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Abstract

In finding the ideologies, the researcher uses CDA (Critical Discourse Analysis) as a tool. By using this analysis model, three main steps were applied: text analysis, discourse practice, and sociocultural practice. It was found that in text analysis, there are 21 repetitions spoken by Obama in his campaign speech, 2 synonymies, 7 hyponymy, 4 metonymies, and 6 antonyms. In the level of discourse practice, in opening, it was found that there are three main regularities in speech; these are phatic expressions, emotive function, and thanking. In content, the regularities are the use of jargon, poetic expressions and directive expressions. In closing, the regularities are sequenced first by uttering the supportive utterance, poetic expressions, and farewell greeting. In terms of sociocultural practice, it was found that there are 9 direct responses, applause for 77 times, laughter for 12 times, and last response by sneezing appears for once. Going through those steps, the researcher concludes three dominant ideologies uttered by Obama: these are “Forwarding United State is needed”, “No choice except choosing Obama”, and “Raising tax is improper to raise citizen’s prosperity”.
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1. INTRODUCTION

Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) had become a very influential academic study activity among subjects in political, social, educational, and linguistic sciences. Some researchers found that language is used as a social practice (Eissa, 2015; Fauzan, 2015; Unchit, 2016; CHEW, 2016). It sees language as social practice. It can be used to reveal the content of a discourse and then determine its impact on the recipient of the text (Briones, 2016). It also examined ideological manipulations and power relation used among people manifested in texts. It is interested to investigate an influential politician’s way to use exclusion and inclusion strategy through his political discourse.

The concepts of discourse, genre, and style were intimately connected with each other. They were dealing with the macro and micro levels of sociological and linguistic studies. Macro and micro deal with the language use, discourse, verbal interaction, and communication belong to the microlevel of the social order. Power, dominance, and inequality between social groups were typically terms that belong to a macrolevel of analysis. Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) is uncovering of implicit ideologies in texts. It outlined the underlying ideological prejudices and therefore the exercise of power in texts (Widdoson, 2000:157). CDA analysis sees the macro level as well as the micro level of analysis.

Obama’s ability in playing politics played main character in delivering his speech in front of at least fifteen thousands of his stalwarts at Fort Collins. His campaign speech was looked so life and adorable by anyone else. Politics has been a struggle for power necessary to put certain political, economic and social ideas into practice. In this process, language played a crucial role. Every political action was prepowered, accompanied, influenced and played by language.

The attempt to link social practice and linguistic practice, as well as micro and macro analysis of discourse (Fairclough 1989: 97). At the same time, the analytical part of analysis would analyze the possible relation of textual properties and power relations, which is also underpinned in Fairclough’s conceptual work. Norman Fairclough's assumptions, in Critical Discourse Analysis, claims that ideologies reside in texts that it is not possible to remove or ignore ideologies from texts and that texts were open to diverse interpretations.

The analytical part of this study work analyzed the possible ideologies of textual properties and power relations, which is also grounded on Fairclough’s conceptual work on Barack Obama’s persuasive strategies showing the relationship between language, ideology and reality. This work would investigate the ability to empower the people with a new political power in speech and analyze Barack Obama’s presidential speeches mainly from the politics’ point, in which the readers can learn how the language serves the ideology and power. Moreover, the readers would have had a better understanding of the political purpose of the speech. This study would try to identify a main question related to President Barack Obama’s campaign speech analyzed critically by using a
critical discourse analysis. This study would constantly identify “What ideologies were brought by Obama in his campaign speech?”. This study concerned to answer a main question related to President Barack Obama’s campaign speech analyzed critically by using a critical discourse analysis. Then, this critical discourse analysis would analyze the ideologies brought by Barrack Obama in his campaign speech that further can influence Americans to get his final aim, that is provocating Americans to vote him instead.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Discourse Analysis

Discourse analysis is concerned with the study of the relationship between language and contexts in which it is used. It grew out of work in different disciplines in 1960s and early 1970s, including linguistics, semiotics, psychology, anthropology, and sociology. Discourse analysis study language in use; written texts of all kinds and spoken data from conversation to highly institutionalized forms of talks. At the time when linguistics was largely concerned with the analysis of single sentences, Harris published a paper with the title ‘Discourse Analysis’ (Harris 1952). In 1960s, Hymes provided a sociological perspective with the study of speech in its social setting. The linguistic philosophers such as Austin (1962), Searle (1969), Grice (1975) were also influential in the study of language as social action, reflected in speech-act theory and the formulation of the conversational maxims, alongside the emerge of pragmatics which is study of meaning in context (Levinson, Leech 1983).

