

Language Pedagogy and English Applied Linguistics PhD Program, Eötvös Loránd University
karoly.nagy201@gmail.com
<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8448-2200>

Károly Nagy: Understanding political concepts through Critical Discourse Analysis: Ideologies concerning Turkish National Identity in the speeches of Mustafa Kemal Atatürk and Recep Tayyip Erdoğan
Alkalmazott Nyelvtudomány, Különszám, 2023/2. szám, 212–231.
doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.18460/ANY.K.2023.2.012>

Understanding political concepts through Critical Discourse Analysis: Ideologies concerning Turkish National Identity in the speeches of Mustafa Kemal Atatürk and Recep Tayyip Erdoğan

Politicians often use discourse to strengthen their positions, power and political ideologies. Critical Discourse Analysis investigates political discourse with the aim to reveal the connection between discourse and power (Fairclough, 2015). Using a Critical Discourse Analysis approach, this study compares the discursive strategies of Turkish presidents Mustafa Kemal Atatürk and Recep Tayyip Erdoğan to highlight ideological differences in their language use through the Ideological Square Model. The Ideological Square Model indicated that Atatürk's out-groups are other countries, while Erdoğan extends the set of out-groups to include the media and his political opposition. Results demonstrate how ideologies and power relations are represented and created using various linguistic tools and in different ways in political speeches.

Keywords: Critical Discourse Analysis, Ideological Square Model, power, ideology, nationalism

1. Introduction

Power is manifest in the use of discourse, and the dominant discourses in society represent the worldviews of those in power. High-ranking politicians often use language and discourse to create, maintain and strengthen their positions, power structures and political ideologies in society. Power can be exercised in and through discourse. This sentence might awake various attitudes in our minds, calling forth our experiences, such as the communicative style of authority figures (e.g., parents, police or governments). Discourse is created through written, spoken, or multimodal forms of communication, in which language is used as a common mediator. Discourse analysis investigates the relationship between language and context (McCarthy et al., 2019) as it “is the study of language in use. It is the study of the meanings we give language and the actions we carry out when we use language in specific contexts” (Gee & Hanford, 2012: 1). Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) as a branch of discourse analysis investigates the relationships between language, power and ideology (Fairclough, 2015), with particular interest in public and political discourses. In this vein, the current study aims to analyse the speeches of two of the most influential Turkish politicians: Mustafa Kemal Atatürk, the first president of Turkey, and Recep Tayyip Erdoğan, the current president of Turkey. Political

speeches represent a typical genre in political discourse; the following paper is based on the critical and extensive analysis of two significant texts from this genre. The aim of this research is to present the results of this analysis and to draw attention to nationalistic elements in the two political speeches, particularly in regard to the words and expressions that promote the idea of superiority over others and the ways in which this idea is realised linguistically. For this reason, relevant parts of the texts were selected. The Ideological Square Model (van Dijk, 1998) was then used to investigate the strategies by focusing on the lexico-grammatical patterns which aid in the identification of in - and out-groups.

1.1. Theoretical background

1.1.1. Language and discourse

Language is not only a tool that people use for communication and transmitting information, but it also “reflects both the individual characteristics of a person, as well as the beliefs and practices of his or her community” (Amberg & Vause, 2009: 1). Beliefs and values are not only manifested in discourse but also shaped and influenced by it. A clear example of this can be seen in political discourse, in which the words and even the grammatical patterns chosen by politicians often serve to influence the audience. Thus, the chosen grammatical patterns and words of politicians include elements of power, as power conveys the capacity to produce an effect: the ownership of authority and influence over others (Merriam-Webster, n.d.). This type of influence is a way of maintaining and exercising power. Although grammatical content is essential during the analysis of a speech or a written text, understanding the reasons or motives behind a chosen structure is crucial, too. Therefore, Nunan (2015) suggests that in the study of discourse, the following questions should be considered:

- “What is the relationship between the speakers and how is this reflected in their language?
- What are the goals of the communication (e.g. to tell a story, to teach something, to buy something)?
- How do speakers manage topics and signal to one another their perception of the way the interaction is developing?” (McCarthy & Walsh, 2003: 174 cited in Nunan, 2015: 136)

When choosing a type of discourse, politicians build on the background knowledge of the hearer, referring to their socio-cultural background through the use of grammatical structures and vocabulary. To be able to analyse a political speech, one must have extensive knowledge of the historical, cultural, and social factors related to the target community.

There is often a reason behind the choice of a word or a grammatical structure for example, behind a word with a more pejorative connotation instead of a more neutral one may influence the audience in a certain way. This is where the

power of discourse resides, and this phenomenon can be observed in the speeches and written statements of politicians and other public figures. The analysis of political discourse provides researchers with the opportunity to understand the possible reasons behind the use of a particular grammatical structure or vocabulary item.

