ETHOS BUILDING STRATEGIES IN THE POLITICAL DISCOURSE ON THE EXAMPLE OF PRE-ELECTION DEBATES FOR THE PRESIDENT OF THE REPUBLIC OF CROATIA

STRATEGIJE IZGRADNJE ETOSA U POLITIČKOM DISKURSU NA PRIMJERU PREDIZBORNOG SUČELJAVANJA ZA IZBOR PREDSJEDNIKA REPUBLIKE HRVATSKE

NIKOLINA BORCIC, PhD,
Senior lecturer at The University of Applied Sciences VERN'

STANA ODAK KRASIC, MJourn.,
Lecturer at The University of Applied Sciences VERN'

JELENA DESPOT, MA,
Teacher at Gimnazija Karlovac

Abstract: *As the main topic of this paper the authors state the analysis of a political discourse on the example of presidential debates, in the first round of the presidential elections in Croatia in 2014. Particular emphasis is placed on testing the basics of communication strategies of candidates, relating to the construction of ethos through the use of certain types of claims and arguments. Since the goal of this study was to demonstrate heterogeneity in communication styles and the identification of possible strategies of building ethos, the emphasis is placed on the analysis of argumentation skills. In the week before the first round of elections that were held on December 28, 2014, three television debates between Kolinda Grabar Kitarović, Ivo Josipović, Milan Kujundžić and Ivan Vilibor Sinčić were aired. The debate on the RTL Television aired on 21 December 2014, Nova TV on 22 December, 2014 and the Croatian Radio Television debate aired on 26 December, 2014. All three debates were the subject of analysis of this paper.*

Key words: Political Discourse, Strategies, Debates, Presidential Candidates

Apstrakt: *Kao glavnu temu ovoga rada autorice navode analizu političkog diskursa na primjeru televizijskih sučeljavanja predsjedničkih kandidata, u prvom krugu, na izborima za predsjednika Republike Hrvatske 2014. Poseban naglasak stavljen je na ispitivanje osnove komunikacijskih strategija kandidata, koje se odnose na izgradnju etosa kroz uporabu određenih vrsta tvrdnji i argumenata. Kako je cilj rada bio pokazati heterogenost u komunikacijskim stilovima i identifikacija moguće strategije izgradnje etosa, naglasak je stavljen na analizi vještine argumentacije. U tjednu prije održavanja prvog kruga izbora 28. prosinca 2014. emitirana su tri televizijska sučeljavanja u kojima su sudjelovali Kolinda Grabar Kitarović, Ivo Josipović, Milan Kujundžić i Ivan Vilibor Sinčić. Sučeljavanje RTL Televizije emitirano je 21. prosinca 2014., Nove TV 22. prosinca 2014. i sučeljavanje Hrvatske Radioteleviziji emitirano je 26. prosinca 2014. Sva tri sučeljavanja bila su predmetom analize ovoga rada.*
Ključne riječi: Politički diskurs, strategija, sučeljavanje, predsjednički kandidati

1. Introduction

The topic of this paper is the analysis of political discourse on the example of presidential debates in the first round of the presidential elections for the Croatian President in 2014. According to Grbeša (2005, cf. Budzyńska-Daca, 2012) democratic political debates are important, because then citizens get information about the values and attitudes of candidates. The article analyzes three television debates between presidential candidates in the first round of the presidential elections for the President of Croatia in 2014.

The intention of this paper is to analyse the heterogeneity in communication styles thus showing the model analysis of the politics language through the analysis of ethos, pathos and logos in certain types of argument claims of the candidates. Aristotle (1987: 24) describes the purpose of political speaker as beneficial or harmful, "because the one who encourages also advises of that what is better, the one who turns away, that one distracts from something

worse" which in this paper translates as one who argues ad rem, he builds his ethos through its credibility, advises what is better, while the one who argues ad hominem builds his credibility diminishing interlocutor, based on which his communication strategy through the Aristotle's vocabulary is understood as one that discourages from a worse thing.

