DOI: 10.7596/taksad.v7i1.1463

The Category of Evaluation in Barack Obama's Election Discourse: An Empirical Account

Rakhim Zakiyevich Muryasov[1], Anna Sergeyevna Samigullina[2],

Rafael Arkadyevich Gazizov[3]

Abstract

The purpose of the present piece of research is concerned with functional peculiarities identification of the category of evaluation as manifested in the Barack Obama election discourse. Present-day linguistics emphasizes the importance of such studies whose findings could be applicable not only in the process of linguistic analysis proper, but also in the related spheres of knowledge such as political science, political rhetoric, etc. Furthermore, taking into account the innate ability of a human-being to perform the so-called evaluative reasoning, it seems topical to consider how this reasoning is reflected in the political discourse of key political figures. Evaluation is treated as a heterogeneous phenomenon typical of human cognition and psychology. Evaluation constructs the ideological basis of a discourse as well as builds and maintains relationships between interactants. Evaluation in discourse is realized within three interacting domains of attitude, engagement, and graduation. The first one (attitude) is seen as of special interest within the scope of the present investigation.

Keywords: Evaluation, Political discourse, Election discourse, Attitude, Affect, Judgment, Appreciation.

[1] Doctor of Philology, Professor of the Chair of German and French Philology, Bashkir State University, Ufa, the Russian Federation. E-mail: muryasov72@gmail.ru

[2] Doctor of Philology, Professor of the Chair of the English Language and Intercultural Communication, Bashkir State University, Ufa, the Russian Federation. E-mail: lingua_anna@mail.ru

[3] Doctor of Philology, Professor of the Chair of German and French Philology, Bashkir State University, Ufa, the Russian Federation. E-mail: ragazizov@mail.ru

1. Introduction

Evaluation is a heterogeneous phenomenon typical of human cognition and psychology. The notion under consideration turns out to be evasive in terms of localization and identification. In Russian linguistics evaluation represents a pragmatic meaning of attitudinal character (see, for example, works by Ivin 1970; Volf 1978, 1981, 2006; Sternin 1979; Khidekel & Koshel 1981; Teliya 1986; Mironova 1997; Arutyunova 1988; Vasilyev 1996; Sergeyeva 2003, 2004; Muryasov, Samigullina, & Fedorova 2004; Matveyeva 2012). In foreign linguistics evaluation (appraisal) is predominantly treated as a "cover term", or "umbrella term" evoking the appearance of an attitudinal meaning, interpersonal meaning, and textual meaning.

Within the framework of the present article **evaluation** is viewed upon as *a certain attitude of a speaker / writer to the objects, phenomena, events. This attitude is primarily realized through affect, judgment, and appreciation emerging on the basis of the normative worldview and the system of socially accepted values.* Being a multi-perspectival model, the category of evaluation bears strong links with such related categories as of **deixis**, **modality**, **emotivity**, and **expressivity**.

Evaluation in discourse is realized within three domains of attitude, engagement, and graduation which inevitably interact with one another. The first one (that of attitude) is seen as of special interest within the scope of the present investigation.

In general terms *political discourse* is viewed upon as a special kind of discourse produced by political actors, placed in a certain political context, and aimed at the general public in order to elicit certain reactions on their part to this or that political event. It is a prominent way of 'doing politics', as most political actions are largely discursive.

Linguists working within the framework of political discourse analysis identify a number of strategic functions characteristic of political discourse, i.e. 1) coercion; 2) resistance, protest, and opposition; 3) dissimulation; 4) legitimation and delegitimation; 5) unification; 6) fragmentation; 7) reification; 8) representation; and 9) misrepresentation (Chilton & Schaeffner, 1997: 212-213).