1.1.2. Power, Ideology, Politics and the Critical Discourse Analysis

Finding a single definition for power is challenging due to its complexity. According to Dahl, it is unlikely that a single theory of power can be constructed, as scholars are more likely to produce theories of limited scope, each of which includes some definition of power that is useful in a particular research context. (Dahl, 1957: 202). Power can also denote authority or dominance over a person or group, be it physical, economical or ideological. In simpler terms, it can be defined as “A has power over B to the extent that he can get B do something that B would not otherwise do” (Dahl, 1957: 202–203). There are various means to exercise one’s power, one of which is language. In this study, the aim is to further investigate the following definition of power: the exercise of authority and influence over others through discourse. Power in discourse can take various forms, and often involves powerful participants controlling the contributions of less powerful participants which can sometimes amount to a form of coercion (Fairclough & Fairclough, 2012).

Power is also involved when the ideas of an individual have an influence on the way others think; however, when these ways of thinking become more extensive and systematic and form a collective belief system, such ideas take the form of ideology. The theory of ideology is closely connected to this paper in that it deals with the “question of how beliefs and concerns which are associated with the interests of particular social groups come to be general beliefs and concerns, and how they come to have effects on social life.” (Fairclough & Fairclough, 2012: 100)

According to Van Dijk (2006a), ideologies control socially shared beliefs and practices. Ideologies are produced and expressed with the help of discourse: when a community or group wishes to explain or legitimise their actions, they routinely take advantage of ideological discourse (Van Dijk, 2006a). For this reason, ideologies are often created by politicians as a means of validation or verification of their agendas. Ideologies unfold in discourse and are closely connected to power, as “the way in which orders of discourse are structured, and the ideologies which they embody, are determined by relationships of power” (Fairclough, 2015: 63). Ideologies include guiding principles that affect the shared attitudes of group members (van Dijk, 2001). Since beliefs and ideas are embedded in discourse (Fairclough, 2015), the intended meaning of a text should be analysed based on the relationship between discourse and society. To apply various types of interpretations and reveal hidden meanings, discourse must be analysed in a critical way.

CDA examines political discourse with the aim of critiquing the “relations between discourse and power, focusing upon discourse as part of exercising power over others in ways which are illegitimate, unjust or otherwise harmful” (Fairclough, 2015: 49). The interrelationships between language, power, ideology, politics, individual thinking and sociocultural structures are the main areas of interest in CDA. It is a separate field in discourse analysis since CDA is concerned with how power, ideology and manipulation affect social inequality, the abuse of power and domination via language (Vadai, 2017). Since CDA is a complex type of analysis, political texts must be investigated from multiple perspectives. The tools of CDA include the bottom-up and top-down models proposed by Chilton and Schäffner (1997), the Discourse Historical Approach proposed by Wodak et al., (1990), the Ideological Square model proposed by van Dijk (1998) and the Three-Dimensional Model proposed by Fairclough (1989).

Related to the above, it is important to mention another term, nationalism, which is highly relevant to the present analysis considering its close connection to ideologies, power and manipulation in political discourses. The term of nationalism draws a connection between a specific community and the commonality of culture-groups (Smith, 1979). However, nationalism differs from the “more universal ideologies in basing itself on a pre-existing mass sentiment” (Smith, 1979: VII). Nation, in broader terms, denotes a “human population sharing an historic territory, common myths, and historical memories” (Smith, 1991: 14). According to Renan (1892), a congregation of like-minded rational people create a sense of nation. However, it has also been argued that “people are not only legal citizens of a nation; they participate in the idea of the nation as represented in its national culture. A nation is a symbolic community” (Hall, 1996: 612).

The sense of national identity is highly influenced by the place and the society where an individual is raised. The relationship between people based on their sociocultural context constitutes the concept of nation. According to Anderson, a nation is an imagined community “because the members of even the smallest nation will never know most of their fellow-members [...] yet in the minds of each lives the image of their communion” (Anderson, 1991: 6). Wodak et al. (2009) similarly claims that the nation is an imagined community, as it is “constructed and conveyed in discourse, predominantly in narratives of national culture. National identity is thus the product of discourse” (22). In addition, it is crucial in the construction of national identity to represent a special type of biological, cultural or religious cleanliness for maintaining national unity and to shield the nation against its enemies (Gökay & Aybak, 2016).

1.1.3. The Ideological Square Model

The ideological square model is a framework for the detailed analysis of discourse production as well as its context (Van Dijk, 1993). The Ideological Square model is particularly suitable for analysing discourses in which information are not expressed explicitly, or when some information “needs to be concealed in the interest of the speaker and the ingroup” (van Dijk, 1998: 269). The model suggests that an ideological rhetoric typically aims to: (1) emphasise positive things about Us, (2) emphasise negative things about Them, (3) de-emphasise negative things about Us and (4) de-emphasise positive things about Them (Van Dijk, 2013); this is how the square of ideology is represented. Since commemorative as well as victory speeches tend to bear ideologically biased representations of membership categorisations, such as the in- (Us) and out-groups (Them) (van Dijk, 2006a), the ideological square model represents an appropriate and useful tool for the current study.

1.1.4. The context of the study: Turkey’s political scene

The predecessor of Turkey was the Ottoman Empire, which lasted for hundreds of years. Various nationalities, ethnic and religious groups were under its control and were designated as *millets* (Ortaylı, 2019). There was a sense of identity and an ideology present even at the time of the Ottoman Empire, called Ottomanism. This ideology was based on the equality among the peoples of the Empire regardless of which millet they belonged. In addition, there was a political attachment, or a sense of belonging to the land which later turned into the concept of *vatan*, meaning fatherland (Ágoston & Masters, 2009). *Vatan* carried the implication of a sacred duty of the individual to defend and belong to the fatherland (Ágoston & Masters, 2009). This version of nationalism emphasised the importance of territory more than ethnicity (Jensen, 2017). Under the influence of Ottomanism, the main ideas and ideology were shaped by the sultan; the government accepted the religious and ethnic differences of the population and applied laws universally (Ágoston & Masters, 2009).