The paper consists of three parts. The first, theoretical part discusses a political discourse and argumentation. In the central, main part of the paper, the empirical research is described, starting from methodological explanations to the presentation of research results. The third part of this paper is a conclusion which contains a generalized presentation of results of the analysis and guidelines for further development.

2. Political argumentation

The task of rhetorics is finding truly convincing and seemingly convincing communication, and by doing so political communication has no clearly defined rules such as judicial or epideictic ones because in political communication, the focus is on the means of communication, targeted on the future, where politicians talk mainly through the perspective of the past (Aristotle, 1987).

Aristotle further states that speech can convince in three ways; ethos or credibility, pathos or emotion caused by the statement, and logos, or the content of the statement (Ibid., Compare and Charteris-Black, 2005, Chilton, 2004, Westen, 2007, Borčić, 2009, 2012, and others). Schopenhauer (2009) also adopts the Aristotelian proof division into the ethos, pathos and logos. The ethos or the reputation of the speaker is the most important for the political speeches (Aristotle, 1987: 81). Logos represent the content of the speech or the speech itself. The patos means an appeal to the emotions of the audience, on conscious or unconscious level (cf. Westen, 2007). The ethos refers to the expression of credibility.

2.1 Ad hominem versus ad rem

This paper stresses the analysis of argumentation skills. According to Škarić (2011: 13) the argument or reasoning is the process of acquiring based on rational evidence or reasoning. In this paper, the emphasis is on the analysis of argumentation through the kinds of statements, and the distinction between the use of ad rem and ad hominem arguments. Ad hominem argu-

ments are frequent in the political discourse "on account" of political opponents in political debates and statements as the underlying mechanisms of building the ethos of politicians. Ad hominem itself can serve for reinforcing their own credibility, if not used as a rhetorical fallacy, when that is an argument to the opponent, e.g. references to their own or other authority in support of its position.

Argumentum ad rem claims to establish an absolute and general conclusion of the form "such and such" is the fact(cf. Misfud, 2001). Every implicit or explicit refutation of unacceptable argument is therefore considered ad rem argument, by which the focus is on the activity or the framework of activity, independent of the interlocutor.

2.2 Claims in argumentation act

The argumentation act consists of claims, a certain audience, the circumstances and reasons or substantiate (Škarić, 2011). Škarić (ibid.) lists four types of claims which are divided according to the issues, the address and the way they are formulated. Factual statements answer the question "what is something" and refer to the nature of things. Causal claims answer the question "why something is" and address the relationship of cause and effect. Value statements answer the question "what is something" and statements that relate to future or the political claims (cf. and Fahnestock and Secor, 2004) declares "what to do".

The role of a claim is multiple – it very often agrues, persuades, convices, proves and even very openly suggests to a reader who possibly agrees or even disagrees with it. In political speeches, the most common should be political claims because they revive a problem, offer a concrete solution and prove why it is the best solution as well as present factual assertions by which it is possible either describe the problem or describe the solution. The research of this paper focuses on the analysis of the ways through which politicians attract the trust of citizens, potential voters. The result will show if they factually describe the challenges and solutions or are they in their discourse focused on identifying a sample for a subsequent (current) condition, measuring "quality" of various political, social, economic and other topics.

3. Research

3.1 Objectives and research questions

In the week prior to the first round of elections[1] held on December 28, 2014 three television debates between Grabar Kitarović[2], Ivo Josipović[3], Milan Kujundžić[4]and Ivan Vilibor Sinčič[5], all four candidates, were aired. The aim of this paper is to demonstrate heterogeneity in communication styles and

---

[1] 47.14% of eligible voters, or 1,787,722 of the 3,792,638 eligible voters in total voted at the first round of presidental elections in Croatia held on December 28, 2014. Invalid and uncasted ballots was 1.60% or 28 712. In the first round 38.46% citizens voted for Ivo Josipović, the current president and candidate of the SDP party1, 37.22% voted for Kolinda Grabar-Kitaroivć, the candidate of Croatian Democratic Union (HDZ), 16.42% voted for Ivan VIlibor Sinčić, a candidate of 'Živi zid' and 6.30% for Milan Kujundžić, the candidate of the Alliance for Croatia. More on elections and election results on http://www.izbori.hr/106pre/rezult/1/rezultati.html (30.12.2014)