Election discourse is a special sphere of communication linked to the time and place of election campaign conduction, and it assists a definite social sphere known as political elections (Gaykova 2003; Golubeva 2009). The discourse under consideration includes speech activity taking place in the process of political communication as well as the results / outcomes of this communication realized through aggregates of texts. *Election discourse* has the following constitutive features, i.e. polysubjectivity, publicity, conventionality, evaluativeness, agonality, aggressiveness, informativity, sense-related ambiguity, dynamism, mass media factor, predisposition to distance keeping, authoritarian stance, theatricality, propaganda-boundness, etc. *Election discourse* consists of such basic structural components as *environment*, *social subject*, *content*, *text*, *direct addressee*, *object of communication*.

2. Methodological Premises

As far as politics is concerned, one can arrive at the conclusion that in struggle for power and domination language plays a key role so that every political action could become effective.

N. Fairclough, in his work *Language and Power,* aims at "examining how the ways in which we communicate are constrained by the structures and forces of those social institutions within which we live and function." (1989: vi). Fairclough singles out three levels of discourse: the first one deals with the so-called *social conditions of production and interpretation*; the second level of discourse emphasizes the *process of production and interpretation*; the third level is the level of the *text* which is looked upon as the outcome of stage one and stage two (Ibid.). In the linguist's theory the above mentioned levels of discourse correlate with the three stages of critical discourse analysis: 1) description deals with the formal

properties of the text; 2) <u>interpretation</u> stresses the relationship between text and interaction; 3) <u>explanation</u> circles around the relationship between interaction and social context (Fairclough, 1989).

Empirical data: Our analysis of the category of evaluation as manifested in the Obamite election discourse is carried out on the basis of B. Obama's three speeches united by the common context that of election campaign and having the so-called temporal proximity:

1) ***President Obama's Remarks in Columbus***, Ohio, May 5th, 2012 [Ohio Speech];

2) ***President Obama's Speech from the Democratic National Convention***, Charlotte, September 6th, 2012 [Acceptance Speech];

3) ***President Obama's Victory Speech***, Chicago, November 7th, 2012 [Victory Speech].

3. The Evaluation-oriented Domain of Attitude in the Obamite Election Discourse

The analysis of the B. Obama election speeches is construed along the methodological prerequisites of evaluation functioning as displayed in the J.R. Martin and P.R.R. White *the Language of Evaluation* (2005). We intend to look exceptionally into the attitudinal dimension of evaluative meaning realized through the subcategories of ***affect***, ***judgment***, and ***appreciation*** (Ibid.).

The Sub-category of Affect

Taking into consideration the fact that **affect** (according to the authors of *The Language of Evaluation* Thesis) represents the emotive dimension of evaluation, it tends to be rather concealed in [Ohio Speech] and [Acceptance Speech], but it comes to the fore in [Victory Speech].

<u>[Victory Speech] affect is realized through the following most common linguistic patterns</u>: [affect as 'state'], [affect as 'process' → affective mental + graduation], [affect as 'quality' → describing participants], [affect as 'quality'→ nominalized realization of quality], etc.:

• It moves forward because of you. It moves forward because you reaffirmed the spirit that has triumphed over war and **depression**, the spirit that has lifted this country from the depths of **despair** to the great heights of hope, the belief that while each of us will pursue our own individual dreams, we are an American family, and we rise or fall together as one nation and as one people. (Cheers, applause.) [affect as 'state'].

• I just spoke with Governor Romney and I congratulated him and Paul Ryan on a hard-fought campaign. (Cheers, applause.) We may have battled fiercely, but it's only because we **love** this country **deeply** and we **care so strongly** about its future. From George to Lenore to their son Mitt, the Romney family has chosen to give back to America through public service. And that is a legacy that we honor and applaud tonight. (Cheers, applause.) In the weeks ahead, I also look forward to sitting down with Governor Romney to talk about where we can work together to move this country forward. [Affect as 'process' → affective mental + graduation in *so strongly*].

• And tonight, despite all the hardship we've been through, despite all the **frustrations** of Washington, I've never been **more hopeful** about our future. (Cheers, applause.) I have never been more hopeful about America. And I ask you to sustain that hope. [affect as 'quality'→ nominalized realization of quality in *frustrations*; affect as 'quality'→ attributed to participants and accompanied by graduation in *to be more hopeful*].

Our analysis shows that the most exploited emotions and feelings conveyed by the Victory Speech are those of **LOVE**, **PRIDE**, **HOPE**, and **GRATITUDE**. The most widespread pattern is **affect as 'quality'**.

[Ohio Speech] affect is realized through the following linguistic patterns: [affect as 'quality'→ attributed to participants], [affect as 'quality' → attributed to states], [affect as 'quality'→ nominalized realization of quality]:

• When some wanted to let Detroit go bankrupt, we made a bet on American workers, on the ingenuity of American companies. And today, our auto industry is back on top of the world. Manufacturers started investing again, adding jobs for the first time since the 1990s. Businesses got back to the basics, exports surged. And over four million jobs were created in the last two years -- more than one million of those in the last six months alone. Are we **satisfied**? [Affect as 'quality'→ attributed to participants].

• My opponent said it was **'tragic'** to end the war in Iraq. He said he won't set a timeline for ending the war in Afghanistan. [Affect as 'quality' → attributed to states].

• That's what we're fighting for. That's what we're fighting for, Ohio. A bold America. A competitive America. A generous America. A forward-looking America, where everybody has a chance to make of their life what they will. That's what made us **the envy** of the world. That's what makes us great. That's why I'm running again for President of the United States. [Affect as 'quality'→ nominalized realization of quality].

[Acceptance Speech] affect is realized through the following linguistic patterns: [affect as 'process'], [affect as 'quality'], [affect as 'comment']:

• Michelle, I **love** you. The other night, I think the entire country saw just how lucky I am. Malia and Sasha, you make me **so proud**…but don't get any ideas, you're still going to class tomorrow. And Joe Biden, thank you for being the best Vice President I could ever hope for. [affect as 'process' in *I love you* → affective mental, affect as 'quality'→ attributed to participants and accompanied by graduation in *to be so proud*].

• I've signed trade agreements that are helping our companies sell more goods to millions of new customers – goods that are stamped with three **proud** words: Made in America. [affect as 'comment'].

Hence, Ohio Speech and Acceptance Speech illustrate the presence of such mixed feelings and emotions as **LOVE**, **PRIDE**, and **SORROW** (being tragic) mainly realized with the aid of affect as 'quality' pattern.

The Sub-category of Judgment

As J.R. Martin and P.R.R. White point out, "with **judgment** we move into the region of meaning construing our attitudes to people and the way they behave – their character (how they measure up)" (2005). Generally speaking, **judgments** can be of two types, according to the linguists, 1) those concerned with 'social esteem' as well as 2) those focused on 'social sanction'. **Judgments** of **esteem** are rightfully associated with such aspects as 'normality' (stressing the usual aspect of someone), 'capacity' (dealing with their capabilities on a large scale) and 'tenacity' (showing the degree of their resolution) (Ibid.). **Judgments** of **sanction** circle around both 'veracity' (demonstrating how truthful somebody is) and 'propriety' (bringing to the fore the ethical aspect of someone and someone's behavior).

Social esteem tends to be expressed mainly through such oral genres of communication as different kinds of rumors, jokes, stories, etc. where the so-called humorous effect is normally created and turns out to be of first-rate importance for both the speaker and the listener. By contrast, **social sanction** is more often rendered in writing (it is common practice to codify it in various rules, regulations and laws about the accepted normality of a person's behavior (Ibid.).

Examples of _judgment as social esteem_ in the Obamite election speeches under consideration (adjectival patterns):

Normality 'how special' (positive [admire]):

The other night, I think the entire country saw just how lucky I am. [Acceptance Speech].

We know that our country is stronger when we can count on affordable health insurance and Medicare and Social Security. [Ohio Speech].

Normality 'how special' (negative [criticize]):

I want to thank so many of our Neighborhood Team Leaders for being here today. You guys will be the backbone of this campaign. And I want the rest of you to join a team or become a leader yourself, because we are going to win this thing the **old-fashioned** way -- door by door, block by block, neighborhood by neighborhood. [Ohio Speech].

Capacity 'how capable' (positive [admire]):

Six months ago, I would watch him walk into a White House dinner honoring those who served in Iraq, tall and twenty pounds heavier, dashing in his uniform, with a big grin on his face; sturdy on his new leg. [Acceptance Speech].

Capacity 'how capable' (negative [criticize]):

I know that political campaigns can sometimes seem small, even silly. And that provides plenty of fodder for the cynics who tell us that politics is nothing more than a contest of egos or the domain of special interests. [Victory Speech].

Tenacity 'how dependable' (positive [admire]):

But that's not an excuse to tell the vast majority of responsible, hardworking Americans, 'You're on your own.' [Ohio Speech].

Tenacity 'how dependable' (negative [criticize]):

I'm not talking about the wishful idealism that allows us to just sit on the sidelines or shirk from a fight. I have always believed that hope is that **stubborn** thing inside us that insists, despite all the evidence to the contrary, that something better awaits us so long as we have the courage to keep reaching, to keep working, to keep fighting. [Victory Speech].

Examples of *judgment as social sanction* in the Obamite election speeches under consideration (adjectival patterns):

Veracity [truth] 'how honest' (positive [praise]):

That's the true lesson of our past, Ohio. That's the right vision for our future. And that's why I'm running for President. [Ohio Speech].

Veracity [truth] 'how honest' (negative [condemn]): Cases of negative veracity haven't been identified in the Obamite discourse under analysis.

Propriety [ethics] 'how far beyond reproach?' (Positive [praise]):

I want to reform the tax code so that it's simple, fair, and asks the wealthiest households to pay higher taxes on incomes over $250,000 – the same rate we had when Bill Clinton was president; the same rate we had when our economy created nearly 23 million new jobs, the biggest surplus in history, and a lot of millionaires to boot. [Acceptance Speech].

Propriety [ethics] 'how far beyond reproach?' (Negative [condemn]):

That's why we do this. That's what politics can be. That's why elections matter. It's not small, it's big. It's important. Democracy in a nation of 300 million can be **noisy** and **messy** and complicated. We have our own opinions. Each of us has deeply held beliefs. [Victory Speech].

Thus, what is noteworthy is the fact that positive evaluations in the sphere of judgment prevail over those negative ones. It could be accounted for by the fact that in order to win over the voters, the politician has to conjure up a positive / optimistic image of everything he is talking about. Such positive affirmations help to manipulate the consciousness of those who are to cast their votes on the appointed day. Capacity judgments form the most numerous group, as B. Obama intends to persuade the audience in everybody's ability (provided that they have the right leader) to improve the current situation and to prosper even more in the long run. Tenacity is also looked upon as a valued domain in the sphere of judgment on the part of B. Obama. It can be explained by the fact that such qualities as being responsible, brave, persistent, hard-working, etc. are the prerequisites to effecting all sorts of improvement.

According to M. Halliday, "the parameters for organizing **judgment** reflect grammatical distinctions in the system of modalization" (1994), i.e. *normality* is linked to usuality, *capacity* is associated with ability, *tenacity* is connected to inclination, whereas *veracity* is mainly concerned with probability, *propriety* circles around obligation. These connections are brought to light through such domains of knowledge as interpersonal grammar and appraisal. Halliday (1994) constructs a number of manifestations for both probability, usuality and capacity. The linguist comes to the conclusion that modalizations of probability in Mood can be bear a number of links with lexicalized forms of veracity judgments:

He's **certainly** naughty.

It's **certain** he's naughty.

It's **true** he's naughty (Ibid.).

It's true, honest, credible, authentic, bogus, etc.

- And I have that kept that promise. I have kept that promise, Ohio. And I **will** keep it so long as I have the honor of being your President. So if you're willing to stick with me, if you're willing to fight with me, and press on with me; if you're willing to work even harder in this election than you did in the last election, I **guarantee** you -- we **will** move this country forward. [Ohio Speech]. [judgment: veracity]

The same is true of the so-called modalities of usuality which are interconnected with judgments of normality:

He's often naughty.

It's **usual** for him to be naughty.

It's **normal** for him to be naughty.

It's **normal, average, fashionable, peculiar, odd,** etc (Ibid.).

- So now we face a choice. My opponent and his running mate are **new to** foreign policy, but from all that we've seen and heard, they want to take us back to an era of blustering and blundering that cost America so dearly. [Acceptance Speech]. [judgment: normality]

Likewise for ability and capacity:

He **can** go.

He's **able** to go.

He's **capable** of going.

He's **strong** enough to go.

He's **healthy enough, mature enough, clever enough,** etc [Ibid.].

• You **can** choose a future where more Americans have the chance to gain the skills they need to compete, no matter how old they are or how much money they have. Education was the gateway to opportunity for me. It was the gateway for Michelle. And now more than ever, it is the gateway to a middle-class life. [Acceptance Speech].

• As citizens, we understand that America is not about what **can** be done for us. It's about what **can** be done by us, together, through the hard and frustrating but necessary work of self-government. [Acceptance Speech]. [judgment: capacity]

When it comes to proposals, different varieties of inclination can be looked upon through the light of lexicalized <u>tenacity</u>:

I'**ll** go.

I'm **determined** to go.

I'm **intent** on going.

I'm **resolved**.

I'm **resolute, steadfast, unyielding, unflinching,** etc [Ibid.].

• And I have that kept that promise. I have kept that promise, Ohio. And I **will** keep it so long as I have the honor of being your President. So if you'**re willing** to stick with me, if you'**re willing** to fight with me, and press on with me; if you'**re willing** to work even harder in this election than you did in the last election, I guarantee you -- we **will** move this country forward. [Ohio Speech]. [judgment: tenacity]

M. Halliday also stresses the fact that obligation and lexicalized judgments of <u>propriety</u> have a plethora of common features:

Go.

You **should** go.

You're **supposed** to go.

It's **expected** you'll go.

It'd be **unfair** for you to go.

It'd be **corrupt, insensitive, arrogant, selfish, rude**, etc [Ibid.].

• And now you have a choice – we can gut education, or we can decide that in the United States of America, no child should have her dreams deferred because of a crowded classroom or a crumbling school. No family **should** have to set aside a college acceptance letter because they don't have the money. No company **should** have to look for workers in China because they couldn't find any with the right skills here at home. [Acceptance Speech]. [judgment: propriety]

As far as B. Obama's judgments are concerned, due to the nature of the discourse considered, again he favors such domains as *tenacity*, *capacity*, *propriety*, and *veracity*. It happens due to the fact that he gives promises, indicates the nation's mutual abilities, pinpoints a number of situations to be remedied, guarantees things, etc. The domain of normality is underdeveloped as far as external verbalized realizations are concerned, but it is always evident on the speculative level, as B. Obama inevitably

focuses on positive changes and various improvements in the current state of affairs, and these positive changes and progressive reforms should become normal for the Americans in the future.

The Sub-category of Appreciation

J.R. Martin and P.R.R. White (2005) view **appreciation** in line with evaluations we make as far as 'things' are concerned, especially those things which people make and the behavior they are engaged in. Moreover, here are also included evaluations of natural phenomena (how we value them). In broad lines **appreciations** can be arbitrarily broken into "our *'reactions'* to things (do they catch our attention; do they please us?, their *'composition'* (balance and complexity), and their *'value'* (how innovative, authentic, timely, etc.)".

1) Reaction:

Impact

a)   Positive

•   And while I'm proud of what we've achieved together, I'm far more mindful of my own failings, knowing exactly what Lincoln meant when he said, "I have been driven to my knees many times by the **overwhelming** conviction that I had no place else to go." [Acceptance Speech].

b)   Negative

•   Examples of negative reactions have not been detected as B.Obama has always wanted to conjure up a positive image of himself and his deeds.