The Ottoman Empire sought to prevent its division by the Great Powers (i.e., France, Russia and Great Britain) by implementing massive reforms in addition to attempts to keep pace with the industrialized world (Jensen, 2017). This period, in which the future of the Ottoman Empire was at stake, saw the emergence of the Eastern Question. Around this time, a military leader called Mustafa Kemal Atatürk predicted the irreversible fall of the Ottoman empire, who saw its transformation into a puppet state of the imperial powers and started to unite the people of Turkey by convincing them to rebel and fight against imperial Ottoman rule.

After the Turkish War of Independence (1919–1923), Atatürk became the first president of the Republic of Turkey, which formed in 1923. During his fifteen years of presidency Atatürk began “the process of converting a country from its semifeudal, agrarian base into a modern industrial economy” (Ahmad,

2014: 92). All this led to various reforms in terms of education, language and ideologies, such as Turkism, “an ideology that shifted national focus away from territory and placed more emphasis on a shared Turkish experience by the people” (Jensen, 2017: 22).

A secular form of governing was established by Atatürk which continued until the election in 2002 of the current president of Turkey, Recep Tayyip Erdoğan, leader of the AKP (Justice and Development Party). Erdoğan has since won thirteen nationwide polls and has risen to become the most powerful leader in the country since Mustafa Kemal Atatürk (Çağaptay, 2020). In contrast to Atatürk’s secular political agenda, Erdoğan revived political Islam, connecting religion to politics in a non-secular style of governing (Çağaptay, 2020). His rule thus marks a turning-point in the country’s politics. The new president sees himself not only as the head of state, but also as the guarantor of the will of people (Seufert, 2014). Since the previously mentioned leaders represent two completely different political agendas, their ideologies are reflected through the way they address the Turkish nation (and the related identity components and values) in their speeches. Considering this, the current study analyses a speech given by Mustafa Kemal Atatürk marking the 10th anniversary of the Turkish republic which was delivered in Ankara on 29th October, 1933, and the 2014 post-election balcony speech of Recep Tayyip Erdoğan, which was also delivered in Ankara on March 30 and 31.

1.2. Research questions

This study attempts to investigate the appearance of nationalistic ideology and its elements through a focus on the following research questions:

1. What ideological strategies are used on the linguistic level and through linguistic means to frame Turkish national identity in the selected political speeches?
2. What are some of the key similarities and differences in the framing of Turkish national identity through linguistic means in terms of ideological representations?

2. Methodology

2.1. The texts selected for analysis

The aim of CDA is to investigate the semiotic, implicit and explicit relationships within a text through linguistic analysis (Fairclough, 2012: 453). For this reason, the two texts that were chosen for the study have the potential to signal both the use of power and ideological bias, since political speeches “may contain various, intentionally-used elements of power, ideologies and manipulation” (Vadai, 2017: 103). This study focuses on finding elements or instances of power, ideology, and nationalism; in particular, it investigates their discursive construction and means of linguistically representing in- and out-groups. The texts chosen for analysis are illustrious instances of ideological speeches from

the two Turkish presidents, namely the first president of the Republic of Turkey, Mustafa Kemal Atatürk and the currently ruling president, Recep Tayyip Erdoğan. Although Atatürk's speech is a commemorative and Erdoğan's is a post-election one, they can both be considered as victory speeches because Atatürk commemorates his success as the founder of the Republic of Turkey, he commemorates his success and Erdoğan's party won the local elections. One of the reasons for selecting the previously mentioned speeches is because commemorative and victory speeches attempt "to appeal to their countrymen to take pride in their country, to cherish her long-held traditions, and to put behind them the divisiveness of the past campaign and unite for the common good" (Rohler & Cook, 1998: 243). Another reason was to compare the ideological strategies of the first secular president and the current non-secular president of the Republic of Turkey. The two speeches are included in the Appendix.

2.2. Analytical tools, procedures, and the investigation of in- and out-group representation

A multifaceted analytical tool, the Ideological Square Model, was used in the current study. The ideological square model suggests "that implied information is not explicitly asserted, and hence not emphasized, and will therefore typically be information that needs to be concealed in the interest of the speaker and the ingroup" (van Dijk, 1998: 269). The model is concerned with the diverse illustrations of those in-groups and out-groups, in verbal as well as in non-verbal discourses, that are referred to with the prototypical ideological pronouns *we* and *they* or *us* vs. *them*, denoting the structure of the ideology underlying the discourse (Van Dijk, 2011). It is a complex method of analysis which includes a deductive qualitative approach, since the groups in question are already described. In addition, it investigates the manifestation of particular messages and their characteristics in texts (Frey et al., 2000). Special attention was paid to the ideological differences in terms of nationality in the speeches of Mustafa Kemal Atatürk and Recep Tayyip Erdoğan. For this reason, the ideological square model was applied in order to investigate the occurrences of four strategies by focusing on the lexico-grammatical patterns used by the politicians. The four strategies that were examined were the following:

