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Abstract
The aim of this research is to investigate the ideology manifestation of each political party (Republican and Democratic) with respect to the current issue of social, economy, politics, education, and foreign policy of the U.S. through the analysis of positive-self and negative-other presentation in the announcement speeches delivered by the candidates who run for the 2016 U.S. Presidential bid. Besides, this study also aims at investigating how the candidates from each party try to justify themselves and persuade the audience to win their consensus. The four candidates whose speeches being analyzed are Hillary Rodham Clinton, Bernie Sanders, Donald Trump, and Ben Carson. The research was conducted under the theory of Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) proposed by Dijk and Wodak. The result shows that the positive and negative-other presentation performed by the candidates through predication, referential/nomination, argumentation, perspectivation, and intensifying strategies. The presence of positive-self and negative-other presentation indicate that the manifestation of ideology in political speech is possible to be delivered through implicit assumptions and evaluative attributions.

Keywords: Positive-self and Negative-other presentation, ideology manifestation

1. Background
In recent years, there has been a significant development on research dealing with political discourse. It is not only due to the fact that politics is very close to our system, but also the development of technology that enables people from across the world to access various political event in media. Speaking of politics, we might look back to the statement...
given by Aristotle saying that humans are political animals. In a simple understanding, as human being, we inevitably practice politics in our daily life. Back in the prehistoric era, the strongest man might be the leader of a group. The members of the group would follow his command as he had shown his physical power to everyone. As the civilization develops from time to time, the concept of politics definitely changes following this development. Physical power that was used as parameter of one’s control has transformed into mind power. One of the manifestations of this power is the ability to convince other people through the use of language.

Language has been proven as one of the important components in politics. Wareing (2004:9) stated that the affective function of language is concerned with who is allowed to say what to whom. What someone says can have a strong influence on how people see things. One of the important platforms in politics that provides a chance for a politician to show his power is through a speech. Fairclough (1989:24) stated that the term political discourse refers to the whole process of interaction of which a text is just a part. Political discourses can be used for various purposes ranging from asserting knowledge, power, and ideology, to expressing resistance and critique.

Speaking of political discourse, Dijk (1997: 25) stated that discourse in this approach essentially serves as the medium by which ideologies are persuasively communicated in society, and there by helps reproduce power and dominant of specific group or classes. In order to be able to keep their dominance, the ruling groups need to reproduce their ideology to the society. Their ideology can be taken for granted if they succeed to bring awareness to the given audience. Ideology will be effective if it is taken as a common sense by the given society.

From the elaboration above, it is clear that for the ideology to be able to reproduce, it needs a medium. In this case, language in political discourse is considered the closest system that can help this process. According to Dijk (1985), texts are not used just to inform us of some reality. To this extent, they, additionally, are based on the ideological standpoints of the person, organization, etc. In their production, they construct the reality. In analyzing political discourse, Critical Discourse Analysis is considered the right platform to perform the autopsy on the discourse, either spoken or written.

Dijk socio-cognitive model is based on the assumptions that cognition mediates between discourse and society. The basic conceptual theory proposed by Dijk works on the macro and micro structure. Dijk's (2004) framework consists of two main discursive strategies of 'positive self-representation' (semantic macro-strategy of in-group favouritism) and 'negative other-representation' (semantic macro-strategy of derogation of out-group). In line with this proposition, Wodak (2009) also proposed the strategies to indicate whether a text contains a positive-self-presentation and negative-other-presentation or not.

Political discourse is meant to convince the audience in order to win the politicians’ consensus. In order to make this to happen, there are two possible ways that the candidates can perform. They could either give a good impression management or called as positive-self presentation or perform in-groups and out-groups strategy called as negative-other presentation. Dijk (2004) introduces these two strategies in the form of ideological square which consist of emphasize our good/de-emphasize our bad and emphasize other-bad/de-emphasize other good.

In order to make it easy to categorize which presentations performed by the candidates in their speech, the five discursive strategies i.e referential, predicational, perspectivation,
intensifying, and argumentative are used in analyzing the data. From these strategies, the underlying ideologies manifest in their speech can be obtained.

2. Methods

This research was conducted by collecting the transcription of the announcement speech delivered by the candidates who run for the 2016 U.S. presidential bid. The four chosen candidates are Hillary Clinton, Bernie sanders, Donald Trump, and Ben Carson. The contents of the speeches were analyzed and categorized to which positive-self and negative other presentation they belong to by using discursive strategy proposed by Wodak. The speeches were later analyzed deeper in order to find the manifestation of the speakers’ ideology.