[2]Grabar Kitarović got her BA in English and Spanish language and literature at the Faculty of Philosophy in Zagreb, and the Faculty of Political Sciences in Zagreb where she did her postgraduate course in international relations. She was employed at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Croatia, was the Minister of Foreign Affairs and European Integration, fulfilling the obligations of the Ambassador of the Republic of Croatia in the United States and prior to the candidacy for the President worked as the Assistant Secretary General of NATO in charge of public diplomacy. She has been a member of the Croatian Democratic Union since the university graduation. More on: http://kolinda.hr/osobno (3. 12. 2014)

[3]Ivo Josipović graduated from Law School in Zagreb, where he also received his MA and PhD. He also graduated in composition at the Music Academy in Zagreb. Before being elected to the presidency, on Febrary 18, 2010 he was an university professor, a member of the Croatian Parliament and a composer. Prior to taking office as the president, he was a member of the Croatian Social Democratic Party (SDP). More on: http://Josipović.hr/biography (3. 12. 2014)

[4]Milan Kujundžić is a doctor by profession. He graduated from the Faculty of Medicine in Zagreb, where he also received his MA and PhD. He has been the head of the Department of Gastroenterology at the University Hospital Dubrava since 1996, and was the director of the same hospital from 2004 to 2012. Prior to 1990, he was not a member of any political organization and the same year he joined the Croatian Democratic Party (HDS), and from 1992 to 2013, he was a member of the HDZ. In 2013 he founded the 'Hrvatska zora' people's party. More on: http://www.milanKujundžić.hr/zivotopis (3. 12. 2014)

[5]Ivan Vilibor Sinčić, in his four years of activism and political work created and actively as the organizer participated in many actions and initiatives aimed against the political elites and their arbitrariness. Back in February 2011, he was one of the co-organizers of protests against the government of the HDZ, and since 2012, has been organizing and coordinaing the work of the 'Živi zid', an organization that actively prevents the eviction of citizens which the banks and corrupted courts and state throw out onto the street. He actively cooperates with many associations for the protection of human rights and activist organizations. Personal information about the candidate are not available on relevant web sites. More on: http://ivan-Sinčić.com (3. 12. 2014)

identify possible strategies of building ethos. Accordingly, the paper raises the following research questions:

1. For which purpose a candidate / candidate uses factual / political / causal / securities claims? For the purpose of enhancing their own ethos or the impairment ofthe opponent's ethos?
2. Is the communication of a candidate based on ad hominem or ad rem arguments / statements and is the purpose of these statements to enhance their own ethos orto impair the opponent's ethos?

3.2 The methodology and corpus

The study is based on qualitative and quantitative content analysis of transcribed testimonies of candidates in the debates. The quantitative serves as a support for the qualitative. A research unit is an account / a statement of speakers about a particular theme concept. Qualitative content analysis uses the basic premises of the model analysis of corpustaken from Brinker (2005), Searle (2003) and Ivanetić (2003). Political statements in the pre-election debates are viewed as means of action in the framework of interaction between the candidates and the (potential) voters, which is in accordance with the communication-pragmatic model description of a text / discourse (cf. Ivanetić, 2003).

The unit of the research is the statement of a presidential candidateor illocution of these statements. According to the Searlov's[6] theory of speech acts (2003) illocutionsare possible to realize in one or more sentences that have meaning. In this paper, the notion of discursive illocution is analysed through the type of a claim (cf. Borčić, 2009, 2012). This way the candidates answering questions define the state of things, express (their) value judgment towards the topic, suggest a causal relationship or define solutions and implications for the future. The qualitative content analysis consists of the following analyses (cf. Borčić, 2009, 2012):

1. The grammatical analysis of a statement / response: relevant syntactic and semantic relations between sentences of the text are analysed, the morphological analysis of component sentence is conducted.

