

**Changing America:
Combining Critical Discourse Analysis and Corpus Linguistics to Analyse
Presidential Nomination Acceptance Speeches**

Simon Berg
Pro gradu-avhandling i engelska
språket och litteraturen
Handledare: Brita Wårvik
Fakulteten för humaniora, psykologi
och teologi
Åbo Akademi
2018

Åbo Akademi University – The Faculty of Arts, Psychology and Theology

Abstract for Master's Thesis

Subject: English Language and Literature	
Author: Simon Berg	
Titel: Changing America: Combining Critical Discourse Analysis and Corpus Linguistics to Analyse Presidential Nomination Acceptance Speeches	
Supervisor: Brita Wårvik	
<p>The aim of the study was to learn if there is any truth to the claims that Donald Trump has caused a new, harsher political discourse. This was done by analysing the presidential nomination acceptance speeches by Bill Clinton, George Bush, Barack Obama and Donald Trump. By comparing the four speeches it is possible to determinate if the speech by Trump stands out, either when it comes to content or how he speaks. The speeches are the first public appearance by the candidates after being elected as candidates for their party, this means that they are the end of the primary election and the beginning of the Presidential election campaign.</p> <p>The study is primarily conducted using critical discourse analysis. Due to the inherent flaws of critical discourse analysis, in that it lacks a dedicated method of gathering data and might therefore allow for a subjective interpretation of the findings, corpus linguistics has been introduced as a supporting element. This also brings another dimension to the research. The study functions as an experiment in combining critical discourse analysis and corpus linguistics, to see if the two can be combined and whether the addition of corpus linguistics negates the characteristic problems of critical discourse analysis.</p> <p>The candidates all focus on the same four themes, this suggests that the speeches fulfil the same functions for all of the candidates. The functions are: self-presentation, introduction of their political agenda, inclusion as a way of connecting with the audience and identification of the opposition through exclusion. All candidates are keen to introduce themselves and their political agenda. While the policies differ somewhat, the idea of a need for change is expressed by all candidates. The differences between the speeches by Clinton, Bush and Obama can be explained by them belonging to tow different political parties and by a changes geopolitical setting. Clinton, Bush and Obama all present themselves as the candidate for all Americans, and do not define who is and who is not American. This makes the speeches extremely inclusive. Trump also describes himself as the candidate for all Americans, but he seems to limit who should be defined as an American. The biggest difference between Trump and the other candidates is how exclusion is used. Trump uses exclusion to target the opposition in the upcoming election and others that he identifies as threats to America by labelling them as dangerous and un-American. Clinton, Bush and Obama also use exclusion to identify the opposition, but they do this without labelling the opposing candidate as dangerous.</p> <p>As the candidates all use the speeches in similar manner, it can be concluded that they form a genre. Trump is shown to differ from the other candidate, both when it comes to the content of his speech and how it is delivered. The study also shows that combining critical discourse linguistics and corpus linguistics works, and that the inclusion of corpus linguistics allows for a controlled way of gathering data which brings objectivity to the research.</p>	
Key words: critical discourse analysis, corpus linguistics, political discourse, political speeches, election campaign, Bill Clinton, George Bush, Barack Obama, Donald Trump	
Date: 21.9.2018	Number of pages: 132

Åbo Akademi – Fakulteten för humaniora, psykologi och teologi

Abstrakt för avhandling pro gradu

Ämne: Engelska språket och litteraturen	
Författare: Simon Berg	
Arbetets titel: Ett Amerika i förändring: en analys av det amerikanska presidentvalets nomineringstal genom en kombination av kritisk diskursanalys och korpuslingvistik	
Handledare: Brita Wårvik	
<p>Studiens syfte var att redogöra för om det finns någon grund för den kritik som har förts fram gentemot Donald Trump gällande han bidragande till en ny, hårdare politisk diskurs. I studien har Bill Clintons, George Bushs, Barack Obamas och Donald Trumps nomineringstal analyserats. Genom att jämföra de fyra talen går det att se om Trump skiljer sig från de övriga, endera genom vad han talar om eller hur han gör det. Talen är det första framträdande som kandidaterna gör efter att de har blivit nominerade som sitt partis kandidater, och de kan därför ses som slutet på kampen inom partiet och början av den egentliga presidentvalskampanjen.</p> <p>Studien har i huvudsak utförts genom att använda kritisk diskursanalys. På grund av vissa brister i kritisk diskursanalys, huvudsakligen dess avsaknad en metodologi för insamlande av data och risken för att genomföra en subjektiv studie, har korpuslingvistik introducerats som ett stödande element. Detta tillför även en extra dimension i avhandlingen. Studien är ett försök till att reda ut om kritisk diskursanalys och korpuslingvistik verkligen fungerar i kombination med varandra, och om inkluderingen av korpuslingvistik kan avhjälpa de karakteristiska problem som kritisk diskursanalys lider av.</p> <p>Alla kandidater fokuserar på fyra gemensamma teman, det här tyder på att talen fyller samma funktion för alla kandidater. Funktionerna är: presentation, introduktion av deras politiska agenda, inkludering som ett sätt att förena sig med åhörarna och identifikation av motståndare genom exkludering. Alla kandidater är prioriterar att introducera sig själva och sin politiska agenda. De policyn som presenteras skiljer sig något från varandra, men alla kandidater lyfter fram behovet av förändring. Skillnaderna mellan Clintons, Bushs och Obamas tal kan förklaras av att de tillhör två olika partier och av förändringar i det geopolitiska läget. Clinton, Bush och Obama för alla fram sig själva som en kandidat för alla amerikaner, men väljer att inte ta ställning till vem som kan räknas som amerikan. Detta gör talen extremt inkluderande. Trump beskriver sig också som en kandidat för alla amerikaner, men till skillnad från de övriga verkar han definiera vem som kan räknas som amerikan. Den största skillnaden mellan Trump och övriga kandidater är hur exkludering används. Trump använder det för att identifiera motståndaren i det stundande valet och andra som han ser som ett hot mot Amerika. Dessa betecknar han som farliga och oamerikanska. Clinton, Bush och Obama använder också exkludering för att identifiera deras motståndare i valet, men de undviker att tala negativt om motståndet.</p> <p>Eftersom alla kandidater använder talen på likande sätt går det att slå fast att de bildar en egen genre. Trump skiljer sig bevisligen från övriga kandidater, detta gäller både vad han talar om och hur han väljer att tala. Studien visar också att kombinationen av kritisk diskursanalys och korpuslingvistik fungerar, och att inkluderingen av korpuslingvistik ger möjlighet till att på ett kontrollerbart sätt samla in data vilket tillför objektivitet till analysen.</p>	
Nyckelord: kritisk diskursanalys, korpuslingvistik, politisk diskurs, politiska tal, valkampanj, Bill Clinton, George Bush, Barack Obama, Donald Trump	
Datum: 21.9.2018	Sidoantal: 132

Table of Contents

1.	Introduction	1
1.1	Nomination Speeches	1
1.2	Critical Discourse Analysis and Corpus Linguistics	2
2.	Critical Discourse Analysis	3
2.1	A Historical Perspective on Critical Discourse Analysis	5
2.2	Critical Discourse Analysis in a context	6
2.3	The Inherent Problems of Critical Discourse Analysis	8
3.	Corpus Linguistics	13
3.1	The Case for Mixing Methodologies	13
3.2	Combining Critical Discourse Analysis and Corpus Linguistics	14
4.	Aims, Methods and Materials	21
4.1	Aims of the Study	21
4.2	Materials	24
4.3	Methods	26
5.	Clinton’s 1992 Speech: “For People, for a Change”	32
5.1	Analysis	33
5.2	Final Notes on Clinton	41
6.	Bush’s 2000 Speech: “Compassionate Conservatism”	42
6.1	Analysis	43
6.2	Final Notes on Bush	57
7.	Obama’s 2008 Speech: “The American Promise”	59
7.1	Analysis	61
7.2	Final notes on Obama	80
8.	Trump’s 2016 Speech: “Make America Great Again!”	81
8.1	Analysis	83
8.2	Final Notes on Trump	101
9.	Discussion	102
9.1	The Candidates’ Personal Presentation	103
9.2	The Candidates’ Core Values and Campaign Promises	104
9.3	Inclusion	108
9.4	Exclusion	112
9.5	The Case for a Mixed Methodology	115
10.	Conclusions	116
11.	Swedish summary	118
	Bibliography	123
	Appendix	132

1. Introduction

It seems to be taken as common knowledge that Donald Trump represents something completely new in American politics. Not only does he and his administration promote controversial policies and, according to some, give credibility to a right-wing movement within American politics, they also bring a new kind of extremely harsh rhetoric into the political discourse. But, is this really the case?