Cook (1989) points out that discourse Analysis is the search of what makes discourse coherence. Hatch (1992) defines discourse Analysis as the study of language for communication. Meanwhile, Brown and Yule (1996) state that discourse Analysis is the study of how forms of language were used in communication. Agreeing with the above definitions, discourse Analysis is basically the study of the underlying systems of discourse. Systems here, however, were different from rules in theoretical linguistics or laws in physical sciences, but rather the refer to regularities (Brown and Yule, 1996). Thus, discourse Analysis is very much concerned with the regularities of occurrence of linguistics features, such as the regularities of occurrence of references, cohesive devices, staging, etc (Chojimah, 2011).

The use of various cohesive ties to explicitly link together all of the proportions in a text results in cohesion of that text. The most obvious structural features of such connected discourse were the cohesive ties identified and discussed by Halliday and Hasan (1976, 1989). There were many grammatical ties such as reference, ellipsis, substitution, and conjunction. According to Renkema, cohesion always deals with the connections evidences in the discourse (1993:40). The cohesion of the text is a result of all these cohesive ties, which link together the words and proportions occurring in the texts.
2.2 Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA)

There were many types of CDA and these may be theoretically and analytically diverse. Critical Discourse Analysis of conversations is very different from an analysis of speeches or of news reports in the press or of lessons and teaching at school. Yet, the common perspective and the general aims of CDA, there can also be overall conceptual and theoretical frameworks that were closely related. “Most kinds of CDA would ask questions about the way specific discourse structures were deployed in the reproduction of social dominance, whether they were part of a conversation or a news report or other genres and contexts” (Van Dijk 1998:131).

Fairclough considered scheme of analysis theoretically on quite specific definitions of some concept that we have to know. The following key terms were helpful to be used in understanding the main knowledge of critical discourse analysis. The key terms would appropriately be helpful in understanding his approach (Fairclough, 1993: 138):

- Discourse (abstract noun) – language use conceived as social practice.
- Discursive event – instance of language use, analyzed as text, discursive practice, and social practice.
- Text – the written or spoken language produced in discursive event. Later, Fairclough emphasizes the multi-semiotic character of the texts and adds visual images and sound such as television.

Fairclough’s understands CDA to be concerned with the investigation of the tension between two assumptions about language use that language is both socially constitutive and determined. The objectives may be derived from the theoretical foundations: “Though in different terms, and from different point of view, most of us deal with power, dominance, hegemony, inequality, discursive processes of their enactment, concealment, legitimating, and reproduction. And many of us were interested in the subtle means by which text and talk manage the mind and manufacture consent, on the one hand, and articulate and sustain resistance and challenge, on the other (Van Dijk 1993)”

CDA sees itself as politically involved research with an emancipator requirement is seeks to have an effort on social practice and social relationship, for example in teacher development, in the elaboration of guidelines for non-sexist language use in proposal to increase the intelligibility of news of legal text. CDA is not only analyzing the text, but also discourse. Within the orders of discourse, Fairclough distinguishes two categories of discourse type, discourses and genres. ‘Discourses’ were formed on the basis of specific areas of experience and knowledge; ‘genres’ were related to the types of activity, such as job interview, media interview, or advertising. Discourse is used because the term discourses to refer to the whole process of social interaction of which text is just a part (Fairclough, 1989).
Critical discourse analysis is often associated with studying power relations. This concept of critical is rooted in the Frankfurt school of critical theory (Adorno, 1793; Adorno and Horkeimer, 1972; Habermas, 1976). Corson raised an important thing pointed concerning the nature of critical discourse work. The intensions of the analyst always guide the theory and method of CDA. Within this framework of critical, the analyst’s intention is to uncover power relationship and demonstrate inequities embedded in society. In this framework, the analyst may believe that the uncovering of the power relationships in their analysis may lead to disrupting the power relations in the social contexts in which they study. Discourse practice, social problems, and ideology are some of the principles of CDA.