---

[6]Compare also: The theory of speech acts (Austin, 2002) divides the speech act in simultaneous sections:

2. The thematic analysis of the structure: the analysis of cognitive correlation-screated by a text with its content.

The survey is conducted on three television debates broadcasted between December 21-26, 2014 on RTL Television (hereinafter RTL), Nova TV (hereinafter: Nova) and Croatian Radio and Television (hereinafter HRT). The analysis is carried out on a total of three hours and 97 minutes of TV debates, of which the debate on RTL lasted one hour and 29 minutes minutes, the debate on Nova for an hour and 30 minutes, while the debate on HRT lasted one hour and 43 minutes. Candidates held a debate on 21 December of 2014 at 7 pm in the show by the name ofRTL Debate on RTL Television[7], then on December 22, 2014 at 8 pm on Nova TV[8], and on December 26, candidates held a debate on HRT[9].

3.3 Results and discussion

3.3.1 The debate of presidential candidates on RTL Television

The debate on RTL[10] lasted 90 minutes and was seen by about 652,000 citizens[11]. The debate was clearly structured in 14 different thematic concepts, questions were asked on topics of internal and foreign policies, monetization of highways, war veterans, functions and powers of the President.

All the candidates were focused on the same goal - getting sympathy from voters, they vigorously argued their positions, using all kinds of state-ments, which Škarić (2011, cf. and Fahnestock and Secor, 2004) differs, whereby securities claims dominate with all the candidates (cf. Table 1), and almost all use for the purpose of enhancing their own credibility.

---

[7]More about the debate at http://www.rtl.hr/vijesti/novosti/predsjednicki-izbori/1451131/cak-651895-ljudi-pratilo-rtl-debatu-predsjednickih-kandidata/ (30.12.2014)

[8]More about the debate at http://dnevnik.hr/vijesti/hrvatska/najvaznija-debata-predsjednicke-utrke-mislav-bago-suceljava-kandidate---365839.html (30.12.2014)

[9]More about the debate at http://www.hrt.hr/predsjednicki-izbori/izbori-za-predsjednika-rh-suceljavanje-kandidata-petak-hrt1-i-hrt4-2010 (30.12.2014)

[10]https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=fFTrgZEsY_M(20.01.2015)

[11]http://m.tportal.hr/vijesti/364264/HRT-jos-ne-zna-tko-ce-biti-njihov-Bobic-i-Bago.html(20.01.2015)

Television	Candidates	purpose of political claims uttered by the candidate?		What is the purpose of using factual claims??		What is the purpose of using security claims?		What is the purpose of using causal claims?		Do candidates use ad hominem arguments?		Do candidates use ad rem arguments?	
		Enhancing personal ethos	Diminishing the opponent's ethos	Enhancing personal ethos	Diminishing the opponent's ethos	Enhancing personal ethos	Diminishing the opponent's ethos	Enhancing personal ethos	Diminishing the opponent's ethos	Enhancing personal ethos	Diminishing the opponent's ethos	Enhancing personal ethos	Diminishing the opponent's ethos
RTL	Kolinda Grabar Kitarović (n=34)	4 12%	1 2%	2 5%	3 (8%)	12 (35%)	4 (12%)	5 (14%)	4 (12%)	12 (35%)	1 (3%)	15 (44%)	6 (18%)
	Ivo Josipović (n=29)	6 (21%)	1 (3%)	5 (17%)	3 (10%)	9 (32%)	2 (7%)	2 (7%)	1 (3%)	9 (33%)	5 (19%)	12 (42%)	3 (6%)
	Milan Kujundžić (n=40)	3 (8%)	2 (5%)	8 (20%)	1 (3%)	8 (20%)	9 (23%)	6 (15%)	3 (8%)	11 (27%)	19 (47%)	7 (18%)	3 (8%)
	Ivan Vilibor Sinčić (n=41)	3 (7%)	1 (3%)	7 (17%)	3 (7%)	11 (27%)	8 (20%)	5 (12%)	3 (7%)	7 (17%)	13 (32%)	12 (29%)	9 (22%)

