refers to Bobby Kennedy.

#### 5.2.5. Barack Obama: speech at Labor Day Rally

(3,533 words)

Text 5 (A-37-43) is a speech with general remarks about certain election issues, Obama's plans for the future and the Bush Administration. It was given on Labor Day in Manchester on September 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2007. Obama begins by pointing out that there is a great diversity (young and old, black and white, Latino, Democrats, etc.) among the crowds that show up during his campaign. He compares this with the "conventional thinking in Washington", which tells people that the country is divided. He continues by criticizing the Bush Administration and politicians in general; he asks the question if Americans should continue like this. According to him many Washington politicians see politics as a game. He himself however, sees politics as a mission. Then he tells an anecdote about his grandfather and an anecdote about a home care worker he followed for one day. After that he says that he is hopeful about America. Obama questions the importance that politicians attach to experience, as in the years they have spent in Washington. He does not have that kind of experience. He emphasizes however that he has another kind of experience, namely as a community worker, a civil rights lawyer, a constitutional law professor, a state Senator and a U.S. Senator. Next he talks about what his experience tells him. The central idea in all of this is change and also: progress, reform and security. What follows is a critique of the Bush Administration and how he, as President, would do things (health care, oil, education and Iraq) differently. To end he tells the audience, the American people that he needs them to realise all his plans, he needs them to believe in America.

#### 5.2.6. Barack Obama on tax fairness for the middle class

(3,095 words)

Obama gave his speech on tax fairness for middle class on September 18, 2007 in Washington DC. As a way of introduction Obama talks about the American economy, which has known ups and downs, but eventually emerged stronger. This was not the case,

however, for the American individual. He then tells about his father-in-law to exemplify the idea of the American dream, an American story. For the American dream to come true it is necessary that there is a social compact: if you work hard, your work will be rewarded. According to Obama, “That social compact is starting to crumble” (A-44). He criticises the fact that the working class is not rewarded enough for their work and the fact that the current tax system creates loopholes for the well-off, which, according to Obama, is the result of the work of special interests. In what follows Obama describes what goes wrong with the current tax system, especially focussing on the complexity of the system. The next step is to present his own solution to the tax problem. The first part of his plan is to give a tax cut to working people. Then he would create a universal homeowners’ tax credit. Thirdly, Obama would provide a progressive tax cut for America’s seniors. Finally, as President, he would simplify the process of filing a tax return for all Americans. At the end of his speech Obama refers to some words of Abraham Lincoln: “Capital is only the fruit of labor, and could never have existed if labor had not first existed. Labor is the superior of capital, and deserves much the higher consideration.” (A-49).

#### 5.2.7. Barack Obama on Iraq

(4,025 words)

The final speech, Text 7 (A-49-57), is about Iraq (*Turning the Page in Iraq*). This speech was given on September 12, 2007 in Clinton. As a way of introduction, Obama uses an anecdote about a woman he met. Her nephew was leaving for Iraq and she told Obama: “I can’t breathe” (A-49). Next, Obama talks about the Bush Administration and their decision to start a war in Iraq, which Obama has never supported. He mentions the consequences of the war: the wounded, the financial costs and the standing of America which has been damaged. Then Obama proposes a plan to stop this war. The first step of this plan is to remove the troops in consultation with the Iraqi government. He wants to stabilise the country and its government. At the same time American diplomacy has to be restored in the region. Diplomacy is also the way to approach the Iran issue, according to Obama. The final part of Obama’s plan is to set up an international initiative to tackle Iraq’s humanitarian crisis. He continues by explaining the possibilities after having ended

the war in Iraq. At the end of his speech he refers back to the anecdote he told at the beginning by saying: “It’s time for us to breathe again.” (A-57).

### 5.3. Results Hillary Clinton

#### 5.3.1. Text 1

##### 5.3.1.1. Affect

The table below shows that few instances of direct realisations of affect can be found in Text 1 (Appendix 1-11) of Hillary Clinton. Moreover there is no clear difference between the frequency of positive and negative affect.

	Positive	Negative
Affect	5	7
X/10,000	8.29	11.6

Table 3: Affect text 1 H.C.

Examples:

1. That is the tragedy at the heart of our health care system. The devastation when one stroke of bad luck undoes a lifetime of hard work. That feeling of being right on the edge that eats away not just at the 47 million who don’t have health care, but many of the 250 million who do. (A-1)
2. It’s the heartbreak you feel when your spouse asks, “can we afford my pills this month”, and you don’t know the answer. (A-1)
3. When your sick child asks, “ can I see a doctor,” and you can’t bear to answer. (A-1)

The underlined words are examples of negative affect. Clinton uses them to give some very emotional illustrations of the malfunctioning of the American health care system. The negative emotions are not only expressed directly through the underlined words, they are also implicitly evoked (see 5.3.4.1.) by the combination of utterances, the discourse.

4. And when it comes to health care reform, I believe I have exactly the experience we need to get it done in my first term as President. While I was disappointed by what happened in 1994, I did not give up. (A-4)

Here, Hillary Clinton expresses her personal feelings, her personal disappointment. She actually wants to emphasize that she has a lot of experience when it comes to health care, but she realises that people will probably remember the failure of the healthcare

task force co-chaired by Hillary Clinton in 1994<sup>21</sup> (Bailey, Blight et al, 2007: 619), so in order to create a reliable, truthful image she needs to mention this and she does this by combining it with a reference to her personal disappointment. Mentioning that what happened in 1994 got to her can actually turn out to have a positive effect. It shows that she is a sensitive person who is also honest about less positive events in her past, so not only emphasizing the positive ones that exemplify her experience. She does it very subtly though, she does not literally say what happened then, she describes it as “what happened in 1994”.

5. I am honored to be here with you today at Broadlawns Medical Center. (A-1)

This is actually the first sentence of Clinton’s speech. A positive feeling is expressed. This kind of positive affect, the kind words at the beginning of a speech, also returns in other speeches and is more like a formality.

6. In the Senate I’ve worked to expand health care to our men and women in uniform. [...] I am proud of the legislation I passed to address the glaring problem. (A-4)

Here Hillary Clinton emphasizes one of her accomplishments by expressing a feeling of satisfaction and happiness, namely a legislation that was passed concerning a better health care for soldiers of the U.S. Army.

#### 5.3.1.2. *Judgement*

From table 4 it can be inferred that Hillary Clinton expresses judgement more frequently than affect. On top of that it becomes clear that she slightly uses more positive judgement markers than negative ones.

	Positive	Negative
Judgement	18	14
X/10,000	29.84	23.21

**Table 4: Judgement text 1 H.C.**

<sup>21</sup> “[Bill] Clinton’s major goal was to make healthcare affordable and accessible for all Americans. But special interests [insurance industry, business community, medical community] mobilized in opposition. [...] The healthcare task force, co-chaired by Hillary Rodham Clinton, could not defeat these forces. Within a year, the centerpiece of Clinton’s fledging presidency had failed.” (Bailey, Blight et al., 2007: 619)

Examples:

7. And if there was ever a moment to do what America does best, to confront the challenges we face, this is it. That's what we've always done [...]. and we made America stronger, more prosperous, and more fair. We are and have always been a nation of opportunity. (A-2)

Here, Clinton the positive judgement words *stronger*, *prosperous*, *fair* and *nation of opportunity* to describe the capacity of America. By using the pronoun *we* in combination with *made*, she involves the American people and emphasizes that they also had an important role in the development of America into a strong, prosperous and fair nation. The two occurrences of *always* are examples of modality, more precisely usuality. In the context of example 7 they function as tokens of judgement, namely expressing the tenacity of the capacity of America. Also the phrase *a moment to do what America does best* can be seen as an indirect expression of the capacity of America to tackle certain challenges, in this case the problems considering the American Health Care System.

8. The story of how people of good faith and good will came together and worked out a solution because they cared too much about our country and their fellow citizens to let this crisis continue. (A-10)

Here, Hillary Clinton praises the American people. She describes them as good people. This is actually something that is recurrent throughout her first speech. She often praises and admires America and the American people, emphasizing that they are capable of making changes in the health care system. To do so she does not only use direct realisations of judgement (and appreciation), but also indirect realisations (see 5.3.4.). The following two examples are actually engagement resources. They reject Bush's claims and therefore convey a judgement of negative veracity. The judgement is implicit however:

9. And, finally, following the horrific attacks of 9/11, I fought the EPA and the Bush administration when they claimed that the air at Ground Zero was safe. (A-5)

By using the verb form *claimed* Clinton questions the veracity of Bush and his administration and their dependability. By what follows it becomes clear that she goes further than just questioning, she condemns them by saying:

10. safe for our first responders and emergency workers; safe for our construction and building trade workers; safe for our residents and our volunteers. It wasn't. [...] the

first responders, the workers, the volunteers and residents who have gotten sick and some have even died. (A-5)

### 5.3.1.3. *Appreciation*

Apparently, appreciation is the kind of attitude marker Hillary Clinton uses most often. Table 5 does not indicate a distinct difference between the positive or the negative use of appreciation.

	Positive	Negative
Appreciation	42	41
X/10,000	69.6	67.96

**Table 5: Appreciation text 1 H.C.**

The word *challenges* in example 9 and the word *crisis* in 10 above are actually examples of negative appreciation of an event which show that Hillary Clinton sees the situation the American Health Care System is in as a challenge and as a crisis situation, someone else could be of another opinion, could describe it differently. By using these words, which return in other passages in the speech, she emphasizes the seriousness of the problem where health care is concerned and that it should be solved urgently.

In Text 1 the negative appreciation markers are primarily used to express Clinton’s negative evaluation of the American health care system, as the following examples show:

11. Because we can no longer tolerate the injustice of a system that shuts out nearly one in six Americans (A-3)
12. So every year, billions of dollars go straight from the pockets of families to profits of drug companies. This is unconscionable, it is intolerable and it is time to put an end to it. (A-3)
13. Now I know my Republican opponents will try to equate health care for all Americans with government run health care. Well don’t let them fool us again. This is not government run. There will be no new bureaucracy. (A-4)
14. I’ve been fighting more generally to improve health care for veterans because it is outrageous that so many service numbers are returning home and being told to take a number and wait in line for the health care they need. (A-4)
15. This legalized discrimination against the sickest of Americans is unfair and immoral and it defeats one of the central purposes of insurances, which is to share risk. (A-9)
16. But if a patient needs his foot amputated, the reason he goes, the insurance company is pretty much stuck with that on their watch. Now that is upside down and backwards. (A-9)

Clinton criticises the role of the insurance companies and the government. *Bureaucracy* is clearly used here in a pejorative way, as in other instances in her speeches, and therefore it is classified under negative appreciation. In 17 *discrimination* is already a negative evaluation when it stands alone, but the combination with *legalized* makes it even more negative.

With regard to examples 11, 12, 14 and 15 it is difficult to distinguish whether or not they should be classified under judgement (people) or appreciation (event) (see also 5.5.). In this case the examples do not explicitly refer to a person, but they actually condemn human behaviour. Therefore it is arguable to see these excerpts as examples of negative judgement.

The positive appreciation often occurs in the context of Hillary Clinton's own plan, which she calls the American Health Choices plan (A-5), to improve the health care system:

17. Third, I learned how important it is to present a plan that is clear and easy to understand. Today's plan is simpler, yet still bold. (A-4)

Here she means that her own plan will be clear-cut, effective and vigorous. In other sentences she associates her plan about health care with the words *quality* and *affordable*:

18. Your coverage will be affordable. My plan provides tax credits to make health care both universal and affordable for everyone. (A-6)

19. Fourth, you will always have an option for coverage that is fully affordable. (A-7)

20. A growing number of CEOs and union leaders are coming together because they agree that now is the right time to renew the national call for quality, affordable health care. (A-3)

Hillary Clinton is a woman with a plan. She actually uses the word *plan* or *my plan* 41 times in Text 1. This is also the gist of this speech. She starts off by criticising the current health care system and then she presents her own plan.

Example 21 is from one of the anecdotes Clinton used. Anecdotes are the parts of her speech in which she refers to an encounter she had with an American citizen. In this way she, and also Obama, show that they have not lost touch with the common people. Hillary Clinton uses this anecdote to express her appreciation of a government program that was developed during Bill Clinton's administration:



21. A couple of months later, Judy was diagnosed with breast cancer. Thankfully a special government program started during my husband’s administration took care of her treatment and she recovered. But then in 2003, John had a heart attack. [...] Fortunately he survived, [...] (A-1)

It is just a way to focus the attention on an accomplishment of her husband in the hope that some of the success will reflect on her.

5.3.2. Text 2

5.3.2.1. *Affect*

Again, as in Text 1, the occurrence of affect markers is low. The difference here is that negative affect is clearly represented better, as there is only one occurrence of positive affect.

	Positive	Negative
Affect	1	8
X/10,000	1.9	15.56

Table 6: Affect text 2 H.C.

This is at the beginning of the speech where Clinton greets her audience:

22. It is such a pleasure to be with all of you today at the Institute of Politics here at Anselm. (A-11)

This is a formality that returns at the beginning of each speech. Clinton continues by praising the Institute of Politics where she is holding this speech. She actually mentions that she hired one of their students even before he graduated (A-11).

By saying that the American people are *cynical* about the government Clinton criticises the current government, especially when she mentions that a good leader (meaning herself) can change that.

23. Now, I do know that people are cynical about our government and that’s sort of the American birthright. But I believe that with the right leadership we can restore trust and faith in government. (A-13)

In the following example she reacts in an emotional way to the shortages of the American electoral system. This is one of the few cases where she uses an affect marker to denounce a certain problem. Usually negative appreciation and judgement are found in those cases.

24. It is almost heart-breaking that I have to mention this on my reform agenda. American should lead the world in the best electoral system, using the best equipment. (A-19)

### 5.3.2.2. Judgement

Table 7 points out that judgement is used frequently in Clinton’s speech on government reform. There is an obvious majority of negative judgement markers.

	Positive	Negative
Judgement	15	33
X/10,000	29.2	64.18

**Table 7: Judgement text 2 H.C.**

These results are not that astonishing when considering the topic of the speech, namely government reform. Text 2 is about what Clinton would change, would do differently if she were President to make government more transparent and reliable. Of course this is an ideal opportunity to criticise the current government system and the Bush Administration. Negative judgement, and to some extent also appreciation, are therefore quite frequent, especially in the context of the current government.

