

PRACTICAL REASONING SCHEMES IN TURKISH POLITICAL DISCOURSE: PRACTICAL ARGUMENTS USED BY THE MAYORAL CANDIDATES OF İSTANBUL

Pınar DANIŞ
Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi, İzmir
pinardaniss@gmail.com
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2450-8154>

Gülsüm Songül ERCAN
Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi, İzmir
songul.ercan@deu.edu.tr
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5392-7008>

<i>Atf</i>	Danış, P.; Ercan G. S. (2021). PRACTICAL REASONING SCHEMES IN TURKISH POLITICAL DISCOURSE: PRACTICAL ARGUMENTS USED BY THE MAYORAL CANDIDATES OF İSTANBUL. <i>İstanbul Aydın Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi</i> , 13(3), 801 - 826.
------------	---

ABSTRACT

Politics is a social domain whose practices are discursively realized. In political discourse, politicians use argumentation strategies to justify their views or refute opposing views to persuade their voters. In this social domain, politicians as political actors try to persuade the masses to whom they address in the direction of their own opinions and ideologies. Political discourse, with this aspect, is one of the areas of Critical Discourse Analysis. Political discourse which is based on the persuasion of public, politicians often use argumentation to justify their own views or refute opposing views. Therefore, political discourse is a type of argumentative text type. In this study, the argumentation strategies were investigated using the Practical Reasoning Model (PRM) (Fairclough and Fairclough, 2012) to identify the practical reasoning structures used by the candidates of the Public and Nation Alliances in İstanbul before the 2019 Local

Elections. To this end, the TV interviews of the two candidates were analyzed using PRM. The findings of the study show that similar claims were asserted by both alliance candidates about the local issues, projects, and voters; however, the claims of the candidates about general politics differed because the candidates are representatives of different political parties and that the claims about the election itself were asserted only by the candidate of Nation Alliance. In this respect, these findings show that ideological differences are discursively constructed in local elections, and that within the context of local elections, not only campaigns and election promises on local issues but also ideologies of the parties exhibited.

Keywords: *Political Discourse, Argumentative Discourse, Practical Reasoning Model, Practical Argument, Turkish Local Elections.*

TÜRK POLİTİKA SÖYLEMİNDE KILGISAL USLAMLAMA ŞEMALARI: İSTANBUL BÜYÜKŞEHİR BELEDİYE BAŞKAN ADAYLARI TARAFINDAN KULLANILAN KILGISAL SAVLAR

ÖZ

Politika, etkinliklerinin söylemsel olarak gerçekleştirildiği toplumsal alanlardan biridir. Bu toplumsal alanda politika aktörleri olarak politikacılar, seslendikleri kitleleri kendi görüşleri ve ideolojileri doğrultusunda ikna etmeye çalışmaktadır. Politika söylemi bu yönüyle, Eleştirel Söylem Çözümlemesi'nin inceleme alanlarından biridir. Bireyleri ikna etme temeline dayanan politika söyleminde politikacılar, kendi görüşlerini haklı çıkarmak ya da karşıt görüşleri yalanlamak amacıyla sıklıkla savlamaya başvurmaktadır. Bu nedenle politika söylemi sav metin tipi özelliği taşımaktadır. Bu çalışmada savlama stratejileri, 2019 Yerel Seçimleri öncesinde İstanbul'da Cumhuriyet ve Millet İttifakı adaylarının kullandıkları kılğısal uslamlama yapılarını belirlemek amacıyla Kılğısal Uslamlama Modeli (KUM) (Fairclough ve Fairclough, 2012) kullanılarak incelenmiştir. Bu amaçla, iki adayın TV görüşmeleri KUM kullanılarak çözümlenmiştir. Çalışmanın bulguları, her iki ittifakın adaylarının yerel sorunlara, projelere ve seçmenlere ilişkin benzer iddialar ileri sürdüğü; ancak adayların genel politikaya ilişkin iddialarının, adayların farklı politik partilerin temsilcileri olması nedeniyle farklılaştığını ve seçimin kendisine yönelik iddiaların yalnızca Millet İttifakı adayı tarafından ileri sürüldüğünü

göstermektedir. Bu açıdan söz konusu bulgular, ideolojik farklılıkların yerel seçimde de söylemsel olarak inşa edildiğini ve yerel seçimler bağlamında salt yerel meselelere ilişkin kampanya ve seçim vaatlerinin değil aynı zamanda parti ideolojilerinin de sergilendiğini göstermektedir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: *Politika Söylemi, Sav Söylemi, Kılışal Uslamlama Modeli, Kılışal Sav, Türk Yerel Seçimleri.*

INTRODUCTION

Politics, in the most general sense, is the activities as a whole through which individuals make, sustain, and reform the general rules under which they live (Heywood, 2013: 1-2). There are two conflicting views regarding the description of politics: Aristotle associates it with ethics and morality; whereas Machiavelli (2014) with violence and hegemony (cited by Wodak, 2009: 5). van Dijk (1997) emphasizes the importance of textual and contextual categories in politics; and specifies values, political ideologies, institutions, organizations, groups, actors, relationships, processes, acts, cognition, and discourse as the social domain of political systems. Discourse, one of the listed aspects, is considered as a form of political action and part of the political process in political science.