2) Reaction:

Quality

a)   Positive

•   I didn't run, and you didn't work your hearts out, just to win an election. We came together to reclaim the basic bargain that built the largest middle class and the most **prosperous** nation on Earth. [Ohio Speech].

•   Governor Romney is a **patriotic** American who has raised a **wonderful** family, and he has much to be proud of. He's run a large financial firm, and he's run a state. [Ohio Speech].

b)   Negative

•   As citizens, we understand that America is not about what can be done for us. It's about what can be done by us, together, through the hard and **frustrating** but necessary work of self-government. [Acceptance Speech].

•   We want our children to live in an America that isn't burdened by debt, that isn't weakened up by inequality, that isn't threatened by the **destructive** power of a warming planet. [Victory Speech].

3) Composition:

Balance

a)   Positive

- You know what? That's not who we are. That's not what this country's about. As Americans, we believe we are endowed by our Creator with certain **inalienable** rights – rights that no man or government can take away. [Acceptance Speech].

b)   Negative

- My opponent and his running mate are new to foreign policy, but from all that we've seen and heard, they want to take us back to an era of **blustering** and **blundering** that cost America so dearly. [Acceptance Speech].

4) Composition:

Complexity

a)   Positive

- I want to reform the tax code so that it's **simple**, fair, and asks the wealthiest households to pay higher taxes on incomes over $250,000 – the same rate we had when Bill Clinton was president; the same rate we had when our economy created nearly 23 million new jobs, the biggest surplus in history, and a lot of millionaires to boot. [Acceptance Speech].

b)   Negative

- As citizens, we understand that America is not about what can be done for us. It's about what can be done by us, together, through the **hard** and frustrating but necessary work of self-government. [Acceptance Speech].

5) Valuation:

a)   Positive

- They knew they were part of something larger – a nation that triumphed over fascism and depression; a nation where the most **innovative** businesses turned out the world's best products, and everyone shared in the pride and success – from the corner office to the factory floor. [Acceptance Speech].

- We know that our country is stronger when we can count on **affordable** health insurance and Medicare and Social Security. [Ohio Speech].

b)   Negative

- Cases of negative valuations are missing in the speeches analyzed due to the fact that during the election campaign B. Obama aspired to appear in the best of light in order to obtain the maximum number of votes and become President.

Thus, our analysis shows that in the Obamite election discourse *reactions* (*quality: did I like it?*) as well as *valuations* (*was it worthwhile?*) prevail over all the other types of appreciation. Evaluatively B. Obama's election discourse is organized around several points of 'attitudinal dimension', involving certain evaluative orientations whose correlation with fundamental American values is quite pronounced.

4. Conclusion

In the Obamite discourse the so-called 'attitudinal dimension of evaluative meaning' is realized through the categories of *affect*, *judgment*, and *appreciation* pinpointed and theoretically described by J.R. Martin and P.R.R. White within the framework of systemic-functional linguistics.

As far as **affect** manifests itself in the emotive dimension of evaluation, it tends to be rather concealed in both Ohio Speech and Acceptance Speech, but it comes to the fore in Victory Speech.

Judgment deals with our attitudes to people and the way they act. J.R. Martin and P.R.R. White claim that all the **judgments** can be subdivided into judgments of 'social esteem' (normality, capacity, tenacity) and judgments of 'social sanction' (veracity, propriety).

Obama's discursive practices show that positive evaluations in the sphere of judgment prevail over negative ones. Lexically formed judgments of *tenacity*, *capacity*, *propriety*, and *veracity* backed up by some grammatical means are abound in the Obamite election speeches. The fact that B. Obama favors such domains as *tenacity*, *capacity*, *propriety*, and *veracity* can be explained by his predilection for giving promises, pinpointing a number of situations to be remedied, guaranteeing things, etc. The domain of *normality* is underdeveloped as far as external verbalized realizations are concerned, but it is always tangible.