1. desired negative representation of the out-group, which entails the intended negative and pejorative depiction of the out-group (e.g., indicating that its members are liars),
2. the desired positive representation of the in-group, which entails the intended positive depiction of Us (e.g., pointing out the trustworthiness of the members of the in-group),

3. the undesired negative representation of the in-group, which entails the unintended pejorative depiction of Us. The emphasis on the better opportunities that the out-group possesses, for example, is ambiguous because it degrades the members of the in-group,
4. the undesired positive representation of the out-group (Van Dijk, 1998, 2006b, 2011; Daghigh et al., 2018), which entails the unintended positive depiction of Them. The emphasis on the better standards of living of the out-group, for example, idealises the members of the out-group.

Various interpretations can be attributed to certain lexical items in terms of meaning and reference, as in the following:

- “**Implications** (propositions implied by propositions explicitly expressed in discourse) – propositions may be used that have (many) negative implications about Them.
- **Presuppositions** (propositions that must be true/known for any proposition to be meaningful) – presupposing propositions (negative about Them) that are not known to be true.
- **Denomination** (of propositions: participant description) – They tend to be named or identified as different from Us (precisely as Them) – strangers, immigrants, Others, opponents, enemies, etc.
- **Predication** (of propositions: meanings of sentences) – any predicate of a proposition attributing negative characteristics to Them.” (Van Dijk, 2011: 398)

For the analysis, excerpts were used from the speeches of the politicians for the identification of ideological elements, and salient lexical items were marked in bold. The identified groups and chosen excerpts were then analysed in detail. Although there were various relevant lexical and structural items that were connected to national identity or in- and out-group representations, only the most striking examples and representations of the membership categorisations, such as instances of the inclusive ‘we’ or polarising ‘they’, were included in the table (See Table 1). In the upcoming section, the analysis of the salient themes and discursive strategies is framed according to the ideological square model.

2.3. Results and Analysis

This section presents the desired and undesired positive representations along with the desired negative and undesired negative representations of the in- (US) and out-groups (THEM) in the speeches of Mustafa Kemal Atatürk and Recep Tayyip Erdoğan (See Table 1 in Appendix).

The table above presents the classification of the speeches. The analysis of the excerpts is presented under the identified categories, namely 1.) Undesirable negative representation, 2.) Undesirable Positive Representation, 3.) Intended Positive Representation, and 4.) Intended Negative Representation. The first two

categories are simultaneously analysed. The latter two are separately listed along with the in-depth analysis of the relevant excerpts.

3. Discussion

3.1. Undesirable negative representation and Undesirable positive representation

Based on the analysis presented in Table 1, it is clear that Atatürk used two discursive strategies which Erdoğan did not: *Undesirable negative representation* and *Undesirable positive representation*. There are excerpts that occur more than once in the table above (Excerpts 1 & 4, 2 & 5 and 3 & 6). The reason for including some of the excerpts twice is that they serve as examples for two categories, namely for the Undesirable negative representation and the Undesirable positive representation of the Turkish nation. The lexical elements are ambiguous, and for this reason there is a need to illustrate them separately. Although the excerpts are depicted in different categories, they are analysed simultaneously in the paragraphs below.

In terms of Undesirable negative representation and Undesirable positive representation, the analysis showed that Atatürk made several mentions of how hard the Turks must work towards the future. Although the above statement in Excerpt 1 is meant as a desirable positive representation (i.e., Turkey deserves to be modern and advanced similarly to other countries in the world), a negative representation is also implied (See excerpt 4). The in-group and the out-group depictions are clear: the inclusive ‘we’ refers to the Turkish nation, while the ‘they’ and the *prosperous and civilized nations* portion implies and addresses the out-group. One way of interpreting the text is to claim that here Atatürk criticises, through predication, the Turks for not being as civilised as the other nations, with Turks implied to be an underdeveloped nation (Excerpt 4). It is as if the out-group is praised instead of the in-group, resulting in an undesirable negative representation of Turks, such as in the case of Excerpts 2 & 5. The intended effect of Excerpt 2 is to motivate the people of the Turkish nation to work harder; the unintentional implication here (Excerpt 5) further signals that Turkey is below the *contemporary level of civilization*, condescending the Turks and yet again idealising the out-group. Similarly, in Excerpt 3, Atatürk makes it clear that the national ideal is yet to be reached; however, he states that it is achievable. Although it is a great nation, Turkey is not yet recognised by the out-group (Excerpt 6), meaning that the Turkish nation must prove itself to the *entire world*. In this way, Atatürk conveys an undesirable negative representation of the Turkish nation and an undesirable positive representation of the out-group.

In line with the qualitative analysis of the lexical items which occur in Excerpts 1–6 along with the help of the ideological square model, the following two strategies, namely *Undesirable negative representation* and *Undesirable positive representation*, are identified only in the speech of Mustafa Kemal

Ataturk. The speech also serves as an implied critique of the Turkish nation intended as a form of motivation for future efforts. The ideological differences between the in- and out-groups are nationalistic elements which include the use of implication, predication and nomination, addressing the ethnicity, pride and continuation of the Republic of Turkey.