CDA explains how social relations of power were exercised and negotiated in and through discourse (Fairclough & Wodak, 1997). It refers to the analysis on how the text is produced or might be interpreted. Discursive practice-through which texts were produced (created) and consumed (received and interpreted) – were viewed as an important form of social practice which contributes to the constitution of the social world including social identities and social relations. It is partly through discursive practices in everyday life (processes of the text production and consumption) that social and cultural reproduction and change take place. It follows that the societal phenomena were not of a linguistic discursive character (Jorgensen, 2002). The aim of critical discourse analysis is to shed light on the linguistics discursive dimension of social and cultural phenomena and processes of change in late modernity. Research in critical discourse analysis has covered areas such as organizational analysis (e.g. Mumby and Clair, 1997), pedagogy (Chouliaraki, 1999), mass communication and racism, nationalism, and economy (Richardson, 1998), and mass communication, democracy, and politics (Fairclough 19951, 2000; Jorgensen, 2002; Fauzan, 2015; Fauzan, 2016).

The second principle is that CDA addresses social problems. CDA not only focuses on language and language use, but also on the linguistic characteristics of social and cultural processes. For critical discourse analysts, discourse is a form of social practice which both constitutes the social world and is constituted by other practices. As social practice, discourse is in a dialectical relationship with other social dimensions. It does not just contribute the shaping and reshaping of social structures but also reflects them (Jorgensen, 2010). CDA follows a critical approach to social problems to make explicit power relationships which were frequently hidden. It aims to derive results which were of practical relevance to the social, cultural, political and even economic contexts (Fairclough & Wodak, 1997). Language is not only socially constitutive, but also viewed as socially constituted or determined. According to Fairclough this is very complex relationship; on the one hand very different types of discourse may coexist within the same institution, while on the other hand the relationship between actual language use and the underlying conventions and norms is not a simple linear one (Fairclough, 1993).
Ideology is meaning construction. According to Fairlough, language is a material form of ideology. Furthermore, he says that ideology is construction of meaning that contribute to the production, reproduction, and transformation of relation domination (in Jongersen, 2002). The first principle is that CDA addresses social problems. CDA not only focuses on language and language use, but also on the linguistic characteristics of social and cultural processes. CDA follows a critical approach to social problems in its endeavours to make explicit power relationships which were frequently hidden. It aims to derive results which were of practical relevance to the social, cultural, political and even economic contexts (Fairclough & Wodak, 1997). Ideology, for Fairclough, is meaning in the service of power. More precisely, he understands ideologies as constructions of meaning that contribute to the production, reproduction, and transformation of relations of domination (Fairclough, 1992b; 87). Ideologies were created in societies in which relations and dominations were based on social structures such as class and gender. According to Fairclough’s definition, discourses can be more or less ideological, the ideological discourses being those that contribute to the maintenance and transformation of power relations. Our view is that there is a problem in operationalizing this definition. The question is power or dominance relations in society. It is difficult to distinguish between what is ideology and what is not (Jorgensen, 2002).

For the systematical operationalization of the theoretical considerations, Fairclough develops an analytical framework (Fairclough 1993, 1995a), and relates to this the concepts of interdiscursivity (that is, the combination of genres and discourse in a text) and hegemony (the predominance in and dominance in political, ideological and cultural domains of society) (Fairclough, 1995:76). He attributes three dimensions to every discursive event. According to Fairclough, there were three main elements consisting on critical discourse analysis, these were text analysis, discourse practice, and social practice (1995: 98). The key concepts applied by Fairclough in 3 different ways and every instance of language use is communicative event consisting of three dimensions, these were text, discursive practice, and social practice.

*Text analysis* refers to the analysis on the internal elements of the text. It encompasses the analysis on the vocabulary, grammar, syntax, and sentence coherency by which the messages were linguistically realized. As the domain of the linguistics, a researcher here is supposed to analyze the aspects of language such as meaning, sentence structure, politeness, diction, and many other aspects that should be considered. This unit, however, focuses on the diction and the language functions used on the speech’s text (Chojimah: 2011). At the *text level*, content and form were analyzed. Instead of form, Fairclough speaks of textual organization and texture, which relates to the work of Halliday and Hasan (1976). These two terms –Content and form/texture- were separable: Contents were realized by particular form; different content also implies different form and vice versa. The form is therefore a part of content (Fairclough 1992). By linguistic analysis of a text, Fairclough means phonology, grammar, vocabulary,
The relationship between texts and social practice is mediated by the discursive practice or usually we called as discourse practice. Hence it is only through discursive practice – whereby people use language to produce and consume texts influences both the production and the consumption process. (Fairclough 1992b). Those discourses and genres which were articulated together to produce a text, and structure that shapes both the production and consumption of the text. The analysis of a communicative event thus includes: Analysis of discourses and genres which were articulated in the production and the consumption of the text (the level of discursive practice); Analysis of the linguistics structure (the level of the text); and Considerations about whether the discursive practice reproduces or instead restructures the existing order of discourse and about what consequences this has the broader social practice (the level of social practice). Discourse practice is also the domain of the linguistics. Here, a researcher is supposed to find out the patterns of the text either the text belong to advertisement, speech, news, etc.