Excerpts:

25. Really, it is a stunning record of cronyism and corruption, incompetence and deception and it has shaken the faith of many Americans in our government. (A-12)

This is a strong indictment against the capability and the propriety of the current government. In the rest of the speech Clinton will elaborate on this and give examples. She criticises, for instance, the giving out of no-bid contracts (A-16) and the government appointing friends and supporters (cronyism and corruption) (A-15).

26. Because this Administration doesn’t respect our government, they run it poorly, and it fails our people. They then point to government’s failure to prove it’s not worthy of respect. (A-12)

Example 27 brings together Clinton’s judgement of the current government and her plans for a future government with her as President. In what follows she presents the ten points of her agenda to reform government. The positive judgement nouns *competence* and *openness* summarise these ten points nicely. She wants to create a government that

is transparent, in order to rule out corruption and cronyism. By using words such as *cronyism*, *secrecy* and *mystery* Clinton again condemns the capability and the propriety of the Bush government.

27. Today I want to lay out a ten point agenda to do just that – an agenda for government reform. [...] To restore competence and end the culture of cronyism. To replace secrecy and mystery with openness. (A-14)

Again, in example 28, the propriety of Bush and his administration is criticised, here in the context of giving out non-competitive or no-bid contracts.

28. Today, there has been an explosion in no-bid contracting, [...]. The result is fraud, waste, and abuse everywhere from Afghanistan and Iraq to the Gulf Coast. (A-16)

Below, Clinton presents the third point of her agenda, namely appointing qualified people, in contrast to handing out jobs to friends who are often not suited for the job like she accuses the current administration of (A-15).

29. Third when I'm President, I will once again appoint the most qualified, dedicated, public-minded people to serve in government. (A-14)

The positive judgement words *qualified*, *dedicated* and *public-minded* do not only describe the capability and propriety of those people she appoints, but they also indirectly emphasize Clinton's capacity of hiring the right people in all sincerity.

### 5.3.2.3. *Appreciation*

Table 8 shows that Hillary Clinton uses appreciation markers relatively frequently, and that there is a slight majority of positive appreciation markers.

	Positive	Negative
Appreciation	19	14
X/10,000	37.0	27.23

**Table 8: Appreciation text 2 H.C.**

Just as with judgement, the appreciation markers mostly occur in the context of criticism of the Bush administration (negative) and Clinton presenting her plan to improve government (positive).

The words *efficient* and *effective* express a positive evaluation of her own plan, of the results of it in the future. The presence of *enhance*, *make* and *more* imply that the current government is not efficient and effective for taxpayers.

30. Today, I want lay out a ten point agenda to do just that – an agenda for government reform. A plan to enhance accountability and transparency. To make government more efficient and effective for taxpayers. (A-14)

Here, Clinton expresses a positive appreciation of an initiative started during her husband’s administration. First, she refers to it in a somewhat neutral way by mentioning his surname, but in the next line she calls him by his first name, as to remind people that they are husband and wife.

31. We also need to go back to doing what was done during the Clinton Administration with the Reinventing Government initiative, known as REGO, which Bill started and asked Vice President Gore to head-up. And the results were astonishing. (A-17)

This is not the only time at which Hillary Clinton refers to her husband’s Administration in a positive way (e.g. A-16 and 17). It seems as if she wants to remind people of some of the successful realisations of Bill Clinton hoping that people will associate this success with her.

5.3.3. Text 3

5.3.3.1. *Affect*

Again, there are not many occurrences of affect markers in Text 3 on the Iraq issue. Still, there are more negative affect examples than positive ones.

	Positive	Negative
Affect	1	8
X/10,000	2.3	18.21

Table 9: Affect text 3 H.C.

Excerpts:

In the example below Hillary Clinton describes the negative feelings the world holds against America after rushing into a war without having reached a consensus with other nations:

32. As a result of these failures, the next President will inherit some of the greatest foreign policy challenges in our history. [...] And the increasingly difficult task of restoring American leadership in a world that has come to view our nation with suspicion and mistrust. (A-22)

In the next case, the negative feeling is connected with Hillary Clinton herself:

33. I have been long worried that the Pentagon is not adequately planning for the withdrawal of our troops because the White House does not want them to plan for withdrawal. (A-24)

This kind of occurrence of affect is quite rare in her speeches. In the example above she gives the impression that she feels personally involved, not only that she disapproves of it, but also that it really affects her.

5.3.3.2. *Judgement*

Table 10 shows that there are more or less the same number of judgement markers as in the two other speeches and that there are also more instances of negative judgement than of positive judgement.

	Positive	Negative
Judgement	19	29
X/10,000	43.26	66.03

Table 10: Judgement text 3 H.C.

The positive occurrences here are often used in the context of praising the soldiers of the U.S. Army. Hillary Clinton strongly opposes the Iraq policy of Bush, but still she expresses her admiration of the soldiers. Of course they, and their families, are potential voters too. Moreover the American public is sympathetic towards their soldiers out of a sense of nationalism.

34. Our brave men and women who wear the uniform of our country deserve nothing less. As a senator and as a member of the Senate Armed Services Committee, I have had the privilege of meeting with many veterans in Iraq, here in Iowa and across America. They represent the very best of our country. When called on, they respond, serving with tremendous courage, dedication, and honor – many of them from our national guard and reserves. (A-21)

*Privilege* is actually a way of expressing her appreciation of the meetings she had with several veterans. The other underlined words are positive judgement markers which express the enormous capability of the U.S. soldiers.

The negative occurrences on the other hand can mostly be found in the context of criticism of Bush and his Administration for their policy concerning Iraq:

35. The catalogue of miscalculations, misjudgements, and mistakes in Iraq shocks the conscience. From the unilateral decision to rush to a preemptive war without allowing the inspectors to finish their work or waiting diplomacy to run its course; to the failure to send enough troops or provide proper equipment for them; [...] (A-22)

The capacity of Bush and his Administration comes under attack, not only his decision to send troops to Iraq in the first place, but also the way he handled the situation once the war had started. The negative judgement nouns *miscalculations*, *misjudgements* and *mistakes* may differ in form, but their meaning is more or less the same. This kind of repetition, together with the examples she gives afterwards, makes Clinton's accusation even stronger.

36. Every year we hear about how next year, they may start coming home. Now we are hearing a new version of that very familiar song from the President. He claims that we can, with slight adjustments, stay the course. (A-21)

The use of the verb *claims* in the example above questions Bush credibility and reliability. Just by using this one verb form, Clinton can depict him as untrustworthy. The phrase *that very familiar song from the President* sounds as if she is quite annoyed by it/him.

Also the President of Iran is evaluated in terms of negative judgement, more precisely his ethics are strongly criticised:

37. Iran's President has hosted a conference devoted to denying the Holocaust, placing him in company with the most despicable bigots and historical revisionists. (A-27)

In most cases however the negative judgement can be associated with Bush and his Administration.

#### 5.3.3.3. *Appreciation*

The numbers in table 11 are similar to those in Text 2, but differ greatly from those in Text 1. Negative appreciation markers occur more frequently than positive markers of appreciation.

	Positive	Negative
Appreciation	15	21
X/10,000	34.15	47.81

Table 11: Appreciation text 3 H.C.

Excerpts:

In example 38 below Clinton refers to the tragic consequences of the war in Iraq. According to her, these consequences prove that it is clear that war is not a solution to the Iraq problem. *Abundantly* functions here as an amplifier. *Clear* is actually an evaluation of complexity here, more precisely that when looking at the consequences it is obvious to see that the war in Iraq is not the right solution.

38. After more than four years, more than \$450 billion, and human costs beyond measure, it is abundantly clear that there is no military solution to the crisis in Iraq. (A-23)

The next extract is another example of a positive evaluation of complexity: Hillary Clinton describes the plan that she will order to develop as *clear*. *Viable* in its turn, is a way of expressing the plan will be worthwhile.

39. As President, I will convene the Joint Chiefs of Staff, my Secretary of Defense and my National Security Council and direct them to draw up a clear, viable plan to bring our troops home starting with the first 60 days of my Administration. (A-24)

Using the words *clear* and *viable* also implies to some extent that, currently, there is no such plan.

The mission Hillary Clinton mentions in example 40 below is to end the war in Iraq and restore America's leadership in the world (A-23):

40. This will be my first and most important mission as President – one I believe I have the strength and experience to complete. (A-23)

The value of this mission is described in the words *my first and most important*. She says that ending the war in Iraq will be a priority when she becomes President.

So, in a lot of cases the positive appreciation markers can be connected with Hillary Clinton and her future policy.

As can be expected the negative appreciation markers are more to be found in the context of Bush and his military policy:

41. But sadly, the Walter Reed scandal is just the tip of a nasty iceberg. (A-24)

This has to be seen in the context of Hillary Clinton criticising the medical care that Iraq veterans receive when faced with, for example, post traumatic stress. Here she refers to the Walter Reed<sup>22</sup> scandal.

In this final example Hillary Clinton again presents her own solution as the best one in comparison with a measure the Bush Administration took.

42. These funds will help ensure a long term solution – one that addresses the fundamental needs of refugees, rather than resorting to the limited and often counter-productive solution of refugee camps. (A-28)

The context is that of the Iraqi refugee problem. Clinton wants to raise money. Different countries in the world should donate money that would go to, for example, schools, hospitals, housing, etc. (A-28). This solution is an answer to that of the refugee camps which she evaluates as being *limited* and *counter-productive*. It is a negative evaluation of the value of such a solution. Clinton does not just criticise the solution of the refugee camps, she also presents an alternative, namely the fund-raising.

#### 5.3.4. Token of Attitude

##### 5.3.4.1. Text 1

As mentioned in 5.3.1.1. the examples 1, 2 and 3 are not only classified under negative affect because of the words *devastation*, *heartbreak*, *can't bear to answer*. If these words were left out the examples would still evoke a negative feeling, a feeling of unhappiness. This becomes even more clear with the sentence that follows examples 1, 2 and 3:

43. When you ask your doctor, “will my insurance pay for that,” and from the look on her face, you already know the answer. (A-1)

The totality of the examples Hillary Clinton gives concerning a health care system that does not function evokes emotions. Examples 1, 2, 3 and 43 can even be seen as a token

---

<sup>22</sup> The Walter Reed Army Medical Center takes care of soldiers who got wounded in Iraq. The treatment there turned out to be substandard. (website CNN politics, <http://www.cnn.com/2007/POLITICS/03/02/army.secretary/index.html?iref=newssearch>)



of negative appreciation, because it exemplifies her negative evaluation of the American Health Care System.

The excerpt below can be seen as a token of negative affect. It refers back to the same event described in example 4 (see 5.3.1.1.). There Clinton mentioned that she was disappointed. Here she refers to this negative feeling with *scars*.

44. Starting as First Lady of Arkansas, where I headed a task force to improve rural health care. And most memorably of course back in the early 1990s, and I still have the scars to show from that. (A-3)

The final part shows that it is something she still carries with her.

45. That's what we've always done, whether it was Teddy Roosevelt busting the trusts, or FDR seeking to end elderly poverty, whether it was President Truman sending the GIs to college and into the middle class, or President Johnson ensuring health care for all Americans in their golden years and who were poor. (A-2)

This whole excerpt, which precedes excerpt 7 (see 5.3.1.2.), can be seen as a token of capacity of America and its people. By referring to some previous Presidents, and the improvements they realised in the American social system, to the history of America, she emphasizes that Americans are very capable of doing something about the health care system. These presidents were all popular, and Clinton probably likes to be associated with them. She assumes that her audience will appreciate it, and her, when she reminds them of these great Presidents. What is remarkable is that Theodore "Teddy" Roosevelt<sup>23</sup> is actually a Republican President<sup>24</sup>.

Another example where Clinton refers to the great American history to emphasize the capacity of America and its people is:

46. We should do it because solving the health care crisis is key to ensuring American competitiveness in the global marketplace. We should do it because in a nation where we split the atom, sent a man to the moon, mapped the human genome, where we have some of the most promising treatments and cures available, hard working people should get the care they need when they're sick. (A-2)

---

<sup>23</sup> Theodore Roosevelt (1901-1909)(Blight, Bailey et al., A-17) was quite progressive. He was a Progressive; the Progressives wanted to change something about the poor economic and social conditions as a consequence of the Industrialization and Urbanization. He was also called the "trustbuster", because of the anti-trust laws he realised. These laws fought the "bad" trusts, the corrupt ones. (Blight, Bailey et al., 389-391)

<sup>24</sup> The others, Franklin D. Roosevelt "FDR", Harry S. Truman and Lyndon B. Johnson, are Democrats. (Bailey, Blight et al., 2007 A-14)

The idea is that if America was able to achieve all these great events in the past, they should be able to improve the health care system now. It is also likely that her audience loves to be reminded of those realisations. This is another example where Clinton praises America. The next example is alike:

47. Now that is who we are at our best. We are a nation where people help those they've never even met. Where we do understand we are all in this together, that when a child is sick and can't see a doctor, the family loses everything because someone had an accident, when a mother or a father lies awake at night worrying about how they possibly care for the people they love. That diminishes all of us. (A-10)

In this excerpt, Clinton describes again how sympathetic the American people are. She praises them for being good, ethical people. This is complemented with the negative affect verbs *worrying* and *diminishes*. The emotional aspect is also expressed more implicitly with the examples she gives of a sick child, an accident.

There are also instances of tokens of negative judgement. These are, as can be expected, often connected with President Bush or his Administration.

48. Unfortunately, that's exactly what we've seen in the past six and a half years. Instead of an era of opportunity, we've had a "you're on your own" era. So many people who can't afford to retire, it's like they are invisible to the President, like he's looked right through them. Well, I don't think anyone in America should be invisible. (A-2)

Clinton describes the years under Bush as a "*you're on your own*" era. This is actually a token of negative appreciation, it is the way Clinton evaluates this period. Bush himself, for instance, would probably describe it differently. Also the use of *invisible* is a token. It is an indirect realisation of a negative judgement about Bush's capacity. *Unfortunately* is a direct realisation of negative appreciation. It sets the, negative, tone from the beginning.

At the beginning and at the end of her speech on health care, Hillary Clinton tells an anecdote. She tells about American citizens she met and who told her their story. The function of these anecdotes is that they exemplify the shortcomings of the health care system. Therefore these two excerpts can be seen as an indirect realisation of the negative appreciation of American health care.

