Empowerment In Romney's 2012 Presidential Debate: A Critical Pragmatic Perspective

By

Ahmed Ibrahim Abed

University of Babylon, College of Education for Human Sciences, Department of English/Iraq
Email: Ahmed.aziz@student.uobabylon.edu.iq

Hussein Hameed Mayuuf

University of Babylon, College of Education for Human Sciences, Department of English/Iraq
Email: hum.Hussain.hameed@uobabylon.edu.iq

Abstract

The present study deals with a critical pragmatic analysis for analyzing empowerment as a social and pragmatic act that is critically manifested by the American candidate namely, Romney. It discusses the pragmatic discourse of empowering speech by the American Presidents and the use of the strategies of power. In order to better understand its objectives, which include identifying the most prevalent linguistic criteria, ideological forms and strategies, most outstanding pragmatic strategies, socio-cultural dimensions and variables, pragmatic functions of empowerment, the study attempts to build a model. The following steps can be taken to accomplish these goals: analyzing the literature on pragmatics' criticality; establishing operational definitions; outlining the idea of empowerment and disempowerment within the American people; and a practical model is made to analyze the data that is randomly chosen from the American presidential debates. This model is an eclectic model based on both critical pragmatics and critical discourse theories namely, dialectical approach by "Norman Fairclough (1992), Wodak's Historical Approach (2001), Van Dijk's Socio-cognitive Approach (1995) and Van Leeuwen's Social Actor Approach". The researcher selects five presidential debates of "*Trump and Clinton 2016*" and "*Romney and Obama 2012*". This study presents applicable conclusions. Candidates use ideological strategies to convey empowerment and disempowerment; pragmatics plays a crucial role in interpreting the act of empowerment discourse critically.

1.   Introduction

New studies on the concept of power, for instance, focus on expressions and aspects in discourse, especially in conversational settings. Power "involves the power to influence in one's favor the forces that affect one's life area."

According to Fairclough (1989), the term "critical" is used to show how language, power, and ideology are related. Language is a tool for social construction, according to critical discourse analysts "Norman Fairclough," "Ruth Wodak, and Teun van Dijk. It both shapes and is shaped by social processes. Ideologies are reproduced, legitimized, and naturalized as "acceptable" society standards through the use of discursive activities like texts and images (Fairclough, 2001).

The idea of empowerment seems to be the result of a number of criticisms and discussions sparked by the international feminist movement. For the first time, in his book

Pedagogy of the Oppressed (1996), Freire explores "empowerment." Several academics who agree with him, particularly those who believe it to be a significant step for women's emancipation, followed him. It is described as a redistribution of power by Moser (1993). However, although being commonly used, the concept of "empowerment" is rarely defined. Confusion around the idea of empowerment arises because the fundamental definition of "power" is up for debate. Power is viewed as a source of debate in social science. Some definitions place a strong emphasis on a person's ability to convince a person or group to act in a way that goes against their desires. Making judgments, engaging in conflict, using force, or having the ability to create friendships based on love, and legitimacy, among other things, are examples of this kind of power (Rowland, 1997).

The current study falls within the realm of critical pragmatics in the American presidential debates. In this concern, the researcher here tries to deal with the criticality of pragmatic analysis of the language of empowerment in the context of American Presidential Debates. The modelof this study is "Norman Fairclough (1992),Wodak's Historical Approach (2001), Van Dijk's Socio-cognitive Approach (1995), Van Leeuwen (2008) and Mey's 2001. Ideologies are embedded within interactional mechanisms of the different kinds of social actions through which empowerment are accomplished in political practices. Yet, the problem of this study will be posed as the following questions:

1.   What is the critical pragmatic structure of analysis in the context of American Presidential Debates?
2.   How is the empowerment of the individual constituted by the empowerment of others in meaningful relationship to them?

2.1 Critical Theory

Critical theory refers to a school of thought that originated in Frankfurt, Germany between 1929/1930 and the present day, including multiple historical periods and generations. (Bohman, 2016: p. 1). Any philosophical approach with close practical goals, such as feminism, post-colonialism, and critical race theory, is referred to as critical theory (ibid.).

"The Frankfurt school identifies three unique theses for critical theories: they have a specific position as a guide to human activity, they have cognitive substance (i.e., they are forms of knowledge), and they are reflective. As a philosophical endeavor, its primary interest is the critical evaluation and analysis of society and culture based on humanities and social science knowledge " ((Geuss 1981: p.3). In terms of Horkheimer (2002: p.244), a theory is significant if it tries to "liberate human beings from conditions that enslave them".