In this thesis, I will analyse four Presidential Nomination Acceptance Speeches, held by Bill Clinton, George Bush, Barack Obama and Donald Trump, in an attempt to find out whether Trump truly is as different as some claim that he is. Are the speeches in question really so different from each other that it is possible to see a clear distinction between the candidates? This might, for example, be in which themes are touched upon in the speeches, or how these themes are presented. In addition, if such differences are found, is it possible to identify any obvious reasons for the differences in question?

This analysis will primarily be done through critical discourse analysis, which in its core is the analysis of discourse in an attempt to find hidden power-structures in the texts. The first part of the thesis will be dedicated to explaining critical discourse analysis. As it will only be possible to analyse the most frequently used lexical items in the speeches, I will also be forced to limit what I will be looking at within them. This will be done by using corpus linguistic methods to identify the most commonly occurring lexical items in the speech, and then analysing them using critical discourse analysis. By incorporating two different methods, critical discourse analysis and corpus linguistics, this thesis will also function as a trial to find a way of combining these two, and to see whether such a combination truly is constructive to the analysis.

1.1 Nomination Speeches

The Presidential Nomination Acceptance speech is the speech held by the candidate once he or she has been nominated by their party. The speech is held at the party convention and represents the culmination of the primary election, and the beginning of the candidates' presidential campaigns as candidates for their respective parties. The speeches and their importance to the presidential election campaign will be presented in chapter 4.2, and the speeches themselves will be presented in chapters 5 through 8.

1.2 Critical Discourse Analysis and Corpus Linguistics

The main methodology that will be applied in the research is critical discourse analysis. Critical discourse analysis is method which takes the into account the context of the discourse and is mainly concerned with finding hidden power-relations and ideologies in the texts. As will be shown in chapter 2.3, critical discourse analysis has some limitations, primarily concerning data collection and subjectivity of the researcher. Because of this I will also be incorporating corpus linguistic methods into the analysis, this will be further expanded upon in chapter 3.2.

2. Critical Discourse Analysis

The school of Critical Discourse Analysis (commonly referred to as CDA) is, according to Tenorio (2011), seen by many as a brainchild of its key-authors; Wodak, Meyer, Fairclough, van Leeuwen and van Dijk. Additionally, also Kress and Chilton have by some been attributed as developers of the school (Tenorio 2011). The common denominator for these scholars, according to Tenorio, is their shared interest in areas of “inequality, control, literacy and advertising” (2011: 184). There seem to be two different directions that critical discourse analysis has taken. The first direction, which this thesis will mainly focus on, are the theories of power and ideology. The second direction, which ought to be mentioned even though I will not be focusing on it, is as described by Blommaert an “attempt to overcome structuralist determinism” (2005: 27). For a more in depth explanation of this view of critical discourse analysis, see for example Giddens (1984).

There are some conflicting views as to what a study of the type that I will be performing should be called. Van Dijk (1997a) suggests the term *political discourse analysis*, and wishes through this to distinguish it from critical discourse analysis. This is ultimately only a question of labels, as van Dijk still mentions that political discourse analysis deals with the understanding and usage of “political power, power abuse or domination through political discourse” (1997a: 11). However, he does concede that this form of analysis will still be done critically, as in his opinion this is the interesting way to do it. As I understand it, with “critically” van Dijk means that we ought to look at the discourse as if it is hiding something, and lets us assume that the speaker or author has an agenda with his or her text or speech. In this case, it becomes the researcher’s job to find the agenda, and the techniques used to bring it forth.

Van Dijk (1997a) brings up the cross-disciplinary aspect of his political discourse analysis, which is also mentioned as a key component of critical discourse analysis. It seems like political discourse analysis is by van Dijk (1997a) only defined by its context (is the text political in nature or not) and its actors or authors (are they connected to politics, for example: are they politicians or voters?). This would suggest that all political discourse analysis can be regarded as a form of critical discourse analysis, but the reverse is hardly true. CDA might also refer to, for example, media or corporate discourse analysis, or any other narrower or more specialized field. Because of this I will only use the term critical discourse analysis, as in a study like this it would be almost impossible to draw a line between what is political and what is not.

Baker (2006) and Wodak & Meyer (2001) defines critical discourse analysis as “discourse analysis with an attitude.” This is, as the bigger picture becomes clear, quite a fitting description. However, this definition does demand that the reader first understands the concept of discourse analysis. Machin and Mayr describe critical discourse analysis as a school that has traditionally been “concerned with ideologies that are hidden in language” (2012: 15). These ideologies do more often than not explain the power balance between the speaker or writer and the target audience.

Machin and Mayr (2012) argue that both the implicit and blatantly explicit social relations of power should be brought to light, which they feel is something critical discourse analysis excels at. To further stress this point, Wodak and Meyer (2009) write that power and the idea of how language is connected to said power, as well as analysing relationships of dominance, can be considered to be the central concept within CDA. Additionally, they claim that while power, and who really is wielding it, often remains indistinguishable, the most important defining features of critical discourse analysis are its “concern with power as a central condition in social life, and its efforts to develop a theory of language that incorporates this as a major premise” (Wodak & Meyer 2009: 10). Jørgensen and Phillips are willing to look at critical discourse analysis in an even broader sense, and claim that “it [CDA] aims to reveal the role of discursive practice in the maintenance of the social world” (2002: 74). This would naturally include questions of power-relationships and projecting images of power. However, I would argue that there are even more aspects to critical discourse analysis than this, as van Dijk (2009) describes the field as a position, opinion or even a perspective rather than a method.

So why does it matter? Is there a point in finding hidden meaning in everything, and can we not be content with just seeing the text as it is, without feeling the need to (over)analyse it? Fairclough argues that there is an “absence of explanatory work on norms”, and a “neglect of power and status” (Fairclough 1995: 49). I believe this statement touches upon the core as to why critical discourse analysis is important, and even necessary. If we cannot connect the language used to relations in real world events, we will have a much harder time to see the social and political implications of language. The political rhetoric also becomes more and more hidden, with a lot taking place through unofficial channels and new media. Most recently this can for example be seen in how elected President Donald Trump uses Twitter to broadcast what could be seen as official foreign policies. If we cannot in a traditional setting identify what is supposed to influence us, we stand even less chance in media that we are not familiar with.

2.1 A Historical Perspective on Critical Discourse Analysis

Wodak and Meyer (2009) claim that critical discourse analysis did not emerge as a school of thought until the early 90's. I however argue that this is a slightly misleading statement. While most attribute the study of critical discourse analysis to the theorems of Fairclough, Wodak, and van Dijk, (as previously mentioned) we need to be aware of that fact that the themes which they put focus on are in no way ground-breaking or unique. The work which, according to Blommaert (2005), is commonly considered to be the real starting point for the school is Fairclough's *Language and Power* (1989), which discusses the political rhetoric and discourse of Thatcher. However, we need to recognize that researchers have always been interested in the discourse and language of power, and if we stretch it enough we could go back to Marxist theories. For further information, see for example Fairclough and Graham (2002), where the authors argue that Marx engaged in what ought to be considered discourse analysis.