In political discourse (henceforth PD) studies, there are various tendencies, one of which is the distinction made between small-scale and large-scale studies. Small-scale studies focus on conflicts of interest, struggles for dominance, and efforts for cooperation between individuals, genders, and communities (Chilton, 2004: 3). At this level, the means such as persuasion, reasonable argument, irrational strategies, threats, entreaties, bribes, and manipulation are investigated depending on the purpose (Jones, 1994 cited by Chilton, 2004: 3). Large-scale studies investigate state institutions where politics is viewed as a tool that resolves conflicts of interest, but on the other hand reveals the power of a dominant individual or group (Chilton, 2004: 3). Fairclough and Fairclough (2012), describe politics as a cooperative decision-making process about what to do in the context of disagreement, power inequality, indecision and threat and conflict of interest. They relate politics to deliberation and decision-making processes in cases where constant conflict, risk, and uncertainty are dominant.

PD is a means for the processes realized in making a decision about how to act in certain areas of politics under specific conditions and for certain purposes in the social domain of politics. In the processes of decision-making and influencing individuals, politics demonstrates its power through language, which makes language an essential means of politics (Rubinelli, 2012: 17). According to Fairclough and Fairclough (2012), these choices and actions are related to practical argumentation that determines decisions about how people act. Practical argumentation is realized through practical reasoning (henceforth PR) which is the way of reacting to a problem or an issue in practice. A practical argument, on the other hand, is the premise-conclusion structure corresponding to this reasoning (Audi, 2006 cited by Fairclough and Fairclough, 2012: 40). Therefore, they are studied within the scope of PR.

Fairclough and Fairclough (2012) proposed an argument model called 'PR Model' (henceforth PRM) for PD. PR is embodied in practical arguments and it

involves reasons for action and typically takes place in the context of problem-solution. Argumentation starts with a ‘problem’ and ‘solution’ to resolve this problem is searched for (Fairclough and Fairclough, 2011: 3). Politicians make their speeches based on a specific problem and, a solution to this problem. These speeches and many other events such as televised press conferences, debates on politics on radio or television, politics related videos on video sharing sites are described as PD (Wodak, 2009: 3). For this reason, TV interviews with the mayoralty candidates were selected as the data of this study to reveal the PR structures made up of a claim and premises related to performing an action (Fairclough and Fairclough, 2012) used in Turkish PD.

This study aims to find answers to the following research questions:

In the context of İstanbul mayoral elections;

1. What are the PR structures used?
2. Do these PR structures differ between the candidates of the Alliances of the Public and Nation?
3. Considering the political ideologies of the candidates, what are the implicatures of PR selection?

To answer these questions, the theoretical framework PRM and its key notions are introduced in the next section.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Politics is one of the social domains in which its practices are only discursively performed (van Dijk, 2006: 728). Thus, there are no political activities without the use of language (Chilton and Schäffner, 2002: 3). The social domain of politics includes discourses representing in varying ways the many areas and aspects of social life that focus on political debate, deliberation and action. These aspects correspond to different perspectives and positions within the social domain of politics (Fairclough and Fairclough, 2012, 83). PD is identified by its actors, that is, politicians. PD studies deal with speeches and texts of politicians such as president, prime minister or other members of the government or political institutions such as parliament and political parties (van Dijk, 1997: 12).

PD has the characteristics of argumentative discourse that include persuasive propositions (Büyükkantarçioğlu and Yazar, 2006: 96). People in a society often disagree with each other; however, they can refrain from admitting that they have different opinions. To resolve this difference of opinion, people try to reach an agreement making a discussion stating arguments about issues disagree on (Eemeren et al, 2002: 3). An argument refers to both a debate between people and a logical discussion put forward by an individual. In this study, ‘argument’

is used in the latter meaning. Accordingly, an argument is a set of propositions whose main purpose is to persuade the individual by calling for their reasoning skills (Barry and Rudinov, 2007: 85). Therefore, argumentative discourse reflects the discussion of the speaker/writer with other people disagreeing with them (Eemeren et al., 2002: xi).

Language use in politics is a common example of persuasive language. The process where PD's persuasive feature becomes prominent is the process of election campaigns where politicians try to persuade voters (Jucker, 1997: 123). As a result, practical argumentation and PR becomes a crucial means in persuading the target group.

PR is described as reasoning about what to do; it is the attempts that motivate individuals by presenting good or bad reasons (Fairclough and Fairclough, 2011: 2-3) PR emerge in two main contexts in this model. In some cases, agents begin with the questions of 'What should I do?' among many choices in the current situation. In other cases, agents are presented with a certain possibility for action and investigating possible positive and negative results for action they have to make a decision questioning 'Should I do A or not?' by (Fairclough and Fairclough, 2012: 35). Some practical arguments are put forward in the form of a problem-solution relationship (I have to do x in these difficult conditions), while others are put forward in terms of a means-goal relationship (I will achieve my goals if I do x) (Fairclough and Fairclough, 2011: 3).

PR is common in all political contexts where the best or most accurate action plan is controversial or unclear. Since politics is a realm of action that include reasons and judgments about what to do and what to defend, PD includes PR structures and is characterized as PR. (Fairclough ve Fairclough, 2011: 1-3). While a way of responding to a practical problem is defined as PR, practical argument is a premise-conclusion structure and corresponds to PR. The conclusion of the practical argument is a practical judgement, which is the agent's reaction to the issue (Audi 2006 cited by Fairclough ve Fairclough, 2012: 40). According to Fairclough and Fairclough (2012), "Practical arguments are plausible arguments and in reasoning practically, agents come up with a claim for action as possible means to reach an end or achieve a goal". They illustrate the structure of practical arguments as follows:

<i>Claim for action</i>	Agent (presumably) ought to do <i>A</i> .
<i>Circumstances</i>	Agent's context of action: natural, social, institutional facts.
<i>Goal(s)</i>	Agent's goal, i.e. a future state of affairs in which values are realized.
<i>Means-goal</i>	If the Agent does <i>A</i> , he will (presumably) achieve <i>G</i> .
<i>Values</i>	Agent is actually concerned with "values" or ought to be concerned with

Figure 1. The Structure of Practical Arguments
Source: (Fairclough and Fairclough, 2012: 45)

This figure (1) summarizes the theoretical points explained so far. This structure consists of a *claim for action* (what agent ought to do), *circumstances* (context of action consists of natural, social and institutional facts), a *goal* (consists of a future state of affairs in which values are realized), a *means-goal* (consists of means that provides to achieve the goal), and *values* (what agent's concerns and values). If noticed, means and goals are placed in the box with dashed lines with the implication that they might be implicit in the text.