Table 1. The results of the presidential debates analysis on RTL

Although according to Fahnestock and Secor (2004) political claims should be dominant in the political discourse, in this case, this cannot be establish. The reason for it may be a large number of statement topics that are not primarily within the powers of the President, and as such probably cannot be solved due to the lack of enough effective mechanisms. Presidential candidates argue using ad hominem or ad rem argumentative approach to the topic statements, dominantly so by Grabar Kitarović and Josipović ad rem (example 1) for the purpose of enhancing their own ethos (see Table 1).

(1) „*In my first mandate, I achieved, together with the Croatian Government a generational goal, Croatian accession to the European Union. I've repaired relations with neighbors*". (I J[12])

According to the results in Table 2, Kujundžić and Sinčić predominantly used ad hominem, but for the purpose of reducing ethos of the opponent, as shown in the example(2).

(2) „*So, Mr. Josipović has now admitted, whose product he is. Of his party and a couple of companies. So, he has told it all – who he is, who did he work for and continues to work for.* (MK)

3.3.2 Presidential debates on Croatian Radio and Television

Presidential debate on HRT[13], which lasted about 100 minutes was watched by around 577,000 viewers[14]. The candidates answered to questions related to the internal and foreign policy, the economy and social policy and personal and world-view questions.

The results presented in Table 2 indicate that this debate was also dominated by securities claims, indicating that all the candidates estimate that Croatian voters are most allured to "how is what " – discourse.

---

[12]The names of politicians will be referred to with the initial letters of the names and surnames.
[13]https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=o_jFYN7GuO8(20.01.2015)
[14]http://m.tportal.hr/vijesti/364264/HRT-jos-ne-zna-tko-ce-biti-njihov-Bobic-i-Bago.html (20.01.2015)

Television	Candidates	What is the purpose of political claims uttered by the candidates		What is the purpose of using factual claims??		What is the purpose of using security claims?		What is the purpose of using causal claims?		Do candidates use ad hominem arguments?		Do candidates use ad rem arguments?	
		Enhancing personal ethos	Diminishing the opponent's ethos	Enhancing personal ethos	Diminishing the opponent's ethos	Enhancing personal ethos	Diminishing the opponent's ethos	Enhancing personal ethos	Diminishing the opponent's ethos	Enhancing personal ethos	Diminishing the opponent's ethos	Enhancing personal ethos	Diminishing the opponent's ethos
HRT	Kolinda Grabar Kitarović (n=52)	3 (6%)	1 (2%)	9 (17%)	6 (12%)	17 (33%)	8 (14%)	5 (10%)	3 (6%)	12 (23%)	4 (8%)	24 (46%)	12 (23%)
	Ivo Josipović (n=47)	4 (9%)	1 (2%)	11 (23%)	4 (9%)	18 (38%)	2 (4%)	4 (9%)	3 (6%)	11 (23%)	4 (8%)	20 (43%)	12 (26%)
	Milan Kujundžić (n=49)	2 (4%)	1 (2%)	6 (12%)	5 (10%)	11 (22%)	15 (32%)	5 (10%)	4 (8%)	15 (31%)	24 (49%)	6 (12%)	4 (8%)
	Ivan Vilibor Sinčić (n=40)	3 (7%)	1 (3%)	8 (20%)	7 (18%)	10 (25%)	6 (15%)	3 (7%)	2 (5%)	12 (30%)	10 (25%)	15 (37%)	3 (8%)

Table 2. Results of presidential debate analysis on HRT

It is evident that with Grabar Kitarović, Josipović and Sinčić dominant are value claims in order to enhance their credibility, while at the same time with Kujundžić they are dominant for the purpose of reducing the ethos of the opponent, in accordance with the results of Table 2. The stated can be seen in the examples (3) and (4) .

