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Abstract

In the modern world of politics, convincing the audience is the key to democratically gain power in society—and the amount of power politicians gain depends on how convincing they are. In this competitive domain, elites use discourse not only to persuade the audience, but also to manipulate the audience. According to van Dijk (2006), persuasion is a legitimate and ethical way to influence the audience, while manipulation is an illegitimate and unethical way of influencing the audience. The present study examines pronoun usage in the political discourse of Donald Trump; it examines the State of the Union Speech and 37 Weekly Addresses. The quantitative approach to the data was taken by incorporating corpus linguistic methods, namely frequency counts, concordances, word list tools, and downsampling. The qualitative approach was taken by using methods from rhetoric and Critical Discourse Analysis. To analyse the examined phenomenon, the Aristotelian persuasion framework, Fairclough’s theory on the pronouns we and you, van Dijk’s triangulation framework with its focus on manipulation, and Wieczorek’s taxonomy of speakers were used. The study concluded that in both the State of the Union Address and the Weekly Addresses, Donald Trump frequently and interchangeably uses the pronouns we and our to refer to two groups with unequal power relations to one another. The identified patterns placed within the societal context of the examined text persuade the recipients. Pronouns such as we, our, I, and they play a key role in the elements of ethos and pathos. Furthermore, the identified patterns placed within the societal context of the examined text also showed that Donald Trump uses discourse structure to use short term memory and long term memory properties to manipulate the audience.
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1. Introduction

In the present day where thanks to mass media information travels faster than ever before, political discourse plays an important role in democratic societies. Through political discourse politicians communicate and persuade the audience. The amount of power they gain depends on how convincing they are. In this competitive world, elites use discourse to persuade the audience, but they also use discourse to manipulate the audience. According to Van Dijk, “[m]anipulation not only involves power, but specifically abuse of power, that is, domination” (van Dijk, 2006:360). Persuasion is a legitimate and ethical way to influence the audience; however, manipulation is an illegitimate and unethical way of influencing the audience (van Dijk, 2006).

According to Proctor and I-Wen Su (2011), while the traditional role of a pronoun is to refer to a noun, there is another approach to pronouns in which pronouns play an important role. Mühlhäusler and Harré (1990) claim that in general when pronouns such as I and we are used, their meaning is dependent the context in which it is used. Billig (1995) argues that in politicians’ daily communication with citizens, they may evoke nationalism while delivering a speech through the use of simple tools such as pronouns. Alavidze (2017) goes a step further and claims that personal pronouns with their deictic role are one of the weapons in the arsenal used by politicians as a mean to achieve political goals. Researchers agree that pronouns used deictically are the marker of political discourse (Alavidze 2017). They have been found to be used frequently in US presidential and electoral discourse (e.g. Wieczorek 2015). The topic is important, because Proctor and I-Wen Su (2011) highlight that pronominal choice partly reveals with whom a politician is identifying, and that such choices can influence crucial decisions like
political elections. Despite the importance of the topic, pronouns in general and modern US political discourse more specifically have not been sufficiently researched.

Every year, except for the first year of a presidency, each president of the United States of America delivers a State of the Union Address which is a report and an agenda-setting message to the nation. The State of the Union Address informs the public about the county’s current financial and economic state and the outline of the legislative agenda of the government. The State of the Union Address is also one of the means of exercising power over the citizens by the government. Another form of communication with US citizens is found in the series of 37 addresses titled President Donald J. Trump’s Weekly Addresses. Donald Trump uses these forms of communication to inform and convince the audience of his agenda. However, the question arises whether he only uses legitimate means to convince the audience?

1.1 Aim

Pronouns certainly play a role in the process of persuasion and manipulation, as shifting the pronouns’ meaning can influence the audience’s discourse comprehension. The aim of this thesis is to examine the usage of pronouns in the transcript of State of the Union Address of Donald Trump delivered on 30 January 2018 and in 37 President Donald J. Trump’s Weekly Addresses, published from 28 January 2017 to 2 June 2018 (these include all the Weekly Addresses available at the moment of conducting the study); and then to use corpus mapping to determine the focus of the analysis of the pronouns; and to evaluate the results in light of Aristotelian persuasion framework, Fairclough’s model on we and you pronouns, van Dijk’s triangulation framework with its focus on manipulation, and Wieczorek’s taxonomy of speakers.
The research questions are: What personal pronouns are used in the selected speeches?; Which pronouns are most frequently used?; Which and How does pronoun usage seen as a linguistic pattern in the speech relate to persuasion and manipulation?

The study approached the topic and the research as an inductive process. The focus in the analysis of the pronouns is determined by the corpus mapping in the transcribed text of the State of the Union. The frequencies of pronouns, as well as the results of examining the concordance plot view determined the focus on the two most frequent pronouns. The less frequent pronouns featured in the extract of the State of the Union were excluded from the analysis. The observed patterns in the most frequent pronouns were also checked in the quantitative analysis of the 37 Weekly Addresses and the results were then compared. The focus in the analysis of the material is on particular linguistic patterns of pronoun usage which may function to persuade and manipulate the audience. It is important to mention that the study analyses the written transcripts only and does not deal with non-verbal communication such as gestures.

2. Theoretical Background

The first sub-section deals with the topic of previous studies on pronouns and political discourse, which is then followed by sub-sections presenting the theories and models which were used for data analysis.

2.1 Previous Studies of Pronouns and Political Discourse

This section consists of three parts presenting previous studies on personal pronoun usage and political discourse. The first part presents work by Proctor and I-Wen Su (2011), Mühlhäusler and Harré (1990), Harré (1991) and Bolinger (1979) which sum up the modern view on pronouns. The next part presents what Titscher et al. (2000) describe as the most accurate

Firstly, regarding the use of the first person plural pronoun in political discourse, Proctor and I-Wen Su (2011) claim that:

“[t]he traditional view of pronouns is that they stand on behalf of nouns. From one point of view, pronouns basically provide an anaphoric function and relegate their deictic function. Some researchers have proposed the contrary – that deictic function (the way the speaker chooses to address himself/herself or the other) does indeed play an important role in pronominal use”

(Proctor & I-Wen Su, 2011)

To Proctor and I-Wen Su (2011), there are two possible approaches to pronouns: first, a traditional one in which pronouns substitute nouns and their deictic role is secondary, and, secondly, the modern view in which deixis plays an important role in pronominal use. The modern view on pronouns is represented by Mühlhäusler and Harré (1990) who argue that some words including pronouns such as I and we are used deictically. Pronouns can be used deictically, so the meaning of a particular pronoun is dependent the context in which the pronoun is used. Furthermore, pronouns, such as I and we, connect an utterance to the immediate context of the speaker and addressee (Harré, 1991). Proctor and I-Wen Su (2011) present the following examples illustrating the deictic role of pronouns, based on Bolinger (1979):

Example (1):
You do not smoke in this room.
One does not smoke in this room.
They do not smoke in this room.
We do not smoke in this room.

(Bolinger, 1979; cited in Proctor & I-Wen Su, 2011)

In the sentences in the example above, the pronouns include the addressee, so the meaning depends highly on the context (Proctor & I-Wen Su, 2011). To Bolinger (1979), one cannot
simply assign any meaning to a pronoun. Another example by Bolinger (1979) presented in 
Proctor and I-Wen Su (2011) illustrates the case of the personal plural pronoun *we*:

Example (2):
My aunt and I went shopping and we bought many things.
You and I, we have known each other for years.

When we still had tails and lived in caves we did not need dishwashers

*(Bolinger, 1979; cited in Proctor & I-Wen Su, 2011)*

To Proctor and I-Wen Su (2011), the last example illustrates that the meaning of *we* remains ambiguous and the reader does not know if the speaker is included in the pronoun *we* referring to a creature with a tail. They highlight that extralinguistic information is crucial for the analysis, so variables such topic or venue of a conversation which influence personal pronoun choice can be determined. The importance of pronominal choice is also highlighted, as it partly reveals with whom a politician is identifying with. It is said that such choices can influence crucial decisions such as in the case of political elections, which are made based on the displayed identification of one politician with other politicians. Proctor and I-Wen Su (2011) point out that the meaning of a personal pronouns in a sentence/utterance cannot be presupposed, as personal pronoun meaning is established above the syntactic level.

Next, this section will present the definition of discourse and political discourse. Titscher et al. (2000) in their study present many definitions of discourse, but propose the definition by Wodak (1996) as most accurately describing the phenomenon and explaining the CDA approach:

“Critical Discourse Analysis sees discourse — language in use in speech and writing — as a form of ‘social practice’. Describing discourse as social practice implies a dialectical relationship between a particular discursive event and situation(s), institution(s) and social structure(s) which frame it: the discursive event is shaped by them, but it also shapes them. That is, discourse is socially constituted, as well as socially conditioned — it constitutes situations, objects of knowledge, and the social identities of and relationships between people and groups of people. It is constitutive both in the sense that it helps sustain and reproduce the social status quo, and in the sense that it contributes to transforming it”

Discourse, according to Wodak (1996), is a form of social practice; there is a dialectal relationship between discourse and context. So, in other words, both discourse and its context mutually influence each other. Discourse is an essential part of social practice for it constitutes and conditions social practices. Discourse is needed to establish situations, knowledge, identities and relationships; and it is needed to maintain, reproduce and transform the social relations. Van Dijk (2002) builds on the definition of discourse in the CDA approach and presents another definition of a specific type of discourse, namely political discourse. Political discourse is defined as follows: “[w]hatever a politician says is thus by definition a form of political discourse; and whatever anybody says with a political aim (viz., to influence the political process, e.g. decision making, policies) is also a form of political discourse” (van Dijk, 2002:216-17). Thus, every instance of discourse produced by a politician and with a political aim is political discourse.

The following section presents previous research on pronouns in political discourse. According to Billig (1995), very simple tools, such as the pronouns I, you, and we, may be used in realising agendas involving for example nationalism. He calls this phenomenon ‘banal nationalism’. According Proctor and I-Wen Su (2011), to Billig (1995), ‘’[b]anal refers to the ‘everyday’ thing that is not noticed easily, hidden in its own simplicity and lack of attractiveness’’ (Proctor and I-Wen Su, 2011: 3252). Furthermore, Billig (1995) links the usage of pronouns, in particular the personal plural pronoun we, to a phenomenon in which deixis is used to flag the homeland:

Politicians, rhetorically presenting themselves as standing in the eye of the nation, evoke the whole nation as their audience, well aware that their words will actually reach only a percentage of the nation's ears and eyes and that they might be overheard by others.

(Billig, 1995:106)
Politicians place themselves at the centre of a nation and address the nation itself as well as other parties. From this standpoint, politicians employ deixis to enhance nationalism. This phenomenon is called the deixis of homeland which “invokes the national ‘we’ and places ‘us’ within ‘our’ homeland” (Billig, 1995:106). Another phenomenon described by Billig (1995) is the syntax of hegemony, that is, language employed to evoke nationalism. The author describes the role of the pronoun we as follows:

“We’ is an important feature of the syntax of hegemony, for it can provide a handy rhetorical device for presenting sectional interests as if they were universal ones. ‘We’, the sectional interest, invoke an ‘all of us’, for whom ‘we’ claim to speak. Hegemonic discourse is marked by such elisions of ‘we’s. […] Political speakers routinely elide first person plurals: we the speaker and audience, we the party, we the government, we the nation, we the right-thinking people, we the Western world, we the universal audience – they all slide together. The boundaries between one ‘we’ and another one are routinely and rhetorically entangled, as speakers skilfully portray a harmonious world, in which all ‘we's speak with one voice – the speaker's own voice.

(Billig, 1995:166)

To Billig (1995), a speaker’s choice to use we invokes the sense of unity within a particular groups which is addressed and the boundaries between many groups included in we are entangled. He describes the usage of we as a rhetorical device used to present the interests of small fractions as common interests. The usage of we is said to play an important role in the syntax employed for evoking nationalism.

Another study on personal pronoun was conducted by Proctor and I-Wen Su (2011) who based the study on Billig (1995). They examined interviews and debates with John McCain, Sarah Palin, Barack Obama and Joe Biden which took place during the 2008 election in the US. Their research question was “do American politicians evoke nationalistic ‘flags’ in their pronominal choices?” (Proctor & I-Wen Su, 2011:3252). They examined ‘flagging’ by analysing the data and determining how frequently the four politicians associate themselves with the US or
Americans in general. The study concluded that “politicians reveal self-identification through pronominal choice, i.e., whom they support. Moreover, pronominal choice indicates the relation strength between a politician and his/her party” (Proctor & I-Wen Su, 2011:3265). In other words, the study confirmed that pronouns play an important role in political discourse by attributing belonging to various fractions such as political parties.

Billig (1995) seem to be in agreement with Alavidze (2017). Alavidze (2017) investigated the use of pronoun in the announcement speeches of the two presidential candidates Hillary Clinton and Donald Trump. That author highlights that the “[c]hoice of personal pronouns is one of the discourse markers in the political discourse. The study showed that choice of deictic words such as personal pronouns is one of the weapons used by politicians to achieve their goals” (Alavidze, 2017:351). The study concluded that different pronouns have different functions in political discourse: the personal singular pronoun I is used to express the individuals’ authority, readiness to take responsibilities, commitment and involvement; the personal plural pronoun we is used to create sense of unity and sense of sharing responsibilities as well as to involve the speakers with the audience; the personal singular pronoun you is used to address the audience or audience’s sub-groups; and finally, the personal plural pronoun they is used for dividing groups and creating a sense of another party outside the addressed group.

2.2 Persuasion - Ethos, Pathos and Logos Framework

This section presents the theories and models used for the data analysis, starting with the framework created by Aristotle. In Rhetoric, Aristotle (1966) claimed that persuasion relies on three factors: understanding human character and goodness in different forms (ethos), understanding the emotions of the audience (pathos), and being able to reason logically (logos).
Meyer (2012) has described Aristotle’s ethos as a prerequisite for adequate authority and knowledge of the persuader concerning a particular topic. Meyer’s (2012) illustrates his view on ethos by giving an example that all the authority and knowledge required for answering a general question is being a human. To a subject-specific question, more specific knowledge and particular kind of authority is required of a persuader to answer the question. Regarding pathos, Meyer (2012) sees its aim as to play on the emotions of the audience. The next element, logos, has been described in Braet (1992) who commented that Aristotle differentiates logos from pathos and ethos. To Braet (1992), Aristotle based this differentiation on arguments which concern a topic directly and arguments which concern a topic indirectly. To Aristotle, the appeal to credibility and emotions is “exo tou pragmatos”, a Greek phrase denoting something that “is outside the case” (Braet, 1992). Braet (1992) remarked that, on one hand, to Aristotle a perfect rhetorical situation would include only the appeal to logic to persuade the audience; but on the other hand the influence of ethos and pathos is unavoidable. Aristotle (1966) highlighted that logos originated from logic and became part of rhetoric, therefore clear and logical reasoning based on examples and enthymemes (a deduction in which one of the elements has been skipped) would be the ideal persuasion method: “a statement is persuasive and credible either because it is directly self-evident or because it appears to be proved from other statements that are so” (Aristotle, 1966, Book I, Chapter 2). In his work, Aristotle (1966) described discourse as a mixture of the appeals to the credibility of the speaker, to the emotions of the audience and to logic through usage of enthymemes and examples; but he highlighted that, ideally, only logical reasoning would fully ethically persuade the audience.

In summary, Aristotle (1966), then Meyer (2012) and Braet (1992) have all come to the conclusion that there are three elements which contribute to persuading the audience, namely, the
credibility of the speaker; the appeal to the audience’s emotions; and logical argumentation. According to Aristotle (1966), these three elements are the foundation of every speech. Additionally, according to Braet (1992), in practice, arguments gain the power of persuasion by using a mix of ethos, pathos and logos.

The studies of studies of Mshvenieradze (2013) and Roitman (2014) provide examples of the use of an Aristotelian framework to analyse political discourse. Mshvenieradze (2013) examined the pre-election of 2002 and 2007 campaign discourses by Jacques Chirac and Nicolas Sarkozy, and used the Aristotelian framework to discover the linguistic means used to realise ethos, pathos and logos. Roitman (2014) used the framework to analyse the 2012 Hollande–Sarkozy debate with a focus on the role of the presidential pronoun *I* and ethos. The author concluded that the pronoun *I* “in relation to the function of negation is relevant to an examination of the ethos rhetoric of the candidates” (Roitman, 2014:741).

### 2.3 Critical Discourse Analysis

This section presents theories and models which have originated from Critical Discourse Analysis. The approach and academic movement (Baker et al. 2008) called Critical Discourse Analysis emerged in the early 1990s, establishing its foundations on the works of Kress (1989), who defined a new way of interpreting language through the scope of society and every process that could be observed in it (Wodak, 2001). CDA relies on assumptions that culture affects the usage of the language; and that societies’ and individuals’ language use are influenced by a particular culture (Kress, 1989, cited in Wodak, 2001). Furthermore, CDA states that audiences do not passively accept the discourse, but respond to it (Kress, 1989, cited in Wodak, 2001). Moreover, in the field of CDA, similarities between different ways of language usage play an important role (Kress, 1989, cited in Wodak, 2001).
According to Strauss and Feiz (2014), CDA is an interdisciplinary methodological approach to language and society which puts a focus on discourse as social practice. CDA uses the microlevel analysis of discourse (an analysis of words, phrases and conceptual metaphors) to uncover the processes and practices on the macrolevels such as ideologies of power abuse, control, hegemony, dominance, exclusion, injustice, and inequity that influence society.

In the early years of CDA, van Dijk showed an interest in discourse analysis as basic units of social practices and used an approach on both microlevel and macrolevel (including the context of the examined discourse) in the analysis (Wodak, 2001). Moreover, Van Dijk researched language processing which resulted in developing cognitive models for explaining the construction of meaning on a societal level (Wodak, 2001). As a result of his research, in 2006, he created a new, triangulated approach to manipulation as a form of social power abuse, cognitive mind control and discursive interaction (van Dijk, 2006).

2.3.1 The Triangulation Framework

The triangulation framework was created as a means to address manipulation as a form of discursive power abuse (Van Dijk, 2001). The framework is a structure which links three components, namely discourse, cognition and society (Van Dijk, 2001), to enable a multi-dimensional and thorough analysis. According to van Dijk (2001), all three components of the framework are equally significant and it is only by incorporating all of them that the user is able to analyse the phenomenon from both a micro and macro perspective as well as include a context while maintaining a critical adequacy of the analysis level (Van Dijk, 1998, 2001). The triangulated framework can be used to analyse political discourse. As an example, van Dijk (2006) provided the analysis of UK Prime Minister Tony Blair’s speech legitimated his government’s decision to join the war against Iraq in 2003.
This remaining section defines and describes the relation of each component of the triangulated framework. First of all, van Dijk (2001) defines the notion and importance of discourse as a term that is used to describe every way of communication: discourse is “a conversational interaction, written text, as well as associated gestures, facework, typographical layout, images and any other “semiotic” or multimedia dimension of signification” (van Dijk, 2001:98). Thus, discourse defined as verbal and physical communication is a crucial part of the analysis of discursive power abuse. Secondly, cognition is defined as the structures, representations and processes which take place in the audience’s mind. Discourse and cognition are linked together, as cognition is a response to discourse and goals, believes, evaluations and emotions are examples of the cognitive responses to a discourse (van Dijk, 2001). Thirdly, communication and the response to it is positioned within society, which is entangled in micro and macro relations (van Dijk, 2001). These structures which create the micro and macro relations are equally important and positioning these structures in relation to the discourse analysis can reveal the mechanism that influence both society and discourse (van Dijk, 2001). The next section will describe the roles of each component of the triangulated framework and present selected tools which enhance manipulation distinguished by van Dijk.

The Role of Discourse

According to van Dijk (2006), discourse contains structures that as such are not manipulative, however in specific communicative situations the structures can gain additional functions and effects that influence the participants; in other words, the structures in particular environment can become manipulative. On one hand, the discourse structures in particular context can become manipulative, but on the other hand the same discourse structures in different context may lose the manipulative effect:
manipulation is a social practice of power abuse, involving dominant and dominated groups, or institutions and their clients. This means that in principle the ‘same’ discourse (or discourse fragment) may be manipulative in one situation, but not in another situation.

(van Dijk, 2006:372)

So, manipulation is a social practice of power abuse that involves a dominant group, a dominated group and the context. Moreover, the effect of the discourse structure depends on the context models of the recipients including models of the dominant group (producers of the discourse), and their attributed goals and intentions (van Dijk, 2006). According to van Dijk (2006), manipulative discourse is typical for the public mass communication which is controlled by dominant group such as political, bureaucratic, media, academic or corporate elites, therefore the participants’ contextual constraints escalate even more when individuals position themselves within their roles, their relations and their typical actions and cognitions such as goals and knowledge.

The author remarks that “[…] discourse is defined to be manipulative first of all in terms of the context models of the participants” (van Dijk, 2006:372) and points out that evaluation of discourse as manipulative begins with the analysis of context categories, rather than in terms of their textual structures. Having that in mind, van Dijk remarks that some discourse structures are more efficient than others in influencing the minds of recipients in the discourse producer’s own interests (van Dijk, 2006). The structures which are more likely to change the functions and effects of the discourse to manipulative are described; one of them involves positive self-presentation and negative other-presentation:

The overall strategy of positive self-presentation and negative other-presentation is very typical in this biased account of the facts in favour of the speaker’s or writer’s own interests, while blaming negative situations and events on opponents or on the Others (immigrants, terrorists, youths, etc.).

(Van Dijk, 2006:373)
Positive self-presentation and negative other-presentation are strategies that influence the interaction between the groups and act in favour of the producer of the discourse. Van Dijk (1993), illustrates the mechanism by giving an example of governmental and media discourse addressed to ordinary citizens picturing the problem of immigration in a way which would blame immigrants (not on government policies) for the bad state of the economy. Positive self-presentation and negative other-presentation can be observed in the following discourse structures: macro speech acts which imply our ‘good’ acts and their ‘bad’ acts such as accusation or defence; semantic macrostructures such as topic selection which emphasize and deemphasise negative/positive topics about us/their; lexicon and syntax choices which emphasize and deemphasise our/their positive/negative (van Dijk, 2003).

**The Role of Cognition**

According to van Dijk (2006), manipulation involves manipulating people’s minds (beliefs which include the knowledge, opinions and ideologies) which influence people’s actions. Van Dijk starts with explaining how discourse influences recipients’ information processing in short term memory (henceforth, STM) and later proceeds to discussing how discourse is being processed within long term memory (hereafter, LTM).

Firstly, STM processes language and links the language units like words, clauses, sentences, utterances and nonverbal signals to meanings and actions instead of analysing each unit separately. Furthermore, STM is involved in processing of any type of discourse (van Dijk, 2006). However, according to van Dijk, STM properties can be used to manipulate recipients:

if dominant groups or institutions want to facilitate the understanding of the information that is consistent with their interests, and hinder the comprehension of the information that is not in their
best interests (and vice versa for their recipients), then they may typically engage in these forms of STM-based manipulation of discourse understanding.

(van Dijk, 2006:366)

In other words, information advantageous for a dominant group’s best interest is presented in a way that makes it easier to comprehend for the audience, while information disadvantageous for a dominant group’s best interest is presented in a way difficult to comprehend for the audience. Van Dijk (2006) comment that cognitive, social, discursive and ethical dimensions are involved in the usage of STM properties to hinder the recipients’ language comprehension. If the producer of the discourse uses STM properties to hinder the recipients’ language comprehension, this is an illegitimate way of using the discourse (van Dijk, 2006).

Secondly, the general properties of LTM, defined as knowledge, attitudes, ideologies, norms and values, play a key role in manipulating cognition. Van Dijk (2006) reports on a study by Neisser and Fivush (1994), who define LTM as formed within the memories that define one’s life history and experiences, and a study by Tulving (1983), who attributes knowledge, attitudes, ideologies, and representations to episodic memory. According to van Dijk (2001), episodic memory is responsible for linking everyday experiences, for example, communicative events to particular mental models with its own individual schemas. The mechanism of LTM manipulation is described as follows:

If manipulators are aiming for recipients to understand a discourse as they see it, it is crucial that the recipients form the mental models the manipulators want them to form, thus restricting their freedom of interpretation or at least the probability that they will understand the discourse against the best interests of the manipulators.

(van Dijk, 2006:367)

In other words, by influencing recipients’ knowledge, attitudes, ideologies as well as memories the creator of the discourse influence forming of cognitive models and restrict the freedom of interpretation of discourse.
In summary, van Dijk states that the producer of discourse, through discourse structures, can manipulate recipients’ cognition. The manipulation of STM can lead to a hindering or biasing of the recipients’ language comprehension; manipulation of LTM is done by changing mental representations. These are powerful tools in the hands of skilled manipulators and can be used to manipulate a large audience (van Dijk, 2006). These methods combined have been used to steer away public critical attention from problems of the elites and draw it away (van Dijk, 1993).

**The Role of Society**

According to van Dijk (2006), the triangulated framework also focuses on the social conditions around the manipulator, and it must be approached from both a micro and a macro perspective. Certain social conditions, such as group membership, institutional positions, professions, material or symbolic resources and other factors which show how the power of groups and their members is distributed, can enable the manipulator to control the audience. Another aspect that should be considered is determining if the manipulator has access to the necessary tools which can enable manipulation, for it requires the manipulator to have special access to scarce social resources. In van Dijk’s (1996) view, access to the mass media and public discourse is essential in manipulation; moreover, access to such resources is only available to particular groups of people, namely to “elites”, such as politicians, journalists, scholars, writers, and teachers (van Dijk, 1996).

**2.3.2 Triangulated Framework, Manipulation and Persuasion**

The triangulation framework is said to be an adequate tool to analyse the phenomenon of manipulation in discourse for three reasons: firstly, manipulation takes place in text and in speech; secondly, the audience are human beings and have a relation to discourse; and thirdly, manipulation is a form of power relation within society (van Dijk, 2001). Van Dijk established the triangulation
framework on the CDA basis formulated by Kress; however, he developed the initial statements of CDA by adding the aspects of cognition and power relations.

Moreover, to van Dijk (2006), the boundary between manipulation and persuasion is context-dependent, as some individuals may be manipulated by the same messages which may not affect other individuals. Van Dijk (2006) based the distinction between persuasion and manipulation on certain criteria that help to determine whether the phenomenon falls into the category of persuasion or manipulation. First of all, the distinction is based on the audience’s awareness and the audience’s best interests (van Dijk, 2006). Secondly, to make the distinction two subjects must be considered, namely: the audience and the person who creates the discourse (van Dijk, 2006). To van Dijk (2006), persuasion is a way of influencing people which occurs with the audience’s full awareness and when it is aligned with the audience’s best interest, but manipulation takes place without the audience’s awareness and lies within the manipulator’s best interest.

In other words, audience’s awareness, audience’s best interests and the two subjects (the audience itself and the creator of the discourse) play a key role in identifying the “fuzzy” boundary between persuasion and manipulation. However, additional factors can be distinguished (van Dijk, 2006). The author also mentions that the variables occur in various degrees and combinations; so in the analysis, many variable factors results in difficulties with distinguishing persuasion from manipulation (van Dijk, 2006). It is important to mention that van Dijk (2006) has highlighted that the person creating the discourse is empowered to shape the discourse and decide if it falls within the area of persuasion or manipulation.

2.4 The Pronouns *We* and *You*

According to Fairclough (1989), in discourse, the pronouns *we* and *you* can have a relational value of different sorts depending on the context. Fairclough defines a relational value as “a trace of and a cue to the social relationships which are enacted via the text in the discourse”
The author describes two types of usage of the personal plural pronoun we: the inclusive we which refers to the producer of the discourse and the audience; and the exclusive we, which refers only to the producer or the discourse (Fairclough, 1989). The use of the exclusive we denotes multiple producers; it refers to this group only, but excludes the addressee or the addressees. Fairclough (1989) explains that by using the inclusive we, the author makes an implicit authority claim, instead of using milder methods to express speaker authority such as relational modality. Fairclough (1989) in his analysis of an interview with Margaret Thatcher points out the relational significance of using the pronoun we: to the author using the inclusive we, we is relationally significant because it assimilates the leader to “the people”. The same means can be used to do the opposite; the pronoun can be used to refer not only to the leader, the leader’s group, the audience, nor individuals within the audience in particular, but it can refers to all the people within the above mentioned categories (Fairclough, 1989). Such imprecision in terms of who is the pronoun refers to reverses the assimilation of the leadership and “the people” (Fairclough, 1989). The example from the interview below illustrates in lines (101) – (104) the described phenomenon:

(101) but of course it showed that we were reliable in the defence of freedom and when part of Britain we: was invaded of course we went we believed in defence of freedom we were reliable I think if I could try to sum

(105) it up in a phrase and that’s always I suppose most difficult of all I would say really restoring the very best of the British character to its former preeminence.


To Fairclough (1989), it is not clear if we in lines (101) – (104) is used exclusively or used inclusively. It may be used to refer to the state and/or the government which excludes the audience; or it may be used to refer to “the people”.
The pronoun *we* can be used to express identity. According to Fairclough (1989), *we* can be used instead of a noun to express identification. Then *we* referring to the speaker and the noun denoting another individual or a group is treated as an equivalent to a noun. The result is that both the speaker and another individual or a group become a part of a composite *we*. Fairclough (1989) gives an example from a British newspaper which, in an act of identification with the government, uses *we* instead of using nouns such as *Britain* or *the government*. Fairclough explains that such reduction serves “corporate ideologies which stress the unity of a people at the expense of recognition of divisions of interest” (Fairclough, 1989:128). This particular usage of *we* instead of a noun implies unity, which is a part of the discourse producer’s agenda and in consequence diminishes the recognition of what lies in the audience’s best interest. As mentioned above, Fairclough (1989) used this model to analyse political discourse, namely, an interview with Margaret Thatcher on BBC Radio 3 from 1985.

### 2.5 Taxonomy of Speakers

The last model used for the analysis is Wieczorek’s (2015) taxonomy of speakers. Wieczorek (2015) proposes a taxonomy of speakers from a socio-pragmatic perspective. To classify the types of speakers, the author proposes three super-categories which help to analyse a speech and its background:

1. (a) the author, that is, the speechwriter who has selected the linguistic means to convey the message intended; (b) the speaker, that is, the person who is delivering the speech; and (c) the sayer, that is, the person whose words are being reported and reconstructed by the speaker

   (Wieczorek, 2015:347)

To Wieczorek (2015), there are three subject: (a) the author (speechwriter), (b) the speaker who is delivering the speech and (c) the sayer that is the person whose words are being reported.
Furthermore, Wieczorek (2015) states that in the single-turn political discourse, there are two main categories of the super-category (b): the singular speaker and the collective speaker. The singular speaker includes the ideologically neutral ‘I’ which is defined by the author as not displaying ideologically biased meanings; and the Presidential ‘I’ which is defined as expressing ideology and marking that the speaker is a representative of a group sharing the same ideology (Wieczorek, 2015). Wieczorek (2015) highlights that the Presidential ‘I’ is “frequent in American presidential and electoral discourse, in which the speaker assumes the role of ‘the head of the ideological option that he represents’” (Blas Arroyo, 2000:7 cited in Wieczorek, 2015:348). The author provided the following example of the Presidential ‘I’ used by Bill Clinton:

“Today, as you know, I have reached an agreement, at least with Senator Nunn and Senator Mitchell, about how we will proceed in the next few days. But first I would like to explain what I believe about this issue and why, and what I have decided to do after a long conversation, and a very good one, with the Joint Chiefs of Staff and discussions with several Members of Congress.”

(Clinton on January 29, 1993, in Wieczorek, 2015:348)

According to Wieczorek (2015), in the example the speaker behaves like a leader who has obtained a certain amount of authority and power. Furthermore, the speaker is capable of making decisions on behalf of the society (Wieczorek, 2015). To the author, “Presidential ‘I’ is between the speaker and the addressees: ‘as you know’ versus ‘I have reached’ and ‘I have decided’” (Wieczorek, 2015:348).

Next, in Wieczorek’s (2015) taxonomy, the collective speaker can be distinguished by the personal plural pronoun we which enables the speaker to represent events from a perspective which the speaker shares with the audience, as well as using it as inclusive or exclusive of particular groups or individuals (Wieczorek, 2015). The author illustrate the usage of collective speaker with the following example from a speech by John F. Kennedy:
The Communist balance of power is still strong. The balance of power is still on the side of freedom. **We are** still the keystone in the arch of freedom, and I think **we will continue** to do as **we have done** in our past, our duty

(Kennedy on November 22, 1963, in Wieczorek, 2015:349)

Wieczorek (2015) explains that, in the example above, the pronoun *we* includes the addressees and excludes the opponents. The author comments that the pronouns *our* together with the pronoun *we* enhances the effect: “[p]ositive evaluation of the in-group is enhanced by such noun phrases and ‘the side of freedom’ and ‘the arch of freedom’, as well as common ground claims indicating sharedness and interdependence: ‘our past’ and ‘our duty’” (Wieczorek, 2015:349).

Wieczorek (2015) points out that the usage of Presidential ‘I’ together with the pronoun *our* is the speaker’s attempts to provide a certain aura of unity and association, but at the same time, it also creates an aura of separation and dissociation from opponents. Wieczorek’s (2015) comment seems to be in agreement with Fairclough’s (1989) thoughts on inclusive and exclusive *we*. The next example given by Wieczorek (2015) illustrates that the collective speaker may be partially unidentified and therefore including the recipients willing to be included:

**We are** on the right track to the 21st century. **We are** on the right track. But **our work** is not finished. What should we do? First, **let us** consider how to proceed.

(Clinton on August 29, 1996, in Wieczorek, 2015:349)

Wieczorek (2015) comments that in this example the inclusion of everyone addressed through the pronoun *we* contrasts with *let us*, which excludes the opponents. The author points out that to understand the meaning conveyed in the collective speaker, it is required of the audience to have previous knowledge of the context (Wieczorek, 2015). To Wieczorek (2015), “the amount of shared knowledge of political, social, cultural and other circumstances influence the accuracy with which the speaker’s messages are comprehended” (Wieczorek, 2015:349). Finally, after
discussing the examples, the author highlights the notion that the collective speaker also conveys some level of vagueness and may be an intentionally and strategically maintained move which allows speakers to keep the reference covert (Wieczorek, 2015).

3. Situational Background

This section deals with the situational background of the examined data, for as it was highlighted many times in the theoretical background section, the context of the discourse is crucial for the analysis. Firstly, the figure of the speaker, who possesses a very significant position in US society, should be taken into consideration. Donald Trump was born to a wealthy family with high status in US society. In the 1970s, he graduated from the University of Pennsylvania’s Wharton School of Finance, joined his father’s business, and became a real-estate developer owning real-estate properties in the USA and around the world (Donald Trump, 2017). In the 1990s, Trump became engaged in politics (Donald Trump, 2017). In 2004, Trump was featured in a reality television series titled *The Apprentice* that was nominated for an Emmy Award, which according to Encyclopaedia Britannica “[…] solidified Trump’s reputation as a shrewd outspoken businessman” (Donald Trump, 2017). In 2012, Trump kept a high public profile during the presidential election; and in 2015, Trump announced his candidacy for the presidential election of 2016 (Donald Trump, 2017). On the 20th of January in 2017, Donald Trump was sworn in as the 45th President of the USA. Donald Trump’s current position in US society, his previous experiences and maintaining a high public profile for many years granted him power over the citizens of USA and the highest position within the societal hierarchy. In addition, Trump as the speaker also represent a certain agenda and ideologies. Donald Trump belongs to the Republican Party.
The background on Donald Trump clearly shows that he has the necessary power to manipulate his audience. According to van Dijk (2006), certain social conditions such as group membership, institutional position, profession, material or symbolic resources and other factors which show how the power of groups and their members is distributed can enable the manipulator to control the audience. Trump has obtained the highest position within the hierarchy of the United States, he belongs to a major political party, and he is wealthy. It is important to highlight that some groups, elites or politicians connected with certain agendas, have power over other groups who do not obtain the same positions within the US society. The best interests of both groups can be aligned or be in a conflict of interest. Another aspect important to discuss, according to van Dijk’s (2006), is whether the manipulator has special access to scarce social resources. As the President, Trump has access to national media and international means of communication such as social media; moreover, with this position within the society, his actions and acts of communication draw the attention of media globally. Therefore, according to van Dijk’s description of the societal role within the triangulation framework, Donald Trump has obtained the required tools and position within the society to be in a position of manipulator.

4. Material and Method

This section presents how the data was collected, the procedures, methods and tools used to analyse the collected data. The method section also defines the qualitative and quantitative approaches taken. Furthermore, the following sub-sections also contain information on the corpus linguistics (CL) approach which was used for the quantitative analysis and on the topic of combining CL methods and a CDA approach.
4.1 Data

The collection of data took place in two stages. In the first stage, the data was retrieved from the official webpage of the White House and contains the full transcript of President Donald J. Trump’s 2018 State of the Union Address delivered on January 31st. The transcribed text was copied from the White House webpage and put into a text file which was used to perform a quantitative and qualitative analysis with the usage of the software AntConc (Anthony, 2014). The text was also tagged by the POS-tagging software TagAnt (Anthony, 2014) to enable more efficient analysis. Additionally, all the sentences of Donald Trump’s State of the Union Address were numbered to enable easier analysis of the examples from the transcribed text. The full 5,145 word long text of the State of the Union Address with the sentences separated to a line with a number per each is included in Appendix 1.

The second stage of the data collection consisted in collecting more data for the analysis. Two corpora were created: one containing the transcribed text of the State of the Union Address; and one containing 37 President Donald J. Trump’s Weekly Addresses. The Weekly Addresses which were published in the time period starting on January 28, 2017, which was the first Weekly Address during Trump’s presidency and ending on June 2, 2018. The data collection included all of the Weekly Addresses available at the moment of conducting the study. The transcribed text of the Weekly Addresses were copied from the White House webpage and put into separate text files. The text files were named with the word “SPEECH” followed by the publication date in format of DD-MM-YYYY. The corpus resulted in 18,874 words. An archive of all files was created in an Excel file and contains file names, number of words, author, title of the address, name of the source and publication date. The POS-tagging software TagAnt (Anthony, 2014) was used to
tag the material. Quantitative and qualitative analysis was performed using AntConc (Anthony, 2014). Altogether, the data collected for the study comprises 24,016 words.

4.2 Method

The data was examined by both qualitative and quantitative approaches. According to Paltridge and Phakiti (2010), qualitative research is defined:

[…] an approach that seeks to make sense of social phenomena as they occur in natural settings. Rather that setting up a controlled environment, qualitative researchers are more interested in understanding contexts as they actually are. Qualitative researchers do not aim for quantification or standardization in the data collection and analysis of data.

(Paltridge and Phakiti, 2010:355)

In other words, Paltridge and Phakiti’s (2010) define the qualitative approach as aiming to find an adequate interpretation of patterns found in some data collected in a natural setting. Quantitative research, by contrast, is an “approach that draws on numeric data. Variables are clearly defined, measurement is standardized, and data are generally analysed using statistical methods” (Paltridge and Phakiti, 2010:355). The quantitative approach focuses on numeric data and uses tools such as statistics to approach the numeric data to draw conclusions on the examined phenomena.

In this paper, the qualitative approach to data was taken through the analysis of the phenomenon of pronoun usage in the State of the Union Address with the usage of the Aristotelian persuasion framework, Fairclough’s model on we and you pronouns, van Dijk’s triangulation framework with its focus on manipulation, and Wieczorek’s taxonomy of speakers. These were chosen to create a unique lens which could be used to examine the relation between pronoun usage and their possible role in persuasion and/or manipulation. The quantitative approach to the data was taken through incorporating corpus-linguistic methods and perform downsampling. Downsampling (Baker et al., 2008) is defined as a method enabling the
researcher to use the quantitative approach by incorporating CL methods to create a map of the areas which can be further analysed with the usage of qualitative approach. Baker et al. (2008) explain that the lexical patterns distinguished by use of the CL tools to enable examination of concordances, text sample or the text itself.

The study approached the research as an inductive process. The focus of the pronouns’ analysis was determined by the corpus mapping in the transcribed text of the State of the Union. The frequencies of pronouns, as well as the results of examining the concordance plot view determined the focus on the two most frequent pronouns. As mentioned above, the less frequent pronouns featured in the extract of the State of the Union were excluded from the analysis. The observed patterns in the most frequent pronouns were also checked in the quantitative and qualitative analysis of the 37 Weekly Addresses and the results were then compared.

4.2.1 Corpus Linguistics

To Baker (2010), the corpus linguistic method has been most accurately defined by McEnery and Wilson (1996), who define it as a study of language based on examples which are drawn from the real life language usage. Baker (2010) points out that deciding whether CL is a methodology or a theory (or both) is problematic. Baker (2010) and McEnery et al. (2006) agree that CL does not qualify as an independent branch of linguistics as it cannot be categorised in the same way as for example phonetics or syntax. Baker (2010) classifies CL as a collection of methods giving researchers a wide spectrum of tools for performing analysis of text and highlights that the “need to determine which ones [techniques] are most applicable in addressing their research questions, along with deciding which software will be used (often the affordances of the latter will heavily impact on the former)” (Baker, 2010:19). In this study, AntConc and TagAnt software (Anthony, 2014) were used. The specific CL tools used in this studies are frequency counts, concordances, concordance
plot views and the wordlist function. These were used on both corpora to map out the area of text to determine extract for the CDA analysis and determine the focus of the analysis. TagAnt (Anthony, 2014) processed the texts and added a Part of Speech tag to each individual lexical item.

**4.2.1 Combining Critical Discourse Analysis Approach and Corpus Linguistics Methods**

As mentioned above, this study incorporates a quantitative approach (CL methods) and a qualitative approach (CDA) which are combined through downsampling. Both approaches have been criticized by other scholars. Mautner (2007) has argued that CL techniques have certain disadvantages. On one hand, large-scale data collections are not adequate for making direct links between the linguistic evidence and the contextual framework, so in other words, the amount of data used for CL methods is problematic when placing the linguistic evidence into a bigger context and then interpreting it with frameworks (Mautner, 2007). On the other hand, Baker et al. (2008) point out that combining CL and CDA methods does not limit the analysis to only the automatic analysis of corpora (Baker et al, 2008). Baker et al. (2008) add that “the examination of expanded concordances (or whole texts when needed) can help the analyst infer contextual elements in order to sufficiently recreate the context” (Brown and Yule, 1982, in Baker et al, 2008:279).

Additionally, Baker et al. (2008) provide two main points of the critique of CDA techniques. Koller and Mautner (2004) comment that “[t]he hidden danger is that the reason why the texts concerned are singled out for analysis in the first place is that they are not typical, but in fact quite unusual instances which have aroused the analyst’s attention” (Koller and Mautner, 2004:218 in Baker et al., 2008:281). To Koller and Mautner (2004), subjective selection of the text for the CDA analysis can overlook parts of the data that contain more complex issues or
even a contradicting issues. Lastly, Stubbs (1994) has argued that analysing a small amount of data cannot reveal all the processing existing in the text, as “some patterns of language use are not directly observable, because they are realized across thousands or millions of words of running text, and because they are not categorical but probabilistic” (Stubbs, 1994:204 in Baker et al., 2008:283). Baker et al. (2008) agree that during selection of the text for CDA analysis, due to the size of data, some issues may be overlooked; however, the authors comment that texts alone can be insignificant, but entities exercising power on certain positions have capabilities to give the texts a great impact (Fairclough, 1989). Finally, Baker et al. (2008) highlight that “CL and CDA can both be seen to have strengths and weaknesses, it is hoped that a combination of the two would help to exploit their strong points, while eliminating potential problems” (Baker et al., 2008:283).

5. Results and Discussion

The first two sub-sections below are dedicated the State of the Union Speech. The first sub-section presents the corpus mapping results and the second sub-section the CDA analysis of the State of the Union Speech. This is followed by a sub-section dedicated to the quantitative analysis of the Weekly Addresses, followed by a sub-section presenting the CDA analysis of 25 representative examples from the Weekly Addresses. The last sub-section compares the findings in the two examined corpora.

5.1 Corpus Mapping

In the tagged corpus, the search for pronoun POS tag was run, and the software found the 21 different pronouns which were used in the State of the Union Address. The pronouns found in the text were he, her, him, himself, his, I, it, its, me, my, our, she, their, them, themselves, they, us, we,
you, your, and yourself. Next, a word list was generated based on the pronouns distinguished by
the previous procedure. The wordlist resulted in twenty-one word types and 485 word tokens
found in the State of the Union Address. The result of the wordlist, together with a calculated
percentage, are presented in Table 1 below.

Table 1. Frequencies of Pronouns Used in the 2018 State of the Union Address, organised by
rank

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Word</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>24,54%</td>
<td>we</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2,68%</td>
<td>my</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>20,82%</td>
<td>our</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1,24%</td>
<td>she</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>6,60%</td>
<td>their</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1,03%</td>
<td>its</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>5,98%</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1,03%</td>
<td>her</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>5,77%</td>
<td>it</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0,82%</td>
<td>him</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>5,36%</td>
<td>he</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0,82%</td>
<td>your</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5,15%</td>
<td>they</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0,41%</td>
<td>themselves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4,95%</td>
<td>us</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0,21%</td>
<td>himself</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4,95%</td>
<td>you</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0,21%</td>
<td>me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3,92%</td>
<td>his</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0,21%</td>
<td>yourself</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3,51%</td>
<td>them</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table (1) shows that the most frequently used pronouns are the personal plural pronoun we, used
119 times comprising 24,54% of all pronoun usage in the examined text; and possessive plural
pronoun our, used 101 times comprising 20,82%. Interestingly, these two pronouns comprise
45,36% of all the pronoun usage in the transcription which is nearly half of all the pronoun usage
in the text. Furthermore, in Table (1) we can note a sharp decline from rank 2nd to rank 3rd,
within the pronoun frequencies. The third most frequent pronoun, used 32 times, is the
possessive plural pronoun their with 6, 60% of all the pronoun usage. The next pronouns, it, he,
they, us, and you slowly decline in frequency by the following percentages: 5,98%; 5,77%;
5,36%; 5,15%; 4,95% and 4,95%. Further, from rank 9 to 10, a rapid drop is noted and the
pronoun frequency is below 3,92%. These pronouns are his (3,92%), them (3,51%), my (2,68%).
she (1.24%), its (1.03%), her (1.03%), him (0.82%), your (0.82%), themselves (0.41%), himself (0.21%), me (0.21%), yourself (0.21%). Another interesting fact is that after creating the wordlist of the State of the Union Speech, out of 1,548 word types, the pronouns *we* and *our* were marked as the fifth and sixth most frequent words in the corpus as a whole. The top ten results of the wordlist generated from the State of the Union Speech are presented in Table 2 below.

**Table 2.** Top Ten Results of the Wordlist Generated from the State of the Union Speech

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Word Type</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Word Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>the</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>our</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>to</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>of</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>we</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>that</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The pronouns *we* and *our* are ranked as the fifth and sixth out of all the word types, with a frequency of occurrence of 119 and 101. This finding shows how important and how frequent the pronouns *we* and *our* are in the examined text.

The tendencies described in Table (1) and Table (2) create a map useful for further examination of pronoun usage in the transcription. It highlights a hotspot of the very frequent usage of the pronouns *we* and *our* which require further mapping. According to Baker et al. (2008), the mapping may include less significant, yet relevant pronouns which contain around 5% each of all the usage. The least common pronouns, ranked 10-21, will not be analyzed in this study.

After establishing frequencies and percentages of the pronouns used in the examined text, other CL tools were used to aid further the CDA analysis. The concordance plot view enable us to determine the areas to focus on in the analysis and to map the locations in which pronouns are frequently used. Figure (1) presents a concordance plot view of the pronoun *we*. 


Figure 1. Concordance Plot View of the Pronoun *we*

In Figure (1) above, all the 119 hits of the pronoun *we* were placed within the rectangle representing the entire text to graphically mark the occurrences of the pronoun within the text. Interestingly, the pronoun *we* occurs frequently at the beginning and the end of the examined text in a relatively condensed manner. In the middle part of the text, the pronoun *we* occurs sparsely with much less density. The half of the text to the right in comparison to the second half of the text carries more markers than the half to the left. In the second part of the text, a notable decline in markers is observed with the exception of the very end where the markers are dense. Another pronoun’s concordance plot view is presented in Figure (2).

Figure 2. Concordance Plot View of the Pronoun *our*

The pronoun *our* is spread out evenly with the exception of the very beginning of the text to the right. The markers increase in numbers, until the markers reach a constant frequency in the middle to the left of the bar, when at the end it decreases slightly and reappears with visible high density.

The next step was to examine the other pronouns *their, I, it, he, they, us,* and *you,* which comprise around 5% each of the overall pronoun usage. The other pronouns, which occurred
significantly less frequently than the pronouns *we* and *our*, after examining the concordance plot view (included in the Appendix 2), in every case the markers were scattered across the image; therefore no hotspots could be distinguished for the analysis based on the concordance plot view. It may be partially because there were not enough examples to illustrate the distribution within the text. This particular finding completed the CL investigation and created a map for the corpus-assisted analysis.

In summary, the pronouns used in the transcript were distinguished with usage of POS tags concordance search and the word list tool, and their frequency distributions were presented in Table 1. Next, the concordance plot views were examined in order to spot patterns in the distribution of the pronouns *we* and *our*. The corpus mapping determined the focus of the study on the two most frequent pronouns and an analysis of the other pronouns *their, it, he, they, us, and you* which comprise around 5% each of the overall pronoun usage. The pronouns below 5% ranked 10-21 will be analysed only if they relate to the pronouns selected to be the focus of the study.

5.2 Analysis of Extracts Involving *We* and *Our*

As we have seen above, particularly dense usage of the two most frequently used pronouns are: for the personal plural pronoun *we*, the beginning and the end of the speech; and for the possessive plural pronoun *our*, throughout the speech. The following section will focus on the CDA analysis of speech extracts taken from the beginning, middle and the end of the speech, as the main focus of the study is to analyse the selected pronouns based on the corpus mapping, and to interpret the examples of usage with the previously presented theories and models.

Extract (1) below presents the first 13 sentences of the State of the Union Address. All the pronouns used in the extract have been underlined.
Extract (1):

1. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Vice President, Members of Congress, the First Lady of the United States, and my fellow Americans:
2. Less than 1 year has passed since I first stood at this podium, in this majestic chamber, to speak on behalf of the American People — and to address their concerns, their hopes, and their dreams.
3. That night, our new Administration had already taken swift action.
4. A new tide of optimism was already sweeping across our land.
5. Each day since, we have gone forward with a clear vision and a righteous mission — to make America great again for all Americans.
6. Over the last year, we have made incredible progress and achieved extraordinary success.
7. We have faced challenges we expected, and others we could never have imagined.
8. We have shared in the heights of victory and the pains of hardship. We endured floods and fires and storms.
9. But through it all, we have seen the beauty of America’s soul, and the steel in America’s spine.
10. Each test has forged new American heroes to remind us who we are, and show us what we can be.
11. We saw the volunteers of the “Cajun Navy,” racing to the rescue with their fishing boats to save people in the aftermath of a devastating hurricane.
12. We saw strangers shielding strangers from a hail of gunfire on the Las Vegas strip.
13. We heard tales of Americans like Coast Guard Petty Officer Ashlee Leppert, who is here tonight in the gallery with Melania.

In Extract (1), the usage of following pronouns can be observed: the personal plural pronoun we was used in sentences (5) to (13); the possessive plural pronoun our in sentences (3) and (4); the possessive plural pronoun their in sentences (2) and (11); the personal singular pronoun I was used in sentence (2); and finally the use of plural object pronoun us was noted in sentence (10).

These results match those observed in the corpus-assisted pronoun analysis, which showed that the pronoun we occurs frequently at the beginning of the text and that the pronoun our does not occur frequently at the beginning of the text. The less frequent pronouns which comprise less than 5% each also occur in Extract (1). As was mentioned in the previous section, this section will contain a CDA analysis which is seen as purely qualitative approach; and as pointed out by Baker et al. (2008), a quantitative CL approach and a qualitative CDA approach in combination provide a complete analysis. The next section will focus purely on the qualitative analysis.

The first pronouns used in the speech are the pronouns I and their.

Sentence (1):
Less than 1 year has passed since I first stood at this podium, in this majestic chamber, to speak on behalf of the American People — and to address their concerns, their hopes, and their dreams.

The pronoun I, which is the singular speaker, is used as the ideologically neutral ‘I’ whose function is simply to refer to Donald Trump as a person. The discursive ‘I’, displays no ideologically biased meanings whereas the Presidential ‘I’ marks ideology and marks that the speaker is a representative of a group (Wieczorek, 2015). So, with the first pronoun, Trump highlights the separation between himself and US society. Then the speaker addresses the nation with the pronoun their which modifies the nouns concerns, hopes, and dreams attributed to the American people. The speaker draws a line between himself and the nation; however, he does not put himself or the American people in opposition to one another. The usage of a singular pronoun creates a sense of distance. Further in the text, the pronoun our is used. Trump shifts to the collective speaker and attributes new administration to some entity:

Sentence (4):

That night, our new Administration had already taken swift action.

The usage is ambiguous if he refers to our US administration, or our Republican administration. This ambiguity can be interpreted as an appeal to pathos and an attempt to invoke a feeling of solidarity, but it can also be an attempt to interfere with the recipients’ capabilities of discourse processing. It is done by blurring the borders between groups. As mentioned above, the border between persuasion and manipulation is not clear, which is evident here.

Proceeding forward in the analysis, the next sentence presents the usage of the personal plural pronoun we. In sentence (5), it is used exclusively and represents the government which acts with a goal to make the country better for the citizens of the US:

Sentence (5):
(5) _we have gone forward with a clear vision and a righteous mission — to make America great again for all Americans._

Contrasting this to the previous ambiguous case of the pronoun _us_, here the pronoun is used to refer exclusively to the government and the president—thus, to refer to the elites. The switching between a pronoun’s meanings may influence the models created in the audience’s mind, so it may be a part of LTM manipulation. According to van Dijk (2006), using discourse to influence the forming of cognitive models and thus restricting the freedom of interpretation of discourse is classified as manipulation. In the examined case, where there is a possibility that cognitive models concerning nation, the government and the power relations between the two can be disturbed. In contrast, different sequences of the discourse could prevent the ambiguity and inconsistency in referring to groups which have power and to groups which do not have power. The exclusive usage of the pronoun _we_ continues through sentences (5) to (7). The next pronoun shifts in meaning and becomes inclusive. In sentences (8) to (13), the pronoun includes the speaker and the audience. Trump recalls events recent to the timing of the delivery of the speech and positions the _we_ on the same level—as people who share a common history and memories of the recent events. In contrast to the previous exclusive usage, when the government was the only subject, now all Americans are included in the _we_. According to Fairclough (1989), using the inclusive _we_ is relationally significant because it assimilates the leader to “the people”; however, this imprecision in terms of who the pronoun is referring to reverses the assimilation of the leadership and “the people” (Fairclough, 1989). This again contributes to changing the mental models of the recipients and enables manipulation with the audience’s cognition.
So far this section has focused on the beginning of the speech. The following section will deal with the analysis of the middle of the speech. Extract (2) from sentences (145) to (155) out of 300 sentences is presented below:

**Extract (2):**

145. *We are proud that we do more than any other country to help the needy, the struggling, and the underprivileged all over the world.*
146. *But as President of the United States, my highest loyalty, my greatest compassion, and my constant concern is for America’s children, America’s struggling workers, and America’s forgotten communities.*
147. *I want our youth to grow up to achieve great things.*
148. *I want our poor to have their chance to rise.*
149. *So tonight, I am extending an open hand to work with members of both parties — Democrats and Republicans — to protect our citizens of every background, color, religion, and creed.*
150. *My duty, and the sacred duty of every elected official in this chamber, is to defend Americans — to protect their safety, their families, their communities, and their right to the American Dream.*
151. *Because Americans are dreamers too.*
152. *Here tonight is one leader in the effort to defend our country: Homeland Security Investigations Special Agent Celestino Martinez — he goes by CJ.*
153. *CJ served 15 years in the Air Force before becoming an ICE agent and spending the last 15 years fighting gang violence and getting dangerous criminals off our streets.*
154. *At one point, MS-13 leaders ordered CJ’s murder.*
155. *But he did not cave to threats or fear.*

As the corpus analysis has shown, the most frequent pronouns *we* and *our* occur in the middle of the speech and the pronoun *our* occurs more frequently in this part of the text. In sentence (145), the pronoun *we* is used inclusively. The voice of a collective speaker speaks for the entire nation and expresses feelings of gratitude for being capable to help *the needy, the struggling, and the underprivileged all over the world.* This appeals to the recipients’ emotions and persuades them to identify as one with the speaker and other groups within US society. Through the usage of the pronoun *we* the speaker makes an implicit authority claim and speaks for the entire nation. At the same time, it expresses unity and homogeneity within the nation. According to Fairclough (1989), the sense of unity may be part of the discourse producer’s agenda and, in consequence,
an implicit authority claim realised by the pronoun usage may diminish the recognition of what is in the audience’s best interest.

In sentences (147) to (149), the usage of the Presidential ‘I’ can be observed. The Presidential ‘I’ marks ideology as well as highlights that that the speaker is a representative of a group (Wieczorek, 2015). Trump makes an authority claim and sets the direction for the entire nation.

After making an authority claim, Trump further strengthens the effect by expressing his agenda-settling “want”:

**Sentences (147)-(149):**

(147) *I want our youth to grow up to achieve great things.*
(148) *I want our poor to have their chance to rise.*
(149) *So tonight, I am extending an open hand to work with members of both parties — Democrats and Republicans — to protect our citizens of every background, color, religion, and creed.*

Donald Trump’s words placed within its societal context gain meaning beyond the discourse structures such as syntax. In sentences (147) to (149) above, Trump expresses the current Republican ideology. Trump, by stating the want of aiding society and announcing the want to cooperate beyond any divisions, makes a strong appeal to ethos and to pathos. Trump highlights his credibility and power as the President to make agenda-setting statements and he highlights his goodwill to aid the young and poor Americans in need. This usage is a different usage of the pronoun *I* that was observed in sentence (2) of Extract (1) above in which the pronoun *I* had no ideologically biased meaning (Wieczorek, 2015). Again, an inconsistency in the usage of the same pronoun with two different relational values was noted.

Furthermore, in sentences (147) to (149), the pronoun *our* is used. Trump, after using his power to express the ideology and the forecast for the future, in sentences (147) and (148) uses
the pronoun *our* to imply the unity which is also part of Trump’s agenda. The Presidential ‘I’ is combined with the case of the collective speaker expressed with the pronoun *our*. On the one hand, Trump distinguishes himself from the *we* and uses his authority, but on the other hand, he uses the pronoun *our* (the inclusive collective speaker) in the same sentence implying unity. Moreover, in the (149), it is not clear any more whether the pronoun *our* refers to the entire nation or includes only the government and its powerful politicians. In this case, Trump employs the strategy described by Wieczorek (2015) of intentional and strategically maintained vagueness in the reference. In the next sentence (149), a shift in the positioning of the groups is noted. In sentences (147) to (148) the pronoun *our* is used inclusively to refer to all the citizens of the US, and in sentence (149) the meaning becomes vague. This shift and the vagueness may manipulate the recipients’ cognition by changing the mental model of *our* within the LTM.

In the next sentence (150), again a shift in the positioning of the groups which have power and groups which do not have power is noted again. The previous unity, then the vagueness in reference, is followed by distancing the President from the people and calling American’s right *their right*:

**Sentence (150):**

(150) My duty, and the sacred duty of every elected official in this chamber, is to defend Americans — to protect their safety, their families, their communities, and their right to the American Dream.

(151) Because Americans are dreamers too.

(152) Here tonight is one leader in the effort to defend our country: Homeland Security Investigations Special Agent Celestino Martinez — he goes by CJ.

This particular case of usage differentiates the President from the people. Then the meaning shifts again and the next pronoun is the pronoun *our* in sentence (152) and refers to all Americans together with the President. As mentioned above, manipulating cognition takes place through STM which links the words with the words’ meaning, and further influences the LTM in
which mental models crystalize (van Dijk, 2006). Shifting the meanings of the same pronouns, through STM, influence the models within the LTM. The observed phenomenon is a sophisticated way of using pronoun and giving relational value to the pronouns. The usage of exclusive and inclusive pronouns as well as using pronouns to increase and decrease the distance between the President and the people results in shifts in meaning, and therefore implement STM and LTM manipulation.

The last section of the State of the Union Address analysis will focus on the ending of the text. Extract (3) below presents the last ten sentences of the State of the Union Address:

**Extract (3):**

290. *Americans fill the world with art and music.*
291. *They push the bounds of science and discovery.*
292. *And they forever remind us of what we should never forget: The people dreamed this country.*
293. *The people built this country.*
294. *And it is the people who are making America great again.*
295. *As long as we are proud of who we are, and what we are fighting for, there is nothing we cannot achieve.*
296. *As long as we have confidence in our values, faith in our citizens, and trust in our God, we will not fail.*
297. *Our families will thrive.*
298. *Our people will prosper.*
299. *And our Nation will forever be safe and strong and proud and mighty and free.*
300. *Thank you, and God bless America.*

At the beginning of the extract, the American citizens and their achievements are referred to with the noun *Americans* and then with the pronoun *they*. The speaker is creating a distance and space between himself and the citizens, and then in sentence (292) Trump continues by saying that *they* remind the government of something *we* should not forget: that *people dreamed this country*. In sentence (292), there is “the people” and “the government” as two separated entities referred by *we/*they pronouns, but not contrasted entities. However, the pattern of changing the relational value of the pronoun is repeated again as Trump uses *we* in an inclusive manner which functions
as a unifying factor between the government and the people in sentences (295) and (296). Then, he switches to the possessive plural pronoun *our* which, similarly to *we*, denotes the American people as a whole, creating unity as well as persuading and manipulating the recipients as described in the previous examples.

### 5.3 CL Analysis of 37 Weekly Addresses

In the Weekly Addresses, 24 different pronoun types were distinguished. The pronouns were *he, her, him, himself, his, I, it, its, me, my, one, our, ours, ourselves, she, their, theirs, them, themselves, they, us, we, you, and your*. The frequency and the percentage of each pronoun is presented in Table 3.

**Table 3.** Frequencies of Pronouns Used in the Weekly Addresses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Word</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>20.37%</td>
<td>our</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1.38%</td>
<td>his</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>393</td>
<td>20.06%</td>
<td>we</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1.38%</td>
<td>them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>10.16%</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1.07%</td>
<td>me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>9.55%</td>
<td>it</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0.97%</td>
<td>her</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>7.81%</td>
<td>they</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.56%</td>
<td>its</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>6.89%</td>
<td>you</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.46%</td>
<td>him</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>5.16%</td>
<td>their</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.46%</td>
<td>she</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>4.70%</td>
<td>my</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.26%</td>
<td>ourselves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>3.22%</td>
<td>one</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.10%</td>
<td>themselves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>2.35%</td>
<td>us</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.05%</td>
<td>himself</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1.58%</td>
<td>your</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.05%</td>
<td>ours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1.38%</td>
<td>he</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.05%</td>
<td>theirs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table (3) shows that the most frequent pronoun of all is the pronoun *our*, which occurred 399 times and comprises 20.37% of the pronouns used in the Weekly Addresses. The next most frequently used pronoun is the pronoun *we*, which occurred 393 times and comprises 20.06% of the pronouns. Similarly to the State of the Union, these two pronouns comprise a significant part
of 40.43% of all the pronoun usage in the transcription. The pronouns ranked below are much
less frequent. The pronoun ranked as the third most frequent is the pronoun *I*, occurring 199
times and comprising 10.16%; by comparison it is half as frequent as *we* and *our*. The next most
frequent pronoun *it* is used 187 times and makes up 9.55% of the pronouns. In the case of the
pronouns *they*, *you* and *their* ranked as fifth, sixth and seventh, the frequency drops to 153, 135,
101 occurrences and the pronoun comprise 7.81%, 6.89% and 5.16% respectively. The pronoun
ranked as the eighth most frequent, *my*, comprises 4.70% of all the pronouns. From rank 9 to
rank 24, the pronouns decrease steadily in frequency going from 63 occurrences in the case of
*one* (3.22%) to 1 occurrence (0.05%) in the case of *himself*, *ours*, and *theirs*. Altogether,
pronouns occur 1,959 times in the 37 Weekly Addresses. This finding determined that the further
analysis will focus on the most frequent pronouns *our* and *we*, with will make possible the
comparison with the State of the Union Speech pronoun analysis.

Examining the wordlist generated based on the Weekly Addresses showed another
interesting result. Just as in the case of the wordlist generated from the State of the Union
Speech, the two most frequent pronouns were placed high within the word type ranking. The top
ten results of the wordlist generated from the Weekly Addresses are presented in Table (4) below.

**Table 4. Top Ten Results of the Wordlist Generated from the 37 Weekly Addresses**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Word Type</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Word Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>840</td>
<td>the</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>393</td>
<td>we</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>816</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>642</td>
<td>to</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>that</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>528</td>
<td>of</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>our</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>for</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The pronoun *our* was ranked as the fifth most frequent word, and the pronoun *we* was ranked as the sixth most frequent word out of 1,548 word types. Similarly to the previous results, this shows how important the role of the pronouns is and how frequently they occur.

This findings become even more interesting in light of the findings in the State of the Union Speech. The analysis has shown a change in the most frequent pronouns. As mentioned in the above sub-section, the most frequent pronouns in the State of the Union Speech are *we* (24.54%) and *our* (20.82%). The most frequent pronouns in the Weekly Addresses are *our* (20.37%) and *we* (20.06%). Interestingly, both pronouns are collective pronouns with express identity and have the exclusive and inclusive functions as well as the option of vagueness in referencing. Another interesting finding is that the two collective pronouns cover a great proportion of all the pronouns. In comparison, the ordering of the other pronouns has also changed. In the Weekly Addresses, the pronoun *I* is ranked as the third and is half as frequent as the pronouns *our* and *we*, but in the State of the Union Speech the pronoun *their* is ranked as the third most frequent pronoun. This makes the Weekly Addresses much more personal, as Trump uses the pronoun *I* more frequently than in the State of the Union Speech. The pronoun ranked as the fourth in the Weekly Addresses is the pronoun *it*, while in the State of the Union Speech it is the pronoun *I*. The State of the Union Address in much less personal as the Weekly Addresses as the pronoun *I* which according to Wieczorek (2015) can be either as the discursive ‘I’ or the Presidential ‘I’, comprises 5.98%.

The next step in corpus mapping of the selected Weekly Addresses was to analyse the concordance plot view of the two most frequently occurring pronouns. The concordance plot view of the pronoun *our* is presented in Appendix 3 below. The pronoun *our* occurred in all 37 Weekly Addresses delivered by Trump. The occurrence in each Weekly Address differed between
a single occurrence in the 11.02.2018 Weekly Address to 26 occurrences in the 21.07.2017. The average frequency of using the pronoun *our* is 12 per Weekly Address. The concordance plot view of the pronoun *our* showed that the occurrence is spread out, varying in location and density. In the case of the pronoun *we*, it occurred in 36 of the Weekly Addresses. The concordance plot view of the pronoun *we* is presented in Appendix 4. The occurrence within the Weekly Address differed between no occurrence in the 09.12.2017 Weekly Address to 18 occurrences in the 19.05.2018. The average frequency of using the pronoun *we* is 6 per Weekly Address. As in the case of the pronoun *our* in the Weekly Addresses, no general pattern could be distinguished for some cases of occurrence were single and sporadic, while some occurrences accumulated in one section. The pronoun occurrences varied in location and density so no particular place for the analysis could be distinguished.

In summary, the corpus mapping and the quantitative analysis of the data determined that the two most frequent pronouns and one of the most frequent word types are the pronouns *our* and *we* which is a constant feature in comparison with the corpus mapping of the State of the Union Speech. The Weekly Address differ in some of the features. Donald Trump used the pronoun *I* more frequently in the Weekly Address than in the State of the Union Speech. Another interesting fact is the distribution of the pronoun *our* and *we* varied in location and density. Therefore, no particular hotspot of the concordance analysis could be determined. The ensuing concordance analysis will deal with the first 25 representative examples of usage of pronouns *our* and *we* in the Weekly Addresses.

**5.4 CDA Analysis of 37 Weekly Addresses**

The concordance analysis results are found in Table (5) below, including examples (1) to (25). The table presents the number of the example; the Key Word In Context view; the analysis of
what groups the pronoun includes; the analysis of what groups the pronoun excludes; whether
the examined pronoun’s meaning is vague; the neighbouring examples of the left and on the
right; whether there is a shift in meaning in the neighbouring pronouns; and the name of the file.

In Table (5) below it is evident that Trump has used the collective pronouns *our* and *we* in
multiple ways. The first way visible is in examples (1), (3), (4), (11)-(21), used to enhance unity
among the citizens and to exclude non-Americans. According to Fairclough (1989), the inclusive
*we* is relationally significant because it assimilates the leader to “the people” and thus creates a
sense of unity. The feelings of unity also involve a rhetorical move, namely, an appeal to pathos,
which is an element of persuasion. In examples (2) and (10), the usage of exclusive *we* is
observed as Trump distances the government from the people such as victims of the hurricane
and the general audience. Trump not only distances the government from the people, but also
uses the pronoun *we* instead of overtly stating that he refers to *the government*. According to
Fairclough, using a pronoun instead of a noun serves to “corporate ideologies which stress the
unity of a people at the expense of recognition of divisions of interest” (Fairclough, 1989:128).
The next way of using the pronouns is to cover the reference and create vagueness as to whom
the pronouns refer to, as in examples (2), (5)-(9) and (15)-(21). According to Wieczorek (2015),
some level of vagueness may be an intentional and strategically maintained move which allows
speakers to keep the reference covert. Another strategy employed by Trump is shifting the
meaning of the pronoun, that is, to whom the pronoun refers to or/and its inclusiveness,
exclusiveness or/and vagueness. This can be observed in examples (10), (15) and (22).
Table 5. Concordance Analysis of 50 Examples from the Weekly Addresses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Example</th>
<th>Concordance</th>
<th>Concordance</th>
<th>Includes</th>
<th>Excludes</th>
<th>Vague</th>
<th>Neighbouring</th>
<th>Shift in Meaning</th>
<th>File Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>caused by Hurricane Harvey has profoundly affected</td>
<td>our entire nation. Many homes and communities have</td>
<td>All the Americans</td>
<td>Non-American Audience</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>SPEECH 01-09-2017.txt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>lost their lives in this catastrophic storm.</td>
<td>We pray for the victims and their families</td>
<td>The Government</td>
<td>Victims, Non-American Audience</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>SPEECH 01-09-2017.txt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>say a special word of thanks to our amazing first responders</td>
<td>our police and law</td>
<td>All the Americans</td>
<td>Non-American Audience</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>SPEECH 01-09-2017.txt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>of thanks to our amazing first responders</td>
<td>our police and law enforcement officers, fire fighters</td>
<td>All the Americans</td>
<td>Non-American Audience</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>SPEECH 01-09-2017.txt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>loss of life and ensure safety, and</td>
<td>we are incredibly grateful for their courage, their</td>
<td>The Government</td>
<td>Victims, Non-American Audience</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>SPEECH 01-09-2017.txt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>To the people affected by Hurricane Harvey: we are with you every single step of</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Government; American citizens</td>
<td>Victims, Non-American Audience</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>SPEECH 01-09-2017.txt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>you every single step of the way. We will help you recover. We will help</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Government; American citizens</td>
<td>Victims, Non-American Audience</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>SPEECH 01-09-2017.txt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>the way. We will help you recover. We will support</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Government; American citizens</td>
<td>Victims, Non-American Audience</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>SPEECH 01-09-2017.txt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>you recover. We will help you rebuild.</td>
<td>We will support you today, tomorrow, and the</td>
<td>The Government; American citizens</td>
<td>Victims, Non-American Audience</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>8,1</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>SPEECH 01-09-2017.txt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>you today, tomorrow, and the day after.</td>
<td>We have been working closely with local authorities</td>
<td>The Government</td>
<td>Americans, the General Audience</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>SPEECH 01-09-2017.txt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>prayers. When one part of America hurts,</td>
<td>we all hurt. When we see neighbors in</td>
<td>All the Americans</td>
<td>Non-American Audience</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>SPEECH 01-09-2017.txt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>of America hurts, we all hurt. When we see neighbors in need, we rush to</td>
<td>All the Americans</td>
<td>Non-American Audience</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>11,13</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>SPEECH 01-09-2017.txt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>hurt. When we see neighbors in need, we rush to</td>
<td>All the Americans</td>
<td>Non-American Audience</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>12,14</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>SPEECH 01-09-2017.txt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>in need, we rush to their aid. We don’t</td>
<td>All the Americans</td>
<td>Non-American Audience</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>13,15</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>SPEECH 01-09-2017.txt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>their names or where they are from</td>
<td>we help our fellow Americans every single time.</td>
<td>The Government; American citizens</td>
<td>Non-American Audience</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>14,16</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>SPEECH 01-09-2017.txt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>or where they are from we help</td>
<td>our fellow Americans every single time. This is</td>
<td>The Government; American citizens</td>
<td>Non-American Audience</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>SPEECH 01-09-2017.txt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>up never gives in never loses hope.</td>
<td>We just keep fighting, we just keep pushing</td>
<td>The Government; American citizens</td>
<td>Non-American Audience</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>SPEECH 01-09-2017.txt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>never loses hope. We just keep fighting</td>
<td>we just keep pushing on, for the people</td>
<td>The Government; American citizens</td>
<td>Non-American Audience</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>17,19</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>SPEECH 01-09-2017.txt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>just keep pushing on, for the people</td>
<td>we love, and for the nation we call</td>
<td>The Government; American citizens</td>
<td>Non-American Audience</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>18,2</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>SPEECH 01-09-2017.txt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>people we love, and for the nation we call home. All American hearts are with</td>
<td>The Government; American citizens</td>
<td>Non-American Audience</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>19,2</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>SPEECH 01-09-2017.txt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>with the people of Texas and Louisiana.</td>
<td>We mourn and pray and struggle through the</td>
<td>The Government; American citizens</td>
<td>Non-American Audience</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>20,22</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>SPEECH 01-09-2017.txt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ray and struggle through the hardships together.</td>
<td>We know that a long and difficult path</td>
<td>The Government; American citizens</td>
<td>Non-American Audience, Victims</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>21,23</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>SPEECH 01-09-2017.txt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>and difficult path lies ahead to get</td>
<td>our neighbors back in their homes and on</td>
<td>The Government; American citizens</td>
<td>Non-American Audience, Victims</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>22,24</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>SPEECH 01-09-2017.txt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>their homes and on their feet. But</td>
<td>we also know that we are stronger than</td>
<td>The Government; American citizens</td>
<td>Non-American Audience, Victims</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>23,25</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>SPEECH 01-09-2017.txt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>their feet. But we also know that</td>
<td>we are stronger than the obstacles in our</td>
<td>The Government; American citizens</td>
<td>Non-American Audience, Victims</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>24,26</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>SPEECH 01-09-2017.txt</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Shifting the meaning of the same pronoun may influence, through the use of STM properties, the mental models created by LTM. According to van Dijk (2006), influencing audiences’ discourse comprehension and purposeful hindering is classified as manipulation. Finally, in examples (5)-(9), Trump separates the victims of the hurricane from the rest of US society. By doing so he uses his authority which is an appeal to ethos, which is an element of persuasion.

5.5 Comparing the Findings

The research has shown many similarities between the examined texts. Firstly, in both corpora, the most frequent pronouns are *we* and *our*. The quantitative analysis has shown that both pronoun are ranked as fifth and sixth of all the word types in the examined texts. In both texts, the importance of the examined pronouns is irrefutable. The next similarity is that the pronouns express the collective speaker and play a context-dependent role of inclusiveness, exclusiveness and vagueness. Moreover, in both corpora, the pronouns are used to attempt persuasion and manipulation. In both corpora, *we* and *our* are used to appeal to pathos and ethos and to influence discourse comprehension.

6. Conclusions

Previous research by Mühlhäusler and Harré (1990), Harré (1991) and Bolinger (1979) has shown that pronouns such as *I* and *we* are used deictically and that pronouns connect an utterance to immediate context of the speaker and addressee. Wodak’s (1996) definition of discourse and van Dijk’s (2002) definition of political discourse were adopted in the study. The studies of Billig (1995), Proctor and I-Wen Su (2011) and Alavidze (2017) have investigated pronouns in
political discourse and uncovered how such small tools are used to create greater meaning which influence modern democratic society. This study has contributed to the research on pronoun usage in political discourse and has hopefully created yet another perspective on pronoun usage in political discourse.

The study answered the research questions: What personal pronouns are used in the selected speeches?; Which pronouns are most frequently used?; Which and how does pronoun usage seen as a linguistic pattern in the speech relate to persuasion and manipulation? The study concluded that, in both the State of the Union Address and in the 37 Weekly Addresses, Donald Trump used 21 and 24 different pronoun types. The most frequently and interchangeably used of these were the pronouns *we* and *our*. *We* and *our* were used to refer to two groups with unequal power relations relative to each other. Trump consistently shifted the meaning of the pronoun *we* between exclusive and inclusive readings or by adding the pronoun *us*. As a result, Trump at times invoked a sense of unity and at times a sense of distance between different groups in US society. Trump also carefully placed other pronouns in the discourse to counteract the differentiation of himself and the government through the pronouns *we* and *our*. The identified patterns placed within the societal context of the examined text aim to persuade the audience. Additionally, the pronouns *we*, *our* and *I* play a key role in the elements of ethos and pathos. Furthermore, the patterns placed within the societal context of the examined text also showed that Donald Trump often shifts the meaning of the same pronoun, which may influence, through the use of STM properties, the mental models created by LTM and as a result may manipulate the audience.

To uncover other patterns concerning the pronoun usage in political discourse and the role of pronouns in persuasion and manipulation further research is needed. An example of a
A possible future study is to examine the usage of other pronouns that may uncover more patterns concerning pronoun usage in the political discourse of Donald Trump. Another idea is to compare the features of Donald Trump’s political discourse with the political discourse of other politicians. An additional question that could be answered in future studies is whether the discovered phenomenon is specific to the general genre of the political speech, or whether it is evident also in other types of political discourse.
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Appendix 1 – Donald J. Trump’s State of the Union Address

1. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Vice President, Members of Congress, the First Lady of the United States, and my fellow Americans:
2. Less than 1 year has passed since I first stood at this podium, in this majestic chamber, to speak on behalf of the American People — and to address their concerns, their hopes, and their dreams.
3. That night, our new Administration had already taken swift action.
4. A new tide of optimism was already sweeping across our land.
5. Each day since, we have gone forward with a clear vision and a righteous mission — to make America great again for all Americans.
6. Over the last year, we have made incredible progress and achieved extraordinary success.
7. We have faced challenges we expected, and others we could never have imagined.
8. We have shared in the heights of victory and the pains of hardship. We endured floods and fires and storms.
9. But through it all, we have seen the beauty of America’s soul, and the steel in America’s spine.
10. Each test has forged new American heroes to remind us who we are, and show us what we can be.
11. We saw the volunteers of the “Cajun Navy,” racing to the rescue with their fishing boats to save people in the aftermath of a devastating hurricane.
12. We saw strangers shielding strangers from a hail of gunfire on the Las Vegas strip.
13. We heard tales of Americans like Coast Guard Petty Officer Ashlee Leppert, who is here tonight in the gallery with Melania.
14. Ashlee was aboard one of the first helicopters on the scene in Houston during Hurricane Harvey.
15. Through 18 hours of wind and rain, Ashlee braved live power lines and deep water, to help save more than 40 lives.
16. Thank you, Ashlee.
17. We heard about Americans like firefighter David Dahlberg.
18. He is here with us too.
19. David faced down walls of flame to rescue almost 60 children trapped at a California summer camp threatened by wildfires.
20. To everyone still recovering in Texas, Florida, Louisiana, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, California, and everywhere else — we are with you, we love you, and we will pull through together.
21. Some trials over the past year touched this chamber very personally.
22. With us tonight is one of the toughest people ever to serve in this House — a guy who took a bullet, almost died, and was back to work three and a half months later: the legend from Louisiana, Congressman Steve Scalise.
23. We are incredibly grateful for the heroic efforts of the Capitol Police Officers, the Alexandria Police, and the doctors, nurses, and paramedics who saved his life, and the lives of many others in this room.
24. In the aftermath of that terrible shooting, we came together, not as Republicans or Democrats, but as representatives of the people.
25. But it is not enough to come together only in times of tragedy.
Tonight, I call upon all of us to set aside our differences, to seek out common ground, and to summon the unity we need to deliver for the people we were elected to serve.

Over the last year, the world has seen what we always knew: that no people on Earth are so fearless, or daring, or determined as Americans.

If there is a mountain, we climb it.
If there is a frontier, we cross it.
If there is a challenge, we tame it.
If there is an opportunity, we seize it.
So let us begin tonight by recognizing that the state of our Union is strong because our people are strong.
And together, we are building a safe, strong, and proud America.
Since the election, we have created 2.4 million new jobs, including 200,000 new jobs in manufacturing alone.
After years of wage stagnation, we are finally seeing rising wages.
Unemployment claims have hit a 45-year low.
African-American unemployment stands at the lowest rate ever recorded, and Hispanic American unemployment has also reached the lowest levels in history.
Small business confidence is at an all-time high.
The stock market has smashed one record after another, gaining $8 trillion in value.
That is great news for Americans’ 401k, retirement, pension, and college savings accounts.
And just as I promised the American people from this podium 11 months ago, we enacted the biggest tax cuts and reforms in American history.
Our massive tax cuts provide tremendous relief for the middle class and small businesses.
To lower tax rates for hardworking Americans, we nearly doubled the standard deduction for everyone.
Now, the first $24,000 earned by a married couple is completely tax-free. We also doubled the child tax credit.
A typical family of four making $75,000 will see their tax bill reduced by $2,000 — slashing their tax bill in half.
This April will be the last time you ever file under the old broken system — and millions of Americans will have more take-home pay starting next month.
We eliminated an especially cruel tax that fell mostly on Americans making less than $50,000 a year — forcing them to pay tremendous penalties simply because they could not afford government-ordered health plans.
We repealed the core of disastrous Obamacare — the individual mandate is now gone.
We slashed the business tax rate from 35 percent all the way down to 21 percent, so American companies can compete and win against anyone in the world.
These changes alone are estimated to increase average family income by more than $4,000.
Small businesses have also received a massive tax cut, and can now deduct 20 percent of their business income.
Here tonight are Steve Staub and Sandy Keplinger of Staub Manufacturing — a small business in Ohio.
They have just finished the best year in their 20-year history.
54. Because of tax reform, they are handing out raises, hiring an additional 14 people, and expanding into the building next door.
55. One of Staub’s employees, Corey Adams, is also with us tonight.
56. Corey is an all-American worker.
57. He supported himself through high school, lost his job during the 2008 recession, and was later hired by Staub, where he trained to become a welder.
58. Like many hardworking Americans, Corey plans to invest his tax-cut raise into his new home and his two daughters’ education.
59. Please join me in congratulating Corey.
60. Since we passed tax cuts, roughly 3 million workers have already gotten tax cut bonuses — many of them thousands of dollars per worker.
61. Apple has just announced it plans to invest a total of $350 billion in America, and hire another 20,000 workers.
62. This is our new American moment.
63. There has never been a better time to start living the American Dream.
64. So to every citizen watching at home tonight — no matter where you have been, or where you come from, this is your time.
65. If you work hard, if you believe in yourself, if you believe in America, then you can dream anything, you can be anything, and together, we can achieve anything.
66. Tonight, I want to talk about what kind of future we are going to have, and what kind of Nation we are going to be.
67. All of us, together, as one team, one people, and one American family.
68. We all share the same home, the same heart, the same destiny, and the same great American flag.
69. Together, we are rediscovering the American way.
70. In America, we know that faith and family, not government and bureaucracy, are the center of the American life.
71. Our motto is “in God we trust.”
72. And we celebrate our police, our military, and our amazing veterans as heroes who deserve our total and unwavering support.
73. Here tonight is Preston Sharp, a 12-year-old boy from Redding, California, who noticed that veterans’ graves were not marked with flags on Veterans Day.
74. He decided to change that, and started a movement that has now placed 40,000 flags at the graves of our great heroes.
75. Preston: a job well done.
76. Young patriots like Preston teach all of us about our civic duty as Americans.
77. Preston’s reverence for those who have served our Nation reminds us why we salute our flag, why we put our hands on our hearts for the pledge of allegiance, and why we proudly stand for the national anthem.
78. Americans love their country.
79. And they deserve a Government that shows them the same love and loyalty in return.
80. For the last year we have sought to restore the bonds of trust between our citizens and their Government.
81. Working with the Senate, we are appointing judges who will interpret the Constitution as written, including a great new Supreme Court Justice, and more circuit court judges than any new administration in the history of our country.
82. We are defending our Second Amendment, and have taken historic actions to protect religious liberty.
83. And we are serving our brave veterans, including giving our veterans choice in their healthcare decisions.
84. Last year, the Congress passed, and I signed, the landmark VA Accountability Act.
85. Since its passage, my Administration has already removed more than 1,500 VA employees who failed to give our veterans the care they deserve — and we are hiring talented people who love our vets as much as we do.
86. I will not stop until our veterans are properly taken care of, which has been my promise to them from the very beginning of this great journey.
87. All Americans deserve accountability and respect — and that is what we are giving them.
88. So tonight, I call on the Congress to empower every Cabinet Secretary with the authority to reward good workers — and to remove Federal employees who undermine the public trust or fail the American people.
89. In our drive to make Washington accountable, we have eliminated more regulations in our first year than any administration in history.
90. We have ended the war on American Energy — and we have ended the war on clean coal.
91. We are now an exporter of energy to the world.
92. In Detroit, I halted Government mandates that crippled America’s autoworkers — so we can get the Motor City revving its engines once again.
93. Many car companies are now building and expanding plants in the United States — something we have not seen for decades.
94. Chrysler is moving a major plant from Mexico to Michigan; Toyota and Mazda are opening up a plant in Alabama.
95. Soon, plants will be opening up all over the country. This is all news Americans are unaccustomed to hearing — for many years, companies and jobs were only leaving us.
96. But now they are coming back.
97. Exciting progress is happening every day.
98. To speed access to breakthrough cures and affordable generic drugs, last year the FDA approved more new and generic drugs and medical devices than ever before in our history.
99. We also believe that patients with terminal conditions should have access to experimental treatments that could potentially save their lives.
100. People who are terminally ill should not have to go from country to country to seek a cure — I want to give them a chance right here at home.
101. It is time for the Congress to give these wonderful Americans the “right to try.”
102. One of my greatest priorities is to reduce the price of prescription drugs.
103. In many other countries, these drugs cost far less than what we pay in the United States.
104. That is why I have directed my Administration to make fixing the injustice of high drug prices one of our top priorities.
105. Prices will come down.
106. America has also finally turned the page on decades of unfair trade deals that sacrificed our prosperity and shipped away our companies, our jobs, and our Nation’s wealth.
107. The era of economic surrender is over.
108. From now on, we expect trading relationships to be fair and to be reciprocal.
109. We will work to fix bad trade deals and negotiate new ones.
110. And we will protect American workers and American intellectual property, through strong enforcement of our trade rules.
111. As we rebuild our industries, it is also time to rebuild our crumbling infrastructure.
112. America is a nation of builders.
113. We built the Empire State Building in just 1 year — is it not a disgrace that it can now take 10 years just to get a permit approved for a simple road?
114. I am asking both parties to come together to give us the safe, fast, reliable, and modern infrastructure our economy needs and our people deserve.
115. Tonight, I am calling on the Congress to produce a bill that generates at least $1.5 trillion for the new infrastructure investment we need.
116. Every Federal dollar should be leveraged by partnering with State and local governments and, where appropriate, tapping into private sector investment — to permanently fix the infrastructure deficit.
117. Any bill must also streamline the permitting and approval process — getting it down to no more than two years, and perhaps even one.
118. Together, we can reclaim our building heritage.
119. We will build gleaming new roads, bridges, highways, railways, and waterways across our land.
120. And we will do it with American heart, American hands, and American grit.
121. We want every American to know the dignity of a hard day’s work. We want every child to be safe in their home at night.
122. And we want every citizen to be proud of this land that we love.
123. We can lift our citizens from welfare to work, from dependence to independence, and from poverty to prosperity.
124. As tax cuts create new jobs, let us invest in workforce development and job training.
125. Let us open great vocational schools so our future workers can learn a craft and realize their full potential.
126. And let us support working families by supporting paid family leave.
127. As America regains its strength, this opportunity must be extended to all citizens.
128. That is why this year we will embark on reforming our prisons to help former inmates who have served their time get a second chance.
129. Struggling communities, especially immigrant communities, will also be helped by immigration policies that focus on the best interests of American workers and American families.
130. For decades, open borders have allowed drugs and gangs to pour into our most vulnerable communities.
131. They have allowed millions of low-wage workers to compete for jobs and wages against the poorest Americans.
132. Most tragically, they have caused the loss of many innocent lives.
133. Here tonight are two fathers and two mothers: Evelyn Rodriguez, Freddy Cuevas, Elizabeth Alvarado, and Robert Mickens.
134. Their two teenage daughters — Kayla Cuevas and Nisa Mickens — were close friends on Long Island.
135. But in September 2016, on the eve of Nisa’s 16th Birthday, neither of them came home.
136. These two precious girls were brutally murdered while walking together in their hometown.
137. Six members of the savage gang MS-13 have been charged with Kayla and Nisa’s murders.
138. Many of these gang members took advantage of glaring loopholes in our laws to enter the country as unaccompanied alien minors -- and wound up in Kayla and Nisa’s high school.
139. Evelyn, Elizabeth, Freddy, and Robert: Tonight, everyone in this chamber is praying for you.
140. Everyone in America is grieving for you. And 320 million hearts are breaking for you.
141. We cannot imagine the depth of your sorrow, but we can make sure that other families never have to endure this pain.
142. Tonight, I am calling on the Congress to finally close the deadly loopholes that have allowed MS-13, and other criminals, to break into our country.
143. We have proposed new legislation that will fix our immigration laws, and support our ICE and Border Patrol Agents, so that this cannot ever happen again.
144. The United States is a compassionate nation.
145. We are proud that we do more than any other country to help the needy, the struggling, and the underprivileged all over the world.
146. But as President of the United States, my highest loyalty, my greatest compassion, and my constant concern is for America’s children, America’s struggling workers, and America’s forgotten communities.
147. I want our youth to grow up to achieve great things.
148. I want our poor to have their chance to rise.
149. So tonight, I am extending an open hand to work with members of both parties — Democrats and Republicans — to protect our citizens of every background, color, religion, and creed.
150. My duty, and the sacred duty of every elected official in this chamber, is to defend Americans — to protect their safety, their families, their communities, and their right to the American Dream.
151. Because Americans are dreamers too.
152. Here tonight is one leader in the effort to defend our country: Homeland Security Investigations Special Agent Celestino Martinez — he goes by CJ.
153. CJ served 15 years in the Air Force before becoming an ICE agent and spending the last 15 years fighting gang violence and getting dangerous criminals off our streets.
154. At one point, MS-13 leaders ordered CJ’s murder.
155. But he did not cave to threats or fear.
156. Last May, he commanded an operation to track down gang members on Long Island.
157. His team has arrested nearly 400, including more than 220 from MS-13.
158. CJ: Great work. Now let us get the Congress to send you some reinforcements.
159. Over the next few weeks, the House and Senate will be voting on an immigration reform package.
160. In recent months, my Administration has met extensively with both Democrats and Republicans to craft a bipartisan approach to immigration reform.
Based on these discussions, we presented the Congress with a detailed proposal that should be supported by both parties as a fair compromise — one where nobody gets everything they want, but where our country gets the critical reforms it needs.

Here are the four pillars of our plan: The first pillar of our framework generously offers a path to citizenship for 1.8 million illegal immigrants who were brought here by their parents at a young age — that covers almost three times more people than the previous administration.

Under our plan, those who meet education and work requirements, and show good moral character, will be able to become full citizens of the United States.

The second pillar fully secures the border.

That means building a wall on the Southern border, and it means hiring more heroes like CJ to keep our communities safe.

Crucially, our plan closes the terrible loopholes exploited by criminals and terrorists to enter our country — and it finally ends the dangerous practice of “catch and release.”

The third pillar ends the visa lottery — a program that randomly hands out green cards without any regard for skill, merit, or the safety of our people.

It is time to begin moving towards a merit-based immigration system — one that admits people who are skilled, who want to work, who will contribute to our society, and who will love and respect our country.

The fourth and final pillar protects the nuclear family by ending chain migration.

Under the current broken system, a single immigrant can bring in virtually unlimited numbers of distant relatives.

Under our plan, we focus on the immediate family by limiting sponsorships to spouses and minor children.

This vital reform is necessary, not just for our economy, but for our security, and our future.

In recent weeks, two terrorist attacks in New York were made possible by the visa lottery and chain migration.

In the age of terrorism, these programs present risks we can no longer afford.

It is time to reform these outdated immigration rules, and finally bring our immigration system into the 21st century.

These four pillars represent a down-the-middle compromise, and one that will create a safe, modern, and lawful immigration system.

For over 30 years, Washington has tried and failed to solve this problem. This Congress can be the one that finally makes it happen.

Most importantly, these four pillars will produce legislation that fulfills my ironclad pledge to only sign a bill that puts America first.

So let us come together, set politics aside, and finally get the job done.

These reforms will also support our response to the terrible crisis of opioid and drug addiction.

In 2016, we lost 64,000 Americans to drug overdoses: 174 deaths per day.

Seven per hour.

We must get much tougher on drug dealers and pushers if we are going to succeed in stopping this scourge.

My Administration is committed to fighting the drug epidemic and helping get treatment for those in need.
The struggle will be long and difficult — but, as Americans always do, we will prevail. As we have seen tonight, the most difficult challenges bring out the best in America. We see a vivid expression of this truth in the story of the Holets family of New Mexico. Ryan Holets is 27 years old, and an officer with the Albuquerque Police Department. He is here tonight with his wife Rebecca. Last year, Ryan was on duty when he saw a pregnant, homeless woman preparing to inject heroin. When Ryan told her she was going to harm her unborn child, she began to weep. She told him she did not know where to turn, but badly wanted a safe home for her baby.

In that moment, Ryan said he felt God speak to him: “You will do it — because you can.” He took out a picture of his wife and their four kids. Then, he went home to tell his wife Rebecca. In an instant, she agreed to adopt. The Holets named their new daughter Hope. Ryan and Rebecca: You embody the goodness of our Nation. Thank you, and congratulations.

As we rebuild America’s strength and confidence at home, we are also restoring our strength and standing abroad. Around the world, we face rogue regimes, terrorist groups, and rivals like China and Russia that challenge our interests, our economy, and our values. In confronting these dangers, we know that weakness is the surest path to conflict, and unmatched power is the surest means of our defense. For this reason, I am asking the Congress to end the dangerous defense sequester and fully fund our great military.

As part of our defense, we must modernize and rebuild our nuclear arsenal, hopefully never having to use it, but making it so strong and powerful that it will deter any acts of aggression.

Perhaps someday in the future there will be a magical moment when the countries of the world will get together to eliminate their nuclear weapons. Unfortunately, we are not there yet. Last year, I also pledged that we would work with our allies to extinguish ISIS from the face of the Earth.

One year later, I am proud to report that the coalition to defeat ISIS has liberated almost 100 percent of the territory once held by these killers in Iraq and Syria.

But there is much more work to be done. We will continue our fight until ISIS is defeated. Army Staff Sergeant Justin Peck is here tonight.

Near Raqqa last November, Justin and his comrade, Chief Petty Officer Kenton Stacy, were on a mission to clear buildings that ISIS had rigged with explosives so that civilians could return to the city.

Clearing the second floor of a vital hospital, Kenton Stacy was severely wounded by an explosion.

Immediately, Justin bounded into the booby-trapped building and found Kenton in bad shape.

He applied pressure to the wound and inserted a tube to reopen an airway.
211. He then performed CPR for 20 straight minutes during the ground transport and maintained artificial respiration through 2 hours of emergency surgery.
212. Kenton Stacy would have died if not for Justin’s selfless love for a fellow warrior.
213. Tonight, Kenton is recovering in Texas. Raqqa is liberated.
214. And Justin is wearing his new Bronze Star, with a “V” for “Valor.” Staff Sergeant Peck: All of America salutes you.
215. Terrorists who do things like place bombs in civilian hospitals are evil.
216. When possible, we annihilate them.
217. When necessary, we must be able to detain and question them.
218. But we must be clear: Terrorists are not merely criminals.
219. They are unlawful enemy combatants.
220. And when captured overseas, they should be treated like the terrorists they are.
221. In the past, we have foolishly released hundreds of dangerous terrorists, only to meet them again on the battlefield — including the ISIS leader, al-Baghdadi.
222. So today, I am keeping another promise.
223. I just signed an order directing Secretary Mattis to reexamine our military detention policy and to keep open the detention facilities at Guantánamo Bay.
224. I am also asking the Congress to ensure that, in the fight against ISIS and al-Qa’ida, we continue to have all necessary power to detain terrorists — wherever we chase them down.
225. Our warriors in Afghanistan also have new rules of engagement.
226. Along with their heroic Afghan partners, our military is no longer undermined by artificial timelines, and we no longer tell our enemies our plans.
227. Last month, I also took an action endorsed unanimously by the Senate just months before: I recognized Jerusalem as the capital of Israel.
228. Shortly afterwards, dozens of countries voted in the United Nations General Assembly against America’s sovereign right to make this recognition.
229. American taxpayers generously send those same countries billions of dollars in aid every year.
230. That is why, tonight, I am asking the Congress to pass legislation to help ensure American foreign-assistance dollars always serve American interests, and only go to America’s friends.
231. As we strengthen friendships around the world, we are also restoring clarity about our adversaries.
232. When the people of Iran rose up against the crimes of their corrupt dictatorship, I did not stay silent.
233. America stands with the people of Iran in their courageous struggle for freedom.
234. I am asking the Congress to address the fundamental flaws in the terrible Iran nuclear deal.
235. My Administration has also imposed tough sanctions on the communist and socialist dictatorships in Cuba and Venezuela.
236. But no regime has oppressed its own citizens more totally or brutally than the cruel dictatorship in North Korea.
237. North Korea’s reckless pursuit of nuclear missiles could very soon threaten our homeland.
238. We are waging a campaign of maximum pressure to prevent that from happening.
Past experience has taught us that complacency and concessions only invite aggression and provocation.

I will not repeat the mistakes of past administrations that got us into this dangerous position.

We need only look at the depraved character of the North Korean regime to understand the nature of the nuclear threat it could pose to America and our allies.

Otto Warmbier was a hardworking student at the University of Virginia.

On his way to study abroad in Asia, Otto joined a tour to North Korea.

At its conclusion, this wonderful young man was arrested and charged with crimes against the state.

After a shameful trial, the dictatorship sentenced Otto to 15 years of hard labor, before returning him to America last June — horribly injured and on the verge of death.

He passed away just days after his return.

Otto’s Parents, Fred and Cindy Warmbier, are with us tonight — along with Otto’s brother and sister, Austin and Greta.

You are powerful witnesses to a menace that threatens our world, and your strength inspires us all.

Tonight, we pledge to honor Otto’s memory with American resolve.

Finally, we are joined by one more witness to the ominous nature of this regime.

His name is Mr. Ji Seong-ho.

In 1996, Seong-ho was a starving boy in North Korea.

One day, he tried to steal coal from a railroad car to barter for a few scraps of food.

In the process, he passed out on the train tracks, exhausted from hunger.

He woke up as a train ran over his limbs.

He then endured multiple amputations without anything to dull the pain.

His brother and sister gave what little food they had to help him recover and ate dirt themselves — permanently stunting their own growth.

Later, he was tortured by North Korean authorities after returning from a brief visit to China.

His tormentors wanted to know if he had met any Christians.

He had — and he resolved to be free.

Seong-ho traveled thousands of miles on crutches across China and Southeast Asia to freedom.

Most of his family followed.

His father was caught trying to escape, and was tortured to death.

Today he lives in Seoul, where he rescues other defectors, and broadcasts into North Korea what the regime fears the most -- the truth.

Today he has a new leg, but Seong-ho, I understand you still keep those crutches as a reminder of how far you have come.

Your great sacrifice is an inspiration to us all.

Seong-ho’s story is a testament to the yearning of every human soul to live in freedom.

It was that same yearning for freedom that nearly 250 years ago gave birth to a special place called America.

It was a small cluster of colonies caught between a great ocean and a vast wilderness.

But it was home to an incredible people with a revolutionary idea: that they could rule themselves.
That they could chart their own destiny.
And that, together, they could light up the world.
That is what our country has always been about.
That is what Americans have always stood for, always strived for, and always done.
Atop the dome of this Capitol stands the Statue of Freedom.
She stands tall and dignified among the monuments to our ancestors who fought and lived and died to protect her.
Monuments to Washington and Jefferson — to Lincoln and King.
Memorials to the heroes of Yorktown and Saratoga — to young Americans who shed their blood on the shores of Normandy, and the fields beyond.
And others, who went down in the waters of the Pacific and the skies over Asia.
And freedom stands tall over one more monument: this one.
This Capitol.
This living monument to the American people.
A people whose heroes live not only in the past, but all around us — defending hope, pride, and the American way.
They work in every trade.
They sacrifice to raise a family.
They care for our children at home. They defend our flag abroad. They are strong moms and brave kids.
They are firefighters, police officers, border agents, medics, and Marines.
But above all else, they are Americans. And this Capitol, this city, and this Nation, belong to them.
Our task is to respect them, to listen to them, to serve them, to protect them, and to always be worthy of them.
Americans fill the world with art and music.
They push the bounds of science and discovery.
And they forever remind us of what we should never forget: The people dreamed this country.
The people built this country.
And it is the people who are making America great again.
As long as we are proud of who we are, and what we are fighting for, there is nothing we cannot achieve.
As long as we have confidence in our values, faith in our citizens, and trust in our God, we will not fail.
Our families will thrive.
Our people will prosper.
And our Nation will forever be safe and strong and proud and mighty and free.
Thank you, and God bless America.
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Appendix 3 – Concordance Plot View of *our* in the Weekly Addresses Corpus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HIT FILE</th>
<th>FILE: SPEECH 01-09-2017.txt</th>
<th>No. of Hits = 6</th>
<th>File Length (in chars) = 2849</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HIT FILE</td>
<td>FILE: SPEECH 02-06-2017.txt</td>
<td>No. of Hits = 4</td>
<td>File Length (in chars) = 3305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIT FILE</td>
<td>FILE: SPEECH 03-02-2017.txt</td>
<td>No. of Hits = 13</td>
<td>File Length (in chars) = 3412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIT FILE</td>
<td>FILE: SPEECH 03-03-2017.txt</td>
<td>No. of Hits = 14</td>
<td>File Length (in chars) = 3019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIT FILE</td>
<td>FILE: SPEECH 04-08-2017.txt</td>
<td>No. of Hits = 14</td>
<td>File Length (in chars) = 2570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIT FILE</td>
<td>FILE: SPEECH 05-05-2017.txt</td>
<td>No. of Hits = 12</td>
<td>File Length (in chars) = 3837</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIT FILE</td>
<td>FILE: SPEECH 07-04-2017.txt</td>
<td>No. of Hits = 17</td>
<td>File Length (in chars) = 3103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIT FILE</td>
<td>FILE: SPEECH 08-09-2017.txt</td>
<td>No. of Hits = 20</td>
<td>File Length (in chars) = 4464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIT FILE</td>
<td>FILE: SPEECH 09-12-2017.txt</td>
<td>No. of Hits = 10</td>
<td>File Length (in chars) = 2242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIT FILE</td>
<td>FILE: SPEECH 10-02-2017.txt</td>
<td>No. of Hits = 8</td>
<td>File Length (in chars) = 3078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIT FILE</td>
<td>FILE: SPEECH 10-03-2017.txt</td>
<td>No. of Hits = 4</td>
<td>File Length (in chars) = 3350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIT FILE</td>
<td>FILE: SPEECH 10-03-2018.txt</td>
<td>No. of Hits = 3</td>
<td>File Length (in chars) = 2574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIT FILE</td>
<td>FILE: SPEECH 11-02-2018.txt</td>
<td>No. of Hits = 8</td>
<td>File Length (in chars) = 1908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIT FILE</td>
<td>FILE: SPEECH 12-05-2017.txt</td>
<td>No. of Hits = 8</td>
<td>File Length (in chars) = 3174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIT FILE</td>
<td>FILE: SPEECH 13-04-2018.txt</td>
<td>No. of Hits = 19</td>
<td>File Length (in chars) = 2413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIT FILE</td>
<td>FILE: SPEECH 13-10-2017.txt</td>
<td>No. of Hits = 19</td>
<td>File Length (in chars) = 2958</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIT FILE</td>
<td>FILE: SPEECH 14-04-2017.txt</td>
<td>No. of Hits = 9</td>
<td>File Length (in chars) = 2838</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIT FILE</td>
<td>FILE: SPEECH 14-07-2017.txt</td>
<td>No. of Hits = 1</td>
<td>File Length (in chars) = 3901</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIT FILE</td>
<td>FILE: SPEECH 15-08-2017.txt</td>
<td>No. of Hits = 18</td>
<td>File Length (in chars) = 2824</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIT FILE</td>
<td>FILE: SPEECH 16-06-2017.txt</td>
<td>No. of Hits = 13</td>
<td>File Length (in chars) = 3926</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIT FILE</td>
<td>FILE: SPEECH 16-12-2017.txt</td>
<td>No. of Hits = 8</td>
<td>File Length (in chars) = 3416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIT FILE</td>
<td>FILE: SPEECH 17-02-2017.txt</td>
<td>No. of Hits = 13</td>
<td>File Length (in chars) = 2412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIT FILE</td>
<td>FILE: SPEECH 18-03-2017.txt</td>
<td>No. of Hits = 5</td>
<td>File Length (in chars) = 2735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIT FILE</td>
<td>FILE: SPEECH 19-05-2018.txt</td>
<td>No. of Hits = 9</td>
<td>File Length (in chars) = 2780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIT FILE</td>
<td>FILE: SPEECH 21-04-2017.txt</td>
<td>No. of Hits = 8</td>
<td>File Length (in chars) = 2867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIT FILE</td>
<td>FILE: SPEECH 21-07-2017.txt</td>
<td>No. of Hits = 26</td>
<td>File Length (in chars) = 3760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIT FILE</td>
<td>FILE: SPEECH 22-09-2017.txt</td>
<td>No. of Hits = 14</td>
<td>File Length (in chars) = 2783</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIT FILE</td>
<td>FILE: SPEECH 23-06-2017.txt</td>
<td>No. of Hits = 4</td>
<td>File Length (in chars) = 2800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIT FILE</td>
<td>FILE: SPEECH 25-02-2017.txt</td>
<td>No. of Hits = 8</td>
<td>File Length (in chars) = 3078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIT FILE</td>
<td>FILE: SPEECH 25-03-2017.txt</td>
<td>No. of Hits = 7</td>
<td>File Length (in chars) = 3061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIT FILE</td>
<td>FILE: SPEECH 25-08-2017.txt</td>
<td>No. of Hits = 11</td>
<td>File Length (in chars) = 2205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIT FILE</td>
<td>FILE: SPEECH 26-05-2017.txt</td>
<td>No. of Hits = 11</td>
<td>File Length (in chars) = 2397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIT FILE</td>
<td>FILE: SPEECH 27-04-2018.txt</td>
<td>No. of Hits = 12</td>
<td>File Length (in chars) = 2633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIT FILE</td>
<td>FILE: SPEECH 28-01-2017.txt</td>
<td>No. of Hits = 4</td>
<td>File Length (in chars) = 1830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIT FILE</td>
<td>FILE: SPEECH 29-09-2017.txt</td>
<td>No. of Hits = 18</td>
<td>File Length (in chars) = 4224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIT FILE</td>
<td>FILE: SPEECH 30-06-2017.txt</td>
<td>No. of Hits = 11</td>
<td>File Length (in chars) = 2696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIT FILE</td>
<td>FILE: SPEECH 31-03-2017.txt</td>
<td>No. of Hits = 14</td>
<td>File Length (in chars) = 2650</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix 4 – Concordance Plot View of *we* in the Weekly Addresses Corpus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hit File</th>
<th>File Name</th>
<th>No. of Hits</th>
<th>File Length (in chars)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HIT FILE: 1</td>
<td>SPEECH 01-09-2017.txt</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIT FILE: 2</td>
<td>SPEECH 02-06-2017.txt</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIT FILE: 3</td>
<td>SPEECH 03-02-2017.txt</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIT FILE: 4</td>
<td>SPEECH 03-03-2017.txt</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIT FILE: 5</td>
<td>SPEECH 04-08-2017.txt</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIT FILE: 6</td>
<td>SPEECH 05-05-2017.txt</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3837</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIT FILE: 7</td>
<td>SPEECH 07-04-2017.txt</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIT FILE: 8</td>
<td>SPEECH 08-09-2017.txt</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIT FILE: 9</td>
<td>SPEECH 09-12-2017.txt</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIT FILE: 10</td>
<td>SPEECH 10-02-2017.txt</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIT FILE: 11</td>
<td>SPEECH 10-03-2017.txt</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIT FILE: 12</td>
<td>SPEECH 10-03-2018.txt</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIT FILE: 13</td>
<td>SPEECH 11-02-2018.txt</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIT FILE: 14</td>
<td>SPEECH 12-05-2017.txt</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIT FILE: 15</td>
<td>SPEECH 13-04-2018.txt</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIT FILE: 16</td>
<td>SPEECH 13-10-2017.txt</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2958</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIT FILE: 17</td>
<td>SPEECH 14-04-2017.txt</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2838</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIT FILE: 18</td>
<td>SPEECH 14-07-2017.txt</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3901</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>