A theoretical view on appreciation practiced by J.R. Martin and P.R.R. White presupposes that appreciation deals mainly with evaluations of 'things', including our patterns of behavior as well as natural phenomena. Thus, appreciations can be arbitrarily broken into our *'reactions'* to things, their *'composition'*, and their *'value'*. B. Obama effectively exploits the potentials of all these spheres, though favors those of *reactions* (quality: did I like it?) and *valuations* (was it worthwhile?). It also noteworthy that B. Obama's election discourse is full of reactions coupled with valuations.

References

Arutyunova, N. D. (1988). Types of Linguistic Meanings: Evaluation, Event, Fact. Moscow.

Chilton, P. & Schaeffner, C. (1997). Discourse and Politics. In: T.A. van Dijk (Ed.). *Discourse as Social Interaction*, (pp.206-230). London: Sage.

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

Gaykova, O. V. (2003). Election Discourse as a Genre of Political Communication (Exemplified by the English Language Data): Dissertation, Volgograd.

Golubeva, T. M. (2009). Linguistic Manipulation in Election Discourse (Exemplified by the American Variant of the English Language): Thesis Abstract. N. Novgorod.

Halliday, M. (1994) An Introduction to Functional Grammar, (2nd ed.). London: Edward Arnold.

Ivin, A. A. (1970). Foundations of the Logic of Evaluation. Moscow.

Khidekel, S. S. & Koshel, G. G. (1981). An Evaluative Component of the Word Lexical Meaning. Foreign Languages at School, 4, 7-10.

Martin, J. R. & White, P. R. (2005). The Language of Evaluation. Appraisal in English. Palgrave Macmillan.

Matveyeva, A. A. (2012). Evaluation-related Parameters of the Linguocultural Category of "one's own – someone else's" in the English Language: Monograph. Ufa.

Mironova, N. N. (1997). Evaluative Discourse: Semantic Analysis Problems. Proceedings of the Academy of Sciences, 56(4), 52-59.

Muryasov, R. Z.; Samigullina, A. S. & Fedorova, A. L. (2004). On Evaluative Utterance Analysis. Problems of Linguistics, 5, 68-78.

Sergeyeva, L. A. (2003). Evaluative Semantics Problems. Moscow.

Sergeyeva, L. A. (2004). Evaluative Meaning and Categorisation of Evaluative Semantics: Interpretational Analysis (Exemplified by the Russian Language Data): Doctoral Thesis. Ufa.

Sternin, I. A. (1979). Problems of the Word Meaning Analysis. Voronezh.

Teliya, V. N. (1986). A Connotational Aspect of the Nominative Units Semantics. Moscow.

Vasilyev, L. M. (1996). The Semantic Category of Evaluation and Evaluative Predicates. Semantic Research: Semantic Categories in the Russian Language, (pp.55-62). Ufa.

Volf, E. M. (1978). The Grammar and Semantics of the Adjective (Exemplified by ibero-romance languages). Moscow.

Volf, E. M. (1981). On Correlation of Qualificative and Descriptive Structures in the Word and Utterance Semantics. Proceedings of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR, 40(4), 391-397.

Volf, E. M. (2006). The Functional Semantics of Evaluation. Moscow.

Empirical Data Sources

President Obama's Remarks in Columbus, Ohio, May 5, 2012 **//** http://www.politicalruminations.com/2012/05/video-full-text-transcript-of-president-obamas-remarks-in-columbus-ohio-on-may-5-2012.html

President Obama's Speech: Full Text from the Democratic National Convention, Charlotte, September 6, 2012 **//** http://www.nationaljournal.com/conventions-speeches/president-obama-s-speech-full-text-from-the-democratic-national-convention-20120906

Election 2012: Text Of President Obama's Victory Speech, November 7, 2012 **//** http://chicago.cbslocal.com/2012/11/07/election-2012-text-of-president-obamas-victory-speech/