PR emerges in the context of a problem-solution, it usually starts with a description of the situation considered as a problem and a solution is sought to resolve it. Some practical arguments emphasize on a problem-solution relation (we must do x in these difficult conditions), others, emphasize on means-goal relation (if we do x, then we will achieve our aims). Generally, multiple courses of action seem logical in the context of uncertainty and risk; in such cases, practical arguments attempt to compare some variables such as situations, goals, values, possible benefits and costs to justify a certain action or to reach an end (Fairclough and Fairclough, 2011: 3).

Fairclough and Fairclough (2012) shows the structure of PR in more detail on a figure and explains the premises as follows:

<i>Claim for action</i>	Agent (presumably) ought to do <i>A</i> .
<i>Circumstances</i>	Agent's context of action is composed of the following relevant facts: (a) natural facts; (b) social, institutional facts, e.g. Agent's value commitments (e.g. duties, promises, socially recognized (moral) values and norms.
<i>Goal(s)</i>	Agent's goal is a future state of affairs <i>G</i> in which Agent's value commitments are realized.
<i>Means-goal</i>	Action <i>A</i> is the means that will (presumably) take the Agent from <i>C</i> to <i>G</i> in accordance with <i>V</i> .
<i>Values</i>	Agents is actually concerned with the realization of <i>V</i> , or Agent ought to be concerned with the realization of <i>V</i> (<i>V</i> designates Agent's actual concerns or Agent's value commitments).

Figure 2. The Structure of PR: A More Detailed Representation

Source: (Fairclough and Fairclough, 2012: 48)

There is another type of premise that Fairclough and Fairclough (2012) do not include in the Figure (2) but is of significance in this study. This premise is 'argument from authority', which is exemplified in their findings, though not directly explained in their work. It is presented as a premise in which the information put forward is based on an authorized individual, community, organization and institution.

The strategies that are presented in the structure of PR have been developed based on goals, values and beliefs concerning what the context of action is and what is likely in that context. These strategies are relational and involve anticipation of how other agents will take action. Means that are used to achieve goals require adjustment continually because other agents affect the circumstances against which we take action (Fairclough ve Fairclough, 2011).

In this respect, the data examined in the framework of the PRM is included in the next section, to determine the practical arguments used in Turkish PD in the context of local elections.

THE CONTEXT OF THE STUDY

In the political history of Turkey, local elections are valued as much as general elections do, especially for İstanbul, as expressed in the catchphrase ‘The one who administrates İstanbul, administrates Turkey’. Since it is the most densely populated city in Turkey, and thus with the highest number of voters, as well as being the center of finance, industry tourism; it, covers a significant part of the national income.

In Turkey, now and then political parties ally to unite their powers and resources to increase their vote rates by not letting the votes be divided among different parties of similar political views and policies and win the elections. Public Alliance consists of Justice and Development Party (JDP) and Nationalist Action Party (NAP), both of which are known to be new conservatism; though JDP has more Islamist tendencies and policies than the latter. Nation Alliance consists of Republican People’s Party (RPP) and Human, Innovation and Goodness Party (HIGP).

As for the political tendencies, RPP as its name suggests, is secular, equalitarian and it is the oldest political party in the history of Turkish Republic and was founded by Atatürk, and it defends the republican values. HIGP, on the other hand, is the newest one and it was founded by the politicians who broke up with NAP since they did not approve the policies of the current administration at the time. In short, considering their political ideologies, JDP is center-right, NAP is a far-right party, RPP is a democratic left party and HIGP is national central party. These alliances participated in the “local election race” as two parties nationwide. However, it became very important especially in İstanbul

31 March 2019 Local Elections had undoubtedly of the most critical importance in Turkey under the JDP government. This local election had the significance of being the first local elections after the regime shift of Turkey, that is, after the transition to the presidential system from the parliamentary system. Accordingly, these elections and their results were crucial, because it metaphorically meant the approval of the new system. Therefore, it was considered as “a vote of confidence”. For the opposing alliance, it was crucially important to win the election since they were also aware of this situation. İstanbul had been under the control of the JDP since 1994 and that was why it was very important for the Nation Alliance to win the elections in İstanbul. So, taking over the administration of İstanbul was more important than other cities for the given reasons.

31 March Local Elections were represented as an issue of perpetuity by ruling party JDP. They tried to persuade the common people that the success of the

government is an obligation for the perpetuity of country and these policies of JDP were supported by its alliance partner NAP. The fact that it was an indicator of social and political objection to the JDP and that the political parties would be collectively remembered with the votes they would have taken in that election until the 2023 presidential and parliamentary elections, caused the government to adopt a general election policy instead of a local election policy. On the other hand, the fact that this election was taking place in a period of economic crisis, the ruling party JDP was aware of the challenge.

JDP, in all these circumstances, faced with the risk of losing the mayoralty of the biggest cities, especially İstanbul's. On the other hand, main opposition party RPP seemed close to winning the elections in İstanbul where it had not been able to since 1994. For JDP government that govern Turkey for 17 years, this election could lead to the loss of the governing the country, which was another reason for their urge to win. As stated previously, in Turkey, it is assumed that the winning party in İstanbul, wins in the forthcoming general election.