Society is the focus of critical theory, which supposedly originates from "Marx's" work and is described in the critique of ideology (Geuss, 1981: p.3). Its constitutional assertion explains the origins of the current and future state of affairs (How, 2003: p.3). Critical theory's core promise is to justify and explain how to contribute to the moral and ethical development of society, accordingly, critical theory must take into account the progress of social morality and ethics (Leist, 2008: p.1).

Fraser (2003: p.245) adds that the objective of the critical theory of society is to incorporate the social sciences into philosophy. Nonetheless, numerous fields of study can be merged into critical studies due to their shared interests in sociology, anthropology, psychology, literary theory, political sciences, ethnography, history, etc. (Bloor and Bloor, 2007: p.2).

2.1.1 A Critical Discourse Analysis

Critical discourse analysis has been on the search for new linguistics-related fields and professions in recent years as a means of addressing unresolved issues. Additionally, the models of discourse analysis (DA) and CDA are developed in order to supply an interdisciplinary model in which different parts of discourse methodology are related with other disciplines that are relevant to CDA in some way (Wodak and Chilton, 2005: XI).Consequently, they emphasize the idea that discourse is an interdisciplinary subfield with numerous disciplines, pragmatics being the most prominent (Wodak and Chilton , 2005: XI).

This section provides a brief overview of CDA's fundamental principles, goals, relationship to ideology, and most practical models, including "Failcough's dialectical approach, Wodak's discourse historical approach, van Dijk's socio-cognitive approach, and van Leeuwen's social actor approach", in order to connect CDA to other disciplines.

Depending on the paradigm they employ, diverse approaches have generated a range of CDA definitions. Fairclough (1993: p.134) describes a CDA as the "interaction between discursive practices, events, and texts; and socio-cultural processes," or what "causes and determines" these connections. In his concept of CDA, van Dijk (1997a: p.3) emphasizes the reproduction of specific social situations by highlighting the sources of power, domination, prejudice, and social inequality. According to Van Leeuwen (2006, p. 290), a CDA is crucial to the application of several linguistics schools. He draws significantly from systemic functional grammar, which asserts that language serves the ideational, interpersonal, and textual purposes (Halliday, 1997: p.33).

Follower et al. (1979: p.185) provides a novel way to linguistics that combines the hidden derivations of language usage with contextual elements for accurate interpretation. The primary method utilized by the critical linguistics school is providing critical commentary on a specific dialogue at multiple levels of micro and macrolinguistic devices. In terms of "critical", it is derived from the Marxist-influenced Frankfurt School of Philosophy. In this instance, "important" refers to the interpretive and explanatory part, which is contingent upon the language analysis of the entire scenario. Although CDA has been tried and explored by multiple practitioners, resulting in conflicts and the development of various ways, there are basic tenets on which the vast majority of these practitioners agree, and this research seeks to disclose those meanings (van Dijk, 2003: p.353).

Ramanathan and Hoon (2014: p.58) provide a summary of the central goals of CDA as a result. Since CDA's inception, four theories have offered and proposed models for assessing text using CDA tools, each of which makes an attempt to produce a holistic portrait of discourse as a social practice in the vein of Ali and Abdulkareem (2019: p.28).

3. Pragmatics and CDA

Each of the aforementioned methods focuses on three interconnected core concepts: society, culture, and cognition, after considering language realizations and tactics. CDA practitioners should pay special attention to context in this situation, as it connects to all three of these principles in a manner consistent with van Dijk (1998b: p.3). According to (Brown and Levinson, 1987), language's use to provide courtesy is a fundamental aspect of civilization.

Opponents have noted several deficiencies in the CDA based on a variety of arguments. Beginning with Widdowson (1995a: p.158), he criticizes CDA on two levels "The requirement for clear distinctions between text and discourse. In other words, it is uncertain when a particular section of language constitutes text or dialogue". On a deeper level, CDA has a bad

reputation for being biased since its practitioners can't help but bring their own preconceived notions and prejudices into their work (ibid: 169).

According to Widdowson (2004, p. 97), CDA requires both theoretical and practical revisions. Not only are concepts like action, power, and emancipation the results of CDA, but they are also its guiding principles. The reader's entire process of interpretation is eliminated by this approach. It is believed that linguistic theories and systematic CDA research are related.