For a historical view on the school of critical discourse analysis, we can turn to Seider's content analysis on speeches by executive business leaders (1974). In a sense, this is critical discourse analysis from before the term CDA was coined. Seider was also concerned with power structure, something which (as we have seen) lies close to the core of critical discourse analysis. Blommaert (2005) refers to what he calls Hallidayian linguistics, a systemic functional methodology most concerned with social-semiotic aspects of the text, which he sees as a crucial source of critical discourse analysis. An even earlier analysis on power relationships can be found in Mills (1956).

While later CDA studies seem to have focused on both political and business discourse, it would seem that both Seider (1974) and Mills (1956) focused mainly on the language of the business elite. However, Seider also claims that before his research, no one had really looked into the connection between the discourse and the ideologies of American "big business" companies (1974: 802). In a sense, we could see his contributions to the field as a starting-point for later, and more nuanced, research into the area. One of the reasons for the lack of research up until the 1970's was, according to Seider, the willingness to accept the rhetoric expressed at face value (1974: 802). Perhaps an increase in class-divergences as well as an increased audience awareness might be some of the reasons for the increased interest in critical discourse analysis and related areas of research?

Seider singles out five reoccurring themes in his study, which he calls classical, nationalism, social responsibility, trustee, and professional (1974: 807). Seider identified these ideologies using theories by Sutton and the Marx-Mannheim thesis. The latter he found to be the more useful of the two (for further reading see: Mannheim 1936 and Sutton et al. 1956). Once again, we observe his interests being connected to power distribution. He also concluded that while there are clear ideological differences between businesses, more research needs to be done to explain the differences properly (Seider 1974).

Chilton (2005) claims that some of the role-models for early critical linguists include Orwell, Bathkin, Foucault and Derrida. The focus on power, and especially the focus on power relations and power inequality, are still central themes in critical discourse analysis. Further information can be found in for example Orwell's "Politics and the English Language" (1946) and Foucault's ideas of the panopticon in *Discipline and Punish: the Birth of the Prison* (1977). Chilton (2005) notes that when it comes to critical discourse analysis, Fairclough, as one of the key figures on critical discourse analysis, has drawn a lot of inspiration from Foucault.

As we can see, it is evident that the interest for how discourse and power divisions relate to each other is in no way a new one. While it is only in the last couple of decades that we find focused efforts to create coherent theories and methods, the ideas and the underlying reasons for doing the research have been around for quite some time.

2.2 Critical Discourse Analysis in a context

Since critical discourse analysis is so closely connected to not only what is happening within the text (or speech) but also the surrounding circumstances and what the implications of the text are, there is a need to be able to see any critical discourse analysis in a larger context.

Fairclough (1995) argues that ideology plays a critical part in creating discourse, and that "no instance of discursive practice can be interpreted without reference to its context" (Fairclough 1995: 88). This in turn would, as Fairclough claims, contribute to "undermine, sustain or create power relations" (1995: 82). This would mean that ideology both shapes the discourse and facilitates our understanding of it.

Fairclough (1995) also claims that our understanding of the discourse revolves around what he calls *knowledge bases*. These four knowledge bases are; 1. Knowledge of language codes, 2. Knowledge of principles and norms of language use, 3. Knowledge

of situation, and finally 4. Knowledge of the world. (Fairclough 1995: 33). This shows us that Fairclough found the surrounding circumstances to be important, and further proves why critical discourse analysis ought to be considered a cross-disciplinary field of study, dependent on outside influence to function properly. Additionally, this leads to a personalized experience, where we as researchers undoubtedly will interpret every act of communication in our own way, and bring our own biases into the interpretation, on good and bad.

Van Dijk suggests that “a sound theory of discourse should comprise not only a theory of the structures of text and talk, but also a theory of context” (2005: 74). By doing this he labels context as a mental model, in other words we have an underlying (and perhaps even a subconscious) idea of the context or setting the discourse takes place within. Van Dijk (2005) stresses that knowledge (of the speaker, listener, subject or surrounding circumstances) is an integral part of the contextual models. These aspects he labels as *k-devices*. I am of the opinion that the context model should not have to be made clear or expressed explicitly before the research starts, as Van Dijk (2005) emphasizes that the models more often than not are dynamic and prone to evolve over time. However, the researcher needs to be aware of and recognize that there are always circumstances surrounding the discourse. These circumstances might change constantly as we get more data to draw information from, and our perception and understanding of the k-devices will change and hopefully evolve. These k-devices might also be strengthened by the additional information surrounding the discourse that is revealed.

Van Leeuwen (2005) in turn argues that social theory should always be integrated when performing (critical) discourse analysis. As he sees it, there are two main reasons for this integration. The first point which he emphasizes is that the theory presented can “play an integrative role in integrationist research projects” (van Leeuwen 2005: 11). Secondly, van Leeuwen claims that those scholars who study social theory tend to reach a conclusion faster than those who study discourse analysis. A combination of these two, as he sees it, would help the researcher to get to the point of the research faster. According to van Leeuwen, this is because researchers of social theory mainly conduct studies which are goal-driven and should therefore less affected by what he calls “methodological baggage” (2005: 12).

This dependency on the outside world means that we need to recognize that the models we create will (almost) always influence our way of thinking. Furthermore, the results from the discourse analysis might give us some indications to possible context

models and allow us to form a qualified hypothesis regarding these. Additionally, the context models which are revealed (or sometimes just hinted at) in any study might always lay the groundwork for further discourse analyses.

2.3 The Inherent Problems of Critical Discourse Analysis

There are two main concerns which usually arise when critical discourse analysis is applied. The first one is that there is a lack of a coherent model for gathering data, and that researchers sometimes seem to make it up as they are progressing with the research. Additionally, not having a model for gathering data makes it hard to analyse longer texts, as it becomes hard to find the relevant parts of the discourse. This issue is, among other, brought up by Mautner (2009a; 2009b) who claims that large text-samples become hard to handle if the researcher is forced to rely on intuition and manual techniques for finding data.

The absence of a clear method for gathering data also leads to the second main problem, which is the risk of conducting and publishing a biased study. Wodak and Meyer (2009) write that while one ought to aspire for objectivity, the risk of showcasing one's beliefs and preconceptions on the subject is great. This would not only steer the analysis towards a specific result, but it could also be presented in a light that would allow for the reader to interpret the results in a certain way. In addition to this, concerns have been brought up regarding the methodology of critical discourse analysis, specifically the combination of it and theories which lie outside the linguistic field of research (see Chilton 2005). I will address these issues in the coming chapter, and try to provide a workable solution to them, alternatively explain why the concerns are unfounded or exaggerated.

Critical discourse analysis generally consists of an undefined number of approaches or methods to studying linguistics. These may all differ (at least slightly) from each other, yet Wodak and Meyer argue that these methods are all “problem oriented and not focused on specific linguistic items”, although “linguistic expertise is obligatory for the selection of the items relevant to specific research objectives” (2009: 31). This would suggest that there should not be methodological problems with combining critical discourse analysis and corpus linguistics, which will be discussed later in chapters 3.1 and 3.2.

As mentioned, the lack of a coherent methodology gives rise to concern regarding the authenticity and impartialness of the studies conducted. The foremost problem

appears to be the issue of data gathering, which is addressed by Wodak and Meyer (2009) and Baker (2006). They claim that the collection of data is not seen as a “specific phase that must be completed before analysis begins.” Instead, they claim, it is “a matter of finding indicators for particular concepts, expanding concepts into categories and, on the basis of these results, collecting further data” (Wodak & Meyer 2009: 27). This issue might also lead the reader to question the authenticity of the research which has been conducted, as to whether it really is unbiased research or if it is a research carefully crafted to support and reflect the researcher’s own opinions. Other writers, for example Baker (2006) have also expressed doubt as to whether those conducting critical discourse analysis would be able to do so in an unbiased way.