31 March 2019 Local Elections in Turkey took place under these social and political circumstances in which general policies and political ideologies surpassed local problems.

METHODOLOGY

The data of this study consists of interviews given by the two İstanbul mayoral candidates of Public and Nation Alliances which are formed by two parties with similar political views each. Nation Alliance's candidate is Ekrem İmamoğlu and Public Alliance's candidate is Binali Yıldırım. The 225 minutes' interviews in total were taken from the TV program called "Türkiye'nin Nabzı (The Pulse of Turkey)" on Habertürk TV channel.

At the stage of determining the data, specific criteria was taken into consideration. The reason for the selection of the TV program is that during the propaganda process for the local elections there were limited number of TV channels and programs which hosted all the candidates from opposing parties and the stated program met the criteria: it entertained all the mayoralty candidates and each was allocated almost equal time. Before the local elections, the candidates appeared in different TV channels. However, because of the different political tendencies, not every candidate was provided with the opportunity to give interviews in every channel and HaberTürk TV and the program Türkiye'nin Nabzı fit this criteria since the program entertained all the mayoralty candidates and each was allocated almost equal time. İmamoğlu participated in the program on December 24, 2018, and Yıldırım on March 20, 2019.

Basically, Türkiye'nin Nabzı is a debate program hosting multiple participants. However, during the election process, the program entertained the candidates from different cities and alliances with the additional title "election special broadcasting" and the format was adjusted so that it unfolded as a semi-structured interview. Therefore the questions asked each candidate showed resemblance and the candidates had the opportunity to express their views and the projects they aim to implement. Thus, the program had the characteristics of argumentative discourse, which met the criteria of the required database of this study.

The data analysis approach adopted in this study is the qualitative research approach that aims to reveal and understand the meaning individuals or groups ascribe to a problem related to society and people (Creswell, 2014). Qualitative research requires collecting visual information or text from participants and the aim of this research differs from quantitative research in terms of accuracy criteria, methods and research objective. Besides, qualitative research does not accept the purely objective and positivist opinions of quantitative research about the world; argues that the reality is structured in the mind of individual and it cannot be treated independently from cultural and historical contexts (Johnson and Vanderstoep, 2009: 179).

The method used in this study is PRM (Fairclough and Fairclough, 2012) which is a qualitative analysis method. PRM is a model that contains responses to practical problems and what to do about these problems. There are agents that in certain circumstances (*circumstance premise*) and try to achieve some goals (*goal premise*). The realization of action is seen as a means (*means-goal premise*) to achieve the goal. Accordingly, the agent claims for action in accordance with the circumstances it is in (*Agent ought to do A*), argues what this action aims and states the values (*value premise*) on which this goal is based.

The premises in PRM have been determined using qualitative content analysis. Content analysis involves analyzing the contents of interviews or observational field notes to identify the main themes that obtained findings like the responses or the observation notes (Kumar, 2011). In content analysis if the meanings based on the categories are given importance, this method is defined as "qualitative content analysis" (Bal, 2016: 265). Qualitative content analysis reveals the underlying meaning of the message; this is a kind of inductive process based on the topics and subjects acquired from data. This method determines typology with the impressions they get from the subjects that reflect their definitions or how they see the social world and the perspectives of the subjects can be better understood accordingly (Bal, 2016: 266).

This data analysis method aims to reveal patterns, themes, assumptions and meanings by detailed and systematic examination and interpretation of a particular whole (Berg and Latin, 2008). It starts with predetermined properties and allows them to be enabled from the data (Lune and Berg, 2017: 83). The subject of this method is the content of all types of text; written texts such as books, magazines, verbal expressions, television programs.

The qualitative content analysis focuses on meaning contents that are crucial for the research questions determined (Früh, 2001 cited by Gökçe, 2006: 17). Forming a category is important in this method of analysis which involves steps such as defining and creating categories that represent codes, and, if necessary, forming new categories based on the text relating to research questions and the text (Bal, 2016: 265). Below, an example of how the data is analyzed based on this model by using qualitative content analysis is exhibited.

Table 1. The Example of Content Analysis from the Data

İstanbul has been living one İstanbul administration for twenty-five years... [*Thus, these twenty-five years are no longer satisfactory for people. That is, İstanbul's energy has decreased a little. Its energy is low and its people are not happy in fact* **CIRCUMSTANCES**].

... this beautiful city, this ancient city, this historical city almost 10,000 years old, İstanbul is a candidate to be the centre of the world. So today, as it was said in the past, in the history, "if the world were a country, its capital would be İstanbul". [*Such a city, the world city needs energy, needs a new generation vision, needs a new generation municipality* **CLAIM FOR ACTION**], [*because communication is very fast, the demands of the citizens are a lot...Almost 60% of people say "If I find an opportunity, I will leave this city"* **CIRCUMSTANCES**]...

[We felt so sad when we saw this unhappiness, we were sad in the name of the city **VALUES**]. Actually, we could identify this to some extent, but of course [*the fact that this came up as the result of a scientific research made me sad as an İstanbulite* **VALUES**].

[*Therefore it needs energy* **CLAIM FOR ACTION**].

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Our analysis of the TV interviews of İstanbul mayoral candidates of the Public (Mr Yıldırım) and Nation (Mr İmamoğlu) alliances, to reveal the PR structures used within the framework of PRM (Fairclough and Fairclough, 2012) is presented in this section. The practical arguments put forward by each candidate which involve a claim for action, and the goal and values that motivate this goal are given.