(3) „*.Unfortunately, the damage to Croatia was directly caused by Ivo Jospović, when we talk about international relations. I'll just enumerate some- lex Perkovic, Knesej, Sarajevo, Belgrade, Banja Luka. Thus, it is a precedent that one president outside the country directly damagesit by saying bad things about the country*" (MK)

(4) „*(…)otherwise I'm a person who cannot be blackmailed, who cannot be manipulated with and I would not let the same be done with my country.*" (KGK).

This debate has almost equal ratio of ad hominem and ad rem shaped arguments, 86 "ad hominem" are in total identifiedin all the statements; the arguments relating to the essence of things are 93. In the statements of Grabar Kitarović and Ivo Josipović there are more ad rem arguments, and with both candidates the dominating arguments are for the purpose of enhancing their own ethos. Ad hominem arguments are more dominant than ad rem arguments in the statements of Kujundžić and Sinčić, as can be seen from Table 2.

3.3.3 Presidential debate on NOVA

The debate on Nova[15] was watched by around 840,000 people[16]. The analysis of thematic, semantic, syntactic and pragmatic structures of expression, or sentence in the statements (Table 3) showed that Ivo Josipović enhances his own dominant ethos using the value (28%) and factual statements (16%), while reducing the opponent's ethos mainly through security claims (14%), and fact (7%) and causal claims (7%), as in Example (5):

(5) *When we talk about the way we can solve the economic crisis, how the president can impact the economy, it really is in all these ways that we have mentioned here, but the concepts of hunting money in foreign banks that was allegedly stolen in this way, as Mr. Sinčić is saying, simply isn't realistic. Therefore, it would be good if Mr. Sinčić synchronises his ambitions with the possibilities provided by the Constitution*" (IJ)

---

[15]https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=D8TrlzWhdvU(20.01.2015)

[16]http://predsjednicki-izbori.hr/vijesti/vise-od-840-000-gledatelja-pratilo-suceljavanje-na-novoj-tv/ (29.12.2014)

Presidential candidate Grabar Kitarovićspeaks on her own credibility by answering questions and / or replicas through securities claims (33%), which are also the most dominant when she wants to point out the lack of credibility of other candidates (15%), as in Example 8. BothJosipović and Grabar Kitarović (example 6) in their statements are more focused on building their own credibility but diminishing the credibility of the opponent, which cannot be said for candidates Kujundžić and Sinčić.

(6) *„In the last two and a half months I have been throughout the entire Croatia. I have been a HDZ party member since '90s. You were too, but you left it and abandoned the party, but I stayed through the hard times, and people appreciate it."* (KGK)

Thus, the statements of Milan Kujundžićare dominated by pronouncements in which he aims at reducing the ethos of his opponents, the security claims (22%) and causal claims (24%). Ivan Sinčić in this debate equally aims to enhancehis credibility and diminish the credibility of the opponents and in the securities claims proportionally increases his own ethos (17%) and reduces the ethos of the opponent (19%), similar to the causal claims, according to the results of table 3.

Analysing the statements of candidates according to the perspectiveof the speakers in relation to the thematic object through the eyes of ad hominem or ad rem, the following results were obtained: Grabar Kitarović and Josipović dominantly argue ad rem (see Table 3) for the purpose of enhancing their own ethos, as in the examples (6), Kujundžić dominantly uses ad hominem arguments undermining the credibility of the opponent (64%), while the dominant argument with Sinčić is ad rem (40%) for the purpose of diminishing the credibility of the opponent, as shown in the examples(7) and (8):

(7) *„Mr. Kujundžić, you were placed on the position of the director of the hospital by mr. Ivo Sanader who was the president of the most corrupted government in the Republic of Croatia. So, please be fair and do not asksuch personal questions, because I respect all the candidates, you included. "*(IS)

(8) *„Actually I'm surprised by Mr. Josipović when he divides crimes to the right-wing crimes and crimes of the left-wing. He actually shows again, maliciously, that he is not mistaken, he maliciously qualifies."* (MK)

Finally, it is clear that the way of conceptualizing the attitudes is similar in the discourse of Grabar Kitarović and Josipovića in the analysed debates.

NIKOLINA BORCIC, STANA ODAK KRASIC I JELENA DESPOT: *Ethos Building Strategies in the Political Discourse on the Example of Pre-Election Debates for the President of the Republic of Croatia*

335

Television	Candidates	What is the purpose of political claims uttered by the candidates		What is the purpose of using factual claims??		What is the purpose of using security|l claims?		What is the purpose of using causal claims?		Do candidates use *ad homine-* marguments?		Do candidates use *ad rem* arguments?	
		Enhancing personal ethos	Diminishing the opponent's ethos	Enhancing personal ethos	Diminishing the opponent's ethos	Enhancing personal ethos	Diminishing the opponent's ethos	Enhancing personal ethos	Diminishing the opponent's ethos	Enhancing personal ethos	Diminishing the opponent's ethos	Enhancing personal ethos	Diminishing the opponent's ethos
NOVA TV	Kolinda Grabar Kitarović (n=52)	3 (6%)	2 (4%)	7 (13%)	4 (8%)	17 (33%)	8 (15%)	5 (10%)	6 (12%)	4 (8%)	10 (19%)	33 (63%)	5 (10%)
	Ivo Josipo-vić (n=58)	4 (7%)	1 (2%)	9 (16%)	7 (12%)	16 (28%)	8 (14%)	6 (10%)	7 (12%)	7 (12%)	16 (28%)	29 (50%)	6 (10%)
	Milan Kujundžić (n=54)	1 (2%)	2 (4%)	5 (9%)	2 (4%)	8 (15%)	12 (22%)	11 (20%)	13 (24%)	7 (13%)	34 (64%)	5 (8%)	8 (15%)
	Ivan Vilibor Sinčić (n=53)	1 (2%)	1 (2%)	9 (17%)	5 (9%)	9 (17%)	10 (19%)	9 (17%)	9 (17%)	10 (19%)	7 (13%)	15 (28%)	21 (40%)

Table 3. The results of debate analysis on Nova TV

4. Conclusion

This paper approaches the topic of political communication in the pre-election debates from textual-linguistic, semantic, cognitive-linguistic and argumentative perspective. The basic language, or textual function of statements in presidential debates is the informative-persuasive function. Presidential candidates through the offered conceptual statements want to challenge recipient's own interpretation in order of gaining their affection.

Prior to the research of presidential debate 2014, it was assumed, and the research confirmed that the discourse is dominated by value judgments as a way of expressing attitude. The above is dominant in the political communication because it is precisely by displaying or criticizing certain segments of a topic the support of (potential) voters is encouraged or lost (cf. Charteris-Black, 2005, Westen, 2007).

When it comes to the type of an argument, in the statements by Grabar Kitarović and Josipović dominant were ad rem arguments and in the statements by Sinčić and Kujundžić dominant were ad hominem arguments. From the above it can be concluded that the ad rem arguments are more effective in the realization of informative and persuasive language functions, since in the first election round, according to the results of the Presidential elections in Croatia[17] held on 28 December 2014, 38.46% of citizens voted for Ivo Josipović, the current president and SDP party[18] candidate, 37.22% voted for Kolinda Grabar-Kitarović, 16,42% voted for Ivan Vilibor Sinčić and 6,30% for Milan Kujundžić.

In conclusion, the main aim of this study isfirst and foremost to show the model analysis of language within which the sentence has a meaning which contributes to the persuasion of political discourse that is analysed. The results based on which the conclusions are drawn are only symptomatic of this sample, but serve as an incentive for further research.

---

[17]More on elections and results at http://www.izbori.hr/106pre/rezult/1/rezultati.html (30.12.2014)

[18]Only SDP is stated here, since this party's name was alongside the candidate's name

Literature

Amossy, R. (2009). Argumentation in Discourse: A Socio-discursive approach to arguments. In: J. Ritola (Ed.), Argument Cultures: Proceedings of OSSA 09, pp. 1- 12

Aristotel (1987). Retorika 1, Retorika 2, Retorika 2. Beograd: Nezavisna izdanja 40

Borčić, N. (2009). Kontrastivna analiza tekstne vrste politički intervju s obzirom na rodne osobitosti. Master's Thesis. Zadar: Sveučilište u Zadru.

Borčić, N. (2012). Konceptualna metafora i semantička polja u tekstnoj vrsti politički intervju u odnosu na rodne osobitosti. Dissertation. Zadar: Sveučilište u Zadru.

Brinker, K. (2005). Linguistische Textanalyse. Eine Einführung in die Grundlage und Methoden. Berlin: Erich Schmidt Verlag.

Budzyńska-Daca, A. (2012). Rhetoris Proof in the Pathos Sphere in the Great Pre-election TV Debates, Studies in Logic, Grammar and Rhetoric, 28 (41), pp. 207-219

Charteris-Black, J. (2005). Politicians and Rhetoric. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Chilton, P. (2004). Analysing Political Discourse. London and New York: Routledge.

Fahnestock, J., Secor, M. (2004). A Rhetoric of Argument. Boston: McGraw Hill.

Grbeša, M. (2005). Suvremene izborne kampanje i kako one utječu na demokratski proces. Politička misao, Vol. XLII/1, 49-59.

Ivanetić, N. (2003). Uporabni tekstovi. Zagreb: Zavod za lingvistiku Filozofskog fakulteta Sveučilišta u Zagrebu.

Mifsud, M. L. (2001). Revision and Immortality in Philosophical Argumentation: Reconsidering the Rhetorical Wedge. InformaI Logic,Vol. 21, No.l, pp.61-69.

Schopenhauer, A. (2009). The Art of Controversy, Adelaide: eBooks.

Searle, J. (2003). Sprechakte. Ein sprachphilosophischer Essay. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.

Škarić, I. (2011). Argumentacija. Zagreb: Nakladni zavod Globus.

Westen, D. (2007). The Political Brain. The Role of Emotion in Deciding the Fate of The Nation. New York: PublicAffairs.

Web sources

Dnevnik.hr, http://dnevnik.hr/vijesti/hrvatska/najvaznija-debata-predsjednicke-utrke-mislav-bago-suceljava-kandidate---365839.html

Hrvatska Radiotelevizija, http://www.hrt.hr/predsjednicki-izbori/ izbori-za-predsjednika-rh-suceljavanje-kandidata-petak-hrt1-i-hrt4-2010

Ivan Vilibor Sinčić, http://ivan-Sinčić.com

Ivo Josipović, http://Josipović.hr/biography

Kolinda, http://kolinda.hr/osobno

Milan Kujundžić, http://www.milanKujundžić.hr/zivotopis

Predsjednički izbori 2014. Republika Hrvatska http://www.izbori.hr/ 106pre/rezult/1/rezultati.html

Predsjednički izbori 2014. Republika Hrvatska, http://www.izbori.hr/ 106pre/rezult/1/rezultati.html

Predsjednički izbori, http://predsjednicki-izbori.hr/vijesti/vise-od-840-000-gledatelja-pratilo-suceljavanje-na-novoj-tv/

RTL Televizija, http://www.rtl.hr/vijesti/novosti/predsjednicki-izbori/ 1451131/cak-651895-ljudi-pratilo-rtl-debatu-predsjednickih-kandidata/

tportal.hr,. http://m.tportal.hr/vijesti/364264/HRT-jos-ne-zna-tko-ce-biti -njihov-Bobic-i-Bago.html

YouTube, https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=D8TrlzWhdvU, (Nova TV, Sučeljavanje predsjedničkih kandidata)

YouTube, https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=fFTrgZEsY_M, (RTL, Sučeljavanje predsjedničkih kandidata)

YouTube, https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=o_jFYN7GuO8, (HRT 1, Sučeljavanje predsjedničkih kandidata)