3. Results and Discussion

Sample Analysis

Republican Candidates
Text 1 Transcript of Donald Trump

Right now, think of this: We owe China $1.3 trillion. We owe Japan more than that. So they come in, they take our jobs, they take our money, and then they loan us back the money, and we pay them in interest, and then the dollar goes up so their deal’s even better. How stupid are our leaders? How stupid are these politicians to allow this to happen? How stupid are they?

Analysis of Text 1

The negative-other presentation in this text can be seen in the statement How stupid are our leaders? How stupid are these politicians to allow this to happen? How stupid are they? This statement constructs negative traits in the social actors, which in this case, refer to the U.S. leaders. The speaker wants to show that the policy made by the current leaders actually brings big loss to the U.S economy. He criticized the foreign debt given by Japan and China. The agreement between the U.S. and the two countries costs the U.S. more loss than benefit such as the jobs that must be sent overseas as well as the interests from the debt itself. By saying that the leaders are stupid, the speaker tries to label the targeted social actors in a more negative manner.

Speaking of the manifestation of the speaker’s ideology, it is implicitly stated in the first sentence. It is clear that the speaker opposes this kind of agreement. There is an implication that the speaker is in favor of the country’s self-dependence without asking any help from other countries.

Text 2 Transcript of Ben Carson

American democracy is not about billionaires being able to buy candidates and elections. It is not about the Koch brothers, Sheldon Adelson and other incredibly wealthy individuals spending billions of dollars to elect candidates who will make the rich richer and everyone else poorer. According to media reports the Koch brothers alone, one family, will spend more money in this election cycle than either the Democratic or Republican parties. This is not democracy. This is oligarchy. In Vermont and at our town meetings we know what American democracy is supposed to be about. It is one person, one vote – with every citizen having an equal say – and no voter suppression. And that’s the kind of American political system we have to fight for and will fight for in this campaign.

Analysis of Text 2
In the first line, the speaker stated *American democracy is not about billionaires being able to buy candidates and elections*. This statement implicitly saying that what is happening right now in the U.S. is that democracy is something that can be bought by those groups who have power. It has been common knowledge that the interference of rich people in the U.S. involve money to control candidates and elections. This practice enables them to remain powerful as the policy that will later be made by those elected candidates bring them huge benefits. Those people who play this game definitely do not donate their money for nothing.

In this speech, the speaker applies negative-other presentation performed through perspectivation strategy. The affected groups from this this statement come from either the ruling authorities or the former ones. He then continued *This is not democracy. This is oligarchy*. This statement implies that the current political situation in the U.S. is actually the manifestation of oligarchy. As we know that oligarchy is a system in which a small group of people having control of a nation, organization, or institution.

Text 3 Transcript of Donald Trump

*Now, it’s very interesting. Today I heard it. Through stupidity, in a very, very hard core prison, interestingly named Clinton, two vicious murderers, two vicious people escaped, and nobody knows where they are. And a woman was on television this morning, and she said, “You know, Mr. Trump,” and she was telling other people, and I actually called her, and she said, “You know, Mr. Trump,” I always was against guns. I didn’t want guns. And now since this happened — it’s up in the prison area — “my husband and I are finally in agreement, because he wanted the guns. We now have a gun on every table. We’re ready to start shooting.” I said, “Very interesting.” So protect the Second Amendment.*

Analysis of Text 3

In this data, the speaker applied positive-self presentation formed through perspectivation strategy. In this text, the speaker spoke about the justification why the second amendment should be protected. Looking back to the context of the problem, the second amendment is a constitution which protects the right of the people in the U.S. to keep and bear arms and was adopted on December 15, 1791, as part of the first ten amendments contained in the Bill of Rights. The Supreme Courts of the United States has ruled that the rights belongs to individuals. This is in line with the classical liberal worldview which is based on criminology. It held that good citizens must always be prepared to defend themselves and their society against criminal usurpation - a characterization no less applicable to tyrannical ministers or pillaging foreign or domestic soldiery (who were, in point of fact, largely composed of criminals inducted from goals) than to apolitical outlaws (cited in www.firearmsandliberty.com) To natural law philosophers, self-defense was "the primary law of nature", the primary reason for man entering society.