PR Structures of İmamoğlu

The speech of the Nation Alliance İstanbul Metropolitan Mayor Candidate Ekrem İmamoğlu on the TV program he participated in to run an election campaign was analyzed using PRM, and PR structures consisting of practical arguments are as follows:

Table 2. PR Structures of İmamoğlu

Premises Claims	Circumstantial	Argument from authority	Goal	Means- Goal	Value
<i>İstanbul and Turkey need a new management mentality.</i>	<i>İstanbul turned into chaos, İstanbul has no route map.</i>	<i>Almost 60% of the people living in such a city, we have done the research, I tell you the research result about 1 year ago. In our research about İstanbul, almost 60% of the people say that if I find the opportunity, I leave this city.</i>	<i>We will prove to this city that good local rulers will create good cities, and when you look at the end of the day, such a city constitution will be created, we will make this city feel how İstanbul will be included in the process for years and how it will reach a beautiful city. They will be the owners of that constitution.</i>		<i>Young, dynamic, whose heart beats for İstanbul, who thinks of İstanbul at every moment, does not distinguish between [management] and the city from early morning to late night. No sense of partisanship, no discrimination, sense of belonging is a society completely based on İstanbul...</i>
<i>the traffic and transportation problems of İstanbul should be attended to</i>	<i>The share of rail transport in İstanbul is currently 14%. In developed countries and cities, this rate is 80% in Paris in London. So,</i>		<i>We will form valuable boards for these transport-related emergency action plans, call on all authorities, call on the</i>		

	<i>we are pretty far behind this.</i>		<i>dynamics of the whole city.</i>		
<i>The future of İstanbul should be planned.</i>	<i>Look, there is an İstanbul that has fallen far behind on the list of livable cities and goes back every year.</i>	<i>Official figures are around 14%. So, unemployment figures in İstanbul are 14%.</i>	<i>It is our biggest project that we will design the future of İstanbul.</i>		<i>We looked at what the society wants rather than the "who is it" question. What people want, what is the demand of the children of this province, what is the demand of their women; the demand of students and young people. What kind of a city they want to live in.</i>
<i>[implicit] İstanbulites should be gotten in touch with.</i>	<i>But it is a fact that there is a political success in the last period [JDP's political success], there is, of course, such a citizen interest funder that political success but does it exist today? I emphasize that there is no today.</i>		<i>We will reach all of İstanbul, we will reach.</i>		<i>If you are distant to the citizen, the rest lies in details (not important).</i>
<i>Regardless of ideologies, it should be allied around Turkey's</i>	<i>There is a polarization as the result of politics in this country based on values.</i>		<i>I am actually looking for an İstanbul alliance where there is everyone in ... there are all</i>		<i>Of course, we will conduct an ethical process together.</i>

<i>common values.</i>			<i>political parties there.</i>		
<i>This process should be managed with the RPP in the best manner.</i>	<i>[implicit] Election process was not managed well by RPP in previous elections.</i>		<i>I underline that we will manage a nearly perfect process today. Experience of İstanbul will be one of the perfect experiences under the administration of the Republican People's Party.</i>	<i>The way to win a city is 4-5 years of work.</i>	

When the arguments of Nation Alliance's candidate İmamoğlu are analyzed in general, we see that İmamoğlu emphasizes the shortcomings and problems (traffic, transportation) of İstanbul, which has been ruled by JDP for years, and he expresses various problems of İstanbul mostly through the emphasis on "the future of İstanbul". For this reason, İmamoğlu emphasizes the necessity of a new management mentality, arguing there are problems with the people in the current management. Also, he overemphasizes that the current administrators from JDP who rule of İstanbul's districts, have ignored the public and have estranged themselves to the people of İstanbul and he opposes such a management mentality. It is remarkable that İmamoğlu structured his speech concerning general politics and refers to the problems of general policy as much as local problems. In this respect, İmamoğlu gives the impression of a candidate competing in general elections rather than local elections.

As regards the general politics, he states that JDP polarized Turkish people and the Turkish people should unite around common values. In this direction, İmamoğlu promises that he will end this polarization and bring peace to Turkey when he has been elected. He implies that in case he takes over the management, he will end discrimination and polarization against both the management staff and the residents of İstanbul.

İmamoğlu as the candidate of RPP, who has not won İstanbul elections for long years, argues that the reason for these problems is the JDP, and emphasizing on

RPP, he puts forward his party RPP in this process. Also, it can be asserted that İmamoğlu is worried that JDP will attempt to reduce the credibility of the election casting suspicion on it due to the incidents in the presidential elections.

PR Structures of Yıldırım

İstanbul mayoral candidate of Public Alliance Binali Yıldırım also brings forward various practical arguments presented below. PR structures consisting of practical arguments are as follows:

Table 3. PR Structures of Yıldırım

Premises Claims	Circumstantial	Argument from authority	Goal	Means-Goal	Value
<i>The priorities of İstanbul should be taken into consideration.</i>	<i>The Priority of the voter in local issues such as traffic and transportation; the second priority is the parking lot; the third priority is the need for green areas. Infrastructure is not suitable for our disabled citizens ... issues such as economic distress, expensiveness. In general policies, unemployment is also on the agenda.</i>		<i>If İstanbulites decide on us, we will try to fulfil our promises.</i>		<i>We talk less, we give the opportunity for İstanbulites to speak.</i>
<i>Every citizen should be treated equally.</i>			<i>... Providing the basic needs of the people... is the most important duty of the government, also of the local administrations.</i>		<i>From my point of view, there is no politics in service, the service is given for all citizens.</i>