As discussed in the previous chapter, critical discourse analysis is highly dependent on outside influence to function, i.e. to understand the discourse one needs to understand the context it exists in. However, this might lead to a problem as Jäger and Maier argue that “all meaningful reality exists for us because we make it meaningful for us” (2009: 42). How should we then find the important parts, and not just the important parts which we want to find or wish to showcase? Wodak and Meyer seem to agree with this assessment, and claim that rigorous objectivity is hard to reach since researchers easily embed their own beliefs and guide the analysis towards the analyst’s preconceptions (2009). This becomes especially apparent if we lack a pre-determined way of gathering data. If the research does not have a set methodology for gathering data, but instead “makes it up on the go,” we might run the risk of cherry-picking data, either cherry-picking the interesting parts of the data, or selecting the parts which support a hypothesis that we potentially might favour. Even if this were not to happen we might still be accused of bias, as the possibility of it happening increases. In addition to this, Fairclough recognizes that the genre of political discourse (speeches, interviews or texts) is socially constructed and especially “open to competing constructions” (2006: 33). In other words, it is unforgivingly easy to find what you wish to find.

Blommaert, in turn, sees another potential problem in the close relationship that critical discourse analysis shares with “particular kinds of societies” (2005: 35). He fears that, since the researcher needs a connection to the society to understand the setting that the discourse is taking place in, there might be an overrepresentation of studies conducted in certain countries. While this is a real issue, it is not something that can be easily dealt with. Since one of the goals of CDA is to bring forth evidence of, discuss and explain the power-structures in a society, the researcher needs to understand them. Dedaic (2006)

also argues that a lack of background information or surrounding circumstances might also lead allow the researcher to draw the wrong conclusions. This means that it is almost necessary for researchers to conduct the studies which are set in a context they are familiar with.

Blommaert (2005) does argue for a more inclusive critical discourse analysis, since the world is more than Europe and North America. However, he does not proved guidelines for how to do this. Because of this, I would argue that the best we can do is to understand that the research conducted can only be applied to the setting it happens in or one very similar to it, i.e. political discourse will differ greatly between presidential campaigns in the USA and in Finland as these are different societies. In contrast, a research conducted on the US Senate Election could be applied on the US House of Representatives election, as these share a number of similarities.

Blommaert also presents the opinion that CDA lacks a “sense of history” (2005: 37). This is very much connected to his previous claims of its connection to societies, as the researcher once again needs the connection (this time a connection over time, not space) to the discourse to be able to interpret it. Therefore, there is perhaps something of an overrepresentation when it comes to contemporary societies in current CDA studies. This is not something that will impact my research, as I will explicitly be conducting research on contemporary and semi-contemporary political rhetoric. However, it is a concern that needs to be acknowledged and recognized. Another outspoken critic of critical discourse analysis is Widdowson (1995). Similarly to Blommaert, he maintains that CDA is not a method of analysis. Instead he sees critical discourse analysis as “interpretation in support of belief [which] takes precedence over analysis in support of theory” (1995: 159). According to Widdowson, we ought to be careful when looking at the analysis the researcher provides, as it will most likely disregard any alternative readings of the text that do not support his or her preconceptions. I am slightly hesitant in regard to the truthfulness of this accusation. However, we should remember that the research topics of critical discourse analysis in many cases do derive from the individual researcher’s interests and areas of knowledge. This could in turn, however unfairly, be interpreted as critical discourse analysis only being a platform to express the researchers’ opinions on the subject that is being researched.

Yet another writer who seems to be highly critical of how critical discourse analysis is performed is Paul Chilton. He expresses doubt that critical discourse analysis has any “credible efficacy, on its own terms, as an instrument of social justice” (2005:

21). In connection to this he also writes that it (i.e. CDA) "claims [...] that its practice provides demystifying and emancipatory effects" (2005: 21). According to Chilton, critical discourse analysis cannot be seen as a useful tool if it cannot provide answer to the very questions it is designed to answer. Additionally, Chilton argues that critical discourse analysis neglects work and developing theories within psychology and cognitive science. He does get some support from Wodak and Meyer, who write that "critical theory [for example CDA] should improve the understanding of society by integrating all the major social sciences, including economics, sociology, history, political science, anthropology and psychology" (2009: 6). This is what one might strive to, but they still emphasize that the defining feature of critical discourse analysis should be "its concern with power as a central condition in social life, and its efforts to develop a theory of language that incorporates this as a major premise" (Wodak & Meyer 2009: 10). In other words, the most important part should not be to combine approaches and methods, but to use something that works.

According to Chilton (2005), practitioners of critical discourse analysis focus unreasonably much on social theory and linguistics, which become overrepresented within the field. In his opinion critical discourse analysis is an interdisciplinary model, but only selectively so. As he sees it, this overrepresentation of specific fields would lead to stagnation within the fields not incorporated into CDA (Chilton 2005). Diversity within theories and a shared common ground is of course a positive thing, at least in theory. However, when is it enough? Should researchers be forced to incorporate everything, or should they be allowed to work with what they know and are comfortable with? Does critical discourse analysis have to provide a safe space to try out every new idea from fields far apart?

Chilton's accusations appear, for the most part, to be both unfounded and unjustified. Critical discourse analysis should not have to present an opportunity for every outside theory to be developed. Instead the researchers should be allowed (and even encouraged) to work with theories that contributes to the development of CDA, not incorporate it for the benefit of the outside methodology. However, much of this might benefit, in this case, theories of psychology. Additionally, the commonly assumed goal of critical discourse analysis is to locate, observe and explain power-relations (e.g. Fairclough 1995). This is something which has successfully been done using social and linguistic theories. Thus it becomes counterproductive to incorporate a variety of different fields if they do not contribute to the research in a meaningful (and natural) way. The

fields Chilton mentions can of course be incorporated, but should be so because they contribute to the end result, not because it would look good to incorporate them. Finally, Chilton (2005) claims that critical discourse analysis lacks theoretically interesting yield for linguistics. This he does without really explaining what he expects of CDA, and what he finds lacking. Chilton seems to believe that this proves that CDA is not actually needed as a separate method. However, I am of the opinion that he intentionally disregards (and perhaps intentionally misinterprets) the results gained from critical discourse analyses. CDA should not only provide interesting linguistic insights and new theories within the field. It, and the research performed using it, should be able to connect to real world events (see for example Fairclough 1995 and Wodak 2009).

3. Corpus Linguistics

While critical discourse analysis is a great approach to analysing political discourse, it (as discussed in the previous chapters) lacks certain key features. Because of this, a logical next step would be to introduce a methodology which makes up for the missing components: corpus linguistics.

3.1 The Case for Mixing Methodologies

Van Leeuwen (2005) presents three different ways of looking at mixed methodology research; the *centralized*, the *pluralist* and the *integrationist* models. According to van Leeuwen, one of the problems with mixing methodologies is that the methods, or rather the practitioners of the methods, tend to see their methodology as the central one. In other words, there is one method which is the main, and the other(s) are only seen as a supporting function of the research. All other forms of analysis are usually described as some sort of fringe methodologies which might have these benefits but still are not the real ones. This is a view held especially by the centralist school of thought (Van Leeuwen 2005: 4). This might be both a strength and a weakness, as it would encourage the further development of methods belonging to whatever field the researcher focuses on, although it would also discourage development of new methods outside of the field or possibly discourage the mixing of different methodologies.

In the pluralist model, it is the problem that is central, not the methods for solving said problem. This means, van Leeuwen writes, that researchers adhering to this theory would not see it as incorporation of other methods into their main method (as opposed to the centralized view). Instead they would see it as combining two equally important parts to create something new (van Leeuwen 2005). The main focus would lie on what these methods could do in combination, rather than one helping the other. Cooperation becomes the key-word, and we should be able to see real interdisciplinary results. The pluralist model has, according to van Leeuwen (2005: 7), been gaining influence.

The final model which van Leeuwen describes is the integrationist model. Similarly to the pluralist model, the integrationist also focuses on the problem at hand rather than the methods of solving it. However, the integrationist model takes this school of thought one step further and claims that no model or method can on its own give a satisfactory solution to the problem (2005: 8). Naturally, this creates problems of its own. For one thing, it diminishes the value of the models and almost relabels them. Can we really speak of a model if it cannot address the questions which are being asked in the

research? This, in my opinion, is not a viable way of looking at research, as we need to have a foundation we can trust before attempting to use it to find a solution to a given problem.

Another problem van Leeuwen (2005) mentions with this approach, is the problem of finding common ground for researchers from different fields. An example of this is that they might lack a common vocabulary. However, contradicting himself, he also mentions that the common trend seems to be that different fields move towards a more coherent vocabulary. However, I would argue that this has more to do with technological development and a freer flow of information rather than some sort of conscious attempt to streamline the different models. This can be seen elsewhere as well, as the internet has undoubtedly had an huge impact on how new terminology spreads. Crystal (2004), for example, discusses at length not only how new terminology is being created online, but also how it spreads from user to user. In the case of van Leeuwen's argument of a more coherent vocabulary, it is a question of researchers becoming more attuned to using computerized tools. Thus they would also be more accepting of using the vocabulary which is used in connection with the tools.

Another case for mixing methodologies was also made by Zhu in 2011, who claimed that a mixed methodological approach works better in practice than in theory. The study which he conducted was in operational research, but I do believe that some of the same ideas can be applied in critical discourse analysis and other mixed methodological research as well. However, Zhu also proposes that if one undertakes a research with mixed methodology it must be secured in a sound, or at least coherent, theory (2011: 788). What one should be aiming for is synergy, not just stitching two theories or methods together. There must be a reason behind using a combination of both methods.

3.2 Combining Critical Discourse Analysis and Corpus Linguistics

Wodak and Meyer see critical discourse analysis as a school of a paradigm which is "characterized by a number of principles: for example, all approaches are problem oriented, and thus necessarily interdisciplinary and eclectic" (2009: 3). They also claim that it should be considered to be a heterogeneous school. Other researchers agree with this assessment. As I have already shown, van Leeuwen (2005) argues for combining discourse analysis and social theory and Chilton (2005) adds that one should strive to include both psychological theory and cognitive science. These are fields of research

which lie reasonably far from each other. If this approach is possible, and, if we believe van Leeuwen and Chilton, even preferred, should we then not also be able to combine two fields which are closer to each other?

The approach I selected for collecting data, getting around being accused of conducting a biased research (which, to be fair, is a real issue when dealing with Donald Trump) and to be able to handle the amount of information in the texts is to use corpus linguistics to single out the important parts of the speech. This Hunston (2006) calls a *theory neutral* methodology. Critical discourse analysis and corpus linguistics will be applied according to Van Leeuwen's pluralist approach as described in chapter 2.3, i.e. the problem is in focus (Van Leeuwen 2005). It has also been noted that discourse analysis assisted by corpus-analysis is inherently comparative (Partington 2003). Biber et al. (2007) write that critical discourse analysis can be approached in three different ways:

1. as the study of how language is used
2. as the study of the linguistic structure which lies beyond the sentence
3. as the study of social practices and ideological assumptions that we associate with the language that is used.

They also argue that corpus assisted discourse analysis has fallen solely under the first approach to discourse, the study of how language is used (Biber et al. 2007). I would argue against this assumption, as it is clear that ideologies, power relations and previous knowledge will shape and help create the results of the conducted research. Therefore, the goal of the research is not necessarily limited to how words are used. Instead, it is very possible that the effects of and on outside factors can be taken into account. It helps that corpus linguistics already is analytical to its nature, as it investigates systematic patterns of language use across discourse contexts, which are generalized over all the texts in a corpus (Biber et al. 2007).

Virtanen writes that the combination of corpus linguistics and critical discourse analysis can be approached in two different ways. The research may take the form of either:

[...] an in-depth context-sensitive analysis of text and discourse, and a corpus-based and/or corpus-driven investigation of some identifiable linguistic elements (or the lack thereof), suggested by the preceding discourse analysis as worthwhile candidates for quantification in a given body of data. (Virtanen: 2009: 62).

Or alternatively:

[...] a corpus-driven study can greatly benefit from subsequent enrichment by a close analysis of some of its results in a particular discourse context. (Virtanen 2009: 62).

The approach I have chosen would correspond to the option described in the second extract. Naturally, I do need to recognize that there are different ways of combining the two methods. However, I believe that the upcoming analysis of the texts will prove that the approach I have chosen will be the one that will bring the most to the research. In other cases, the alternative approach (where the discourse analysis is conducted before corpus linguistics is applied) might be the better option. In theory, this might work best if we have a large sample of text, and we were to use critical discourse analysis to select which ones we were to analyse using corpus tools.

Mautner laments the fact that “techniques of corpus linguistics are not yet generally regarded as being at the core of CDA’s methodological canon” (2009a: 122). However, that is changing, as both she (see Mautner 2009a; 2009b) and van Leeuwen (2005), argue for incorporation of the two disciplines. However, it is only in the last decade that the combination of the two fields has really started to be explored. The foundations have been laid, but the finer details remain unexplored and new areas of interest will continuously crop up as society develops, and CDA traditionally reaches outside of the text to look at the circumstances surrounding it (Mautner 2009b). Another strong proponent for this is Baker (2006). According to him, when corpus linguistics is combined with critical discourse analysis it reduces researcher bias. In most cases it lets the researcher find the data without cherry-picking (Baker 2006). Biber et al. (2007) agree and emphasize that corpus linguistics in combination with critical discourse analysis should be able to create representative text samples. Additionally, Mautner writes that “corpus linguistics allow CDA to work with much larger data volumes than they can when using manual techniques” (2009a: 123). This is especially true in larger corpora.

The use of corpus linguistics should allow the researcher to find the linguistic features (in my case the lexical items) in the text in an unbiased manner (however, we need to recognize that there is still manual labour in choosing which linguistic devices we are looking for, as well as choosing the corpora). This is one of the main points which Hunston (2006) brings up. According to her, corpus linguistics is an excellent way to observe relative frequencies in a text-sample.

As discussed in chapter 2.3, the manual nature of critical discourse analysis limits the research when it comes to the length of the text that can be analysed. A corpus

linguistic approach also lets us handle a much larger text-sample than we could be able to process manually. In this way we are not limited by the texts that we are analysing, but can use corpora consisting of millions of words (Baker 2006). Mauther notices the same things as Baker, as she emphasizes this (apart from negation of bias) as the most useful feature of combining corpus linguistics with critical discourse analysis. In other words, it allows the researcher to “extract information from data that would not be accessible to intuition alone” (2009b: 36). I feel that this is a great point, as it seems like a lot of critical discourse analysis consists of manually finding and counting the features that are looked at in the research.

The notion that one might get the results from a text by just intuition is expressed as a concern by Widdowson (1998). This is perhaps true in some shorter texts with a simple message. In longer texts, texts where the message is not obvious, or texts which might contain multiple messages, the use of corpus linguistics will help greatly in finding meanings. In this research, the size of the corpora will be limited due to the fact that the speeches are relatively short (only 4100 to 4800 words). This is perhaps also a positive thing, because as Weisser (2015) points out, there have been instances where the quantity of the data has taken precedent over its quality. This was perhaps never a risk when creating the corpora that I will be using, which will be discussed in chapter 4, but there is still very little reason to strive for bigger corpora than what is strictly necessary. Therefore, in this case, the main advantage of using corpus linguistics would be to reduce the bias of the researcher when looking at the text.