3.2. Intended Positive Representation

As for the category of Intended Positive Representations, Table 1 provides illustrative examples from both speeches. Both presidents praise and point out the bravery of the Turks in their speeches. Furthermore, they both refer to the Turkish nation as an entity, although in different manners.

In a statement from Excerpt 7 the pace and valour of Turkish hard work is nominally stated by Ataturk, who represents Turks as the heroes and defenders of the Republic of Turkey. Undoubtedly, the Republic is shown as the greatest achievement of the Turkish nation. Not only the people and the army but the institution of the republic is represented positively. However, the statement fails to mention other ethnicities that participated in the War of Independence, giving credit only to the in-group and disregarding the out-group. In contrast to Ataturk's allusion, Erdogan puts forward an analogy between the *Independence War of Turkey* and the 2014 Turkish local elections (Excerpt 8). The voters and supporters are the *brothers*, through the use of nomination, who belong to the in-group. However, there is no specific reference to the ethnicity of the *protectors of the new Turkey*. There is another comparison present in the statement, which is the association between the victory of the party and the independence of Turkey.

In Excerpt 9, Erdogan refers to different ethnicities and nationalities; however, they are all part of the in-group, united under the Turkish flag, Turkish nation and the Islamic religion. In addition, the prime minister also belongs to this common entity, and he expresses his strong feelings about the future of the ethnically merged nation. He praises and positively represents and nominates the Turkish voters and the people who sent their votes from different countries. In contrast, the excerpts from Ataturk's speech (Excerpt 10) suggest that according to him, as there is no reference to other ethnicities, only the Turks are holding *the torch of positive sciences*. Although national unity is expressed, the other ethnicities that belong to the nation are neglected.

In Excerpts 11–12 there are two pronouns referring to the same entity: the Turkish nation. The inclusion of a rhetorical question is used for emphasis and to raise attention. Interestingly, according to Erdogan, the most important attributes of the Turkish nation are the possession of the land and pride. As stated above, the model of the nation resides in its firmness and unyieldingness. The aim of the speaker is to imply and highlight the indestructible nature of Turkey in a positive manner. The national character is further extended with conservatism,

as stated in Excerpt 11 with the phrases *objection to change the direction of Turkey*.

To further support the intended positive representation, Atatürk expresses his firm belief regarding the future of the talented Turks and believes that the heart of civilisation will be Turkey (Excerpt 13). He also emphasises the ethnicity of the in-group, suggesting that belonging to the in-group is associated with feelings of joy (Excerpt 14). There is no reference to any out-group. This connection between happiness and the in-group ethnicity has the potential to incite strong feelings from the Turkish audience toward their birthplace, further promoting nationalistic views.

According to the in-depth analysis of the lexical items and the application of the ideological square model in Excerpts 7–14, the ideology of desired positive representation was found in the speeches of both politicians. However, there were certain differences regarding the manner in which the two politicians depicted the Turkish people. In the case of Atatürk, careful attention is paid to describing the positive qualities of the Turkish nation. Comparisons are made between Turkey and other countries; however, neither the negative attributes of the Turkish people nor those of other countries are emphasised. In addition, the positive representation of the out-groups is not expressed explicitly. Erdoğan, on the contrary, highlights the negative characteristics of the out-group through various lexical items. The main difference between the positive representations is that Atatürk only glorifies and nominates the Turks, referring only to the ethnicity, whereas Erdoğan praises all the people who supported his party regardless of their ethnicity.

3.3. Intended Negative Representation

Based on the analysis presented in Table 1, Erdoğan used one discursive strategy which Atatürk did not: Intended Negative Representation. In terms of Intended Negative Representation, the analysis showed that Erdoğan criticised the out-groups several times. Multiple out-groups are mentioned in the examples.

In Excerpt 15 the presence of in- and out-groups is expressed explicitly by Erdoğan through nomination and denomination. The inclusive uses of ‘we’ represent the Turkish nation, people and government, whereas the inclusion of the pronoun ‘they’ serves as a tool to refer to top-level AKP associates and the Gülen movement (Taylor, 2014), who are viewed as *traitors* to the nation, an example of denomination. Although the speaker invokes a negative representation of the out-group, he assigns positive attributes to himself by stating that he, as a part of the nation, has foreseen the trap of the enemy. What the hearer receives from these pieces of information is that there is an enemy which can be defeated through political action.

In Excerpts 16–18 there are multiple out-groups present, such as the media (Arango – Yeginsu, 2014), the opposition and Fethullah Gülen (Sly – Sly,

2014). He accuses the leaders of the opposition of being untrustworthy and assigns negative attributes to them. While the leaders of the other parties are labelled as dishonourable, Erdogan nominates himself as the ever-caring *brother* of the Turkish nation. Erdogan also describes and denominates the out-groups using the words *those people*, *Pennsylvania*, *media* and *capital*. The *walk in to their dens* is used as a pejorative idiom as well as a means of denomination (Excerpt 17) since it is defined as the following, “enter into a particularly dangerous, hostile, or oppressive place or situation, especially due to an angry or sinister person or group of people within it” (Farlex Dictionary of Idioms, 2015), basically referring to the institution of the enemy. The references indicate separate organisations; however, they all embody and entail the same meaning: the enemy. What is invoked and implied in the hearer’s mind is that Turkey is being attacked by a common foe from multiple fronts. However, the Turks were able to prevail thanks to their support for the government. These excerpts represent a clear example of the desired negative representation of the opposing parties along with the positive representation of the Turkish voters.

Based on the analysis of the lexical items and the Ideological Square Model in Excerpts 15–18, the ideology of desired negative representation was found in only one of the speeches. Erdogan extends the list of out-groups by including the opposition and the people who voted for the opposition and uses negative, ideologically representative lexical items in reference to them. The members of these out-groups are only spoken of in a pejorative manner. The winners are implied to be those who constantly maintain strong support for the government. Although Erdogan expresses his happiness for having won the local elections, a considerable amount of anger is also present in his speech.

4. Conclusion

By using an analytical tool associated with CDA, this study explored the salient themes of ideological representations. The thorough analysis paid special attention to the representations of in- and out-groups, as well as nationalistic elements, to detect where and how they occurred. The study aimed to investigate how the two politicians used different discursive strategies to construct Turkish nationalism as well as to identify the ideological similarities and differences between the speeches. It was clear from the examples and extracts in Table 1 that a designation between in- and out-groups along with a sense of national identity was created, pointed out or even hidden by referring to values such as history, nationhood, religion and ethnicity.

Regarding the ideologies which occurred in the speeches, the ideological square model helped to identify similarities as well as differences in terms of the representation of the in- and out-groups by the two politicians (see Table 1). The results of the study indicate that elements such as implication, presupposition, denomination, and predication as well as nationalism, ideology and power can be identified on various linguistic and structural levels of the political speeches.

The study also sheds light on the significance of the representation of the in- and out-groups, as the strength of a national leader rests on his capability to maintain the attention of the people while also drawing their focus towards a common enemy (Fairclough, 2015). Although Erdogan describes the out-groups as invaders of Turkey, Ataturk implicitly refers to the out-group as a rival rather than the enemy. The political leaders either attempt to create an image of an enemy or competitor, as

enemies must always be regarded as one in such a way that in the opinion of the mass of one's own adherents the war is being waged against one enemy alone. This strengthens the belief in one's own cause and increases one's bitterness against the attacker. (Fairclough, 2015: 108)

This study has a number of limitations, firstly in terms of the number of speeches that were analysed, as the researcher did not take into account other speeches that would deserve academic attention and investigation. Although the speeches of Recep Tayyip Erdogan and Mustafa Kemal Ataturk were rich in terms of analysable data, a limited number of extracts were chosen and categorised; other categories may arise as a result of further research. In addition, the range of analytical tools can be increased in future research: the two texts can also be examined with other tools associated with CDA, such as Chilton and Schäffner's Bottom-up method (1997), Fairclough's 3D model (1992) or Vadai's Power, Ideology and Manipulation Identification instrument (2017). In this way other points of view might be revealed, and cultural, social and historical insights can be gained. The focus of this research was on linguistic rather than political analysis, and the study did not intend to make any political claims. Due to the limited amount of data and scope of the analysis, it would be inappropriate to make any generalisations based on the findings. At the same time, the results from this study not only reveal how and in what ways language use can be suitable for discursively representing and creating groups, identities and ideologies, but can also provide insights into how language can be used for influencing the audience and exercising power.

Acknowledgements

I am grateful for all those who have helped me put together these ideas together as well as given effort and time to this paper. I would also like to thank the proof-reader, Jamil Eftim Toptsi, for his advice and suggestions. Their valuable guidance and feedback have provided to be essential in enhancing the quality of this article. Without their support, this study could not have been completed.

References

- Ahmad, F.** (2014). *Turkey: The quest for identity*. London: Oneworld.
- Anderson, B.** (1991). *Imagined communities: Reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism* (Rev. ed.). London: Verso.
- Amberg, J. S. & Vause, D. J.** (2009). *American English: history, structure, and usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Arango, T. & Yeginsu, C.** (2014.). In Local Election, a Referendum on Turkey's Leader. *The New York Times*. March 28. 2014. <https://www.nytimes.com/2014/03/29/world/europe/turkeys-looming-local-elections.html>
- Ágoston, G., & Masters, B. A.** (2009). *Encyclopedia of the Ottoman empire*. New York: Facts On File, Infobase Publishing.
- Çağaptay, S.** (2020). *Erdogan's empire: Turkey and the politics of the Middle East*. London: I.B. Tauris.
- Chilton, P. & Schaffner, C.** (1997). Discourse and Politics. In van Dijk T. A. (ed.). *Discourse Studies: A Multidisciplinary Introduction*. (206–230). London: Sage.
- Daghigh, A. J., Sanatifar, M. S. & Awang, R.** (2018). Modeling van Dijk's Ideological Square in Translation Studies: Investigating Manipulation in Political Discourse Translation. *InTRALinea: Online Translation Journal*, 20, 1–7.
- Dahl, R. A.** (1957). The concept of power. *Behavioral science*, 2(3), 201–215.
- Fairclough, N.** (1989). *Language and power*. London: Longman.
- Fairclough, N.** (1992). Discourse and Text: Linguistic and Intertextual Analysis within Discourse Analysis. *Discourse & Society*, 3(2), 193–217. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0957926592003002004>
- Fairclough, I. & Fairclough, N.** (2012). *Political discourse analysis: A method for advanced students*. London, UK: Routledge.
- Fairclough, N.** (2015). *Language and power*. London: Routledge.
- Farlex Dictionary of Idioms.** (2015). Retrieved January 18 2022 from <https://idioms.thefreedictionary.com/walk+into+the+lion%27s+den>
- Frey, L. R., Botan, C. H. & Kreps, G. L.** (2000). *Investigating communication: an introduction to research methods*. Needham: Allyn and Bacon.
- Gökay, B. & Aybak, T.** (2016) Identity, race and nationalism in Turkey—Introduction to the special issue, *Journal of Balkan and Near Eastern Studies*, 18(2), 107–110, DOI: 10.1080/19448953.2016.1141575
- Hall, S.** (1996). The Question of Cultural Identity. In Hall, S., Held, D., Hubert, D. & Thompson, K. (eds.), *Modernity: An Introduction to Modern Societies*. (595–634). Cambridge: Mass., Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Jensen, A. L.** (2017). *The sociolinguistic role of Ottoman Turkish and Arabic in Turkish nationalism* (Doctoral dissertation, Sabanci University, Istanbul, Turkey). Retrieved from <http://risc01.sabanciuniv.edu/record=b1669265> (Table of Contents).
- McCarthy, M., Matthiessen, C. & Diana, S.** (2019). *Discourse analysis. An introduction to applied linguistics*. (55–71). London: Routledge.
- McCarthy, M. & Walsh, S.** (2003) Discourse. In D. Nunan (ed.), *Practical English Language Teaching*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Merriam-Webster.** (n.d.). Power. In *Merriam-Webster.com dictionary*. Retrieved August 4, 2022, from <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/power>
- Nunan, D.** (2015). *Teaching English to speakers of other languages: An introduction*. New York & Oxon: Routledge.
- Ortaylı, I.** (2019). *Ottoman studies* (5th ed.). Istanbul: Kronik.
- Renan, E.** (1892). What is a Nation? text of a conference delivered at the Sorbonne on March 11th, 1882 (translated by Ethan Rundell). In *Qu'est-ce qu'une nation?* Paris: Presses-Pocket. Retrieved from http://ucparis.fr/files/9313/6549/9943/What_is_a_Nation.pdf
- Rohler, L. E. & Cook, R.** (1998). *Great Speeches for Criticism and Analysis*. Pennsylvania: Alistair Press.
- Seufert, G.** (2014). *Erdogan's "New Turkey" Restoring the Authoritarian State in the Name of Democracy*. Berlin: German Institute for International and Security Affairs. SWP Comments

- Sly, L. & Sly, L.** (2014). *In Turkey, prime minister's party comes out on top in municipal elections*. Washington Post, March 31, 2014. https://www.washingtonpost.com/world/middle_east/in-turkey-prime-ministers-party-comes-out-on-top-in-municipal-elections/2014/03/30/6e08c986-b85a-11e3-9a05-c739f29ccb08_story.html?itid=lk_inline_manual_2
- Smith, A. D.** (1979). *Nationalism in the twentieth century*. Oxford: Martin Robertson.
- Smith, A.** (1991). *National Identity*. London: Penguin Press.
- Taylor, A.** (2014). *How Erdogan's jubilant victory speech targeted his two biggest enemies*. Washington Post, March 31, 2014. <https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/worldviews/wp/2014/03/31/how-erdogans-jubilant-victory-speech-targeted-his-two-biggest-enemies/>
- Vadai, K.** (2017). Critical discourse analysis for language education: Unveiling power, ideology and manipulation in political discourse. *Working Papers in Language Pedagogy*, 11, 96–138.
- Van Dijk, T. A.** (1993). Principles of Critical Discourse Analysis. *Discourse & Society*, 4(2), 249–283. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0957926593004002006>
- Van Dijk, T. A.** (1998). *A Multidisciplinary Approach*. London: Sage
- Van Dijk, T. A.** (2001). Multidisciplinary CDA: A plea for diversity. *Methods of critical discourse analysis*, 1: 95–120.
- Van Dijk, T. A.** (2006a). Ideology and discourse analysis. *Journal of political ideologies*, 11(2), 115–140.
- Van Dijk, T. A.** (2006b). Discourse and manipulation. *Discourse & Society*, 17(3), 359–383.
- Van Dijk, T. A.** (2011). Discourse and Ideology. In: van Dijk, T. A. (eds.), *Discourse Studies: A Multidisciplinary Introduction*. (379–407). London: Sage.
- Van Dijk, T. A.** (2013). Ideology and discourse. In Freedon, M., Stears, M. & Sargent, L. T. (eds.), *The Oxford handbook of political ideologies*. (75–196). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Wodak, R., Nowak, P., Pelikan, J., Gruber, H., de Cillia, R. & Mitten, R.** (1990). *“Wir sind alle unschuldige Täter!” Diskurshistorische Studien zum Nachkriegsantisemitismus*. Frankfurt, Germany: Suhrkamp.
- Wodak, R.** (2001). The Discourse-Historical Approach. In R. Wodak & M. Meyer (eds.), *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*. (63–94). London: SAGE.
- Wodak, R., De Cillia, R. & Reisigl, M.** (2009). *The discursive construction of national identity*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Appendix

Table 1. The Ideological Square Model in the speeches of Erdogan and Ataturk

Ideological Square Model	Erdogan’s speech (Appendix A):	Ataturk’s speech (Appendix B):
Undesirable negative representation		<p>Excerpt 1 “We shall raise our country to the level of the most prosperous and civilized nations of the world”</p> <p>Excerpt 2 “We shall raise our national culture above the contemporary level of civilization”</p> <p>Excerpt 3 “that it will soon be acknowledged once again by the entire civilized world that the Turkish nation, who has been progressing towards the national ideal in exact unison, is a great nation”</p>
(2) Undesirable positive representation		<p>Excerpt 4 “We shall raise our country to the level of the most prosperous and civilized nations of the world”</p> <p>Excerpt 5 “We shall raise our national culture above the contemporary level of civilization”</p> <p>Excerpt 6 “that it will soon be acknowledged once again by the entire civilized world that the Turkish nation, who has been</p>

Ideological Square Model	Erdogan's speech (Appendix A):	Ataturk's speech (Appendix B):
(3) Intended positive representation	<p style="text-align: center;">Excerpt 8</p> <p>“I express the gratitude of my people to all our brothers and friends who gave a support to Turkey's independence struggle just like before the Independence War of Turkey. Of course, this precious people deserve the greatest appreciation. My brothers; I thank you very much because you have protected the new Turkey's struggle for independence.”</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Excerpt 9</p> <p>“As long as the world stands, God willing, our flag will continue to wave in the highest bastions forever. For this, what have we said? We have said one nation with Turks, Kurds, Laz, Caucasians, Abkhazians, Bosniaks and Roma people. I do not love a Turk for being a Turk, a Kurd for being a Kurd, or a Laz for being a Laz. I love them because Allah who has created me has created the 77 million people”</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Excerpt 11</p> <p>“The message our precious people gave is very clear. The people gave a clear message to Turkey and to</p>	<p>progressing towards the national ideal in exact unison, is a great nation”</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Excerpt 7</p> <p>“We have accomplished many and great tasks in a short time. The greatest of these is the Turkish Republic, the basis of which is the Turkish heroism and the great Turkish culture. We owe this success to the cooperative progress of the Turkish nation and its valuable army”</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Excerpt 10</p> <p>“Turkish nation is of excellent character. The Turkish nation is intelligent, because the Turkish nation is capable of overcoming difficulties of national unity, and because it holds the torch of positive sciences”</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Excerpt 13</p> <p>“Never have doubted that the great, but forgotten, civilized characteristic and the great civilized talents of the Turkish nation, will, in its progress henceforth, rise like a new sun from the high horizon of civilization for the future.”</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Excerpt 14</p> <p>“How happy it is to say</p>

Ideological Square Model	Erdogan's speech (Appendix A):	Ataturk's speech (Appendix B):
	<p>the world: What did they say? They said “We are here.” They said, “The Turkish people are impassable.” “We are the owners of this country. the people will not bow and Turkey is invincible.”</p> <p>Excerpt 12</p> <p>“My brothers; there is a very important message conveyed by our people through the polls. Our people have made their objection and their stance against attempts to change the direction of Turkey through non-political ways”</p>	<p>that I am a Turk!”</p>
(4) Intended negative representation	<p>Excerpt 15</p> <p>“What did they say? They said “Chaos after March 25.” Correct. We saw the chaos. What was this chaos? This country found the opportunity to see the traitors who eavesdropped on the Foreign Ministry and committed treachery by interfering in the national security of this state and people. That was their chaos plan. I've been saying for months that “We'll walk into their dens.””</p> <p>Excerpt 16</p> <p>“Second, why don't you ask the same to the leaders of the opposition parties? But they [opposition leaders]</p>	

Ideological Square Model	Erdogan's speech (Appendix A):	Ataturk's speech (Appendix B):
	<p>have no such target. They will keep silent but will claim their win. Regardless of whether he receives 26, 27 or 28 percent, the general directorate [CHP leader] will say he won the elections. The other [MHP] will claim his win although he gets 13, 14 or 15 percent. Why? Because they have spent their lives this way. But what did your brother say?"</p> <p>Excerpt 17</p> <p>“As I have said, from now on, we'll walk into their dens. They will pay for this. How can you threaten our national security? Syria is in a state of war with us. They are harassing our planes. They have martyred our 74 brothers and the Süleyman Şah Tomb is our lands. An attack against there is an attack against 780,000 square kilometers. Can we remain silent about such a thing?"</p> <p>Excerpt 18</p> <p>“You know those people who used that blood-dripping, anger-inducing, hate-mongering headlines... Today, they have lost heavily again. O, Pennsylvania [referring to U.S.-based Islamic cleric Fethullah Gülen], o, the media who support them</p>	

Ideological Square Model	Erdogan's speech (Appendix A):	Ataturk's speech (Appendix B):
from here, o, the capital that supported them..."		