<p>Politics should not be made based on the common values of this country.</p>	<p><i>[Politics is carried out over Atatürk]</i></p>				<p><i>It is a pity for our country that the foundation values of this country the important people and important events of this country have become the subject of separation.</i></p>
<p>Urban transformation is required in İstanbul.</p>	<p><i>There are 5-storey 6-storey buildings along the whole block, the whole neighborhood. You are giving 5 precedents, one building that looks like a television tower like a pile looks all over the top, disrupts the chemistry of that neighborhood and creates a great injustice.</i></p>		<p><i>We will accelerate [the transformation of structures] at once, we will consider this as a priority issue.</i></p>		
<p>İstanbul's voters should vote in this election.</p>			<p><i>I always call for high participation in my speeches.</i></p>		

<p>Price stability must be ensured in Turkey.</p>	<p><i>After an operation of exchange, the balances were broken, costs changed, production amount changed according to the costs. So, an unpredictable situation arose here.</i></p>		<p><i>İstanbul will enrich. Thus, Turkey will be richer.</i></p>	<p><i>What will these three goals [increasing İstanbul's share in national income, increasing its share in exports, increasing the investments that will increase employment]? It will be realized with our 178 billion investment.</i></p>	
--	---	--	--	---	--

Table 3.1. PR Structures of Yıldırım

<p>Premises Claims</p>	<p>Circumstantial</p>	<p>Argument from authority</p>	<p>Goal</p>	<p>Means-Goal</p>	<p>Value</p>
<p>Traffic and transportation problems of İstanbul should be coped with.</p>	<p><i>Even if you use the streets, you can only find it [parking space] for 700 thousand [cars] of them.</i></p>		<p><i>I promise a traffic flow that is sustainable and not cause suffering.</i></p>	<p><i>To increase the rate of the rail system that will save us.</i></p>	
<p>Agriculture should be encouraged in and around İstanbul.</p>	<p><i>The share of agriculture in İstanbul is 1.4, so there is no agriculture in İstanbul.</i></p>		<p><i>Flower and ornamental plants are planted on the side of Çatalca. We will expand this a little more.</i></p>		
<p>[implicit] Green areas should be increased in İstanbul.</p>	<p><i>Now, most of these streams have disappeared.</i></p>		<p><i>İstanbulites will meet green in my mayoralty.</i></p>	<p><i>We will bring these streams back to life and transform these streams into a green network ... Thus, we will create a balanced green</i></p>	

				area map in the city.	
More tourists should be attracted to İstanbul.	<i>We cannot make money from congress and fair.</i>		<i>Everyone will win (from tourism).</i>	<i>We will be able to increase this in two ways: First, we will highlight this congress [and] fair tourism and tourists will come here. Second, health tourism...</i>	
İstanbul should be made more open to the TV series and cinema sector.			<i>Now, we will take this [the cinema and TV industry] one step further... we aim to increase the annual return here to-500 million dollars in the first place.</i>	<i>We will build a large film plateau on the European Side to make these series more professional.</i>	
İstanbul should be made suitable for the lives of disabled people.	<i>Our cities generally do not have the infrastructure to facilitate the lives of our disabled citizens.</i>			<i>We will do (remove obstacles in minds) this with education.</i>	

Public Alliance's candidate Yıldırım argues that there is "a lot more to do" rather than bringing a clear criticism to the city, which was previously ruled by mayors from his party and thus implicitly emphasizes that what is done is not enough and asks the voters to give a chance again to JDP. While doing this, he states that the priorities of the voters will be taken into consideration. He implicitly states that there are important problems like earthquake and urban transformation, traffic and transportation, declining of green areas, lack of agricultural areas and lack of conditions suitable for the life of the disabled people, which have not been taken into consideration until now. Also, Yıldırım states that every citizen should be treated equally and in fact again implicitly states that the discrimination in the services provided in many towns and districts up to that time will end. He also mentions the price instability and economic failure that are the results of the economic crisis caused by JDP, which has been the ruling party for years; as representative of the ruling party, he tries to persuade the voters of İstanbul through economic commitments because of İstanbul is' being the largest economy in Turkey. Finally, because of fear that the voter will not go to the polls, Yıldırım calls for the İstanbul electorate to vote for them.

When the claims of both candidates are compared, it can be stated that while İmamoğlu makes two claims regarding general politics, two about local issues and projects, one about the voters of İstanbul and one about the election itself, Yıldırım makes two claims about general politics, seven about local issues and projects and three about the voters of İstanbul; however, he does not make any claims about the election itself, which is quite understandable since the opposition parties fear that the elections will not be held in a healthy atmosphere and the figures will be fiddled, which was the claim for the presidential elections.

Table 4. Claims for Actions of İstanbul Metropolitan Mayor Candidates

Claim for actions	Ekrem İmamoğlu	Binali Yıldırım
General politics	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regardless of ideologies, it should be allied around Turkey's common values. • İstanbul and Turkey need a new management mentality. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Politics should not be made based on the common values of this country. • Price stability must be ensured in Turkey.
Local issues and projects	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traffic and transportation problems of İstanbul should be coped with. • The future of İstanbul should be planned. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The priorities of İstanbul should be taken into consideration. • Traffic and transportation problems of İstanbul should be coped with. • Earthquake and urban transformation should be realized in İstanbul. • Agriculture should be encouraged in and around İstanbul. • Green areas should be increased in İstanbul. • More tourists should be attracted to İstanbul. • İstanbul should be made more series and cinema sector. • İstanbul should be made suitable for people to live
Voters of İstanbul	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • İstanbulites should be contacted with. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Every citizen should be treated equally. • İstanbul's voters should vote in this election.