Virtanen (2009) highlights two issues when it comes to combining corpus and discourse linguistics. These are “the difference between a product and a process view of discourse” as well as the “status of the textual, situational and socio-cultural context in the particular study” (Virtanen 2009: 50). While some might argue that the process is as important as the results within discourse analyses, the main focus in corpus linguistics will should arguably always be on the results. This means that there is a need to recognize that there are differences between the two disciplines, and that everything cannot be transferred directly from one discipline to another. One of the main features of corpora is that they are static (Virtanen 2009). The discourse looked at in CDA, on the other hand, rarely is as it is heavily influenced by the setting it occurs in, if the setting changes, the discourse will likely change as well. Additionally, new outside information on the source of the discourse (i.e. the writer or the speaker) might allow for a different interpretation of a text. This is a reflection of the second characteristic feature of discourse analysis,

which was discussed in chapter 2.2, its dependency on outside factors. This is also expressed by for example Blommaert, who writes that “CDA states that discourse is socially constitutive as well as socially conditioned” (2005: 25). While corpus linguistics strive for a more quantitative research through qualification, CDA analysts “tend to prefer situated analyses of the particular” (Virtanen 2009: 52-3). These differences might act as roadblocks when it comes to combining methods. Another issue which is discussed by Virtanen (2009) is the authenticity of the source material. The main concern here is that everything that should be considered authentic in corpus linguistics need not be authentic in discourse studies, and vice versa. While this is a valid concern, I would argue that in this case the materials I have chosen ought to be considered authentic and suitable as they are direct transcripts of the speeches which were delivered by the presidential candidate.

When discussing the problems facing those who wish to combine corpus linguistics and discourse analysis, Virtanen writes that:

It is difficult to come up with quantitative findings which respect the inherent dynamism of discourse unless methods are combined so that an in-depth analysis of discourse is also conducted, and typically a large part of the counting will have to be manual (Virtanen 2009: 59-60).

This is exactly what I hope to do. Corpus studies (somewhat contrary to discourse studies) tend to be explicit to their nature. However, I am hoping that it will be possible that a combination of corpus and discourse studies would provide the reader with an insight into the implicit meanings of the text, without compromising when it comes to researcher integrity.

A corpus linguistic approach to analysing discourse also gives the researcher a stronger foundation to work on. Baker exemplifies this by using a connection between two words to show the incremental effect of discourse (2006: 13). Words connected to each other in an unsuspected way, for example *confined* and *wheelchair*, which often occur close to each other. This does provide the reader with the idea that being in a wheelchair is a negative experience, as you are confined to it as if you were confined to a prison. The question then becomes, what is the author’s opinion of the life of the disabled. Corpus linguistics may also be used to show how the discourse has changed, by comparing corresponding corpora from different periods of time. Baker claims that discourse is never static, but rather an evolving phenomenon (Baker 2006). How the discourse changes may also tell us of societal or political changes in the real world.

However, we do need to recognize that we will not be able to analyze anything else than what is included in the corpus. This means that, for example, gestures, facial expressions, stance and intonation cannot and will be almost impossible to look at an account for, even though this is an integrated part of spoken communication. Additionally, information on social conditions and the context the discourse occurs in must be found outside the texts themselves. Baker mentions that corpus linguistics only provides the means to do an unbiased discourse analysis (2006: 18). However, the researcher still needs to do the qualitative analysis. Still, the corpus analysis will be able to provide patterns and frequencies, which should be easier to interpret.

All texts have a high number of grammatical words (also known as function words) such as *the, and, you* and *or* (Baker 2006: 54), and this might not say much about the content of the text. Of course, we might see if the grammatical words are overrepresented when compared to a reference corpus of general language, such as the British National Corpus. What might be more interesting is the frequency of what I generally labelled lexical words and terms, such as nouns, verbs, adjectives and lexical adverbs (Baker 2006). These will give us a much better understanding of which themes the corpus is centered around. The higher the frequency, the more important the words are to the meaning of the text. This is where we must realize the shift from a purely quantitative to a qualitative analysis based on quantitative data. We are forced to use critical discourse tools to decode the message in the text.

We might also look for word clusters, which contain the most frequently used words in the text. This lets the researcher uncover how a number of words are used. The words connected to the most commonly used lexical words may also provide us with an understanding as to how the words are used, and why. This comparison can naturally be done based on a number of different characteristics of the writers or speakers. For example age, gender or social status. Here we would perhaps assume that the differences we might see in the words used, if there are differences, can be attributed to the previously mentioned features. However, Baker does caution us against drawing conclusions like this. Just because a certain word seems to occur at a higher frequency within a specific group does not mean that all people in that group prefer to use the word (2006: 65).

This is where critical discourse analysis might come in handy, as we will be able to analyze those data and the tables in a qualitative manner. We still need to remember that the qualitative part of an analysis solely falls to the researcher. As Baker remarks, an analysis is only as good as its analyst (2006: 89). For example, words are not always

used in a straight-forward way, and the analyst must understand in what sort of setting the word is used. As with all corpus linguistics, the analyst might also have to try to explain a lack of what Baker calls “instances.” Here, according to Baker, the analyst’s own original hypothesis and intuition will play a role (Baker 2006: 91). In a sense, we can never conduct a truly objective research. While opinions can be suppressed or ignored, previous knowledge of the subject surrounding circumstances cannot.

As mentioned in chapter 2.3, one of the main concerns raised by Wodak and Meyer (2009) is that researchers applying methods of critical discourse analysis might make things up as they go along. The concern is especially great when it comes to gathering data. As CDA lacks a dedicated way of compiling data, the risk of researcher bias can be increased. By creating a system before we start gathering data, which we then follow, we ought to avoid the trap of being accused of conducting a biased analysis where we cherry-pick the parts that we find interesting and/or the parts that support our hypothesis. Therefore, a dedicated data compiling method should be a top-priority for anyone applying the methods of critical discourse analysis.

4. Aims, Methods and Materials

As previously discussed, critical discourse analysis and corpus linguistics will be applied in an attempt to analyse Presidential Nomination Acceptance Speeches. This chapter contains an outline of the aims of the study, an overview of the methods that will be used, and an introduction to the Presidential Nomination Acceptance Speeches as well as an explanation as to why they are important to the candidates' election campaigns.

4.1 Aims of the Study

One of the main areas of interest of contemporary critical discourse analysis is, according to Wodak and Meyer, to analyse, understand and explain phenomena in Western political systems, which are due to the impact of new media and to “transnational, global and local developments and related institutions” (2009: 11). In other words, by using CDA we should be able to see and explain changes (or perhaps even more interesting, the possible lack of these) both in the political system and in the power structure surrounding it. In this research, these tendencies should be observable in the speeches by the nominees.

Dedaic (2006) labels political speeches as genre of relatively autonomous discourse, where the main objective of the orator is to convince the audience that he or she holds the correct opinions (and has the correct solutions). Political speeches are a genre that appears to have been quite heavily researched. Examples of this can be found in Muntigl (2002), Graham, Keenan, and Dowd (2004) as well as Sauer (2002). However, the nomination speeches seem to be less researched than, for example, the victory speeches (held by the candidate after winning the Presidential election) or the Inaugural Address (held when the candidate is sworn in as President).

Historically speaking, the opinions expressed in speeches have been the politicians' own. However, in the parliamentary democracies of the 21st century we are forced see the speeches held by the politicians, in addition to their personal opinions, as representations for the opinions of the political parties that they are part of and represent. At least in some form, the emphasis might shift from one occasion to another. There might also be a difference between politicians, even while they hold speeches in comparable settings.

An important notion is that all speeches are created with a specific target audience in mind (Dedaic 2006). In these speeches, three likely target groups are: the supporters of the candidate in question, the supporters of a different candidate within the same party, and the voters that have still not decided who to vote for. While the first group, those that

already are supporters of the candidate, is an important group, they are probably not the most important ones. The reason is that they will most likely vote for the candidate no matter what. For the same reason the supporters of the opposing candidate are an unlikely target, as these will continue to support their candidate no matter how great the speech in question is. It can be expected that the two main target groups are those who supported another candidate in the party's primary election, and those voters that remain undecided. By affecting the voter turnout of these two groups, the candidate can possibly affect the outcome of the election. For an overview of what causes voter turnout, and consequences of the same, see for example Fowler (2013).

It is of importance to note that while speeches in general are held in front of a live audience, we cannot label them as normal face-to-face discourse since, as Dedaic writes, the content and development of them is not influenced by the audience's reactions (2006). Instead they form a specific genre of their own where the whole performance and interaction is, normally, pre-planned. Fairclough (2006) writes that since political speeches (like most other political discourse) are constructs of social events and are tied into what is happening elsewhere in relations between politics and business, media and leisure we should consider them to be fluid and shifting. He also labels political speeches as interconnected with other political genres. Dedaic further argues that focus is usually on comparing linguistic and political behaviour (2006). Therefore, we ought to consider them in relation to other genres (Fairclough 2006). In this research, there will be no comparison between the speeches and other genres. Instead, I will present an interpretation of what the speeches represent and a comparison between them. Dedaic writes that "language has become a central source for analysis of social action" (2006: 702), which perfectly describes the underlying interest which I had before beginning my research. She also highlights critical discourse analysis as a school of thought which encompasses useful, and perhaps even necessary, tools when researching political speeches and political discourse in general (Dedaic 2006).

Hopefully, my thesis can help in forming a cohesive theoretical and practical link between discourse and (political) action, as described by Wodak and de Cilla (2006), and provide a comprehensive starting-point for further research into political discourse.

Among others, Machin and Mayr (2012) have highlighted the use of corpus linguistics in combination with critical discourse analysis to alleviate some of the criticism aimed at the latter. As previously mentioned, CDA is commonly recognized as a qualitative method and Machin and Mayr (2012) argue that corpus linguistics brings a

quantitative aspect to the analysis which otherwise would not be possible. Machin and Mayr especially see corpus linguistics as a way to make critical discourse analysis more “objective and verifiable” (2012: 216). This should also alleviate some of Widdowson’s (1995) previously mentioned accusations of CDA being the researcher’s way to showcase and present an opinion instead of doing a verifiable analysis. It is also important to note that combining discourse analysis and corpus linguistics has previously not been an easy thing to do, and there have been limitations on how much data the corpora contain. Culpeper (2009) writes that corpus studies have only become feasible for the majority of researchers in the last few decades, due to the emergence of affordable computers. However, he adds that there is evidence of corpus-studies (in some form) being done as early as the 18th century.

Concordance software should provide us with a good starting point when conducting critical discourse analysis. Such programs will provide us with a way of gathering information on (among other things) frequencies and distributions of lexical markers, as well as regularities and irregularities in discourse patterns. Additionally, this provides a point of entry to what Bayley (2012) labels the intertextual dimension. With this term he describes the relationship between texts, which in our case (as already have been mentioned) are transcripts of speeches delivered by four different presidential candidates. Wordlists, corpus data and keywords might seem innocuous or merely idiosyncratic at first, but with enough material repeated patterns should become visible and a clearer picture of the discourse should appear (Duguid 2012).

In conclusion, the goals of the study are to find out answers to the following questions:

1. Is there any one candidate who specifically stands out when compared to the rest, either in regard to what is talked about or how it is talked about?
2. Are there any explanations to why or why not there are differences between speeches?
3. Is corpus linguistics a necessary complement to critical discourse analysis, and is it able to alleviate any of the issues expressed in chapter 2.3?

4.2 Materials

The four speeches that are included in this study are:

1. Bill Clinton's speech in 1992 at the Democratic National Convention in New York
2. George W. Bush's speech in 2000 at the Republican National Convention in Philadelphia
3. Barack Obama's speech in 2008 at the Democratic National Convention in Denver
4. Donald Trump's speech in 2016 at the Republican National Convention in Cleveland

The speeches in question are interesting in the sense that they represent the first real public performance that the presidential candidates conduct as newly nominated candidates. The speeches take place immediately after the candidates have been confirmed as the candidates for their respective parties and can therefore be considered both to be an end and to be a form of beginning. Up until this point the candidates have primarily competed against other candidates from the same party, but from now on the opponent will be the candidate nominated by the opposite party. However, as the candidates will most likely be running a campaign on the same platform as in the primary election. While the audience is probably another, the nomination speeches cannot be considered to be the start of a completely new campaign.

The Presidential Nomination Acceptance Speeches are all available through the American Presidency Project, a non-profit and non-partisan collaboration between John T. Woolley and Gerhard Peters.

The speeches that are looked at were held at Republican National Conventions (in 2000 and 2016) and Democratic National Conventions (in 1992 and 2008), where the candidates were announced. Before this decision had been made, there is an almost two-year long process with primary elections. These so-called *primaries* may have divided the parties between two or more candidates. These divisions could in many cases run extremely deep (see for example Gurian et al. 2016), and the distrust for the official (and newly elected) candidate of the party may be clearly evident. In some cases, we might theorize that the voters may like their own party's candidate even less than the opposing party's. For example, a report released by Pew Research Center (2016) paints a picture of parties that were internally deeply divided on core issues as well as on their view of the candidates facing the 2016 election. The speeches should therefore foremost be seen

as the first step towards reconciliation within the party and should ultimately focus the attention of the audience outwards, towards what is perceived as the opposition.

Additionally, as it is the launch of the real election campaign (see for example Hoffman and Howard 2009), these speeches can be considered as the first contact with the undecided voters and the voters leaning towards voting for the opposing candidate. However, due to the nature of the two-party system in the USA the candidates have very little chance to sway voters that are firmly “in the other camp”, i.e. are going to vote for the opposite party no matter who their candidate turns out to be. The incentive to try to do so is therefore likely not especially high.

A more in-depth introduction to each candidate, their campaigns and their speeches can be found in chapters 5-8. As this point should be mentioned that the headlines for the chapters are not necessarily the names of the speeches. However, they are slogans connected to the candidate’s campaign.

Whenever material is gathered for a linguistic study there is always a need to consider how, when, what, and ultimately if certain texts can be used. Private communication is always problematic, as the speaker or writer ought to be made aware of and give his or her permission for use of the texts. However, in this study the speeches can be considered public communication, and we need not consider issues with permission or anonymity. Weisser (2015) mentions the complexity of compiling data of spoken language. He is mainly concerned with privacy (which, as mentioned, is not an issue in this research as the speeches are public), but he also brings up the possible difficulties of obtaining the data. One extremely labour-intensive aspect of this, as I noticed while doing a previous study, is transcribing spoken language. Fortunately, as the speeches that I will be looking at are historically important and of general interest to the public, it was easy to find all of them already transcribed online. I have however listened to the speeches while reading the transcripts to make sure that the transcripts are true to their sources. There is also no turn-taking to be concerned with, as I am only interested in what the candidates are saying, not how the audience (or anyone else) responds to it, either verbally or otherwise (for example by applauding).

The speeches will function as the corpus on which the analysis will be based. Due to this, each sub-corpus will contain a fairly limited number of words, between approximately 4100 for the transcript of George W. Bush’s speech to roughly 4800 in the transcript of Barack Obama’s speech.