In this speech, the speaker came up with a story of two murderers who escaped from prison, and nobody knows where they are now. By narrating that there was a woman who spoke to him saying that she and her husband finally agreed to bear guns because they worried of the murderers who escaped might jeopardize themselves, there is an implication that the speaker was involved and trusted. It creates a perspective that the speaker was someone who is in favor of second amendment because the way the woman spoke to him looked like someone who finally agreed to what the speaker suggested so far.

From this data, we can see the manifestation of the speaker’s ideology. It carries the ideology of self-protection. The speaker agrees with the constitution which grants the citizen
to own guns to protect themselves. In other words, it is implied that according to the speaker, the second amendment is vital to the U.S. citizens’ liberty since it provides a platform for them not to be invaded by others.

Text 3 Transcript of Ben Carson

But, I want to tell you what we’re going to do if God ordains that we end up in the White House. I’m going tell you what we are going to do. We are going to change the government into something that looks more like a well-run business a behemoth of inefficiency.

Analysis of Text 4

In the sentence We are going to change the government into something that looks more like a well-run business a behemoth of inefficiency Carson presents the current government which he called as a monstrous creature which causes inefficiency. Looking back to the background of Ben Carson as the candidates from the Republican Party, it gives an understanding that the different visions between Republican and Democratic is seen from how each representative run the country. So far, the Republican has been well known as the party which holds an ideology that country needs to support business so they can prosper and all Americans can have access to products and services. Different from the democrats who think that the tax cut must be given to middle and low income families, the Republicans believe there should be tax cuts for corporations so that they can develop. Besides, the Republicans also oppose the too much involvement of the government in the healthcare system which is considered burdening the government’s expense.

In this speech, the negative-other presentation is formed through referential or nomination strategies. It is clear that the government is represented through a categorization by the speaker. The label of behemoth of inefficiency shows that the speaker tries to attach the in-group and out-group strategy that gives a negative impression towards the mentioned party. From the speaker’s statement, it is clear that the ideology of the Republican is brought up by the speaker. The polarization of ideology shows how the speaker holds the beliefs that a country should be run like a business instead of what is happening at the moment.

Democratic Candidates

Text 1 Transcript of Bernie Sanders

As a member of Congress I voted against the war in Iraq, and that was the right vote. I am vigorously opposed to an endless war in the Middle East – a war which is unwise and unnecessary. We must be vigorous in combatting terrorism and defeating ISIS, but we should not have to bear that burden alone. We must be part of an international coalition, led by Muslim nations that can not only defeat ISIS but begin the process of creating conditions for a lasting peace.

Analysis of Text 1

In the last two decades, there have been several wars between the U.S. and the countries in the Middle East. The issue of Islamic terrorism rose after the 9/11 attack which led the U.S. to invade Afghanistan. Wars after wars have been declared, but they did not happen without criticism. Many people are against the government’s decision. The wars have been proven to bring nothing but big loss, both money and dead or wounded soldiers. The latest war is between the U.S. and Syria which is the basis of ISIS.

In this data, the positive-self presentation is formed through perspectivation strategy. Here, the speaker said that when he was member of congress, he voted against the war in Iraq. He is opposed to the endless war which is unnecessary. The way the speaker position his point
of view frames his involvement in this issue. He then added that the U.S. must join the international coalitions in combatting the terrorism.

From the way the speaker shows his objection towards the war, it is seen that he is not in favor of the U.S. attitude so far in the Middle East. Especially in the statement that the U.S. must not bear this burden alone. This is of course contradictory with the concept of world police that the U.S. applies for decades. As seen from the U.S. involvement in the Middle East so far, we can see that there is hidden agenda behind it. Therefore, we can conclude that the speaker is not in the same line with the ideology of the U.S. government towards world peace.

Text 2 Transcript of Hillary Clinton

Well, instead of a balanced budget with surpluses that could have eventually paid off our national debt, the Republicans twice cut taxes for the wealthiest, borrowed money from other countries to pay for two wars, and family incomes dropped. You know where we ended up.

Analysis of Text 2

The decision of the Republicans in cutting the taxes for the wealthiest is based on the ideology of the party itself. The Republican Party has long been known as the party of business. In their members’ understanding, if the country would leave the economy in their hands, business would boom. The investment in the wealthy will produce remarkable economic growth.

From the philosophy of the party itself, it is understandable why the policy of cutting taxes for big corporations and the wealthiest could come into final decision. The policy brings benefits to those corporation because they could earn more money. But for some people who stand against their ideology, of course, think this policy is actually the source of the problem.

In this speech, the speaker uses negative-other presentation formed through argumentation strategy. In the first sentence, the clause instead of a balanced budget with surpluses that could have eventually paid off our national debt indicates that actually, the national debt can be paid off if a balanced budget can be achieved. But instead of doing so, the Republicans, who in this case might belong to the decision makers cut taxes from the wealthiest. The tax cut means less money to the national income. Moreover, they borrowed money to finance the war. These two actions of course influenced the national balance sheet.

From this text, we can see that the speaker is totally against the Republicans’ vision which has labelled themselves as the party of business. The manifestation of the speaker can be seen from the way she criticized the policies made by the Republicans.

Text 3 Transcript of Bernie Sanders

Today, we live in the wealthiest nation in the history of the world but that reality means very little for most of us because almost all of that wealth is owned and controlled by a tiny handful of individuals. In America we now have more income and wealth inequality than any other major country on earth, and the gap between the very rich and everyone is wider than at any time since the 1920s. The issue of wealth and income inequality is the great moral issue of our time, it is the great economic issue of our time and it is the great political issue of our time. And we will address it.

Analysis of Text 3

The speaker in this speech applies negative-other presentation through argumentation strategy. In this data, the speaker said that the U.S. is one of the wealthiest country, but in fact, the distribution of wealth is not fair among the U.S. citizens. The presentation of other party is not clearly stated. But if we look back to the context, we can find out that the speaker
tries to attach a negative attribution to the people and the government of the U.S. who have created the problem of income and wealth inequality.

In the sentence “...because almost all of that wealth is owned and controlled by a tiny handful of individuals”, it can be inferred that the wealth that is supposed to be distributed evenly to all U.S. citizens is owned and controlled by individuals. The individuals here refer to the upper class society who gets benefit from the policies applied now. As mentioned in the previous data analysis, the tax system which is beneficial only for the wealthiest has caused the gap between the classes.

From this speech, it is seen that the speaker puts the blame on the policies makers who lead the condition into current wealth inequality. Therefore, we can identify the manifestation of the speaker’s ideology which is against the concept of capitalism.

Text 4 Transcript of Hillary Clinton
And they turn their backs on gay people who love each other.

Analysis of Text 4
The Republican Party is commonly referred to the GOP (abbreviation for Grand Old Party). As reflected by its name, this party’s platform is generally based on American conservatism. By holding its socially conservative policies and traditional values which is in line with Christian overtone, the Republicans are always against the recognition of gay people’s existence. Moreover, the concept of marriage according to traditional and religious value is a bond between man and woman. Therefore, it is impossible that the Republicans will support same-sex marriage because it is against the human nature.

In this data, the speaker applies negative-other presentation formed through predicational strategy. The speaker said that they turned their backs on gay people. It implies that those Republicans ignore the existence of American gay people. Gay people are also human being, and they need companionship. One if the rights that the gay people have struggled for decades is marriage. By opposing the same sex marriage legalization, they do not give a chance for those people to follow their intuition to love each other. From this elaboration, we can see that the speaker tries to attach a negative attribution as the phrase turn their backs can be understood as being ignorant.

From this speech, the manifestation of the speaker’s ideology can be seen. The speaker is in favor of same sex marriage. She does not hold a conservative thoughts which is based on traditional value and religion.

Having all the data analyzed, the result shows that the manifestation of ideology revealed by the candidates is mostly performed through negative-other presentation. The data concluding can be seen in figure 1 as follows:
The negative other-presentation performed by the candidates is categorized based on the five discursive strategies. Figure 2 presents the concluding data.

![Figure 2. Concluding data of negative-other presentation](image)

### 4. Conclusion

From the data analysis, it is found that the most common strategy occurs in the speeches is negative-other presentations which are performed through predicational strategy. It is shown by its presence in the speech delivered by Hillary Clinton (5 times), Donald Trump (4 times), and Ben Carson (1 time). The fact that negative-other presentation performed through predicational strategy happens to be the most in occurrence shows that by labeling social actors in a more negative way, the speakers give an evaluative attribution in order to emphasize their positive-self presentation. This is to enable them to invest their ideology in the audience.
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