Election	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• This process should be managed together with the RPP in the best way.	
----------	---	--

About the reasons why there is a numerical difference between İmamoğlu's and Yıldırım's claims about "local issues and claims about projects", it can be said that the problems about İstanbul put forward by İmamoğlu's are İstanbul within the framework of "the future of İstanbul" but Yıldırım approaches these problems under different headings. Regarding the general politics, İmamoğlu calls for a change on the management and argues that İstanbul should be ruled by a new management mentality, and also emphasizes that Turkey should unite around common values based on assumption that Turkey has been polarized. Thus, it can be said that as a mayoral candidate İmamoğlu talks about not only problems of İstanbul, but also Turkey. Similar to İmamoğlu's claim, Yıldırım talks about Turkey's common values, but he does not base the appeal of uniting Turkey on the claim that it has been polarized; on the contrary, he bases this appeal on discriminatory events carried out over the faith on Atatürk what he calls 'singular'. In this direction, he states that politics should not be made on the common values. Therefore, the problems asserted by İmamoğlu within the scope of this claim are different from the problems asserted by Yıldırım.

Relating the local issues and projects, İmamoğlu defines traffic and transportation in İstanbul as "chaos", states that the rate of public transport in transportation is low when compared to other countries of the world, the current administration has not been able to reach the metro length they had promised many years ago and the people of İstanbul make high payments due to transfer system in transportation and states that he aims to make immediate action plan to solve these problems within the scope of the same claim, Yıldırım mentions that parking lots cause a traffic jam and there are not enough parking areas. Although Yıldırım states that the reason of traffic jam is the insufficiency of the parking areas, similar to İmamoğlu, he states that the way of relieving the traffic jam is to increase the rate of the rail system within overall public transportation.

The reason that İmamoğlu emphasizes the problem of public transportation, but Yıldırım parking lots is, depending on the report of the KONDA Research and Consulting Company on the JDP's voter profile in 2018. The reason for KONDA is a reliable source is that it is a company that has the deepest knowledge and experience of the genetic codes of the society of Turkey. Besides, another reason for its reliability is that it is not a pro-government and partisan research company and therefore, it reveals objective, unbiased and reliable results, unlike partisan research companies. Thus, according to the report of KONDA, it can be alleged

that İmamoğlu targets the low or medium-income people who voted for JDP in previous elections, which constitutes a great majority of the voters and he tries to persuade them.

Regarding local issues and projects, İmamoğlu argues that planning the future of İstanbul is a priority. On the other hand, Yıldırım does not emphasize the “future” in İstanbul, ruled by his party for many years, but emphasizes the priorities and problems of İstanbul. Yıldırım states that İstanbul’s deficiencies related to earthquake and urban transformation, lives of disabled people, agriculture, green areas, tourism, and filming industry should be corrected. The underlying emphasis of Yıldırım’s on green areas is that many green areas in İstanbul were zoned for construction to support the construction sector within the scope of government policies in previous periods and concretization of Taksim Park. Therefore, voters of higher socio-cultural class reacted to these allegedly wrong construction policies and it can be argued that Yıldırım tries to persuade this electorate.

Regarding the İstanbul electorate, İmamoğlu fully opposes to the JDP’s “us and them” distinction policy towards their electorate, while Yıldırım defends the “equal treatment” to all voters, and thus makes similar emphasis. Yıldırım’s reference to the concept of equality also shows that he is aware of his party’s (JDP) discriminatory policy and is in the effort to correct this perception. Concerning the election, İmamoğlu, together with his party RPP, claims that this election process should be managed well and makes a claim for action related to its party. However, Yıldırım does not claim regarding the election for the fear that he casts doubt on the reliability of the election.

CONCLUSION

In this study, the argumentation schemes and PR structures in Turkish PD are investigated in the framework 2019 Local Elections by using Fairclough and Fairclough (2012) PRM. The data of the study consists of the election interviews on the same TV channel and the same program of the Mayoral candidates of İstanbul of the Nation and Public Alliances. Relating the types of PR structures used in the context of local elections in Turkish PD, the analysis on the texts in the database revealed that the mayoral candidates used PR structures regarding the (i) general politics, (ii) local issues and projects, (iii) voters of İstanbul and (iv) the forthcoming election. Regarding the general politics, it was found that the arguments were asserted about *management mentality, unity and solidarity, economic problems in Turkey, alliances, democratic governance, participation and ideological obstacles*. Relating the local issues and projects, the arguments are on *the local government, the problems of the city and the citizens in the existing local governments, and attempts towards these problems*. The voters of İstanbul were related with the arguments of *the rights and responsibilities of them*

and finally, for the forthcoming election two arguments were put forward, i.e., *the best way of management of the forthcoming local election and the election evening.*

The second research question aimed at finding out whether the PR structures differ between the candidates of the Alliances of the Public and Nation. It was found that the candidate of the Nation Alliance İmamoğlu made claims regarding *general politics, local problems and projects, voters and elections.* The candidate of the Public Alliance Yıldırım also made the same claims except for the election since similar questions were directed to him as well. However, İmamoğlu's arguments regarding general politics were based on Turkey's polarization while Yıldırım does not mention the polarization, stating that the policy should not be based on common values regarding general politics, Yıldırım also made claims on general politics by evaluating the general economy throughout the country instead of the local economy. While İmamoğlu expressed the city's problems within the context of İstanbul's future, Yıldırım addressed the current problems of the city, making claims about the problems and an implicit self-criticism about the problems in İstanbul that his party could not solve them in their long administration period.