The last stage is socio-cultural practice phase. This is the phase whereby the analysis on how discourse practices operate at a number of levels, in the immediate situation, in the wider situation or organization, and at a social level is discussed. Besides, the implication of discourse practices toward society is also touched upon in this step (Chojimah: 2011). Principally, the researcher tries to find out the impact of language to the society. In this case, the readers were hopefully can see the ideologies brought by the speaker by using his/her utterances. In Barrack Obama’s speech, the researcher would try hard to analyze his speech text to find his ideologies as the meaning construction that he used to persuade his stalwarts to vote him.

2.2.3 Political Campaign

Campaign is really playing apart as one of the important thing before Election Day comes; campaign seems to be effective to attract the voters to pay more attention about the candidate’s programs. And there were several reasons to believe that campaigns were important to the election outcome, despite the evidence to the contrary. First, recent research has found that the number of potentially persuadable voters could be as high as 25% (Hillygus and Shields, 2008). This was the percentage of voters who strongly believe in an issue not traditionally supported by the party they identify with in the 2004 presidential election. Therefore any small difference in the campaigns could make a larger impact than previously thought. Second, if a candidate did not campaign at all, many voters would be uncertain about the candidate and uncertainty has been found to have a negative effect on voters (Alwerez, 1997). Furthermore, it is certainly believable that if a candidate ran a counterproductive campaign, the number of loyal voters for that party would decline in that election.
There were four types discussed in the literature related to campaign: *persuasion*, *priming*, *mobilization*, and *strategic alteration*. Persuasion is when a campaign is successful in switching the intended vote of a voter. Priming is just like what Ford’s campaign team wrote, “If past is indeed prologue, you would lose on November 2nd – because to win you must do what has never been done: close a gap of about 20 points in 73 days from the base of a minority party while spending approximately the same amount of money as your opponent...You cannot overcome the Carter lead on your own, no matter what you do” (Campaign Strategy for President Ford, 1976) where campaigns make a certain issue or consideration salient to a particular voter. Mobilization is when campaigns cause a voter to vote. Finally, strategic alteration is where campaigns change the decision calculus of a voter, such as voting for the candidate most likely to win, not the one closest to them ideologically.

3. FINDINGS

There were four main styles of responses given by the stalwarts toward Obama’s hegemony; these were in the form of direct responses, applause, laughter, and sneezes. Basically, the researcher counts there were 9 direct responses, 77 responses for applause, 15 times for laughter, and once for sneezes. For every single response given by the society, the meanings of the responses were totally diverse and interpretable.

All in all, the researcher sums up that in finding the ideologies of Barrack Obama at his campaign speech, there were three primary steps which should be done; these steps were text analysis, discourse practice, and sosiocultural practice. In text analysis, the researcher concerns to analyze the lexical cohesion of the case in the form of repetition, synonymy, antonym, hyponymy, and metonymy.

**Table 1: The Frequency of Cohesive Devices**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Types of Cohesion</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Repetition</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Synonymy</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Hyponymy</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Antonymy</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Metonymy</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

After understanding them, we come in to the next level named “discourse practice” in which we analyze the regular regularities of Obama’s speech in three primary parts. In opening, the researcher found that the regularities of the opening of Barrack Obama’s speech were including the use of phatic expressions, emotive functions, and thanking. The deeper analysis is concerned to the content and the researcher found there were three regularities were analyzed, these were the regularities of jargon, the regularities of
poetic expressions, and the regularities of directive expressions. In closing, there were the regularities of poetic, simile, and a closing greeting indeed. Last, the step of sociocultural practice is used to analyze the feedbacks given by the audiences toward Obama’s hegemony.

Table 2: The Regularities of Speech Content

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Regularities</th>
<th>Expressions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>The use of jargon</td>
<td>FORWARD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GottaRegister not GottoRegister</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I Believe in You</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>The use of poetic expressions</td>
<td>No matter your last name is, you can pursue your own happiness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Campaign seems manner and smaller, Washington seems more gridlocked than ever!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>We go forward, we don’t go backward!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>The use of directive expressions</td>
<td>Get Registered!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Don’t boo, vote!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Now, look, show in Tampa!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ask your friends, ask your neighbors!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Luckily, the researcher found that there were four kinds of responses given in the form of direct feedback, applause, laughter, and sneeze.

Table 3: The Frequency of Responses Of Sosiocultural Practice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Spoken responses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I love you!</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Boo!</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>You did!</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>With your help!</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Four more years!</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No!</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bless you!</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Response in the form of applause</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Response in the form of laughter</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Response in the form of sneezes</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

After having those three primary steps above, the researcher can conclude that there were three important ideologies brought by Obama in his campaign speech, these are: firstly, By, his main jargon “FORWARD” and some other jargons consisted of the word
FORWARD; Obama creates the meaning that “Something forward is something good in development”. It aims to make a whole understanding that for four previous years, Obama has leaded United States to be forward and developed in many aspects of life, and for the future four years, he can totally lead United States to be more FORWARD in many aspects that lead the citizens of America to be more prosperous and developed. Secondly, By his primary poetic motto of campaign “GottaRegister not GottoRegister, Obama creates a meaning construction that “Registering to vote him is a must”. Obama builds his power dominancy by stating that registering to the voting booth is a must to all people who want to see United States moves forward. Thirdly, Based on the explanations of Obama’s view related to Romney’s plan to raise the taxes, Obama creates his ideology that “Raising the taxes is decreasing the citizens’ prosperity”. Consciously, Obama constructs the meaning to give the description that what were planned by Romney can make the citizens spend much money and time to do something wasteful. So that, the citizens unconsciously aware that raising the taxes based Romney’s plan is decreasing their prosperity.

4. DISCUSSION

Background study of this research reveals that there must be something hidden behind the text, explicitly on the surface of the discourse. Ideologies will be found by using a specific analysis in the framing of critical discourse. This way is usually called as CDA (Critical Discourse Analysis). the analytical part of this study also analyzed the possible relation of textual properties and power relations, which is also underpinned in Fairclough’s conceptual work. Furthermore, this study work would attempt to deconstruct ideology which is ‘hidden’ in the text – President Barrack Obama’s campaign speech, considering at the theoretical hypothesis of the Critical Discourse Analysis.

The objective of Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) is to perceive language use as social practice. The users of language do not function in isolation, but in a set of cultural, social and psychological frameworks. Critical discourse analysis (CDA) accepts this social context and studies the connections between textual structures by taking this social context into account and explores the links between textual structures and their function in interaction within the society. One of the objectives of CDA is to create a framework for decreasing this said opacity.

In the basic of the theory of Fairclough, there were three main primary steps in finding the ideologies of Barrack Obama in his campaign speech, these main steps were; text analysis, discourse practice, and sociocultural practice. In case of text analysis of this research, the researcher concerns to the lexical cohesion that consists of repetition, synonymy, antonym, hyponymy, and metonymy. In analyzing the discourse practice, the researcher analyzed the regularities of three main parts of speech such as the regularities of opening, content, and closing. Further analysis is concerned to sociocultural practice is which is used to analyze the feedbacks given by the audiences.
toward Obama’s hegemony in the form of direct responses, applause, laughter, and sneezing. After having those three primary steps above, the researcher can conclude that there were three important ideologies brought by Obama.

Critical discourse analysis tries to reveal that language is used as a social practice; the presence of polarization in presenting news to readers and there is an ideological structures of polarized discourse coded in the reports of two online news websites in Egypt (Eissa, 2015), televisions used different language use and strategy because they are affiliating to two different political parties, which have different ideology and they want to attract the people’s sympathy (Fauzan, 2015), and the content of a discourse and then determine its impact on the recipient of the text (Briones, 2016).

5. CONCLUSION

All in all, the researcher sums up that in the basic of the interpretation of the whole meaning constructions of Barrack Obama’s ideologies of his campaign speech, it is understandable that there is no any neutral discourse. Obama brought his ideologies through his hegemony by consciously spreading what he means to influence the society that the things he brought to the public were unconsciously true for the society. After understanding the text analysis, discourse practice, and sociocultural practice, we come in to the next level named finding the ideologies. After having those three primary steps above, the researcher can conclude that there were three important ideologies brought by Obama is his campaign speech, these were: (1) Something forward is something good in development, (2) Registering to vote Obama is a must, and (3) Raising the taxes is decreasing the citizens’ prosperity.
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