49. I want to start by telling you about Judy Rose, who I met last month in Dubuque along with her husband John. Back in 2001, John lost his job of thirty years when the plant where he worked closed with just one day's notice. And so, Judy and John lost not only John's job, they lost their health insurance. A couple of months later, Judy was diagnosed with breast cancer. Thankfully a special government program started

during my husband's administration took care of her treatment and she recovered. But then in 2003, John had a heart attack. He spent hours in surgery and was in the intensive care unit. Fortunately he survived, but when the bills came, their luck ran out. The costs of John's care were so high they had to sell the home they lived in for thirty years. (A-1)

50. Lisa Scott from Greenville, Iowa, whom I met back in May, is one of those people. Six years ago, Lisa's daughter, Janelle, began having chest pains and black outs. She was sick for almost a year. Janelle requested a chest x-ray, but she never received it, because while she was working two jobs, she didn't have health insurance, and she couldn't afford to pay for it out of her own pocket. One week after being denied the chest x-ray, at the age of 18, Janelle died. Her death certificate listed the cause of death as unknown, because Janelle was never able to afford a proper diagnosis, a diagnosis that with care might have saved her life. It's too late to help her daughter, but Lisa Scott hasn't stopped speaking out and calling on us to come together and fix our health care system. She is determined to help other families, to spare them the loss and pain that her family felt. (A-10)

The anecdotes also carry an emotional element, because they are often sad stories, and they are used to prove that the candidates, in this case, Hillary Clinton, still have contact with “regular” people and are aware of the problems the American citizens are confronted with in everyday life.

#### 5.3.4.2. Text 2

The token *invisible* is taken up again in Text 2 about Clinton's plan for government reform. Again, it is an indirect realisation of a negative judgement of Bush's capacity and propriety. According to her the President does not care about, for instance, hard working people, victims of Hurricane Katrina and the soldiers in Iraq.

51. It's like middle class and hard working families don't even exist to this Administration. It's like they're invisible. For six long years, our President has looked right through them. If you were a victim of Hurricane Katrina – if you're one of the nearly 90,000 people still living in trailers – you're invisible. If you're a soldier who returned from Iraq only to be warehoused in crumbling facilities at Walter Reed, fighting to get the treatment you need – you're invisible. If you're a parent who can't afford childcare or a student who can't afford college, a family that can't afford to get by on the minimum wage – while the wealthiest of us get tax cuts -- you're invisible too. (A-12)

The repetition of the word makes it come out very strongly. It stresses the point that Bush is a President who favours the rich section of the population and who does not take into account the less well-off people. This can also be related to the criticism of Bush putting the special interests first, instead of the public interest, and the cronyism which Clinton

remarks on in several instances in a more direct way too (see 5.3.2.2.). In the excerpt below however the idea of cronyism is more implicitly there:

52. It seems as though the motto for the Administration has been "What's a few billion tax dollars between friends?" (A-16)

This should be seen in the context of no-bid contracts where non-competitive contracts were given out to supporters of Bush and his Administration. Clinton proposes to eliminate 500,000 such contracts and believes that would save the government between \$10 and \$18 billion a year (A-16).

In example 53 Clinton denounces the lies of the Administration, especially by saying *truth has been the first casualty*. According to Clinton not enough scientific research has been done to establish facts about issues like pollution, global warming or food safety and quality. The American citizens are not informed sufficiently and correctly.

53. Over the past six years, this Administration has tried to turn Washington into an evidence-free zone [...] all too often, ideology has replaced facts, and truth has been the first casualty. (A-16)

Finally, an example that expresses a more general critique of the Bush Administration:

54. I'm here this afternoon to talk about the importance of government and how we make our government work for us. Now, I know for some that might be an unusual choice of topic in the "Live free or die" state, where the general feeling is, the less government, the better. But after what I have seen the last six years in Washington, I certainly understand that sentiment. (A-11)

"Live free or die" is the motto of the state New Hampshire, where this speech is held (website New Hampshire government<sup>25</sup>). Freedom is an important feature of the society of New Hampshire in particular, and the United States in general. It includes the idea that people are not keen on too much government interference. (van Minnen 2006) Therefore it is not evident for Clinton to go there and talk about the importance of an efficient government. Here, she acknowledges this and in addition she uses it as a means to express her negative judgement of the Bush government. By saying that she cannot blame the people of New Hampshire for not wanting too much control in Washington due to *the last six years* she criticises Bush and his government by means of a token of

---

<sup>25</sup> <http://www.nh.gov/nhinfo/emblem.html>

judgement. It could also be regarded as a token of appreciation when it is seen as an evaluation of the events of the past six years, but when it is looked at with regard to the people that are part of the government it can be seen as a negative judgement of their capacity.

#### 5.3.4.3. *Text 3*

The next example does not contain any direct realisations of attitude, but the general effect of the excerpt is one of negative affect, sadness:

55. And our troops are paying the price. 3,598 of them have lost their lives – 43 from right here in Iowa. [...] One Army chaplain told a reporter that he tries to read a unique passage from Scripture over the body of each soldier who has been killed in his unit. But the casualties have been so heavy, he has nearly run out of suitable verses. (A-21)

This example is a way for Hillary Clinton to bring to notice the human suffering as a consequence of the Iraq war. Such emotional examples possibly have a stronger effect on people still doubting whether to support the war or not than a dry enumeration of facts and numbers.

The excerpt below is also a very tragic one:

56. I want to end by telling you about one of those service members – a Chief Warrant Officer in the Iowa Army National Guard, named Bruce Smith, from West Liberty, Iowa. My friend Tom Vilsack, told me about Bruce Smith and his courageous wife, Oliva. Bruce was deployed to Iraq, in November 2003 the Chinook helicopter he was piloting was shot down near Fallujah. Bruce had to make a split-second decision about how to maneuver the helicopter. One choice would possibly save his life. The other would possibly save his crewmates. Bruce chose to save his crew. And while he and his co-pilot were killed, 17 members of his crew survived. His wife, Oliva has said that in those few seconds, those 17 men needed Bruce more than she and her children would need him for the rest of their lives. (A-29)

Rather than criticising the Bush policy in Iraq, this excerpt emphasises the bravery of the American soldiers by giving a heroic and brave example. It evokes positive evaluation of the capacity of the soldiers of the U.S. Army. It also draws attention to the human suffering, namely the family that is left behind.

Example 57 expresses a negative appreciation of the costs of the war. By exemplifying which other measures could be taken with the money spend in Iraq Clinton criticises the Bush policy in Iraq in general and his money spending to finance this war in particular.

57. Then there are the financial costs. More than \$450 billion so far. At the current rate of spending, we could provide access to high quality pre-kindergarten for every four year-old in America, extend health care to all 45 million Americans who are currently uninsured, and make college more affordable for more than one million students. (A-22)

In the next example Hillary Clinton strongly doubts the capacity and reliability of the Bush Administration, especially the Vice President's (Dick Cheney).

58. I have promoted the idea of an oil-trust for more than three years [...]. I'm told that my idea which didn't have Republican support got as far as the Vice President's office where a lot of good ideas apparently die. (A-25)

Clinton gives the impression that when an idea does not have republican support it cannot possibly get accepted. The addition of *apparently* gives her utterance a cynical undertone.

The final example can be seen as an indirect realisation of a negative judgement, more precisely the capacity and reliability of President Bush:

59. The President's go-it-alone attitude has diminished our position in the region and around the world. (A-25)

This *go-it-alone attitude* refers to Bush unilateral decision to start a war in Iraq in spite of the fact that a lot of countries in the world disapproved of the war.

#### 5.3.5. Discussion Clinton

##### *Affect*

Hillary Clinton uses few affect markers, certainly in comparison with judgement and appreciation markers (see tables 24, 26 and 28 in section 5.4.7). Generally, there is a majority of negative affect markers. Only in Text 1 is there no real difference between the frequency of positive and negative affect. Clinton uses four utterances of positive affect with regard to her own feelings. In two of these instances she uses negative affect. Considering the positive evaluation of her own feelings, Clinton uses these positive affect markers at the beginning of her speech when telling the audience and her introducer how happy, honoured etc. she is to be there. These positive affect markers are part of the sentences that function as polite formalities. Such kind of formalities return at the end of her speeches where she thanks the audience for their attention.

The majority of the affect markers which occur in Clinton's speeches however are not related to her personal feelings. In most cases they relate to the American people or a citizen who suffers the consequences of the policy of the Bush Administration.

### *Judgement and Appreciation*

Judgement and appreciation markers are far more frequent than affect markers (see tables 24, 25 and 26).

Overall, Clinton uses more negative judgement than positive. The exception in this respect is Text 1. There, the positive judgement markers form a slight majority. Appreciation markers are even more frequent than judgement markers. Generally, there is no difference between the number of positive and negative appreciation markers. In Text 1 no real difference can be noticed between the frequency of positive and negative appreciation. Text 2 even shows that there are slightly more occurrences of positive appreciation. Negative appreciation is dominant in Text 3.

The number of judgement and appreciation markers, positive or negative, is related to the topic and the content of the speeches. Text 1 deals with the Health Care crisis. There are more appreciation markers than judgement markers. Clinton criticises the current health care system, the insurance companies and other special interests. These are not particularly connected with people. Therefore there are many occurrences of negative appreciation. The high number of positive appreciation markers is related to the prominence of Clinton's plan to reform the health care system. She presents her own plan for the future, as President, and evaluates this plan in a positive way. She expresses her positive appreciation of the plan.

Text 2 shows a high number of judgement markers. Moreover there are twice as many negative as positive occurrences of judgement. There are fewer appreciation markers and there are more positive ones than negative ones. The topic of this speech is government reform. Thereby two aspects are prevalent. On the one hand there is the evaluation of the current government and on the other hand there is the evaluation of the plan of what the future government, with Clinton as President, should look like. The high number of negative judgement markers can be related to the aspect of criticism on the current

government, on President Bush and his Administration. The presentation of Clinton's plan for government reform is evaluated by her in a positive way. This explains the positive appreciation markers.

Text 3 deals with the war on Iraq. This is actually a sore subject for Hillary Clinton. Initially, she voted in favour of the war and now she has to defend her changed viewpoint, namely that she wants to withdraw troops from Iraq. The explanation she gives for voting in favour at first is weak and meaningless (she would have voted differently "if we knew then what we know now", website CNN issues election 2008<sup>26</sup>).

There is no significant difference between the number of appreciation markers and the number of judgement markers. The general tendency however is that there are more negative than positive attitude markers. In text 3, positive judgement markers are often used in the context of the positive evaluation of the U.S. soldiers. Positive appreciation markers occur when Hillary Clinton talks about her plan to end the war in Iraq when she is President. The negative judgement markers are typically connected with the negative evaluation of the role of America, referred to as *we*, and of President Bush and his Administration in the Iraq war. The negative appreciation markers are often used to negatively evaluate the current Iraq policy.

With regard to the semantic subdivisions of judgement (see tables 32 and 34 in Appendix, 73-74), it can be noted that Hillary Clinton mostly praises the capacity of someone, namely in 73% of all cases of positive judgement. Only in a few other cases the propriety (10%), tenacity (12%), veracity (4%) and normality (2%) of a person are praised. Where negative judgement is concerned, in 58% of the cases someone's capacity is criticised. Also propriety occurs frequently (38%). Veracity (3%) and normality (1%) are rare.

Not only the semantic subcategories themselves are significant, but also the people who are evaluated in one way or another. Tables 32 and 34 show the number of judgement markers that Hillary Clinton uses to evaluate the core players in her speeches, namely herself, Bush and/or the Bush Administration and America (the country and its citizens).

---

<sup>26</sup> <http://edition.cnn.com/ELECTION/2008/issues/issues.abortion.html>



With regard to positive judgement it is remarkable that 28% of all positive judgement markers are related to Clinton herself. In 16% of the cases she positively evaluates her own capacity. Sometimes (10% and 2%) she praises her tenacity and propriety. America and its citizens is another group that is praised frequently (33%). There are no occurrences where President Bush and his Administration are evaluated in a positive way.

Hillary Clinton often stresses her capacity, but never criticises herself. There are no negative judgement markers which relate to Clinton. The large majority of all negative judgement markers can be connected with President Bush and/or his Administration (79%). What is most frequent is the criticism of their capacity (46%) followed by doubting their propriety (30%). Only in 7% of the cases America is criticised, more precisely its capacity.

As far as the positive appreciation markers are concerned, table 36 (A-75) shows that valuation (63%) is the most prevalent semantic subcategory in Hillary Clinton's speeches, followed by quality (17%), complexity (12%) and impact (8%). A large part of the valuation markers (30%) are related to Clinton's health care plan, more precisely what the health care system should look like when she is President. This is not astonishing, because health care is the area which Hillary Clinton has been concerned with her whole career. Therefore it plays an important role in her campaign and speeches. Also the semantic subdivision of complexity (7%), more precisely Clinton's plan to make the health care system less complex, is used to positively evaluate the health care system as it should look like. The health care system is the main topic of Text 1, but also occasionally appears in Texts 2 and 3. The other main topics, government and Iraq, are not frequently evaluated with positive appreciation markers (8% and 12%).

Valuation also constitutes a large part (28%) of the negative appreciation markers (see table 38, A-75). The kind of negative appreciation markers that occur most frequently however, are those which mark quality (38%), a type of reaction. Also impact, another type of reaction, is often represented (25%). Complexity occurs less frequently (9%). The current health care system is negatively appreciated most frequently (34%), especially the quality (18%) is questioned. The current government and the war in Iraq are also

frequently evaluated in a negative way (24% and 18%), more precisely the impact (9% and 5%), the quality (5% and 7%), the complexity (1% and 3%) and valuation (8% and 4%).

Certain groups or people are recurrently evaluated in a positive or negative way throughout Clinton's speeches. It is typical that the American people, America as a country, the U.S. Soldiers and Clinton's own plans for the future are positively evaluated. The President, the Bush Administration and the special interests are criticised. Both these tendencies contribute to the Us vs. Them dichotomy (Simon-Vandenberg, 1997: 353). They create a general feeling of solidarity between Clinton and her audience.

### *Rhetorical Means*

#### i) Historical figures and other politicians

Another remarkable aspect in the speeches of Hillary Clinton is the reference to historical figures and other politicians. It is a matter of name-dropping. Mostly the names are people she admires or knows personally. Only in a few cases the names receive a negative connotation (Bush, Saddam Hussein). Overall, Hillary Clinton uses 16 different names: Teddy Roosevelt, President Truman, President Johnson, FDR, Andy Stern, Lee Scott, President Bush, Governor Lynch, Bill Clinton, Madeleine Albright, Senator Webster, Tom Vilsack, Saddam Hussein, Senator Lugar, Senator Voinovich and Senator Domenici.

Just like Obama, Clinton describes the greatness of America and its history. The following excerpt is a nice example of that:

And if there was ever a moment to do what America does best, to confront the challenges we face, this is it. That's what we've always done, whether it was Teddy Roosevelt busting the trusts, or FDR seeking to end elderly poverty, whether it was President Truman sending the GIs to college and into the middle class, or President Johnson ensuring health care for all Americans in their golden years and who were poor. When the time for change came, we weren't afraid, we didn't look away, we came together and we made America stronger, more prosperous, and more fair. We are and have always been a nation of opportunity -- a nation that believes in giving everyone a chance to make the most of their own lives. (A-2)

She describes America as a *nation of opportunity*, a nation of people who show solidarity and cooperate to become *stronger, prosperous, and more fair*. This notion of cooperation and solidarity goes back to the ideals of the first Puritan settlers in America led by John Winthrop (see section 5.4.6. for further information).

## ii) Anecdotes

Hillary Clinton uses anecdotes (7) throughout her speeches. These anecdotes are stories of people she met or stories she heard from, for example, Madeleine Albright. The function of these anecdotes is that they exemplify the topic she is talking about (e.g. health care: two examples of American citizens who suffered because of the current health care system). It makes the issues she is talking about more realistic for the audience when she gives these examples. Moreover it shows that she has contact with the common people and knows which problems they are faced with in everyday life. These anecdotes occur at the beginning of her speeches as a way of introduction or towards the end as a way to conclude the speech.

## iii) Repetition

Another significant characteristic of Hillary Clinton's speeches is repetition. Certain words and phrases are repeated frequently, often rapidly following each other. In 3.3. it was mentioned that Hillier distinguishes between lexical and grammatical repetition (2004: 120, 127). Some examples are provided in section 3.3., but more are to be found in the texts themselves in the Appendix (1-57). The words that are repeated often carry a meaning that is important for the general idea of the speech, e.g. *affordable* in connection with health care occurs 9 times in Text 1. Repetition is a way of emphasizing certain ideas. When repetition is used frequently there is a good chance that people will remember certain parts, certain ideas of a speech. It is almost a way of indoctrinating the audience, if something is repeated enough it is possible that people start to believe it. Repetition is meaningful and persuasive. It contributes to the main purpose of Clinton and Obama's speeches: persuading the electorate to vote for them. Repetition is one of the rhetorical devices which both Obama and Clinton use.

### *Experience*

Throughout her speeches Clinton emphasizes her experience, especially in Text 1 about health care, an issue she has been concerned with her whole career. Her experience is her trump card in comparison to Obama. In Text 1 she mentions this experience:

60. Now as you may know, I've been fighting on health care for nearly thirty years. Starting as First Lady of Arkansas, where I headed a task force to improve rural health care. And most memorably of course back in the early 1990s, and I still have the scars to show from that exercise. But I've also learned some valuable lessons that have shaped how I approach health care reform today. (A-3)

She continues by summing up what she has learned. This happens in four points, each time beginning with *I learned that...* Then Clinton again refers to experience: "And when it comes to health care reform, I believe I have exactly the experience we need to get it done in my first term as President." (A-4) To prove that she indeed has experience she sums up some of her accomplishments from the past. To do so she frequently uses material process verbs in the past tense: *I worked (2), I wrote legislation, I also worked as First Lady, I helped to establish, in the Senate I've worked to expand, the legislation I passed* (A-4). Also verbs (mostly *to fight*) expressing her tenacity are frequent in this context: *I did not give up, I continued to fight, I've been fighting more generally to improve, I fought the EPA and the Bush administration, I fought for health care* (A-4-5).

#### 5.4. Results Barack Obama

##### 5.4.1. Text 4

##### 5.4.1.1. Affect

Barack Obama uses very few affect markers in Text 4, a speech on Urban America. Moreover, he only uses negative ones as can be seen in Table 12.

	Positive	Negative
Affect	0	7
X/10,000	0	19.8

Table 12: Affect text 4 B.O.

Examples:

The following excerpt is an anecdote about Robert "Bobby" Kennedy<sup>27</sup>, the brother of John F. Kennedy.

61. It's been four decades since Bobby Kennedy crouched in a shack along the Mississippi Delta and looked into the wide, listless eyes of a hungry child. Again and again he tried to talk to this child, but each time his efforts were met with only a blank stare of

<sup>27</sup> Robert Kennedy was a Democratic presidential candidate in 1968. He was shot by an Arab nationalist after winning the primary election in California. (Bailey, Blight et al., 2007: 572)

desperation. And when Kennedy turned to the reporters traveling with him, with tears in his eyes he asked a single question about poverty in America: “How can a country like this allow it?” (A-29)

It functions as an introduction to Obama’s speech on how he would combat poverty in urban America as President. He wants to point out that the poverty problem from those days still exists now and that it is intolerable in a country like America. The markers of negative affect (*desperation, tears*) express this evaluation. The first sentence could perhaps be, maybe just changing the name, the beginning of a novel. Also the image of Bobby Kennedy with tears in his eyes is dramatic. Obama probably wants to associate himself to some extent with Bobby Kennedy, because just as Kennedy Obama wants to do something about poverty in America. The answer to the question posed at the end of this example is expressed in the excerpt below:

62. [...], the most American answer I can think of to that question is two words: “We can’t.” We can’t allow this kind of suffering and hopelessness to exist in our country. (A-30)

Again two markers of negative affect are used to give his statement a stronger effect. At the beginning of his speech Obama tries to focus attention to the problem of poverty by playing the emotional card and using a reference to the historic figure of Bobby Kennedy.

The addition of *American* at the beginning is a way for Obama to say that Americans are people who would not tolerate a problem like poverty and would do something about it, as if this were a typical American quality.

#### 5.4.1.2. Judgement

What is significant in the table below is that Barack Obama uses few judgement markers. Negative judgement markers are in the majority, but only slightly.

	Positive	Negative
Judgement	7	10
X/10,000	19.8	28.28

Table 13: Judgement text 4 B.O.

Excerpts:

What is remarkable about the first example here is that Obama does not only criticise the Republicans (*the right*), but also the Democrats (*some on the left*). This is a given that returns in some of his other speeches as well. More than just attacking the Republicans he attacks the established order in Washington in general and this includes criticising his own party at times. In the example below he remains mild though for his own party: *some* (not everyone) *on the left* in comparison with *the right* (more generalised) and he also admits that the War on Poverty program of the Democratic President Lyndon B. Johnson<sup>28</sup> also contained some positive elements.

63. It's true that there were many effective programs that emerged from Lyndon Johnson's War on Poverty. But there were also some ineffective programs that were defended anyway, as well as an inability of some on the left to acknowledge that the problems of absent fathers or persistent crime were indeed problems that needed to be addressed. The right has often seized on these failings as proof that the government can't and shouldn't do a thing about poverty [...]. And so Ronald Reagan launched his assault on welfare queens, and George Bush spent the last six years slashing programs to combat poverty, and job training, and substance abuse, and child abuse. (A-32-33)

Then, however, Obama notices that some programs were *ineffective*, which is a negative appreciation marker here, because it is an event (the effects of the programs) that is being evaluated. *Inability* and *failings* on the other hand are examples of the negative evaluation of the capacity of the people on the left. Then, Obama uses two examples of Republican Presidents (Reagan and George Bush) to exemplify the lack of capacity and propriety with the politicians on the right. Reagan's<sup>29</sup> politics is negatively described as an assault and he criticises Bush's policy of cutting down on certain programs.

At the end of his speech Barack Obama comes back to Bobby Kennedy. During his speech Obama has presented his plan to combat poverty. This plan is based on a local program, the Harlem Children's Zone, that has proven to be effective. Now Obama wants to expand it nationally. In the next excerpt he asks why this would not be possible (as some of his critics may say):

---

<sup>28</sup> Lyndon B. Johnson was President from 1963 until 1969. (Bailey, Blight et al.; 2007 A-18)

<sup>29</sup> Ronald Reagan's economic policy was also called Reaganomics. Part of this policy was to cut down on social welfare programs. (Bailey, Blight et al.; 2007: 598) Welfare queens is a reference to "the stereotype of welfare recipients as unwed, black, teenage mothers who kept having babies to collect larger checks." (Bailey, Blight et al.; 2007: 598). Reagan is said to have fed this stereotype (Bailey, Blight et al.; 2007: 598).

64. And that, of course, is the final question about poverty in America. It's the hopeful one that Bobby Kennedy was also famous for asking. Why not? It leaves the cynics without an answer, and it calls on the rest of us to get to work. (A-36)

The people who do not believe in the possibility are described with the negative propriety marker *cynics*, the ones who do not have any hope. These cynics may not only be Republicans, but Democrats as well.

In the following excerpt the founder of the program is described as being inspirational and innovative, two positive judgement markers which express that Obama thinks of him as a very capable person.

65. Geoffrey Canada, the program's inspirational, innovative founder, put it best – instead of helping some kids beat the odds, the Harlem Children's Zone is actually changing the odds altogether. (A-34)

A more negative side of the plan is that it will cost a lot of money.

66. Now, how much will this cost? I'll be honest – it can't be done on the cheap. It will cost a few billion dollars a year. (A-34)

People, voters in particular, generally do not like to hear that something is going to cost a lot. Therefore Obama tries to give it a positive turn by saying *I'll be honest*, thinking that people will appreciate his honesty about such a delicate matter as finances.

#### 5.4.1.3. *Appreciation*

Table 14 shows that appreciation is more equally distributed alongside the positive and negative line.

	Positive	Negative
Appreciation	11	12
X/10,000	31.1	33.94

**Table 14: Appreciation text 4 B.O.**

Excerpts:

In the next example Obama wants to stress the seriousness of the poverty problem.

67. There are vast swaths of rural America and block after block in our cities where poverty is not just a crisis that hits pocketbooks, but a disease that infects every corner of the community. (A-32)

According to him it is not just a temporary problem, where someone is short of money, and that can be resolved rather easily but, says Obama, it is a disease, meaning that it is a long-term problem which is rooted deeply and which cannot be done away with that simply.

To solve the problem Obama wants to fall back on a couple of programs that have proven to be successful in the past:

- 68. I will invest \$1 billion over five years in innovative transitional jobs programs that have been highly successful at placing the unemployed into temporary jobs and then training them for permanent ones. (A-35)
- 69. To make work pay, I will also triple the Earned Income Tax Credit for full-time workers making the minimum wage. This is one of the most successful anti-poverty programs in history [...] (A-35)

The positive appreciation markers (*innovative, successful*) show that Obama evaluated these programs as being valuable and therefore wants to apply them nationwide. Again, as with Hillary Clinton, elements of his personal plan are evaluated positively, even before they have been tested by practical experience (part of Obama’s plan has been tested locally, but not nationally).

5.4.2. Text 5

5.4.2.1. *Affect*

Barack Obama uses few affect markers in his speech at Labor Day. Still he uses twice as many negative affect as positive ones.

	Positive	Negative
Affect	4	8
X/10,000	11.3	22.6

**Table 15: Affect text 5 B.O.**

Excerpts:

In the following example Obama describes the American people believing in their country no matter what the circumstances are:

- 70. We’re here today – you and I – because we believe in what this country can be. In the face of war, we believe that there can be peace. In the face of despair, we believe there can be hope. (A-37)



To do so he uses a rather rhetorical style. The negative affect marker *despair* is part of that quite dramatic description of the situation. *Hope* in its turn is a positive affect marker.

The extract below expresses a positive feeling in connection with Barack Obama himself.

71. Well I stand guilty as charged. I am hopeful about America. (A-39)

The concept of hope is an important aspect in this speech, just as the word *change*. Obama uses *hope(ful)* 12 times in Text 5 and *change* 10 times. In combination with his comments on Washington politics in general this gives a nice impression about the central idea of this speech which is also an important aspect of his campaign in general.

#### 5.4.2.2. Judgement

Table 16 shows that Obama uses more judgement markers than in the previous speech. There are slightly more negative than positive judgement markers to be found.

	Positive	Negative
Judgement	13	18
X/10,000	36.8	50.95

Table 16: Judgement text 5 B.O.

Examples:

The next example elaborates on the idea of Obama being hopeful (see 5.3.7.1.):

72. Now, when the folks in Washington hear me speak, this is usually when they start rolling their eyes. “Oh, there he goes talking about hope again. He’s so naive. He’s a hope peddler. He’s a hope-monger.” (A-39)

He is actually describing how he believes other politicians (the folks in Washington) think of him. According to Obama they negatively evaluate him as being *naive*. The expressions a *hope peddler* and a *hope-monger* can be seen here as tokens of negative judgement. This excerpt actually precedes example 72. So his answer to their so-called opinion of him is that he does not deny that he is hopeful. He does not see it as something negative, but as something positive. Notice that Obama says *the folks in Washington*. The indefiniteness that is contained in *the folks* carries a negative connotation. He does not

make a distinction between the different parties, he is talking about politicians and politics in general, including his own party members. This is something that returns frequently, in the next excerpt for instance:

73. The conventional thinking in Washington tells us that we're a country divided into Red States and Blue States; that we're doomed to fight the same tired partisan battles over and over again. They tell us we can't come together to take on big challenges like health care, or energy, or education; that we can't agree on what America should be, so we might as well settle for the way America is right now. (A-37)

*Conventional thinking* is an expression of negative judgement here. Conventional does not necessarily have to be negative, but in this context it is. Obama is opposed to this conventional thinking and wants to offer something new; he wants change. Again, he talks about *Washington* to refer to politicians and politics in general. According to Obama those politicians emphasize the differences between Democrats (*Blue States*) and Republicans (*Red States*) and use that discrepancy as a reason for not doing something about certain issues such as health care, because the country is too divided to cooperate on something so large. Obama uses the phrases like *we can't come together* and *we can't agree* to express a certain amount of incompetence, inability with the American people, according to the established order in Washington.

Not only politics in general, but also Bush and his Administration are being commented on by Obama:

74. We've seen the triumph of ideology over reason; of cronyism over competence. (A-37)

Just like Hillary Clinton (see 5.3.2.2), Obama accuses the Bush Administration of cronyism, a sign of incompetence and impropriety.

In the next excerpt Obama simply describes Bush as *bad*.

75. But we also know that, as bad as George Bush has been, it's going to take more than a change of parties in the White House to truly turn this country around. (A-38)

He also mentions that a different party (the Democrats) in the White House will not be enough to change America. This, again, implies that some Democrats (Hillary Clinton for instance) are not that different from the Republicans. In other words it will take someone like him, Barack Obama, to make change happen.

Below, he describes what this change would look like:

76. And the change that's required, this new spirit of responsibility and honesty, of seriousness and sacrifice, starts with you. (A-38)

*Responsibility, honesty, seriousness* and *sacrifice* are all positive judgement markers of propriety and competence. The words *change* and *new (spirit)* imply that the current government does not show these characteristics.

In the final excerpt below, Barack Obama puts his own competence into perspective:

77. I am reminded every single day that I am not a perfect man. I will not be a perfect President. But I can promise you this – I will always tell you what I think and where I stand. I will be honest with you about the challenges we face. (A-42)

First he acknowledges that he realises he is not perfect, still he promises to be honest stressing his veracity. This use of judgement markers (not perfect, honest) actually implies another type of veracity, namely modesty.

#### 5.4.2.3. *Appreciation*

As can be derived from table 17 appreciation markers occur quite frequently. Negative appreciation is more explicitly there.

	Positive	Negative
Appreciation	14	23
X/10,000	39.6	65.1

**Table 17: Appreciation text 5 B.O.**

Examples:

In the first example below Barack Obama evaluates the years under Bush and Cheney negatively (*bad*).

78. We know we need a new direction. And that change begins with an end to the Bush-Cheney Administration. Their years haven't just been bad years for Democrats. They've been bad years for America. (A-37)

Again, Obama speaks of change, a new direction. Notice the pun, whether or not intended, *begins with an end*.

The next excerpt is to be situated in the context of the experience issue. Barack Obama is less politically experienced than his opponents. In this speech he tries to put this into perspective and he also tries to prove that he has some kind of experience. Here, he questions the importance of experience in Washington by referring to Cheney and Rumsfeld:

79. There were a couple of guys named Cheney and Rumsfeld who had two of the longest resumes in Washington and they led us into the worst foreign policy fiasco in our history. (A-39)

The valuation of the foreign policy, greatly directed by Cheney and Rumsfeld, is negatively evaluated here as bad, in the superlative form *worst*, and described as being a fiasco. The wording *a couple of guys* expresses a mild form of contempt. Obama wants to make clear that a great amount of experience in Washington, as Cheney and Rumsfeld both have, does not necessarily guarantee good government.

The final example is about Obama commenting on Bush and his Administration for just not wanting to talk with certain adversaries, such as the President of Iran. He would handle it differently:

80. Strong countries and strong Presidents shouldn't be afraid to talk to our adversaries to tell them where America stands. That's why I will – because that's how tough, principled and smart diplomacy works. (A-42)

First, he implies that Bush is a weak President, because he does not talk to certain adversaries of America. Then he states that he will talk to them and he describes that as diplomacy which is *tough, principled* and *smart*, thus positively evaluating the value of this kind of diplomacy.

#### 5.4.3. Text 6

##### 5.4.3.1. *Affect*

In his speech on tax fairness for middle class Americans Obama uses a relatively large number of negative affect markers. Positive affect markers on the other hand are scarce.

	Positive	Negative
Affect	2	10
X/10,000	6.5	32.3

**Table 18: Affect text 6 B.O.**

Obama denounces the evolution in America where people who have worked their whole lives cannot be sure anymore that this work will be rewarded when they retire. The following utterances all deal with this issue:

81. In our economy, there is no shortage of new wealth. But wages are not keeping pace. Workers are more vulnerable to job loss and more worried about retirement. (A-44)
82. When folks are hurting out there on Main Street, that's not good for Wall Street. (A-45)
83. [...] many seniors are struggling to keep pace with costs. And as so many Americans know, their worry becomes an entire family's worry. (A-47)

Barack Obama uses several negative affect markers to describe the problems that workers and seniors face resulting from the current economic situation. It is remarkable that Obama typically uses these negative affect markers in connection with American citizens as if wanting to depict them as victims. He does not judge them, like he does with his political opponents in Text 4 and 2.

#### 5.4.3.2. *Judgement*

It is striking that there are very few occurrences of judgement, both negative and positive, in Text 6.

	Positive	Negative
Judgement	4	2
X/10,000	12.9	6.5

**Table 19: Judgement text 6 B.O.**

Excerpts:

The excerpt below includes a positive evaluation of the Obama government in the future:

84. To ensure that we are fiscally responsible, we'll gain revenue by shutting down corporate loopholes and tax havens. (A-48)

It stresses his competence and propriety.

In the example below *illegally* can be seen as a negative judgement of propriety:

85. And we'll penalize companies and individuals who use those havens and illegally evade their tax obligations. (A-46)

The lack of judgement markers is probably due to the content of the speech. Obama chiefly talks about his plans concerning the tax system for the future. When he mentions what is going wrong currently he does not become personal, he rather criticises the tax system which falls under appreciation.

#### 5.4.3.3. *Appreciation*

Appreciation is the most frequent attitude marker in this speech. Table 20 shows that Obama uses slightly more positive appreciation markers than negative ones.

	Positive	Negative
Appreciation	17	14
X/10,000	54.9	45.23

Table 20: Appreciation text 6 B.O.

Examples:

In the example below the complexity of the tax system is negatively evaluated:

86. We've got a shift in our tax values that disproportionately benefits the wealthiest Americans; [...]an overloaded tax code that's too complicated for ordinary folks to understand, but just complicated enough to work for someone who knows how to work the system. (A-45)

Obama really lays emphasis on the complexity of the tax code:

87. The tax code has become far too complex. [...] According to the IRS National Taxpayer Advocate "the most serious problem facing taxpayers today is the complexity of the Internal Revenue Code." [...] It's time to cut through the complexity. (A-48)

Next to focussing on the complexity of the tax code, Obama also presents his plan for the future, as President, to improve the tax system and of course this includes simplifying the system:

88. I'll restore simplicity to the tax code, and fairness for the American middle class. (A-46)

Positive appreciation markers are used in the explanation of his plan. The plan will not only be an answer to the complexity but also to the lack of fairness in the system (*disproportionately benefits the wealthiest Americans*).

At the end of the speech Obama returns to the importance of the social compact (hard work is rewarded) he talked about and that is crumbling:

89. It's a simple proposition. That the wealth we earn comes from the work that we do. It's a proposition that is lived, day in and day out, in the homes of millions of working Americans. The steady pursuit of simple dreams. (A-49)

As President he wants to restore that compact. This is the *proposition* he mentions here. The two occurrences of *simple* have a positive connotation here, although in some contexts it can be the other way around. In the final line Obama refers to an element from the Declaration of Independence and to the American Dream. *Pursuit* reminds of "the pursuit of happiness"<sup>30</sup>, a phrase from the Declaration of Independence (Bailey, Blight et al.; 2007: A-1). The idea of the American dream also fits into the context of hard work and being rewarded for that.

#### 5.4.4. Text 7

##### 5.4.4.1. Affect

In his speech on the Iraq war, Barack Obama uses a lot of negative affect markers in contrast with no positive affect markers at all.

	Positive	Negative
Affect	0	19
X/10,000	0	47.2

Table 21: Affect text 7 B.O.

Excerpts:

The very beginning of Obama's speech is an anecdote about a woman he met who had a family member leaving for Iraq. It is a rather emotional and dramatic example of how the war in Iraq affects the American citizens.

<sup>30</sup> "We hold these truths to be self-evident: That all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness;" (Bailey, Blight et al.; 2007: A-1)

90. A few months ago, I met a woman who told me her nephew was leaving for Iraq. As she started to tell me about how much she'd miss him and how worried she was about him, she began to cry. "I can't breathe," she said. "I know when I am going to be able to breathe again." (A-49)

The words *miss*, *worried* and *cry* express the unhappiness of this woman. By using this particular story as an introduction Obama tries to catch the attention of the audience. It shows that the Iraq war affects many people, including the American people. Obama repeats the notion *holding one's/our breath* in other instances in his speech. He generalises it to the American people holding their breath when it comes to the war in Iraq. (e.g. A-49-50, 57). Moreover at the end of his speech he says: "It's time for us to breathe again." (A-57). The feeling, the idea that was expressed in the anecdote at the beginning is taken along throughout the speech to come back to it once again at the end.

The negative affect markers in the following two extracts also concern the people of America.

91. The American people have had enough of the shifting spin. We've had enough of extended deadlines for benchmarks that go unmet. We've had enough of mounting costs in Iraq and missed opportunities around the world. We've had enough of a war that should never have been authorized and should never have been waged. (A-51)

The repetition of *had enough* makes Obama's statement very strong. The use of *we* creates a feeling of solidarity, as in many other examples.

In the final example the combination American people, under the form of *we*, with negative affect marker can be found again.

92. At every stage of this war, we have suffered because of disdain for diplomacy. (A-53)

Americans are depicted as victims here. In addition to that the reason for this suffering *because of disdain for diplomacy* also hints at the culprits, namely the Bush Administration.

#### 5.4.4.2. Judgement

Table 22 shows that judgement markers are also well represented especially the negative ones which comprise two thirds of all judgement markers.



	Positive	Negative
Judgement	10	22
X/10,000	24.8	54.7

**Table 22: Judgement text 7 B.O.**

In the context of Obama’s speech on Iraq the positive judgement markers can often be brought into connection with the U.S. soldiers:

93. The excellence of our military is unmatched. But as a result of this war, our forces are under pressure as never before. (A-50)

He stresses their competence. Although not supporting the war in Iraq Obama does not want to seem to be unsympathetic towards the Army. This is probably because they are citizens, potential voters, too with family and friends, just doing their jobs. Hillary Clinton actually did the same thing in her speech on Iraq (see 5.3.3.2.).

In the next example Obama again compliments the Army and their competence:

94. Our troops have performed brilliantly. (A-51)

Negative judgement markers on the other hand can be found in the context of his political opponents:

95. Conventional thinking in Washington says Presidents cannot lead this diplomacy. But I think the American people know better. Not talking doesn’t make us look tough – it makes us look arrogant. (A-53)

By saying *the conventional thinking in Washington* again no distinction is made between political parties. It functions as a generalisation: all politicians in Washington are the same, Republican or Democrat. *Conventional thinking* is a negative judgement marker of lack of competence of those politicians. Further on he criticises the government for not wanting to talk to certain countries. He negatively comments on their propriety as being not *tough* and *arrogant*.

In the following excerpt the competence of the Bush Administration is once again negatively evaluated:

96. When we end this war in Iraq, we can once again lead the world against the common challenges of the 21<sup>st</sup> century. [...] Against ignorance and intolerance. Corruption and greed. Poverty and despair. [...] We can be that beacon of hope, that light to all the world. (A-56)

*Ignorance* is a marker of lack of competence. *Intolerance*, *corruption* and *greed* on the other hand are markers of impropriety. The Bush Administration is accused of not being ethical. Volition is involved where ethics are concerned, therefore it is perhaps an even worse accusation than incompetence. The *beacon of hope* that Obama mentions can be seen as a token here. It is an indirect realisation of the competence of America and its people. Obama refers to the speech of John Winthrop in which the idea of America having a special mission in the world was first voiced (see 5.4.6. for further information).

#### 5.4.4.3. *Appreciation*

Table 23 shows that negative appreciation markers are frequent. Positive appreciation on the other hand is rare.

	Positive	Negative
Appreciation	6	28
X/10,000	19.4	69.57

**Table 23: Appreciation text 7 B.O.**

The next two examples are both negative appreciation markers and lexical repetitions (Hillier 2004).

97. I worried about, “ an occupation of undetermined length, with undetermined costs, and undetermined consequences.’ (A-50)

This is actually Obama explaining why he opposed the war in Iraq right from the start. It is accompanied by a negative affect marker *worried* in connection with Obama himself, which is rare in these speeches. In the next example Obama refers to the negative consequences for the image of the United States following the Iraq war:

98. Our diplomacy has been compromised by a refusal to talk to people we don’t like. Our alliances have been compromised by bluster. Our credibility has been compromised by a faulty case for war. Our moral leadership has been compromised by Abu Ghraib. (A-50-51)

The repetition makes these statements even stronger. The example above also implies to some extent an indirect realisation of incompetence of the Bush Administration, namely their refusal to talk to certain leaders (dictators), starting a war in Iraq without legitimate

reason, the blustering also refers to the current government and, finally, permitting situations as in the Abu Ghraib prison.

99. So there is something unreal about the debate that's taking place in Washington. (A-50)

Negatively evaluating the debate about the Iraq war as unreal is a conclusion (so) after summing up some ironic (as Obama says himself A-52) consequences of the war, e.g. the rise of terrorist threats when the purpose of the war was to fight terrorism.

100. I'm tired of this notion that we either fight foolish wars or retreat from the world. We are better than that as a nation. (A-55)

This final example above expresses Obama's negative appreciation of the Iraq war once again. With the final sentence he refers to the competence of America as a nation, the idea that they have an exemplary function in the world.

#### 5.4.5. Token of attitude

##### 5.4.5.1. *Text 4*

While making a plea for his plan to combat urban poverty, Barack Obama regularly comments on the Bush Administration:

101. With the stroke of a pen, billions are spent on programs and policies; on tax breaks for those who didn't need them and a war that should never been authorized and never been waged. Debates rage and accusations fly and at the end of each day, the petty sniping is what lights up the evening news. (A-30)

Here, he criticises the Administration for supporting a politics of special interests, where decisions are made in favour of the few (rich and powerful) and he also comments on the war in Iraq which he does not support at all. In a rather rhetorical style he evaluates the propriety and capacity of the current government in a negative way.

In the next two extracts Obama, again, comments on the politics of special interests and on the war in Iraq:

102. They suffer most from a politics that has been tipped in favor of those with the most money, and influence, and power. (A-30)

Here Obama negatively evaluates the propriety of the Administration, then he accuses them of only bearing in mind the well-off and neglecting the more suppressed groups in society.

103. The Harlem Children's Zone is saving a generation of children for \$46 million a year. That's about what the war in Iraq costs American taxpayers every four hours. (A-34)

In this final example Barack Obama negatively evaluates the war Iraq and its costs by pointing out that this money could be spent on other, better, causes. It is also a way of putting the costs of his plan to combat urban poverty into perspective.

#### 5.4.5.2. Text 5

The following excerpt is an example of how Barack Obama positively describes the competence and propriety of America and its citizens.

104. We are the last, best hope of Earth. We are the nation that liberated a continent from a madman, that lifted ourselves from the depths of Depression, that won Civil Rights, and Women's Rights, and Voting Rights for all our people. We are the beacon that has led generations of weary travellers to find opportunity, and liberty, and hope on our doorstep. That's who we are. And that's who we can be again. (A-42)

He starts off with a rather exaggerated and idealising utterance, claiming that America has to save the earth. Next he refers to some great historic realisations of America as a way of stressing the greatness and competence of the country. Then he alludes to the speech *A model of Christian Charity* given by the Puritan leader John Winthrop<sup>31</sup>. The central idea of that speech is that the new country should be an example to the rest of the world ("In America we shall be as a city upon a hill" "the eyes of all people are upon us"; Bailey, Blight et al.; 2007: 34). This was religiously inspired:

The Puritans expressed their communal ideal chiefly in the doctrine of the covenant. They believed God had made a covenant – that is, an agreement or contract – with them when they were chosen for the special mission to America. In turn, they covenanted with one another, promising to work together toward their goals. (Bailey, Blight et al.; 2007: 34)

Their community was based on cooperation and coexistence. This speech has been of great importance to the self-image of America. At a certain point in the speech Winthrop describes America as a beacon of hope (van Minnen 2006). This is exactly the word that Obama uses here: *beacon*. Obama's allusion to this famous speech proves that its idea(s) are still of great importance in America. The idea of cooperation within America is present

---

<sup>31</sup> John Winthrop was a member of the group of Puritans who came to Northern America as one of the first settlers. Winthrop became the governor of the Massachusetts Bay Company in 1629. (Bailey, Blight et al.; 2007: 33-34)

throughout his speeches (and actually also in those of Hillary Clinton). One expression of that is the use of the pronoun *we* in certain contexts.

In the next excerpt Obama implicitly criticises the policy of the Bush Administration by giving an example of what has gone wrong.

105. We've seen the policies that have widened the divide between Wall Street and Main Street and marginalized organized labor at a time when American workers need a voice most. We've seen fellow citizens abandoned on rooftops after a storm. (A-37)

Obama refers for instance to Hurricane Katrina and the inadequate assistance afterwards (*fellow citizens abandoned on rooftops after a storm*).

#### 5.4.5.3. Text 6

The next two examples are both indirect realisations of a positive judgement of capacity. The first example is more specific and is a personal anecdote. It tells about Obama's father-in-law who, despite his disease, worked very hard to provide for his family and give his children a better future.

106. Here I think of my father-in-law, Fraser Robinson. He raised his two children with his wife Marian in 1960s Chicago. They faced what other African-American families faced at the time - both hidden and overt forms of racism that limited their effort to get ahead. And they faced an additional obstacle. At age 30, Fraser was diagnosed with multiple sclerosis. And yet, every day of his life, even when he had to leave an hour earlier in the morning and rely on a walker to get him there, he went to work at the local water filtration plant while Marian stayed home with the children. And on that single salary, Fraser Robinson provided for his family, sending my wife Michelle and her brother Craig to Princeton. (A-43-44)

It exemplifies the image of the hard-working American. The personal aspect of the anecdote is something Obama's audience will appreciate. It does not only show that Obama himself, or his wife in this case, comes from a regular family, but generally people also like to get to know some personal details about their (future) President's life.

The next example follows the one above and is more general, about all sorts of hard-working people.

107. This is an American story that plays out in millions of families each and every day. It is a story that is shared by the caregiver who is up before dawn and the teacher who never misses the bell; by the trader who works late and the janitor on the night shift. It is the story of a society that values work, and of people who work to create a better future for their families. (A-44)

It stresses the competence of the American working class and builds a nice introduction to his speech about tax fairness for the middle class.

#### 5.4.5.4. Text 7

One way of expressing negative judgement, often a lack of competence, in an indirect way is summing up a couple of facts to exemplify this incompetence. Not surprisingly this kind of negative judgement often occurs in reference to President Bush and his Administration:

108. President Bush likes to warn of the dire consequences of ending the war. He warns of rising Iranian influence, but that has already taking place. He warns of growing terrorism but that has already taken place. And he warns of huge movements of refugees and mass sectarian killing, but that has already taken place. (A-54)

What is also remarkable here is the repetition of *warn* and the phrase *that has already taken place*. This kind of lexical repetition (Hillier 2004) is frequent in all the speeches.

109. But if we have learned anything from Iraq, it is that the judgment that matters most is the judgment that is made first. (A-57)

This is an example of the negative evaluation of the decision to start a war in the first place (appreciation) and of the incompetence and impropriety of those who voted in favour of this war (judgement). It is not only a way of criticising the supporters of the war such as President Bush or some other Republicans, but it is also a way of questioning those people, like Hillary Clinton, who oppose the war now, and in Clinton's case also use this in their campaign, but initially voted in favour of it.

#### 5.4.6. Discussion Obama

##### *Affect*

When taking into account the total number of judgement and appreciation markers (see tables 27 and 29) it can be noted that Barack Obama uses affect markers less frequently, especially positive affect markers. Negative affect markers he uses more regularly.

Just as with Clinton, most of the affect markers are an evaluation of the feelings of the American people, an American citizen or, in Obama's case, they also often concern the feelings of the people in the anecdotes. Since the majority of affect markers are negative

ones, it is the case that the negative affect markers are used to describe the feelings of the American people caused by the consequences of a certain policy or politics in general.

Two out of the six positive affect markers he uses, relate to his own feelings. In two cases out of 44 he refers to his personal feelings in a negative way. Obama does not start his speeches by saying how happy he is to be there. He does not use the same kind of formality as Hillary Clinton does. This explains why Clinton has more positive affect markers concerning her personal feelings than Obama has. In Text 4 for instance Obama begins by telling an attention-catching anecdote about Bobby Kennedy. At the end of his speech he returns to that anecdote. This kind of introduction is a first indication of Obama's rhetorical style which is discussed in further detail below.

### *Judgement and Appreciation*

Generally, Obama uses appreciation markers more often than judgement markers. One general tendency with regard to judgement and appreciation is that there is a higher number of negative evaluation than of positive evaluation. Only in Text 1 is there no clear difference between positive and negative appreciation and in Text 3 there is a slight majority of positive appreciation and judgement.

The number of judgement and appreciation markers in Obama's speeches also relates to the topic and the content. Text 4 is a speech on poverty in urban America. The total number of attitude markers is not very high. With regard to appreciation and judgement there is no large difference between positive and negative. The negative evaluation is especially an evaluation of the current policy where poverty is concerned and it is also an evaluation of the poverty found in urban regions and of the people that are confronted with this poverty. According to Obama poverty is like a disease. The occurrences of positive evaluation have to do with the Harlem Children's Zone project and with Obama's own plan, based on this project, to combat poverty as President.

Text 5 is a speech given on Labour Day with some general remarks. Obama mainly criticises the conventional thinking in Washington, traditional politics and pleads for a change by presenting his view on politics and his plan for government in the future. The negative judgement is mostly concerned with criticising politicians in general and the

current President and his Administration. The positive judgement is about how good government under his lead would be like. Negative appreciation can mostly be connected with the criticism of certain problems (such as Iraq, health care crisis) caused by the current government.

Tax fairness for the middle class is the topic of Text 6. One possible explanation of the low number of judgement markers and the higher number of appreciation markers is that this speech mainly evaluates a system, namely the current tax system and what the future tax system, with Obama as President, would look like. Obama negatively evaluates the current tax system and is positive about his own plans for the future concerning the tax system.

Text 7 on Iraq is the most negative of all four of Obama's speeches. Here the number of attitude markers is the highest. This is probably because the war in Iraq is a topic which creates the greatest stir. Obama also uses negative affect markers frequently here, which is in contrast with his other speeches. Iraq is an emotionally charged topic, or, at least Barack Obama makes an emotionally charged topic of it. The negative affect markers often refer to the suffering of the Americans and also the citizens of Iraq caused by the war. Positive judgement can be typically connected with the positive evaluation of the competence of the American soldiers. Negative judgement on the other hand especially emphasises the failure of the Bush Administration and politicians in general (*the conventional thinking in Washington*). The positive appreciation markers are mostly positive evaluations of the military and also of Obama's future plan to end the war in Iraq as President. Negative appreciation refers to the problems concerning the war.

With regard to the semantic subdivisions of judgement (tables 33 and 35, A-74) it is remarkable that judgement is mostly a positive (65%) or a negative (69%) evaluation of the competence, the capacity of a person. Also the negative evaluation of a person's propriety is frequent (31%). Where positive judgement is concerned, there are no occurrences of normality, 7 of propriety, 3 of veracity and 1 occurrence of tenacity.

Tables 33 (A-74) shows that 24% of all positive judgement markers relate to Obama himself. In 15% of the cases he positively evaluates his own capacity, in 6% his tenacity and in 3% his propriety. America is praised less frequently than with Hillary Clinton (12%



vs. 33%). President Bush and his Administration do not get praised at any point in Obama's speeches.

What is significant with the negative judgement markers (Table 35, A-74) is that, in Obama's speeches, another group is prevalent next to Obama himself, America, and Bush and/or the Bush Administration, namely politicians in general, traditional Washington politics. This additional group constitutes 27% (21% capacity and 6% propriety) of all negative judgement markers in Obama's speeches. Also Bush and his Administration are criticised frequently (35%), especially their capacity (21%) and their propriety (14%) are questioned by Obama. America is negatively evaluated in 6% of the cases (capacity 2% and propriety 4%). What is remarkable is that there are also 2 occurrences (see 5.4.2.2., example 77) of Obama negatively evaluating his own capacity (4%). These are not instances of Obama doubting his own capacities. They can be interpreted as Obama wanting to be modest and realistic.

Table 37 (A-75) shows that the semantic subcategory of positive appreciation that occurs most frequently is valuation (73%), followed by complexity (10%) and quality (8%). There are no occurrences of impact and balance. Obama's plans for the future, which are presented in his speeches, are typically evaluated in a positive way. His plan to combat poverty is highly valued (19% of all positive appreciation markers). Also his plan to improve the tax system is evaluated positively (21% of all cases of positive appreciation). Especially the valuation is high (10%), followed by complexity (8%) and quality (2%), which is rare. As President, Obama wants to withdraw the troops from Iraq. Also this plan is highly valued (10%) and the appreciation of the plan constitutes 13% of all positive appreciation markers.

According to table 39 (A-76) the current situation in Iraq is the topic that is most frequently negatively appreciated by Barack Obama (35%). This is followed by the negative appreciation of the current government and current politics (22%). Also the current tax system and poverty in urban America are frequently appreciated in a negative way (both 13%). These four main topics are obviously the main subjects for negative appreciation.

Table 39 further shows that the semantic subcategory valuation is prevalent, namely 44% of all negative appreciation markers are examples of valuation. Also quality is often negatively appreciated (34%). Complexity is used to criticise the current tax system (9%) and constitutes 16% of all cases negative appreciation. Impact (5%) and balance (1%) are not frequently present.

#### *Rhetorical means*

##### i) Anecdotes

Barack Obama uses six anecdotes throughout his speeches. Three of these anecdotes are concerned with his family (his grandparents and his father A-39, his father-in-law A-43 and his mother A-40). These anecdotes have the same function as with Clinton (see 5.3.5). However, she did not tell stories about her own family. She just referred to her husband Bill Clinton, but this was in the context of him being President, not an anecdote from their personal life. By talking about his family the audience gets to know him better. It is also a popular choice: people like to hear such stories and Obama responds to this.

##### ii) Historical figures and other politicians

Another significant aspect of Obama's speeches are the references to historical figures and other politicians. He mentions the names of 14 different people (Bobby Kennedy, Lyndon Johnson, Ronald Reagan, President George Bush, Martin Luther King, Geoffrey Canada, Dick Cheney, Rumsfeld, Abraham Lincoln, Saddam Hussein, Bob Graham, Osama Bin Laden, Prime Minister Maliki and President Ahmadinejad). What is different compared to Clinton is that Obama actually quotes some of these people or paraphrases their words. He does this five times. It is interesting to see who exactly he quotes: Bobby Kennedy, Martin Luther King (3 times) and Abraham Lincoln. Obama clearly admires these people and he likes to be associated with them, especially with Martin Luther King. Coincidence or not, but these three people have all been killed because of their political choices and ideas. As mentioned in 3.2., Sornig points out the persuasive force of "name-giving" and "quotational language" (1989: 100). Using another, prestigious, person's words can be convincing.

### iii) Intertextuality and American history

At certain points in his speeches Obama refers to American history. This is often connected with the idea that America is a great country with an exemplary function for the rest of the world. Also the notion of the American dream is present in Obama's speeches. This idea that America is a great country with a mission to fulfil in the world is often used by other politicians and presidents in their speeches as well.

The idea originates from a speech given by one of the first settlers (see also 5.4.5.2.), John Winthrop. He was one of the Puritan settlers who set foot on the American continent (Massachusetts) in the early 17<sup>th</sup> century. He was the governor of the newly founded colony and gave a speech called *A Model of Christian Charity*. In this speech he explained what this new society should look like. Key concepts were cooperation, a society with a Calvinistic foundation and Church as a binding element (a treaty between God and the colonists). This new community had to serve as an example for the rest of the world. Winthrop described this new community as "a beacon of hope". He also said: "In America we shall be as a city upon a hill", "the eyes of all people are upon us". Even the well-known phrase "God bless America/us" comes from this speech. It has had and still has a great influence on the self-image of America. Part of this mentality has been adopted by America (van Minnen 2006).

Barack Obama literally refers to John Winthrop's speech when he uses the word "beacon" (A-42) and when he says: "We can be that beacon of hope, that light to all the world." (A-56). The idea of cooperation is certainly present in Obama's speeches, and also in the speeches of Hillary Clinton. They often point out the possibilities that are created when all Americans work together. This idea of cooperation often stands in relation with the idea of solidarity that is evoked.

The idea of the American dream was largely shaped in the Gilded Age (1877-1900), the period of greatest expansion during the Industrial Revolution. This was the time in which the belief grew that a newspaper boy could become a millionaire if only he worked hard enough (van Minnen 2006).

In his speeches, Obama literally uses the word *dream* (in the context of the American dream) nine times (A-41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47 and 49). These occurrences are all to be found in Texts 5 and 6. Text 6 (A-43-49) is about tax fairness for the middle class. The idea of the American dream is used here in the context of people working really hard and not being rewarded for it (as they should be according to the ideal of the American Dream).

Two important documents in American history are the Declaration of Independence (1776) and the Constitution (van Minnen 2006). Obama also refers to these documents. The ideas of liberty, opportunity, etc. are present in all his speeches, as well as in Clinton's. Obama even literally refers to them: "The steady pursuit of simple dreams." (A-49) This alludes to the "pursuit of happiness", which comes from the Declaration of Independence (Bailey, Blight et al., 2007: A-1) and the American dream. At one point he also quotes a phrase from the Constitution: "we believe we can be one people, reaching for what's possible, building that more perfect union" (A-37). The words *more perfect union* originate from the beginning of the Constitution: "We the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice, [...]" (Bailey, Blight, 2007: A-2). By using the word *that*, it is as if Obama assumes that everyone knows what he is talking about, that it is common knowledge. *That* actually refers to the Constitution here, and not to some former point in his speech because he has not used the word (*perfect union* or something alike before.

At one point in Text 4, Obama actually alludes to a phrase from the Bible, more precisely the Cain and Abel story from the Genesis book.

110. what holds this country together is this fundamental belief that we all have a stake in each other - that I am my brother's keeper; that I am my sister's keeper. And that must express itself not only in our churches and synagogues or in our personal lives, but in our government too. (A-39)

*I am my brother's keeper; that I am my sister's keeper* is an allusion to the answer Cain gave when God asked him where his brother was. Cain then answered: "Am I my brother's keeper?" (Genesis, 4:9; website biblegateway<sup>32</sup>). In this excerpt, the idea of cooperation between and solidarity among the American people is expressed. This idea is also symbolized in the phrase that refers to a Bible passage.

---

<sup>32</sup> [www.biblegateway.com/passage/?search=genesis%204;&version=9](http://www.biblegateway.com/passage/?search=genesis%204;&version=9)

There is one paragraph in Text 5 that can be seen as the ultimate example of Obama's rhetorical style, particularly the intertextuality (the use of references to American history in general, the references to the speech of John Winthrop, *we are the last, best hope of Earth; beacon*, and the Declaration of Independence, *liberty*):

111. We are the last, best hope of Earth. We are the nation that liberated a continent from a madman, that lifted ourselves from the depths of Depression, that won Civil Rights, and Women's Rights, and Voting Rights for all people. We are the beacon that has led generations of weary travelers to find opportunity, and liberty, and hope on our doorstep. That's who we are. And that's who we can be again. (A-43)

Obama also refers to the Second World War and Hitler (*madman*) and other milestones in American history to describe the greatness of America and their exemplary function in the world.

Hillary Clinton also refers to the greatness of America and the American dream, but Obama does it more explicitly and has more occurrences of intertextuality. This contributes to the general impression that Obama has a very rhetorical style of speaking, certainly more than Hillary Clinton.

#### iv) Repetition

Barack Obama uses repetition frequently. Both lexical and grammatical repetition (Hillier 2004) occur often (also see 3.3.). This high number of repeated words and phrases contributes to the persuasive force of Obama's speeches. Take for instance this example of lexical repetition:

112. America's standing has suffered. Our diplomacy has been compromised by a refusal to talk to people we don't like. Our alliances have been compromised by bluster. Our credibility has been compromised by a faulty case for war. Our moral leadership has been compromised by Abu Ghraib. That is a cost of this war. (A-30)

The repetition of *has/have been compromised* is a way of emphasizing and convincing the audience of the truth and the importance of the statement at the beginning of this excerpt, namely: *America's standing has suffered*. He tries to prove this statement by giving some examples, by going into detail. The repetition of the possessive pronoun *our* contributes to the realization of a feeling of solidarity. He involves every American citizen by using this pronoun.

v) Metaphor

Obama constantly makes use of metaphors in his speeches. A couple of examples are:

113. Forty years later, we're still asking **that question**. **It echoes** on the streets of Compton and Detroit, and throughout the mining towns of West Virginia. It lingers with every image we see of the 9th Ward and the rural Gulf Coast, where poverty thrived long before Katrina came ashore. (A-30)
114. **Debates rage** and **accusations fly** and at the end of each day, the **petty sniping** is what lights up the evening news. (A-30)
115. where **poverty** is not just a crisis that hits pocketbooks, but a **disease** that infects every corner of the community. (A-33)
116. Well I stand guilty as charged. **I am hopeful** about America. Apparently the pundits consider this **a chronic condition**, a symptom of a lack of experience. (A-39)
117. We are the last, best hope of Earth. [...] We are the **beacon** that has led generations of **weary travelers** to find opportunity, and liberty, and hope on our doorstep. (A-42)

Barack Obama knows how to bring across his message. The use of metaphors makes his speeches more lively and compelling.

*Experience*

As said before, Clinton plays out the experience factor in her speeches (see 5.3.5.). Obama is said to have a lack of experience in Washington. In Text 5 (A-36-43) Obama tries to tackle this argument and he tries to turn his lack of experience in Washington into something positive (A-39-40). At the same time he makes clear that he has a different kind of experience. A kind that is more valuable than the years spent in Washington (he refers to Cheney and Rumsfeld, who, despite their long experience in Washington, have led America into a war with Iraq). He talks about his experience as a community organizer, a civil rights lawyer, a constitutional law professor, a state Senator and a U.S. Senator. Then Obama elaborates on the experience he built up throughout the years. He begins each paragraph with *My experience tells me that*. In these paragraphs, he uses a lot of material process verbs in the past tense, which are there to refer to his realisations from the past and to prove that he indeed has some kind of experience (*I worked ... to*

*reform, I worked ... to expand, I worked ... to pass a law, I...passed the first ethics reform in twenty-five years, I passed a law that earned... A-40)*

What Barack Obama is saying, is that the established order sees him as an outsider because he does not have experience with Washington politics. They use this as an argument against him. Obama himself does not see this lack of experience in Washington as a disadvantage, but as an advantage. He is opposed to this established order and the traditional politics in Washington (he often refers to them as “the conventional thinking in Washington”). He presents himself as the candidate that brings change. Thereby he does not only react against the Bush Administration and the Republicans, but also against members of his own party who have served a long time in Washington politics, though he does not do this explicitly. He does not make a distinction between parties. It is just *the conventional thinking vs. him*. An example of this generalisation of the established order is:

118. I know that politics and politicians have disappointed you so many times before, to the point where sometimes it seems easier to just tune out and walk away. But what you have to remember is that when you walk away, the same old politics wins every time. (A-42)

He also mentions in his speech that these politicians who belong to the established order see politics as a game, but that he sees politics as a mission. Obama never mentions Hillary Clinton by name, but it is obvious that he also sees her as one of these traditional politicians.

Barack Obama fits in the experience argument in his plea against the traditional politics in Washington and presents himself as the candidate of hope and change, two words he uses frequently.

#### 5.4.7. Final discussion: comparison

So far the results of Barack Obama and Hillary Clinton have been discussed separately (both in the analysis, sections 5.3. and 5.4., and in the discussion, sections 5.3.5. and 5.4.6.). In this section their results are brought together into one table per attitude category and speaker, whereas in the analysis the results were discussed per speech, in order to be able to compare Clinton’s and Obama’s speeches.

5.4.7.1. *Affect*

	Positive	Negative
Affect H.C.	7	23
X/10,000	4.5	14.8

**Table 24: Affect H.C.**

	Positive	Negative
Affect B.O.	6	44
X/10,000	4.2	31.01

**Table 25: Affect B.O.**

Where affect is concerned, tables 24 and 25 show that there is no difference between the number of positive affect markers Clinton and Obama use. They both use very few positive affect markers, certainly in comparison with the other attitude markers. With regard to negative affect markers it can be noted that Obama uses twice as many affect markers as Clinton. This is a very significant result. Clinton’s speeches obviously contain fewer occurrences of negative affect. This difference becomes even more remarkable when the judgement and appreciation tables (26-29) are taken into account. Then it becomes clear that Clinton uses far fewer affect markers (19.2 on 10,000), especially negative affect markers, than judgement and appreciation markers. With Obama (35.2 affect markers on 10,000) the difference is not very large, especially with regard to negative judgement markers. It can be concluded that Obama obviously uses more affect markers than Clinton (35.2 vs. 19.2). The emotional and sometimes even dramatic nature of some of his utterances already came to the surface in the analysis section (see 5.4.1.1., 5.4.2.1. and 5.4.4.1.) and is discussed in 5.4.6.

What is typical of both Clinton and Obama is that they do not frequently use affect in relation to their own personal feelings (see 5.3.5 and 5.4.6). This logically means that they most often use affect markers to evaluate the feelings of other people, especially of the American people, as represented as victims of the policy of Bush and his Administration.

Overall, the outcome of the study of Biber and Finegan with regard to the stance style, including prepared speeches, called “faceless stance” (1989: 108) (see section 4.2.) is not applicable to the speeches of Obama and Clinton. The results show that Clinton and Obama certainly express stance.



5.4.7.2. *Judgement*

	Positive	Negative
Judgement H.C.	52	76
X/10,000	33.4	48.8

**Table 26: Judgement H.C.**

	Positive	Negative
Judgement B.O.	34	52
X/10,000	24	36.6

**Table 27: Judgement B.O.**

From tables 26 and 27 it can be derived that, generally, judgement markers are more frequently present in Clinton’s speeches. The difference between the two is not large, but still, Clinton uses more positive judgement markers and also more negative judgement markers. This difference indicates that Clinton criticises people (versus events, things) more frequently than Obama. At the same time she is also more positive in her judgements than he is.

Considering the semantic subcategories of judgement it is remarkable that capacity is the most prevalent one, both where positive and where negative judgement are concerned. Propriety is also well represented, but only in Obama’s and Clinton’s criticism of Bush and his Administration and of Washington politics in Obama’s case. The other semantic subdivisions are rare.

5.4.7.3. *Appreciation*

	Positive	Negative
Appreciation H.C.	76	76
X/10,000	48.8	48.8

**Table 28: Appreciation H.C.**

	Positive	Negative
Appreciation B.O.	48	77
X/10,000	33.8	54.27

**Table 29: Appreciation B.O.**

There is no great distinction between the number of judgement markers and appreciation markers with Hillary Clinton. She only uses more positive appreciation markers than positive judgement markers, while in Barack Obama’s speeches there are obviously more appreciation markers.

Hillary Clinton uses more positive appreciation markers than Barack Obama, while Obama uses negative appreciation markers more frequently than Clinton.

5.4.7.4. *Attitude Markers*

	Positive	Negative
Attitude H.C.	135	175
X/10,000	86.7	112.4

**Table 30: Attitude H.C.**

	Positive	Negative
Attitude B.O.	88	173
X/10,000	62	121.92

**Table 31: Attitude B.O**

Two elements that are significant in tables 30 and 31 is that, first, Hillary Clinton uses positive attitude markers more frequently than Obama, second, Obama uses negative attitude markers more frequently than Clinton. The sum of these elements means that, generally, Obama tends to be more negative in his speeches, even though both use more negative attitude markers than positive ones.

5.4.7.5. *Remarks*

*Judgement vs. Appreciation*

Theoretically (Martin and White 2005), the distinction between judgement and appreciation seems to be clear-cut: judgement is an evaluation made with regard to people and appreciation is a way of evaluating an event. Each category is further subdivided into different types of meaning (see 4.3.). The data have shown, however, that there is not always a straightforward distinction between judgement and evaluation. In 5.3.1.3 it is indicated that the examples 11,12, 14 and 15 are classified under negative appreciation, but there is certainly also an argument for regarding these examples as negative judgement of human behaviour. *The injustice of a system (A-2), This is unconscionable, it is intolerable (A-3), it is outrageous (A-4) and this legalized discrimination (A-9)*: at first sight these seem to be instances of negative appreciation, there are no references to people in the examples, but what these words actually do, is condemn human behaviour and decisions (negative judgement).

More important however, in such cases as mentioned above, than distinguishing between appreciation and judgement is whether or not the evaluation is positive or negative, whether it is a matter of praise or a matter of criticism. Certain groups or people are typically evaluated in a positive way in the data and others in a typically negative way.

Where judgement is concerned Bush and his Administration are constantly evaluated in a negative way (both with Obama and Clinton) and never in a positive way. America and Clinton and Obama themselves are typically represented in a positive way. Both Obama and Clinton evaluate themselves positively in about a quarter of all occurrences of positive judgement. Clinton criticises Bush and his Administration heavily. Obama attacks Bush less frequently, but an additional group is criticised in Obama's speeches, namely conventional Washington politics. Together with Bush and his Administration they constitute about 60% of all negative judgement markers in Obama's speeches. This means that Hillary Clinton is more outspoken in her criticism on Bush and his Administration.

The semantic subcategory of positive appreciation that is prevalent, both with Clinton and Obama, is valuation. Hillary Clinton most often praises the value of her own health care plan. Her other plans for the future are also frequently found to be worthwhile. Obama also typically praises the value of his plans for the future.

The dominant semantic subcategories of negative appreciation are valuation and quality. Valuation is predominant with Barack Obama, closely followed by quality. With Hillary Clinton it is the other way around. The current situation in Iraq is most frequently negatively appreciated with Barack Obama, followed by the current government and traditional politics and with Hillary Clinton it is the current health care system which is not being appreciated. It is no coincidence that the war in Iraq and politics are typically negatively appreciated by Barack Obama and that the current health care system is not appreciated by Clinton. Iraq is a major issue in Obama's campaign (because he never voted in favour of the war and can easily blame those who did by pointing out all the damage it caused). Also Obama's aversion to the established order in Washington runs as a common thread through Obama's campaign. Health care has been a major issue for Hillary Clinton throughout her whole career.

### *Speech Topics*

The number of appreciation markers or judgement markers also depends on the topic of the speech. When the health care crisis or the tax system are discussed, there are more occurrences of appreciation, because a system is being evaluated rather than an

individual. When the speech is about government reform the number of judgement markers is higher because the competence and propriety of Bush and his administration are typically criticised.

### *Experience*

Hillary Clinton has the greatest amount of experience in Washington politics, especially with regard to health care. She proves this by talking about some of her realisations from the past and does this by using material process verbs in the past tense and verbs expressing tenacity. Barack Obama cannot fall back on the same amount and the same kind of experience, but he is able to turn this into an advantage by using it in his plea against all those experienced politicians in Washington who, according to Obama, see politics as a game. He presents himself as the candidate of change, who sees politics as a mission. He refers to his experience he obtained in his years as a community organizer, a civil rights lawyer and a constitutional law professor. Just as in the speeches of Clinton there is a high number of material process verbs in the past tense in the parts where Obama exemplifies this experience. According to Obama this different kind of experience is more valuable than the years spent in Washington.

### *Rhetorical devices*

The focus in this dissertation is on attitude. The analysis of the data, however, shows that there are other possible centres of attention. One prevalent feature of Clinton and especially of Obama's speeches is the use of rhetorical devices, e.g. the anecdotes, the high number of repetitions (see also 3.3.), intertextuality and metaphors.

#### i) Anecdotes

This is a rhetorical device which both Obama and Clinton use. These anecdotes are a way of making their speeches and the political issues they deal with more accessible to a larger audience. The anecdotes exemplify certain issues. The anecdotes are often stories they heard from American citizens during their campaign. In this way Clinton and Obama show that they have contact with the common people and that they know which problems the American people are faced with in everyday life. The only difference

between Clinton and Obama here is that Obama uses a couple of anecdotes that relate to members of his family.

#### ii) Repetition

Both Clinton and Obama make abundant use of repetition (Trosborg 2000), both lexical and grammatical (Hillier 2004). These repetitions help to create a clear structure in the speeches. Moreover, repetitions have a persuasive effect. It is a means of emphasizing certain ideas.

#### iii) Intertextuality and American History

This feature is prevalent with Barack Obama. Hillary Clinton also pays attention to the use of references to American history and to the greatness of America and its role in the world, but due to the addition of intertextuality and the other rhetorical devices, this feature is most salient with Obama.

#### iv) Metaphor

This dissertation did not focus on metaphors and does not provide any specific information on this rhetorical feature. Still it was obvious during the reading of Obama's speeches that he uses metaphors frequently. They have the effect of making his speeches more lively and compelling.

Although Hillary Clinton also uses the rhetorical means mentioned above, they are much more frequent with Obama. Overall, it can be stated that Hillary Clinton has a more matter-of-fact to style, while Obama has a more rhetorical style of speaking.

## 6. Conclusion

An important aspect of the speeches of Barack Obama and Hillary Clinton in order to persuade the electorate is how they depict themselves and others subjectively and how they evaluate certain events (e.g. Iraq war, health care system, tax system, etc.). This dissertation has therefore focused on the language of evaluation, more precisely attitude.

The analysis and the discussions have shown that the subjective description of attitude with Obama and Clinton is similar in many ways. The differences, however, are not to be

neglected and are an indication for one major distinction between Obama and Clinton, namely the general atmosphere of their speeches evoked by their different style of speaking.

The similarities between the two Democrats are very often features that can no doubt be found in other political speeches in America, such as the typical praising of the greatness of America and its people (van Minnen 2006), which is expressed by a combination of positive attitude markers and references to historical figures, American history and the use of anecdotes. A second resemblance is that, overall, the candidates use more negative than positive attitude markers. This means that they spend more time criticising someone or something than praising a person or an event. The analysis and the discussions have shown that they rarely criticise themselves or the American people and that they mostly react against their adversaries, which is actually unsurprising. With regard to the semantic subcategories of judgement and appreciation it is typical that they both praise a person's capacity and criticise a person's capacity and propriety. Next to that Obama and Clinton typically express that a certain event is worthwhile (valuation) and they especially criticise the value and the quality of other events. What they both appreciate positively are their own plans for the future on certain issues such as Iraq or health care which they present in their speeches as an answer to the earlier criticism on the current situation of those issues.

A third significant similarity is that Obama and Clinton praise themselves in a quarter of all cases of positive judgement. I believe this is a number which creates a clear balance of not wanting to seem too egocentric, but still emphasizing their own qualities enough in the attempt to convince the electorate of those qualities.

Next to these resemblances between the two candidates there are also differences to be found. First, Hillary Clinton generally uses judgement markers more frequently than Barack Obama, which indicates that her appraisal is directed more towards people than towards events. Secondly, there is one important group which Obama and Clinton both criticise frequently, namely Bush and his Administration, but Obama adds an extra group of people to that: the conventional thinking in Washington as he describes it, the established order or traditional politics in Washington. This is significant because it is an

indication of the central idea of Obama's campaign, namely that there must be change. He reacts against traditional politicians in Washington, which includes Clinton. It is a way of covering his inexperience and turning it into an advantage by presenting himself as the candidate of change and hope as opposed to the cynicism of the established order.

Finally, the analysis has shown that Barack Obama uses far more affect markers, mostly negative ones, than Clinton. In comparison with the number of judgement and appreciation markers they use it becomes clear that Clinton uses few affect markers. In combination with the high number of rhetorical devices in Obama's speeches this means that Clinton's style of speaking can be described as matter-of-fact and that Obama's style is far more rhetorical and emotional.

The high number of rhetorical devices which Obama uses, contribute to this final conclusion. Although this dissertation mainly focussed on the linguistic aspect of attitude these rhetorical devices were touched upon because they were an obvious feature of Obama's speeches. There is thus room for further research in the area of rhetoric.

One variable that has an influence on the results is that Obama and Clinton, although they are adversaries for now, are members of the same party, the Democrats. Selecting two Republican candidates or opposing a Republican and a Democratic candidate would probably give a different result. Therefore it would be interesting to look at the language of evaluation in speeches of other candidates, for example John McCain.

Now that this dissertation is finished, the next results to look forward to are those of the Democratic party convention and of the eventual presidential election. May the best man, or woman, win.

## Bibliography

Bailey, B.; Blight, D.; Chudacoff, H.; Katzman, D.; Logevall, F.; Norton, M.B.; Paterson, T. and Tuttle, W.

2007 *A People and a Nation. A History of the United States.*  
Boston, New York: Houghton Mifflin Company

Biber, D. and Finegan, E.

1989 Styles of stance in English: Lexical and Grammatical Marking of Evidentiality and Affect.  
*Text 9*, 93-124

Chung, C.; Pennebaker J.; Slatcher, R. and Stone L.

2006 Winning words: Individual differences in linguistic style among U.S. presidential and vice presidential candidates.  
In: *Journal of Research in Personality 41*, 63-75

Harris, S.

1991 Evasive Action: How Politicians Respond to Questions in Political Interviews.  
In: *Broadcast Talk.*  
Scannell, P. (ed.); London: Sage Publications, 76-99

Holly, W.

1989 Credibility and political language.  
In: *Language, power and ideology : studies in political discourse*  
Wodak, R. (ed.); Amsterdam: Benjamins, 115-131

Levin, S.; Mio J.S.; Reese R. and Riggio R.

2005 Presidential leadership and charisma: the effects of metaphor.  
In: *The Leadership Quarterly 16* (2005), 287-294

Martin, J.R. and White, P.R.R.

2005 *The Language of Evaluation: Appraisal in English*  
Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005

Schneider, K.P.

2008 Guest lecture Text and Genre course, 28 May 2008  
personal notes

Simon-Vandenberg, A-M

1987 Pronouns for Strategic Purposes.  
In: *Argumentation: analysis and practices.*  
Van Eemeren, F.H., R. Grootendorst, J.A. Blair, C.A. Willard, eds.,  
Foris Publications, Dordrecht, 261-269



- 1996a A Functional Approach to Modality.  
In: *Anglistentag Greifswald, Proceedings Volume XVII*  
J. Klein and D. Vanderbeke (eds.), 149-167
- 1996b Image-building through modality: the case of political interviews.  
In: *Discourse and Society*, Vol. 7, No 3 (1996).  
London, 389-415
- 1997 Modal (Un)certainly in Political Discourse: A functional account.  
In: *Language Sciences*, Vol. 19, No 4, 341-356
- 2000 The functions of I think in political discourse.  
In: *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, Vol. 10, No 1 (2000), 41-63
- Sornig, K.  
1989 Some Remarks on linguistic strategies of persuasion.  
In: *Language, power and ideology : studies in political discourse*.  
Wodak, R. (ed.); Amsterdam: Benjamins, 95-109
- Thornborrow, J.  
2002 *Power Talk. Language and Interaction in Institutional Discourse*.  
London: Pearson Education
- Trosborg, A.  
2000 The Inaugural Address. President Clinton's 1993 address  
In: *Analysing professional genres*.  
Trosborg, A. (ed.); Amsterdam: Benjamins, 121-144
- van Minnen, C.A.  
2006 Course on American History, 26 Sept-12 Dec  
personal notes

Dictionary:

*Van Dale Snelzoeker Nederlands-Engels* op CD-ROM, 2004, Van Dale Lexicografie bv,  
Antwerpen Utrecht

*Van Dale Snelzoeker Engels-Nederlands* op CD-ROM, 2004, Van Dale Lexicografie bv,  
Antwerpen Utrecht

Websites:

Bible Gateway, <[www.biblegateway.com/passage/?search=genesis%204;&version=9](http://www.biblegateway.com/passage/?search=genesis%204;&version=9)>;  
(09/04/08)

Campaign website Barack Obama, <[www.barackobama.com/index.php](http://www.barackobama.com/index.php)>, (26/10/07)

Campaign website Barack Obama biography, <<http://www.barackobama.com/about/>>,  
(27/12/07)

Campaign website Barack Obama issues, <<http://www.barackobama.com/issues/>>,  
(27/12/07)

Campaign website Barack Obama speeches,  
<http://www.barackobama.com/speeches/index.php>, (20/10/07):

*Text 4,*

<[http://www.barackobama.com/2007/07/18/remarks\\_of\\_senator\\_barack\\_obam\\_19.php](http://www.barackobama.com/2007/07/18/remarks_of_senator_barack_obam_19.php)>

*Text 5,*

<[http://www.barackobama.com/2007/09/03/remarks\\_of\\_senator\\_barack\\_obam\\_22.php](http://www.barackobama.com/2007/09/03/remarks_of_senator_barack_obam_22.php)>

*Text 6,*

<[http://www.barackobama.com/2007/09/18/remarks\\_of\\_senator\\_barack\\_obam\\_25.php](http://www.barackobama.com/2007/09/18/remarks_of_senator_barack_obam_25.php)>

*Text 7,*

<[http://www.barackobama.com/2007/09/12/remarks\\_of\\_senator\\_barack\\_obam\\_23.php](http://www.barackobama.com/2007/09/12/remarks_of_senator_barack_obam_23.php)>

Campaign website Hillary Clinton, <[www.hillaryclinton.com/?splash=1](http://www.hillaryclinton.com/?splash=1)>, (20/10/07)

Campaign website Hillary Clinton biography, <<http://www.hillaryclinton.com/about/>>,  
(27/12/07)

Campaign website Hillary Clinton issues, <<http://www.hillaryclinton.com/issues/>>,  
(27/12/07)

Campaign website Hillary Clinton speeches,  
<http://www.hillaryclinton.com/news/speech/>, (20/10/07)

*Text 1,* <<http://www.hillaryclinton.com/news/speech/view/?id=3329>>

*Text 2,* <<http://www.hillaryclinton.com/news/speech/view/?id=1445>>

*Text 3,* <<http://www.hillaryclinton.com/news/speech/view/?id=2366>>

CNN.com:

CNN political ticker, <<http://politicalticker.blogs.cnn.com/>>, (26/12/07)

CNN election Center 2008, <<http://edition.cnn.com/ELECTION/2008/>>, (26/12/07)

CNN election candidates, <<http://edition.cnn.com/ELECTION/2008/candidates/>>, (26/12/07)

CNN election candidates Barack Obama,  
<<http://edition.cnn.com/ELECTION/2008/candidates/barack.obama.html>>, (26/12/07)

CNN election candidates Hillary Clinton,  
<<http://edition.cnn.com/ELECTION/2008/candidates/hillary.clinton.html>>, (26/12/07)

CNN election issues,  
<<http://edition.cnn.com/ELECTION/2008/issues/issues.abortion.html>>, (26/12/07)

CNN election path to presidency,  
<<http://edition.cnn.com/ELECTION/2008/path.presidency/>>, (27/12/07)

CNN politics news Walter Reed scandal,  
<[www.cnn.com/2007/POLITICS/03/02/army.secretary/index.html?iref=newssearch](http://www.cnn.com/2007/POLITICS/03/02/army.secretary/index.html?iref=newssearch)>, (10/03/08)

New Hampshire government, <[www.nh.gov/nhinfo/emblem.html](http://www.nh.gov/nhinfo/emblem.html)>, (15/04/08)

Pindell, James; Boston Globe political blog; Proving Ground. Inside the Issues for 2008.; January 2007  
<<http://www.boston.com/news/local/politics/primarysource/>>, (10/11/07)

YouTube account Barack Obama,  
<<http://nl.youtube.com/profile?user=BarackObamadotcom>>, (27/12/07)

YouTube account Hillary Clinton,  
<<http://nl.youtube.com/profile?user=hillaryclintondotcom>>, (27/12/07)

YouTube Democratic Debate,  
<[http://nl.youtube.com/democraticdebate#qa\\_H7Dz0jc1mUs](http://nl.youtube.com/democraticdebate#qa_H7Dz0jc1mUs)>, (27/12/07)

YouTube Republican Debate,  
<[http://nl.youtube.com/republicandebate#qa\\_H7Dz0jc1mUs](http://nl.youtube.com/republicandebate#qa_H7Dz0jc1mUs)>, (27/12/07)