Wodak (2007: p. 203) asserts that "pragmatics is a good strategy for overcoming CDA's unresolved concerns" by focusing on the breadth of the context and multidisciplinary methods. After indirectness and context-dependence, several transdisciplinary concepts—such as allusion, shared knowledge, and background assumptions from Searle 1970, as well as mutual manifestations and common-sense knowledge from van Dijk—are included (2005).

Pragmatics is crucial to discourse analysis, especially in terms of being critical. Ji (2009: p. 23) contends that speakers might utilize pragmatic assumption to normalize particular beliefs, which then affect the collective consciousness of the reader. Here is a second opportunity for pragmatics to join the CDA team.

Recent studies into the role of pragmatics in CDA seeks to identify all possible interactions among CDA and pragmatics. Chen (2020: p. 25-6) shows through three arguments why all pragmatic concepts are essential for CDA by addressing all three concerns CDA is seen as highly subjective since most practitioners are biased and prejudiced, and because semantic/pragmatic discrepancies are not addressed. The CDA-based latent ideologies conclusions lack detailed accounts and explanations of how particular ideologies were developed. The statement "Britain was overrun by an army of illegal immigrants" is implicitly racist. However, there is no persuasive reason for the expression of these ideas. CDA is applicable not only to the analysis of ideological expressions, but also to the investigation of several other social problems such as fraud, linguistic ugliness, and uncertainty that underlie the usage of languages (ibid).

Pragmatics may address both positive and negative ideologies in response to the claim that the CDA shows some views in an unfavorable light. In other words, pragmatics can be utilized to counteract implicitly negative or positive attitudes in conversation. Verscheren claims that depending on the situation and pragmatic application, it may contain both excellent and terrible ideas (2009).

Therefore, pragmatics has the capacity to explain the CDA issue in a way that is more objective. Critical discourse analysis should be viewed as a comprehensive method because it is quite related to pragmatics.

The three linguistics subfields that are most intimately related to one another are pragmatics, (critical) discourse analysis, and sociolinguistics, according to Reisgil (2007: p. 20–6). Instead of a hierarchical framework, these interactions are based on a circular one. In other words, some subfields may be dominating at some levels while being submissive at others (ibid: 13).

Mey (2001: p. 6) inserts CDA in his taxonomy of pragmatics, highlighting the idea of criticality in pragmatics, as a sub discipline of macro-pragmatics overlapping with social-pragmatics and intercultural pragmatics. This explanation of CDA was drawn from Verschueren's (1999: p. 7) inclusion of discourse analysis as a branch of pragmatics. Contrary

to what some pragmatists and sociolinguists claim, pragmatics is merely one branch of discourse analysis, according to Schiffrin (1994) and Gumperz (2001). This is illustrative of the differing viewpoints on the question of the paternity of the child in question.

Beyond this defense, it is simple to draw a link between pragmatics and discourse analysis. Therefore, these disciplines must finally support one another. Discourse analysis must be able to examine a wide range of text types and contexts as a method or approach (Johnstone, 2002: p. 4). The need for pragmatism is now abundantly obvious. CDA implies a pragmatic approach, but this does not preclude the recognition of important similarities and distinctions.

According to Reisigl's theories, there are three key distinctions between pragmatics and (critical) discourse analysis: (2011: 20). Discourse analysis is a technique or group of techniques that examines language usage using specific models; pragmatic analysis is not one of these techniques. The use of speech is employed in the study of language. As a result, pragmatics is a subset of discourse, and it is necessary for pragmatics to expose the real implicature, assumption, illocutionary variables, etc. that underlie the language used in different contexts.

CDA employs a vast array of linguistic and non-linguistic disciplines, whereas discourse analysis employs fewer inter- and trans-disciplinary features. This is a further distinction that may introduce pragmatism to the CDA domain.

The third distinction is between the mental representations of pragmatics and discourse analysis. Pragmatics and discourse analysis are mirrored in various cognitive domains. These distinctions demand that pragmatics be incorporated into discourse analysis (critical). This puts both fields in the same linguistic boat by highlighting their similarities and distinctions (ibid: p. 21).

1. Pragmatics and discourse analysis are more functionally oriented than formally oriented; they both rely on context rather than the abstract use of language. Despite their varied approaches to context, pragmatics focuses on all pragmatic context elements while studying language (ibid: p. 22).
2. Pragmatism, like discourse, is centered on utterances, however it places more emphasis on the function and meaning of particular utterance types. Even though (critical) discourse analysis starts with words, sentences are evaluated depending on the linguistic strategies they employ (ibid).
3. Both pragmatics and discourse analysis view language as a social activity in line with Halliday's (1994) Systemic Functional Grammar. Pragmatics sees social components as the means by which the speaker's intention and the listener's anticipated interpretation are accomplished. Discourse analysis that incorporates the concept of criticality sees language as similar to other ideological social activities, according to Fairclough's (1992) definition. As a result, while they have different approaches and vocabularies, they have similar foundations and goals (ibid: p. 23).
4. Pragmatics and discourse analysis are inter- and trans-disciplinary at the CDA level because they work with many different disciplines to assess the consequences of a given conversation. Discourse analysis, in the tradition of Habermas, Bourdieu, and Luhmann, encompasses a wide range of distinctive domains that could normalize other fields of study, like CDA, as macro-dimensions of discourse. Only a small number of other disciplines can work with pragmatics to provide thorough explanations of language users' intents. The benefits of other fields are, nevertheless, shared by these two disciplines.

Along with the aforementioned, it is clear that pragmatic analysis is only occasionally utilized in conjunction with critical analysis when dealing with criticality. To put it simply, CDA can offer a straight path to practical concepts like implicature, assumption, and relevance, among others. Pragmatics, in the opinion of Levinson and Mey (1983: p. 4), reveals the hidden purposes of language users. Macro-pragmatics reveals particular speaker attitudes that the listener is expected to understand. (Critical) discourse examines the ideas of the language user after pragmatics clarifies and interprets the function.

4.   The Concept of Empowerment

Across the disciplines of community studies and interventions, the concept of empowerment has been central (Perkins, 2010; Maton 2008). The term "empowerment" refers to a theory that applies people's innate strengths and abilities as well as their networks of support and their own initiative to the improvement of social policies and the evolution of (Rappaport, 1984). Basically, empowerment connects an individual's happiness to the greater social and political context in which they operate.

Literally, the word "empowerment" means "to authorize or enable." Possession of one's own ideology (one's core beliefs, values, and attitudes) and mastery over one's own resources (physical, human, intellectual, and monetary) constitutes empowerment (beliefs, values and attitudes). Women's empowerment is a complex topic that spans several disciplines, including law, economics, culture, and politics. The term "empowerment" is used to describe a strategy for allowing individuals and groups to improve their communities by making meaningful changes to the physical and social worlds. Acquiring more knowledge, resources, and experience increases one's overall competence. Sonwalkar, J., and T. Nandedkar, 2016: p. 122) cite Baltiwala (1994) for this statement.

According to Batliwala (2010), the term "empowerment" has been "'mainstreamed' in a way that has virtually stripped it of its original meaning and strategic value," despite having been central to the social and political struggles of the mid- to late-20th century Black power movement, feminism, popular education, labor rights, and liberation theology (p. 111). As a concept, "empowerment" has been around since the 1700s. To permit, delegate, or allow anything. Scholars from all around the world have used a wide variety of descriptors to explain what it is like to be empowered. Multiple studies have found a correlation between freedom and authority. Rappaport (1984) argues that its absence is easier to describe (alienation, impotence, helplessness), but its presence is more nebulous and "takes on numerous shapes for different persons and settings" (p. 2).

The phrase 'empowerment' has various meanings depending on context, culture, and political, economic, and social circumstances. Investigating local vocabulary of empowerment throughout the world always yields a variety of definitions. These concepts include, among others, self-strength, self-control, self-power, self-reliance, personal choice, the ability to fight for one's rights, independence, the capacity to choose one's own judgments, and freedom. These ideas have their origins in regional belief and value systems. Both intrinsic and instrumental benefits result from empowerment. Empowerment is typically understood to mean giving a previously powerless group the same degree of power as a previously powerful group (Bhadra, 2001, p. 61).

It was in the 1980s that the concept of "empowerment" developed as a movement for fundamental social change, with the goal of helping previously powerless groups to define and assert their rights as a whole. The implications of this issue extend to multiple levels of power:

Table (2). *Understanding Implications for Empowerment*

Relation of Power	Implications for an understanding of empowerment
Power Over: ability to influence and coerce	changes in underlying resources and power to challenge constraints
Power To: organize and change existing hierarchies	Increased individual capacity and opportunities for access
Power With: increased power from collective action	Increased solidarity to challenge underlying assumptions
Power from Within: increased individual consciousness	Increased awareness and desire for change

Empowerment based on a notion of power as "power over," as argued by Rowlands (1997, p. 1), places an emphasis on participation within existing economic and political structures but does not seek to transform them. If power is understood as "power over," then the dominating person is in charge of it and can bestow it upon subordinates. Furthermore, in contrast to "power over," "power with" highlights how attaining power really enhances the power of others. Having this distinction is what sets collective empowerment apart from individual empowerment. Empowerment theories, however, are often phrased in individualistic terminology, with the ultimate goal being to increase individual freedom of choice and self-reliance. Similar to how the focus on 'power to' has resulted in an increased emphasis on participation in decision making, the focus on 'power inside' has resulted in an increased emphasis on fostering confidence. Gaining such authority needs a shift in one's own ideas about one's own rights, abilities, and potential, and this shift must begin within the individual (ibid, 1997; P. 6-7).

Four definitions of power have been used over the years to help people understand the idea of power within the idea of empowerment. Following are definitions that illustrate what the phrases "empowerment" and "disempowerment" mean and how they are used by and among people: "Power within, denotes the evolution of personal consciousness, which results in newfound courage to act" (Rowlands, 1977). Together, people may do great things, and this is what we call "power with" (Gamnage et. al 2016). This power, according to Cornwall (2016), is the "solidarity or sociality that the processes of empowerment entail." Power is the ability to enact change or to resist it. According to Allens (1999), this form of power is the ability to take action, which is frequently related to empowerment. The power that deals with social relations of dominance or subordination between people is known as power over. This view of power as an individualistic trait is expressed in the phrase "I am empowered."

5.   Motivations of Empowerment and Disempowerment

The pragmatic strategies that fulfill the ideologies that indirectly expose empowerment and Disempowerment are organized in accordance with the following ideologies that are primarily recognized as the triggers of empowerment and disempowerment:

a.   It is considered that prejudice with its own pragmatic strategies is one form of ideology that empowerment and disempowerment can take. It consists of the verbal acts that communicate the following attitudes:

1.   Selections
2. No supporting evidence

3. Negatively predisposed

b. Discrimination is an additional type of ideology whose ramifications are pragmatically naturalized discriminating acts constituting empowerment and disempowerment. The speaking activities that communicate this form include:

1. Differentiating based on religion
2. discriminating against others
3. demonstrating the disparity depending on religion

c. Intolerance encompasses all actions that can lead to empowerment and disempowerment in the form of bigotry among sects. It is exemplified by the speaking acts that communicate the following characteristics:

1. Rejection of alternative beliefs
2. Incapable of tolerating the practice of nominees
3. Refusing to embrace other actions.

d. Instigation can relate to the ideology of the act of empowerment and disempowerment, in which nominees attempt to excite the audience using particular pragmatic instruments that they and their audience share. There are specific utterances that communicate this form:

1. Inciting others
2. provoking others
3. Inducing something to occur
4. compelling to take some action

During this stage, realistic techniques are displayed, and the ideas of power (empowerment or disempowerment) discourse, such as bias, discrimination, instigation, intolerance, and, etc., are highlighted. The linguistic realizations of the CDA are also concerned with uncovering the power ideologies in use. Finally, the authority exercised by politicians during their debates manipulates and normalizes the latent ideologies concealed inside the speech.

In addition to CDA techniques, these ideologies are exercised through language realizations and pragmatic ideas. Primarily, van Dijk's ideological square, and Leeuwen's Inclusion – exclusion dichotomies are utilized. In principle, these interpretations have the same operational meaning, but their applications and included tools are distinct.

According to van Dijk's ideological square and Leeuwen (2008: 4-16), inclusion, exclusion, the following are examples of ideologies-which are selected as empowerment strategies:

1. Enhancing one's own individual is accomplished by communicating all socially acceptable and highly regarded topics.
2. Indoctrination is employed as a tactic to strengthen one's group and to constantly reinforcing its ideology in the brains of others.
3. Individualization refers to the politician's utilization of all actions that result in inclusion.
4. Association the politician might utilize it to depict an in-group.

5.   Indetermination is utilized to clarify certain distinctions and ambiguities that are typically employed to conceal other realities.

6.   Collectivization means to refer to one's group as united.

According to van Dijk's ideological square and Leeuwen (2008: 4-16), inclusion, exclusion, the following are examples of ideologies-which are selected as disempowerment strategies:

a. Politicians suppress other opponents and make every effort to disregard and disregard all aspects of these sects.

c. Politicians utilize the strategy of degrading other individuals to distract audience attention away from them.

b. specification in order to deformalize the usage of disempowerment is to specify.

C. Assimilation refers to the politician's utilization of all actions that result in exclusion.

d. Disassociation is that the politician might utilize it to depict an - out-group individuals.

e. Differentiation is utilized to clarify certain distinctions and ambiguities that are typically employed to conceal other realities.

f. Politicians marginalizes opponents by emphasizing their own and use language that places other them in a subordinate position. This can cause the dominant sect to become superior and the less prominent sects to become inferior.

6.   Methodology

6.1   Data Analysis

The data under analysis is selected from the American presidential debate between Trump and Clinton. It is necessary to clarify some of the contextual factors of the data before moving on to its explanation. The numerous facets of communication in speech events are described by Hymes' (1974: 55–62) grid of SPEAKING. To describe the contextual factors of the genre types of data under scrutiny, his model is modified and then accepted.

Table (2) below shows the dimensions of the model of Hymes (1974) with their explanations taken from Saville-Troike (2003: 95-124).

Table (2). *Hymes' (1974: 55-62) Model of Contextual Factors*

Dimension		Subcomponents
S	Settings	a. Indicates the time and place of the event b. Psychological setting: participants' understanding of event or environment of setting
P	Participants	Speaker, sender, addressor, hearer, receiver, audience, addressee (present or absent)
E	Ends	Purpose- goals Purpose- outcome
A	Act sequence	Sequential organization of speech acts Message form Message content (or the form and order of the event)
K	Keys	Tone or spirit of the communicative act.
I	Instrumentalities	Medium of transmission of speech Forms of speech and speech style.
N	Norms	Rules of interaction: rules governing speaking Norms of interpretation: rules governing cultural belief systems
G	Genre	The discourse type that achieves the speech event

Each utterance is determined to be example of empowerment and disempowerment based on a set of criteria that unfold during the scrutiny. "*empowerment is the attitude that is based on the beliefs and feelings of being superior and distinguished as it is inspired by the*

concept of being positively different in terms of specific aspects of differentiation like those of race, religion, gender and so o ". This differentiation implies the concept of presenting the Self as positive and the Other as negative.

The analysis comprises several levels as the analytical framework suggests. The first level specifies the kind of empowerment. Then, the pragmatic perspective is put under scrutiny within each form. The other step includes applying the reproduction mechanism of CPs. A stance has been taken from the very start . Thus, the stance and critique mechanisms are conducted to proceed throughout the analysis itself. Each utterance is then studied to find out how the reproduction mechanism can be specified.

Extract (1)

"And number three, I will not, under any circumstances, raise taxes on middle-income families. I will lower taxes on middle-income families. Now, you cite a study. There are six other studies that looked at the study you describe and say it's completely wrong. I saw a study that came out today that said you're going to raise taxes by 3,000 dollars to $4,000 on — on middle-income families. There are all these studies out there".

Table (4). *The Contextual Factors of Extract (1)*

Contextual Factors	Description
Settings	*Oct. 3, 2012, in Denver*
Participants	Speaker: Romney Addressee: Obama and the audience
End	Electional campaign
Instrumentalities	Spoken form of an utterance
Genre	Debate
Kind	Prejudice

Romney begins by denying almost everything his opponent just claimed about his tax proposal. Using a pragmatic approach, he publishes a series of remarks to explain his stance and refute Obama's assertion that he is pursuing a $5 trillion tax cut. He refuses to enact any tax reduction that will add to the national debt. There is no way I'm lowering the percentage paid by the wealthy. He will not support a reduction in the rate of taxation for the wealthiest Americans. He will never, ever support an increase in taxes on middle-class households. he will reduce taxes on middle-income families. In this regard, he uses Commissive SA of planning. He promises and gives his word that he will help them for a better. Moreover, he empowers the middle-income families using the sympathy maxim of politeness.

The first stage of the analysis shows that Romney is bias and supportive to those who are the middle-income families giving them the power to live their life. Thus, they are empowered.

The second stage of the naturalization shows that the following strategies are used:
a.   Enhancement strategy is adopted to show the in-group inclusion. Accordingly, they are enhanced highlighting the aspect of empowerment of the middle- and low-income families.
b.   Indoctrination is used as a strategy to enhance the middle-income families and to keep focusing on them in order to solidify their own ideologies in the individuals'' minds.
The third stage of the critical pragmatic mechanisms which have been employed are as follows:
a.   Critique

The pragmatic factors are revealed in the critique are the following: the Commissive

SA of planning, and the sympathy maxim of politeness regarding the low- and middle-income families. Enhancement strategy is adopted to show the in-group inclusion highlighting the aspect of empowerment of the middle- and low-income families. Indoctrination is also used as a strategy to enhance the middle-income families and to keep focusing on them in order to solidify their own ideologies in the individuals'' minds.

b.   Stance
          The stance of the speaker is clear here that Romney is helpful and cooperative.
c.   Reproduction

In this extract, the socio-pragmatic factors that are used show that these utterances are appropriate and need not to be reproduced again to minimize the size of shock.

Table (4). *The Contextual Factors of Extract (2)*

Contextual Factors	Description
Settings	Oct. 3, 2012, in Denver
Participants	Speaker: Romney
	Addressee: Obama and the audience
End	Electional campaign
Instrumentalities	Spoken form of an utterance
Genre	Debate
Kind	Prejudice

Here, Romney presents himself as the country's savior. He feels that the president's home city of Washington has corrupted the soul of the United States. He makes reference to himself in numerous speeches as the person who will restore America to its rightful position as the world's leader, directly or indirectly. This is one of many techniques for what Van Dijk (1988) refers to as positive self-representation. Thus, he uses the positive us and negative them dichotomy. Moreover, Romney uses the maxim of quality as a metaphorical tool representing that Romney will stand by American people. Hence, it is represented by flouting the quality maxim. This is regarded as the lexical signaling of the pragmatic factors. Moreover, Romney uses the generosity maxim which is minimizing benefit to self and maximizing benefit to others.

The first stage of the analysis deal with the prejudice as a form of motivation for the self-esteem empowerment.

The second stage of the analysis shows the use of naturalization strategies which are as follows:
a.   Enhancement is referred to as a n empowerment strategy that is used to show the strengthening of his in-group in terms of inclusion.
b.   Indoctrination is also adopted here to keep focusing on the in-group until being solidified in the individuals' minds.
The   third   stage   of   the   critical   pragmatic   mechanisms   which   have   been employed are as follows:
a.   Critique

Thus, he uses the positive us and negative them dichotomy. Moreover, Romney uses the maxim of quality as a metaphorical tool representing that Romney will stand by American people. Hence, it is represented by flouting the quality maxim. This is regarded as the lexical signaling of the pragmatic factors. Moreover, Romney uses the generosity maxim which is minimizing benefit to self and maximizing benefit to others. Concerning the first stage,

Romney uses prejudice as a form of motivation for the self-esteem empowerment. With reference to naturalization strategies, Enhancement and indoctrination are also adopted here to keep focusing on the in-group.

b.   Stance

The stance is represented by the maximizing of benefit to others and minimizing the efforts to one's own self. Thus, empowerment is achieved here.

c.   Reproduction

Conceding reproduction strategies, the utterances that are uttered in this extract are seen as natural in terms of Romney's Stance. Thus, empowerment is achieved of the American people.

7.   Conclusion

This study comes up with the following conclusions: -

1.   Empowerment can be seen in the social, political, and linguistic fields of study. However, political sphere is seen superior, and the primary source studied in the current study.

2.   In general, pragmatic concepts are used at the levels of politeness/impoliteness as culturally oriented concepts and the CP; then, CDA and pragmatics need each other.

3.   Critical pragmatics can be very utilized in the act of empowerment and disempowerment since it focuses on the pragmatic use of discourse markers and standards as strategies to represent the Candidates' ideas and to disclose the ideologies of power competence.

4.   Depending on the data analysis, the pragmatic theories and the ideological representations are not manifested at the same time, but each extract is analyzable according to its strategies.

5.   The most common pragmatic strategies that represent empowerment in the American presidential debates are politeness and Speech acts of commissive.

6.   Enhancement is the highest strategy to reveal the process of empowerment in the American presidential debates.

7.   The most common motivation used to imply the empowerment of people

References

Baynham, M. (2011). Stance, Positioning, and Alignment in Narratives of Professional Experience. *Language in Society*, *40*, 63–74. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404510000898. Accessed on August 10, 2017.

Bhadra, B. (2001). Janani O Prayukti: Lingakaran O Kshamatayaner Sahabastan. (Bengali ed.) Yojana.

Bloor, M. & Bloor, T. (2007). *The Practice of Critical Discourse Analysis: An Introduction.* London: Hodder Arnold.

Bohman, J. (2016). Critical Theory. In Edward N. Zalta (ed.), *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy.* (Fall 2016 Edition). URL: https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/fall2016/entries/critical-theory/.

Chen, X.R. (2020). *Critical Pragmatic Studies on Chinese Public Discourse*. London: Routledge.

Chilton, P. A. (2004). **Analyzing Political Discourse**. London: Routledge

DuBois, J. (2007). The Stance Triangle. In R. Englebretson (Ed.), *Stance-taking in Discourse:*

Subjectivity, Evaluation, Interaction (pp.139-182). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Fairclough, N . (1989b). *Language and Power*. London: Longman

Fairclough, N. **(1995)** *Critical Discourse Analysis: the Critical Study of Language*. **London: Longman. 253**

Fraser, N. (2003). Social Justice in an Age of Identity Politics: Redistribution, Recognition and Participation. In N. Fraser & A. Honneth (Eds.), *Redistribution or Recognition: A Political-Philosophical Exchange* (pp.7-109). London: Verso.

Holmes, J. (2009). Politeness Strategies as Linguistic Variables. In J. Mey (Ed.) *Concise Encyclopedia of Pragmatics* (2nd ed.) (pp. 711-723). Oxford: Elsevier Ltd.

Korta, K. & Perry, J. (2011). Critical Pragmatics: An Inquiry into Reference and Communication**. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.**

Lillis, T. M. (2006). Communicative Competence. In J. Mey (Ed.*), Concise Encyclopedia of Pragmatics* (2nd ed.) (pp. 92-99). Oxford: Elsevier Ltd.

Mey, J. (2001). *Pragmatics: An Introduction* **(2nd Ed). Blackwell Publishing.**

Rappaport, J. (1984). Studies in empowerment: Introduction to the issue. Prevention in Human Services, 3, 1-7.

Reisigl, M., & Wodak, R. (2009). *The discourse-historical approach*. **In R.**

Silverstein, M. (1992). The Indeterminacy of Contextualization: When is Enough Enough? In P. Auer & A. Di Luzio (Eds.), *The Contextualization of Language* (55-76). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Sonwalkar,J and Nandedkar, T. (2016). Empowering Women through E-Ship in India: A Pragmatic Study of Challenges, Journal of Management Research and Analysis, July-September;3(3):122-125

van Dijk, T. A. (1984). *Prejudice in Discourse.* Amsterdam: John Benjamin Publishing Company.

van Dijk, T. A. (1991). *Racism and The Press*. London: Routledge.

van Dijk, T. A. (1992). Racism and argumentation: "Race riot" Rhetoric in Tabloid Editorials. In F. H. van Eemeren, R. Grootendorst, J. A. Blair & C. A. Willard (Eds.), *Argumentation Illuminated* (pp. 242-259). Dordrecht, Netherlands: Foris.

van Dijk, T. A. (2001). Critical Discourse Analysis. In D. Tannen; D. Schiffrin and H. Hamilton (Eds.), *Handbook of Discourse Analysis* (pp. 352-371). MA: Blackwell Publishing.

Van Leeuwen, T. (2008). *Discourse and practice: New tools for critical analysis.* London: Oxford University Press.

Vandergriff, I. (2012). Taking a Stance on Stance: Meta-stancing as Legitimation. *Critical Approaches to Discourse Analysis across Disciplines*, 6(1), 53- 75.

Verdonk, P. (2002). *Stylistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Verschueren, J. (1999). Predicaments of Criticism. *Critique of Anthropology*, 21(1), 59-81.

Widdowson, H. G (1995b). Discourse Analysis: A Critical View: Language and Literature: *International Journal of Stylistics* (www.journal.sagebub.com)

Widdowson, H. G. (2004). *Text, Context, Pretext: Critical Issues in Discourse Analysis.* Oxford, UK: Blackwell.

Wodak, R. (2007). *Ideology and Discourse: A Multidisciplinary Introduction.* Barcelona: Pompeu Fabra University.