Regarding the voters of İstanbul, İmamoğlu criticized administration of JDP because JDP was estranged to the citizens and asserted that he would be in contact with İstanbulites. On the other hand, Yıldırım emphasized people's priorities and implicated that the problems of İstanbul would be solved in case voters gave JDP one more chance. Also, it is seen that he was aware that people were not treated equally, and that non-supporter citizens of JDP would be given the long-deserved importance. Yıldırım aimed to persuade the voters to go to the polls by implicitly expressing all the insufficiencies and faults of the JDP and expressed this explicitly by emphasizing that İstanbulites should vote. The reason for this is that JDP was worried about the possibility that JDP's offended voters would not go to the polls. Also, there is a crucial difference between two candidates; it was found that Yıldırım did not made any claims regarding the election unlike İmamoğlu. It can be argued that the reason for this is that Yıldırım possessed power as a candidate of the ruling party and did not have such worry, and if any interference would be involved it would likely be to his benefit.

Lastly, the findings of the study are indicative of the close relationship between argumentative structures and ideological standpoints of the candidates. İmamoğlu, the candidate of the Nation Alliance, based his practical arguments on "what should be done for a better İstanbul" since the city had been ruled by the mayors who were the members of the ruling party for many years and the focus of his value premises are equality, caring for the minority groups involving

children, women, people of diverse ethnicities, and ethics, all of which are in line with the values of political party he belongs to. He also implicitly reminds the voters the debate on the result of the previous presidential election and assure them that this time RPP would control the process better. Yıldırım, the candidate of the Public Alliance, bases his arguments on similar claims using more argument schemes, less value premises, however. He emphasizes the importance of hearing the citizens' wishes, providing service without discrimination. One significant difference between the two candidates is on the approach to the common values. While İmamoğlu blames the current ruling party's policy on the common values of Turkish society for the polarization in the society and thus suggest remembering their importance and gathering around them, Yıldırım considers the common values an issue of polarization, implicitly promoting negative "Them" by referring to the debates over Atatürk; therefore suggests leaving them out of politics being aware of the negative outcomes to be of such a debate since one of the parties in the given debate is his party. In conclusion, it can be asserted that the practical schemes put forward by the candidates are reflections of the political ideologies of the parties they are a part of and the model proposed by Fairclough and Fairclough (2012) provides a comprehensive framework for the analysis of political discourse.

It should be kept in mind that these findings are limited to the data of the study, In the future studies on Turkish PD, more comprehensive results can be obtained by examining different texts such as party group speeches, parliamentary speeches, and electoral speeches.

REFERENCES

- Bal, H. (2016). *Nitel Araştırma Yöntem ve Teknikleri*. İstanbul: Sentez Yayınları.
- Barry, V. E. & Rudinov, J. (2007). *Invitation to Critical Thinking*. USA: Thomson Wadsworth.
- Berg, K. E. & Latin, R. W. (2008). *Essentials of Research Methods in Health, Physical Education, Exercise Science and Recreation* (3rd edition). Philadelphia, PA: Lippincott, Williams & Wilkins.
- Büyükkantarcıoğlu, N. & Yazar, E. (2006). Dil ve İkna: Türk Politika Söyleminin İkna Edici Boyutları. *Dilbilim Araştırmaları*, 91-114.
- Chilton, P. (2004). *Analysing Political Discourse*. London: Routledge.
- Chilton, P. & Schäffner, C. (2002). Introduction: Themes and Principles in the Analysis of Political Discourse. Chilton, P. & Schäffner, C. (Ed.). *Politics as Text and Talk: Analytical Approaches to Political Discourse*. (pp. 1-41). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing.
- Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches* (4th edition). California: Sage.
- Fairclough, I. & Fairclough, N. (2011). Practical Reasoning In Political Discourse: The UK Government's Response To The Economic Crisis In The 2008 Pre-Budget Report. *Discourse and Society*. 22(3): 243-268.
- Fairclough, I. & Fairclough, N. (2012). *Political Discourse Analysis: A Method of Advanced Students*. London: Routledge.
- Gökçe, O. (2006). *İçerik Analizi*. Ankara: Siyasal Kitabevi.
- Heywood, A. (2013). *Politics*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Johnson, D. D. & Vanderstoep, S. W. (2009). *Research Methods for Everyday Life*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Jucker, A. H. (1997). Persuasion by Inference: Analysis of a Party Political Broadcast. *Belgian Journal of Linguistics*. 11: 121-137.
- Kumar, R. (2011). *Research Methodology a step-by-step guide for beginners*. London: Sage Publications.
- Lune, H. & Berg, B L. (2017). *Qualitative Research Methods for the Social Sciences* (9th edition). Essex: Pearson.

Rubinelli, S. (2012). Rhetoric as a Civic Art from Antiquity to the Beginning of Modernity. Forchtner, B., & Wodak, R. (Ed.). *The Routledge Handbook of Language and Politics*. (pp. 17-29). Oxon: Routledge.

Uncu, B. A. (2018). *KONDA Voter Clusters: Voters of Justice and Development Party*. İstanbul: KONDA Research and Consultancy.

van Dijk, T. A. (1997). What is Political Discourse Analysis.” *Belgian Journal of Linguistics*. 11(1): 11-52.

van Dijk, T. A. (2006). Politics, Ideology and Discourse. Wodak, R. (Ed.) *Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics: Volume on Politics and Language*. (pp. 728–740). Amsterdam: Elsevier.

van Eemeren, F., Grootendorst, R. & Henkemas, F. S. (2002). *Argumentation: Analysis, Evaluation, Presentation*. Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Wodak, R. (2009). *The Discourse of Politics in Action: Politics as Usual*. Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan.