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Abstract
A political discourse contains some features that must be constant in them to be recognized and understood by the audience as such, but it must, at the same time, fulfill the purpose of persuading the addressees. This work dealt with the persuasive strategies in President Bush’s and President Obama’s selected speeches aiming to uncover persuasive strategies as well as covert Ideologies. Segments of speeches were investigated to verify illocutionary act using Searle’s Speech Act theory. Afterwards, the use of agencies and pronouns were analyzed in light of Fairclough’s (1995) assumption in Critical Discourse Analysis. Furthermore, the use of Aristotle’s persuasion appeals, Ethos, Logos, and Pathos were examined. Lastly, In light of Wodak’s (2001) discursive strategies of (de)legitimization, the presentation of image and otherness was investigated. The findings indicated that multiple speech acts can occur in a single utterance. Some speech acts might be employed in order to provide a background for occurrence of other speech acts. It also showed that the use of agencies and pronouns can be strategic. The process of manipulation can be fostered by significant resort to logos, which can also reinforce ethos appeal. Moreover, it can be claimed that predication strategy correlates mostly with the use of nomination strategy with regard to positive self-representation and negative other-representation. The comparison of Obama’s speeches with Bush’s speeches revealed that Obama’s discourses tend to be more inclusive.
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1. Introduction
Politics is a struggle for power in order to put certain political, economic and social ideas into practice. In this process, language plays a crucial role, for every political action is prepared, accompanied, influenced and played by language. Stobbs (2012) believed that political speeches are very cautiously written. They might be creation of several speech writers other than addresser. Persuasion is expounded as an effort to “influence a person’s beliefs, attitudes, intentions, motivations or behavior” (Gass & Seiter, 2010, p. 33). A politician’s ideology is occasionally expressed with clarity, but generally the profound ideology is concealed in rhetoric.

This study attempted to investigate the persuasive strategies in the selected presidential speeches of two US presidents, i.e. speeches of George W. Bush and Barack Hussein Obama in light of speech act theory. The point of departure was the inaugural speeches. For this purpose, this study focused on language in society analyzing it from speech acts’ perspectives in order to stress how distinctive language usages enable us to investigate issues of social concern. Precisely speaking, to see how the ways in which politicians deliver their speech are informed and structured by the forces of social institutions defined by such particular language use. However, in order to confirm and compare the findings and patterns of persuasive strategies, one more speech from each president is included.

In order to investigate the persuasive strategies and covert ideology that reside in text, George W. Bush’s second Inaugural speech as well as his 2002 state of Union Address were analyzed and explained. Bush served as the 43rd President of the United States from 2001 to 2009. He depicted himself as an empathetic conservative, implying he was more centrist than other republicans His ideologies seemed to be greatly influenced by the the New Testament, the second major part of the Christian biblical canon (New Testament, n.d.).

Bush asserted in his January 29, 2002 State of the Union Address that an axis of evil including North Korea, Iran, and Iraq is the threat to world (George W. Bush, n. d.). On the other hand, in order to provide the opportunity of comparative study of persuasive strategies, Barack Hussein Obama’s Second Inaugural speech along with his speech on First Step Agreement on Iran’s Nuclear Program will be investigated. Obama, a social-democrat and the 44th President of the United States, was the first African American to hold the office. While he sponsored the toughest sanctioned on Iran at same time, he administered diplomatic efforts toward Iran (Barack Obama, n.d). This research is concerned with hidden beliefs and persuasive strategies, boosting the eloquence and effectiveness in aforementioned president’s speech.

2. Theoretical Underpinnings
People adopt strategic actions in particular circumstances and use conventions instead of pursuing them; therefore, what is required for someone is a theory of social action or social practice that could explain the shaping effect of conventions and strategic creativity of individuals, without decreasing practice to one or other (Fairclough, 1989). In conclusion, Anglo-American pragmatics have the features of the ways in which it has developed. While it provide the opportunity for studying the interdependence of language and social context, it is a
severe area, since it is assumed as an extra level of language study “which fills in gaps left by the ‘core’ levels of grammar and semantics. Social context is acknowledged but kept in its place, which does it less than justice” (Fairclough, 1989, p.10).

2.1 Speech Act Theory
Austin’s (1962) Speech Act Theory provides a tool to assist in the pragmatic analysis of discourse. It is concerned with the meanings assigned to speech acts by participants based on their relationship and context. Searle (1978): Speaking a language is performing speech acts, acts such as making statements, giving commands, asking questions, making promises and so on, and more abstractly, acts such as referring and predicating, and secondly that these acts are in general made possible by and are performed in accordance with certain rules for the use of linguistic elements (p.16).

2.2 Locution, Illocution, and Perlocution
The locutionary act, which is the production of sounds that mean something, has been the traditional concern of linguistics.

Illocutionary acts, such as promises and orders, reveal the intention of the speaker through their utterance (Fairclough, 2001, p. 130). Moreover, the validity of any illocutionary act necessitates that the participants have social roles within a social institution that permit their speech acts to come into effect, as when a defendant guilty is pronounced in a court, or a couple are declared husband and wife by a priest in a church (Searle, 1978). Similarly in terms of political speech, a speech act is posited to be persuasive one (Stobbs, 2012).

The perlocutionary act deals primarily with the effect of the utterance on the hearer, such as to persuade, convince, threaten, amuse, and so on (Stubbs, 1983).

In this study, persuasion is the intended perlocutionary act. In discourse, it is possible to see argumentation as a strategy.

2.3. Performatives and Searle’s Typology
Understanding speech acts would be easier if the relationship between illocutionary and perlocutionary acts were always straightforward, which is not invariably the case (Stubbs, 1983). Only a good knowledge of the context of the utterance may reveal the intended illocutionary act, which is the essence of pragmatics as the study of language within its context (Fairclough, 2001). Searle (1978) classified illocutionary force into five categories in what is known as Searle’s typology of speech acts: assertives, directives, commissives, expressives, and declaratives. Assertive speech acts, or representatives, are represented by the speaker’s assertion of the truth of what is said, as in giving conclusions, complaining, boasting or describing events or states in the world. Directive speech acts are an attempt to get the hearer to do something, and are typified by orders, invitations or requests. Commisive speech acts, such as promises, threats or offerings, express the speaker’s intention to take certain actions; in political speeches, usually “fair and responsible” ones (Fairclough & Fairclough, 2012, p.122). An expressive speech act is performed whenever there is an expression of psychological state by the producer of the utterance, as when apologizing and thanking. Declarations are speech acts that change the world
by declaring that a new state of affairs has come into existence, such as a declaration of war; to have any effect, they must be pronounced by the right person in the right context.

2.2 Deictic Pronouns
Politicians chose one deictic category rather than another to express the degree of their personal involvement. This is consonant with the manipulation of the first person plural *we*, which can designate the speaker and one or more other persons. Or it may refer to persons other than the speaker, as in the example of Churchill. Identity and membership may be expressed through the use of personal deixis as a persuasive technique. This determines who belongs to the group and who does not. Typical group members share common features that distinguish them from other groups. Politicians tend to emphasize this difference through the categorization of groups using person deixis.

2.2.1 Inclusive and Exclusive ‘we’
Fairclough, (2001) posited two relational values if different sort for pronouns in English. Accordingly, there are two values for ‘we’: inclusive *we* and exclusive *we*. The former, Inclusive *we*, includes addresser and addressees, and the latter, exclusive *we*, includes addresser plus one or more others but not the addresses.

2.3. Aristotle’s Persuasive Strategies
In his seminal work *The Art of Rhetoric*, Aristotle (1967) presented three different persuasive strategies: logos (rational argumentation), ethos (reliability and credibility of the speaker) and pathos (emotional appeal). These three appeals aim to convince the addressee to reach “out of free choice” a goal desired by the addressee (Poggi, 2005, p. 298). This is achieved by convincing the addressee of the high value of the perceived goal through the manipulation of their beliefs.

3. Methodology
In this work, an additional analysis was incorporated, a sub-category of critical layer, as a complement to speech acts and agency investigation, to address more factors involved in the process of discourse production and persuasion, to compensate for the shortcomings of linguistic analysis, and to redress the weakness of pragmatics that merely focuses on individualism.

3.1 Procedure:
With regards to procedure of analysis, in the first step, the data were tabulated and analyzed from pragmatic point of view. For this reason, sentences were used as the unit of analysis dealing with speech acts, performatives, agency and pronouns.

Subsequently, the whole text was fully analyzed through personal scrutiny of data in view of necessity to interpret the assigned coherent shared meaning to utterances within
their context. The ideological analysis of George W. Bush’s and Barack Obama’s speeches attempted to link their discourses with the social processes and to decipher covert ideology of this text. For this reason, in order to shed light on the distinction between inclusive and exclusive nature of pronouns, the critical analysis of each chunk of speeches was conducted in light of Fairlough’s (1989) aforementioned assumptions on CDA; Furthermore, The critical investigation of Aristotelian persuasion appeals was essential so as to reveal their sheer complexity. In the final section, each segment of speeches were set against five discursive strategies of (De)legitimization (Wodak, 2001).

4. Results and Discussion
In order to make more accurate comparisons the frequencies were converted into percentage graphs. The table below represents the analysis of Constantative/Performative function and Speech Acts as a sample.

Table 1: Investigation of Constantative/Performative function and speech Act/s

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sentence/ Phrase</th>
<th>Constative</th>
<th>Performative</th>
<th>Speech acts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vice President Cheney, Mr. Chief Justice, President Carter, President Bush,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Expressive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reverend clergy, distinguished guests, fellow citizens:</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On this day, prescribed by law and marked by ceremony, we celebrate the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Assertive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>durable wisdom of our Constitution, and recall the deep commitments that</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Expressive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unite our country. I am grateful for the honor of this hour, mindful of the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Commissive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>consequential times in which we live, and determined to fulfill the oath that</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have sworn and you have witnessed.</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The analysis of all chunks of sentences depicted that approximately all of the chunks of sentences, i.e. 92% Obama’s First Inaugural Speech and 93% of Bush’s Second Inaugural Speech, contain performatives. These results are in substantial agreement with those of Jarraya (2013). Similarly, it is also in line with the attributes of political discourse as “an act of conversion” (Diamond & Cobb, 1999, p.225) that urges the addressees to take a side through statements that are intended to convince them to behave in a manner conforming with the intention of the persuader (Austin, 1962). The analysis of these figures clearly suggests that even when there is no clear performative verb, the statement still carries a performative act as Austin (1962) argued.
“a performative utterance, or for short, a performative” conveys the same speech act intended by the addressee in spite of the fact that it might not include an explicit verb. Furthermore, the Figure 2, 3, 4, and 5 illustrate that more than half of the sentences used in all of the speeches contain multiple speech acts.

Fairclough (2001) argued that the illocutionary force, i.e. the purpose of the addressee, can be interpreted only within its context. An intense awareness of the context permits the investigator to unveil the true illocution behind any statement. Consequently, Searle’s classification of speech acts provides the following distribution for each speech:
The use of expressive in presidential speeches is associated conventionally with expressing gratitude to the previous presidents for their service and expressing their gratitude or positive feelings for the rendered assistance. The figures above clearly demonstrate that the use of Expressive Speech acts in Obama’s speeches was higher. As far as the Assertives are concerned, the percentage of frequencies displays that they outnumber the other types.

It is to suggest that the use of assertives might be an artful medium to provide the context and pass to another speech act that is intended, namely Commissives and Directives. Accordingly, assertive speech acts were used as a subtle medium to attain the goal of persuasion. Obama attempted to introduce his policies to bring about changes that would result in prevailing a...
lasting peace while Bush aimed to display his commitments to revival of human rights. Commissive speech acts hold an informed assurance and promise to “commit the speaker to some future course of action”, (Searle, 1978, p.17). In this regard, the comparison of figures shows that there is a marked use of *commissives* in Bush’s speeches that signals his commitments and promises, especially in foreign policy, to fight with terrorism and to support democracy. In addition, in both of the speeches there were promises to make determined efforts to address social concerns.

Furthermore, *directives* are used as an influencing strategy especially through which the addresser, namely, President Bush intended to incite the US allies to cooperate in the war against terrorism by perlocutionary power of taking action. Each of the speech acts in these public speeches contain an illocutionary act that can be deciphered through social, political and contextual analysis. The majority of speech acts carried performatives.

So far as Searle’s typology of speech acts is concerned, assertive speech acts, employed to establish the context for another speech acts, were used the most, whereas declaratives, indicating crucial decisions, had the least presence in these speeches. Originated from philosophy, Speech act theory provide invaluable tool to justify writers intention

### 4.1 Agency and Pronouns

In line with Fairclough and Fairclough (2012) and Wilson (1990) who claim that personal deixis serves to express ideologies and manipulate people in political discourse, the findings of my study confirmed that the use of inclusive deixis was to persuade groups and individuals.

### 4.2 Analysis of First Person Singular Pronoun ‘I’

As a sample of analysis, Table 3 exhibits the correspondence between the use of first person singular pronouns with other elements.

#### Table 2: Correlation among first Person Singular Pronoun, Performatives and Speech act

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sentence</th>
<th>Speech Acts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>When I (1) called our troops into action, I (2) did so with complete confidence in their courage and skill. And tonight, thanks to them, we are winning the war on terror.</td>
<td>(1) Assertive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shannon, I assure you and all who have lost a loved one that our cause is just, and our country will never forget the debt we owe Michael and all who gave their lives for freedom.</td>
<td>Commissive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>My hope</strong> (1) is that all nations will heed our call and eliminate the terrorist parasites who threaten their countries and our own.</td>
<td>(1) Expressive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Many nations are acting forcefully. Pakistan is now cracking down on terror, and I (2) admire the strong leadership of President Musharraf.</td>
<td>(2) Expressive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Our first priority must always be the security of our nation, and that will be reflected in the budget I send to Congress. My budget supports three great goals for America: We will win this war, we will protect our homeland, and we will revive our economy.

September 11 brought out the best in America and the best in this Congress, and I join the American people in applauding your unity and resolve.

The comparison of speech acts frequencies in the inaugural speeches revealed that President Obama resorted more to expressive speech acts in order to illustrate his benevolence. Typical instances are when the addresser expresses gratitude, greets with kindness, or apologizes.

### 4.3 Analysis of Exclusive and Inclusive ‘we’

In Table 4, the sentences that contain *first person plural pronouns* along with the assigned speech act they bear are depicted. The concentration is on pronouns that include or exclude the addressees. Also a brief and critical explanation whenever the pronoun was labeled as exclusive was provided.

**Table 3: Correlation between Inclusive/Exclusive Deictic Pronouns and Speech acts**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sentence</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Speech Acts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>America's vital interests and (1) our deepest beliefs are now one. From the day of our Founding, (2) we have proclaimed that every man and woman on this earth has rights, and dignity, and matchless value, because they bear the image of the Maker of Heaven and earth. Across the generations (2) we have proclaimed the imperative of self-government, because no one is fit to be a master, and no one deserves to be a slave. Advancing these ideals is the mission that created (2) our Nation. It is the honorable achievement of our fathers. Now it is the urgent requirement of (2) our nation's security, and the calling of (2) our time.</td>
<td>His idelistic neo-conservatist beliefs are not in agreement with those of his liberal and non-liberal realist counterparts. (Eland, 2009)</td>
<td>(1) Assertive</td>
<td>(2) Expressive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(2) Commissive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As mentioned earlier, the use of ‘we’ as the deictic pronoun serves for the purpose of segregation or integration in a particular group (Koole, as cited in Bührig & ten Thije, 2006).

The data presented in Figure 11 illustrate that the use of inclusive in President Obama’s discourse was more than his antecedent president’s discourse. In both President Obama’s and President Bush’s Inaugural speeches, inclusive pronouns were employed to reinforce the concept of belonging to American society and sharing same goals with others, whereas the use exclusive ones were employed in pursuing manipulative strategies in addressing the opposition groups. As for President Bush, he employed exclusive first person pronouns to speak to his realist counterparts and critics. Even though Bush in his second inaugural speech did not distinctly show to whom he is referring by use of ‘we’, it was potential to identify 39% of we to be exclusive.

In a similar manner, Obama made use of exclusive first person pronouns to show his integrity with discordant Republicans, social middle-class, and lower class people. He does not belong to the group, but he tried to identify himself with them to create sense of sympathy. The frequent use of inclusive pronouns in Obama’s speech might suggest that his speeches tend to give devoted and close impression.

4.4 Analysis of Third Person Plural Pronoun ‘they’
Table 5, as a typical exemplification of analysis, depicts the coherent chunks that contain third person plural pronouns as well as the speech act that they carry.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sentence</th>
<th>Speech Acts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Some of these regimes have been pretty quiet since September 11, but we know their true nature. North Korea is a regime arming with missiles and weapons of mass destruction, while starving its citizens.</td>
<td>(1) Assertive (2) Assertive (3) Assertive (4) Commissive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iran aggressively pursues these weapons and exports terror, while an</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
unelected few repress the Iranian people's hope for freedom.

Iraq continues to flaunt its hostility toward America and to support terror. The Iraqi regime has plotted to develop anthrax and nerve gas and nuclear weapons for over a decade.

This is a regime that has already used poison gas to murder thousands of its own citizens, leaving the bodies of mothers huddled over (2) their dead children. This is a regime that agreed to international inspections then kicked out the inspectors. This is a regime that has something to hide from the civilized world.

States like these, and (3) their terrorist allies, constitute an axis of evil, arming to threaten the peace of the world. By seeking weapons of mass destruction, these regimes pose a grave and growing danger.

(4) They could provide these arms to terrorists, giving them the means to match (4) their hatred. (4) They could attack our allies or attempt to blackmail the United States. In any of these cases, the price of indifference would be catastrophic.

We will work closely with our coalition to deny terrorists and (4) their state sponsors the materials, technology and expertise to make and deliver weapons of mass destruction.

The analysis of George W. Bush’s 2002 State of the Union Address and his Second Inaugural Speech revealed that third person plural pronouns, ‘they’, were employed in these speeches mostly in order to make reference to terrorist leaders, US enemies, and dissidents. Through the creation of the otherness, generally in a negative manner, by attributing condemnable actions to others (Machiavelli, 1985), a positive self representation is attained. Sporadically did he attempt to honour US victims, martyrs, US men and women in service. It is worth reminding that assertive speech acts are used in order to establish the context and move to another speech act. In this regard, Bush in 2002 State of the Union Address resorted to vilification of the enemy by portraying North Korea, Iran, Iraq as the axis of evil, accusing them of helping terrorism and seeking weapons of mass destruction. These findings are also in substantial accord with Weintraub’s (2007) analysis in which he elucidated how President Bush used metaphors and appeals to frame and present the enemy. As far as Obama’s speeches are concerned, no sign of vilification of enemies was detected. He rather employed third person plural pronouns in order to refer to challenges before the nation, America's Founding Fathers, forces of progress, etc.

5 Analysis of Aristotelian Appeals
The following illustrates Aristotelian Appeals in addition to investigation of discursive strategies of discourse historical approach, in Obama’s speech on “First Step Agreement on Iran's Nuclear Program”.

http://www.ijhcs.com/index.php/ijhcs/index
Table 6: Analysis of the Discursive strategies and Aristotelian Appeals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sentences</th>
<th>Logos</th>
<th>Ethos</th>
<th>Pathos</th>
<th>Discursive Strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>While today’s announcement is just a first step, it achieves a relationship great deal. For the first time in nearly a decade, we have halted the progress of the Iran’s nuclear program, and commitments to moral key parts of the program will be rolled back. Iran has Iran’s right for new generation centrifuges, which are used for enriching uranium. Iran cannot install or start up new centrifuges, order to ensure and its production of some Persian centrifuges will be limited. Gulf nations as the mean/goal relationship is established. Along with Iran’s commitments, the US accepted Iran’s right for Uranium enrichment for the first time (Kesselman, Krieger, &amp; Joseph, 2012); however, in order to ensure some Persian Gulf nations as well Israel, Obama’s speech revolves around Iran’s commitments. High level of transparency in bilateral commitments contributes to moral substance of persuader. He tries to convey positive feelings such as trust, especially to concerned nations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As the table 6 illustrates, the appeals are interwoven in most of the cases (Aristotle, 1967). In some of the chunks of speeches, only a single appeal was identified to be present, while in some of them multiple appeals were layed. In the closing lines, Both Bush and Obama made use of logos appeal in order to manifest their moral substance. Both Barack Obama and George Bush resorted to biblical quotations to foster their ethos. Deep investigation of these speeches led the researcher to infer that presentation of ideologies that maintain values may contribute to ethos appeal. Obama constantly attempted to substantiate his ideology that was ‘a call for change’ and transition to realistic policies by reiterating terms like ‘new era’, ‘new age’, whereas Bush tied to display his doctrine for revival of human rights by use longer terms such ‘expansion of freedom in all the world’, ‘expansion of freedom in all the world’, and narratives throughout the speech.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

http://www.ijhcs.com/index.php/ijhcs/index
5.1 Legitimization Strategies of Discourse-Historical Approach

Along with addressing Aristotelian appeals, the attempts were made to investigate the discursive strategies of positive self-presentation and negative other-presentation (legitimization and delegitimization strategies) developed by Wodak (2001). In the figures 12 to 15 below, the use of discursive strategies were depicted in concerned political speeches.

![Figure 11: Use of DHA Discursive Strategies in President Obama’s First Inaugural Speech](image1)

![Figure 12: Use of DHA Discursive Strategies in President Obama’s First Step Agreement on Iran’s Nuclear Program](image2)
As the findings suggest, the use of argumentation strategy has outnumbered the other ones. The reason for this pattern in these political speeches could be the claims of truth that are often based on topoi, since they are often part of argument relating the premise of an argument to its deduction and conclusion (Lawton, 2013). The inspection on the inaugural speeches shows that the second most frequent distribution was for the use of perspectivization strategy that positions the viewpoint of the addresser (Lawton, 2013). In the Obama’s inaugural speech, the results may be explained by his reiteration of calling for change in different forms throughout the text, whereas Bush resorted to different narrations in order to justify his perspective for liberation and revival of human rights. Regarding Bush’s 2002 State of Union Address, the use of predication strategy was also notable. According to Lawton (2013), this strategy is recognized by attributed characteristics to objects, actors, and phenomena. Along with referential strategy or nomination, that investigates how actors, objects, events are named, it seems that Bush also employed predication, for example, in order to associate nations like Iran with nefarious acts, and eventually he referred to these countries as the axis of evil. The investigation of predication strategy in these four political speeches led the researcher to infer that the use of predication strategy correlates mostly with the use of referential (nomination) strategy in vilification of enemy or praising actors, corresponding to positive self-representation and negative other-representation.

5. Discussion and Conclusion

5.1 Speech acts
Based on the analysis of the aforementioned political speeches, it is likely that speech can be interpreted only within their specific contexts, where multiple manipulation devices are employed.

Due to the fact that assertive speech acts are the most used type, they might be employed in order to establish the context and act as means of passing to other speech acts. For this reason, political discourses are gerenerally represented by considerable use
of marked multiple speech acts, i.e. assertives accompanying other types, in the same statement. In the analysed speeches, the presidents made use of assertives in order to narrate events and make intertextual allusion to US history that finally led to realization of Aristotelian persuasion appeals. Moreover, it appeared that Obama employed expressive speech acts in order to illustrate his benevolence by arousing sympathy and sharing social values. It is worth mentioning that the expressives probably occur at the beginning and closing part of speeches. Eventually the analysis of performatives led the researcher to infer that they can be present in most of sentences regardless of being implicit.

5.2 Deictic Pronouns and Agency
The detailed study of person deixis suggested that pronouns and agencies were crafted and used in a strategic manners. With regard to exclusive use of ‘we’, Bush attempted to build rapport with his realist counterparts and critics in terms of his belligerent policies. Similarly, Obama also employed first person plural pronouns in exclusive manner to include his dissidents in his speech and to express sympathy to other social groups.

Furthermore, the use of inclusive in President Obama’s discourse, according to frequency distribution, was more than his antecedent president’s discourse. In both President Obama’s and President Bush’s Inaugural speeches, Inclusive pronouns were likely to be used in order to reinforce the concept of belonging to American society and sharing same goals with others, whereas exclusive ones were used to pursue manipulative strategies in addressing the opposition groups. As for President Bush, he employed exclusive first person pronouns to speak to his realist counterparts and critics. In a similar manner, Obama made use of exclusive first person pronouns to show his integrity with discordant Republicans, social middle-class, and lower class people. He does not belong to the group, but he tried to identify himself with them to create sense of sympathy. The comparison of Obama’s speech with his antecedent president’s speech revealed that he employed more linguistically inclusive pronouns.

As far as the strategic use of the third person plural ‘they’ is concerned, the critical examination of George W. Bush’s 2002 State of the Union Address and his Second Inaugural Speech suggests that this pronoun, ‘They’, was used in these speeches mostly in order to make reference to terrorist leaders, US enemies, and dissidents by formation of the otherness, generally in a negative manner, and by attributing condemnable actions to others. Notwithstanding, no sign of vilification of enemies was detected in Obama’s speeches. He rather utilized third person plural pronouns in order to refer to challenges before the nation, America’s Founding Fathers, forces of progress, etc.

5.3 Aristotelian Appeals
Considering the persuasion in light of Aristotle’s three-fold classification, the identification of logos in most of the segments of the analyzed political text might imply that logos equally increases the power of ethos due to the fact that presentation of rational argument makes the addressee look more reliable and credible. Furthermore, the identification of rhetorical devices such as parallelism, anaphoric repetition, tricolon, intertextuality, etc., between the lines of these political speeches led the researcher to assume that the use of these devices might correspond
with boosting the eloquence of speech in terms of logos appeal. In addition, the deliberate syntactic choice of structures, maintenance of the intimacy and inclusiveness in President Obama’s speech likely to give flow and contribute to logos and ethos appeal. Regarding the use of pathos, it is likely to assume that narratives and use of inclusive pronouns raise shared impression of values related to an individual’s system of judgments and beliefs.

5.4 Legitimization and Delegitimization Discursive Strategies

Generally in inaugural speeches, presidents attempt to reflect their ideologies for their term of office. In the Obama’s inaugural speech, the perspectivation strategies may be explained by his reiteration of calling for change in different forms throughout the text, whereas Bush adopted different narrations in order to vindicate his perspective for liberation and revival of human rights. In conclusion, the investigation of predication strategy in these four political speeches led the researcher to believe that the use of predication strategy correlates mostly with the use of referential (nomination) strategy in villification of enemy or praising actors, corresponding to positive self-representation and negative other-representation.
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