Whereas corpora in general are considered to be decontextualized (Virtanen 2009), as they are in many cases assembled of many different texts where one cannot differentiate one from another, in this case the speeches will make up their own subcorpora, with clear boundaries between them. I have only edited the speeches to make them clearer and machine-readable. In other words, I have removed anything not uttered by the speakers (such as indicators of interruptions by the audience, applause or laughter). Additionally, the speeches have been converted into plain-text format (.txt) to make them as readable as possible for the program. I am also looking less at what the surrounding factors might say about the speeches than what might be customary for critical discourse analysis, but I believe that this will help to smooth out the differences between corpus linguistics and discourse analysis. The issues expressed by Wodak and Meyer (2009) as well as Baker (2006), that the gathering of data is sometimes not treated as a specific phase that should be completed before the research can begin, are neutralized. In this study, the data was gathered from predetermined sources, i.e. the speeches, before the research was conducted.

4.3 Methods

The first part of the research has been to create the corpus that is being investigated. Mautner (2009b) does argue against using a purpose-built corpus. However, due to the nature of my study I will be forced to do so. Since I am interested in very specific pieces of discourse, it would not make any sense to use some form of general corpus. I do call the collection of texts a corpus, and consider it as such. However, it needs to be made clear that the corpus consists of relatively small, specialized samples of text, and that it in no way resembles the large and publicly available corpora. Using four different speeches allows for looking look at the changes over a prolonged period of time.

The corpus all contains a limited number of words. As previously mentioned, the speeches all contain between approximately 4100 for the transcript of George W. Bush's speech to roughly 4800 in the transcript of Barack Obama's speech. The effect of using a word concordance program will therefore not be as pronounced as if I were using a corpus containing millions of words. However, the impact will be seen, and this study should work as a way of showcasing that corpus linguistics can function as a complementing tool to critical discourse analysis (and likely also other forms of discourse studies).

While the corpus that is being used is rather small, Mautner defines a corpus as machine-readable, sampled, authentic and representative (2009a). The size of the corpus

should therefore not be seen as a hindrance, as a certain size is not one of the defining criteria. It is also completely possible to use concordance programs on small-scale corpora as well, as Mautner (2009b) references a study which was conducted on the correspondence between Tony Blair and a reporter, where the total number of words was roughly 4000. While 4000 words is still manually manageable, the use of corpus analysing tools greatly reduces the time the analysis takes, and makes sure that no parts are overlooked. It also allows the researcher to redo the analysis, either with the same text-sample or with a larger one.

The software used is WordSmith Tools, version 5.0. The program in question allows for the researcher to adopt both quantitative and qualitative perspectives on textual data, and it also offers the option of computing frequencies and measuring statistical significance. Additionally, it presents data extracts in such a way that individual occurrences of specific terms can be assessed and be examined qualitatively within the environment they exist in. It can also be used to help the researcher find important semantic patterns, as well as identifying discourse functions. (Mautner 2009a). Additionally, it is also readily available and relatively easy to use.

I have not altered the speeches, except to make reading them easier to read by dividing the texts into manageable paragraphs. As I will only be looking at the lexical words in the word-lists, I first need to filter out the function words of the speeches, this is done through a stop-word list. This was done after the word-lists were compiled, as this allows for a better overview of the words in question. I have identified the function words as words that express grammatical relationships and classifications, for example prepositions, determiners and conjunctions, using the *Longman Student grammar of Spoken and Written English* by Biber et al. (2002). This book provides a comprehensive guide to classifying words (as well as phrases, if one were inclined to do so).

I have not looked at numbers that appear in the text, as they do not contribute much to the content or the themes of the speeches. Additionally, neither modals (e.g. may, could) nor quantifiers (e.g. many, few) have been counted. These would be excellent examples to include if I were to look at hesitation within the speeches. However, the modals and the quantifiers do not bring much to a content-analysis of this type.

As previously mentioned in chapter 3.2, all texts have a high number of function words (Baker 2006). Naturally, it is therefore expected that the speeches also contain a large number of function words. As these would bring very little to the analysis I have decided to focus on the lexical words in the speeches, with a few exceptions as some

function words do provide some information on, for example, the targets of the speech and the opinions of the speaker. Among the determiners these are the possessive determiners (e.g. *my* and *our*). From the pronouns, I have been counting the personal pronouns (e.g. *I* or *you*), as well as the possessive pronouns (e.g. *mine* or *ours*). I have not included any auxiliary verbs, prepositions, adverbial particles, coordinators or subordinators. The reason for this is that the possessive determiners as well as the possessive and personal pronouns are content which brings important information to this research. The personal ones might give insight into what the candidates rate more highly, for example *I* or *we*. The same goes for the possessives, as the usage of *our* instead of *my* might indicate an attempt to include the audience in the speech. Also, oblique forms of personal pronouns (e.g. *us* and *them*) have been counted, as this has once again given us an insight into how the candidates talk about what might be seen as the foreign.

All third person plural pronouns (*they*, *them* and *their*) will be looked at separately. The reason to this approach is that these words form the subjective, objective and possessive cases. Due to this, it is to be expected that they will carry both different syntactic and semantic meanings. Third person personal pronouns are commonly used to refer to a group of people who are not the speaker or the direct audience. In addition to this, the personal pronouns can be used anaphorically (Huddleston and Pullum 2005). This would mean that the third person personal pronouns could be used to indicate exclusion, (when the word refers to a group the speaker does not want to be associated with) as well as inclusion (when the word refers to a group the speaker wants to be associated with). What the personal pronoun is used to refer to should become clear when looking at the context in which it appears.

Instead of having to closely examine all four texts to single out words not included in the analysis, I have instead gone through a combined wordlist and created a list of the function words that are most likely to appear in the speeches. By using the Highlight Cells Rules in Excel, and setting the parameter to finding duplicate values within the marked cells, it is possible to cross-reference this list with the word-lists from the speeches themselves and remove the function words that are present. The function words (grammatical words) can be found in table 1 on the following page. To save space, the table has been divided into two columns. I have isolated the function words that were to be found within the top 150 words within the corpus, the function words make up a slight majority of these with 78 occurrences.

Tabel 1: Function words within the top 150 words in the combined wordlist

Function words by frequency rank	Frequency in occurrences	Frequency in percent	Function words by frequency rank	Frequency in occurrences	Frequency in percent
1	THE	794	41	BEEN	48
2	AND	675	42	THAN	42
3	TO	521	43	UP	40
4	OF	477	44	IF	38
5	A	339	45	AM	36
6	IN	303	46	DON'T	34
7	THAT	270	47	JUST	34
8	WILL	194	48	THAT'S	30
9	IS	191	49	THESE	29
10	FOR	182	50	IT'S	28
11	THIS	149	51	S	27
12	HAVE	147	52	WANT	27
13	BUT	127	53	INTO	26
14	ON	120	54	OUT	26
15	ARE	119	55	WHERE	26
16	MY	108	56	THERE	25
17	NOT	107	57	THOSE	25
18	WITH	101	58	MANY	24
19	#	99	59	TAKE	24
20	WHO	93	60	AFTER	23
21	BE	88	61	MADE	23
22	HAS	82	62	DOWN	21
23	SO	81	63	NEVER	21
24	ALL	76	64	OWN	21
25	CAN	73	65	SHOULD	21
26	AS	69	66	WAY	21
27	FROM	66	67	WERE	21
28	MORE	66	68	WON'T	21
29	BY	63	69	EACH	20
30	WHEN	62	70	EVEN	19
31	WAS	60	71	HERE	19
32	AN	58	72	I'VE	19
33	DO	58	73	OTHER	19
34	ONE	55	74	ALSO	18
35	AT	53	75	LIKE	18
36	OR	53	76	MOST	18
37	WHAT	53	77	ONLY	18
38	NO	50	78	CANNOT	17
39	BECAUSE	49			
40	NOW	49			

I have chosen to only look at lexical words (and included function words) that have a frequency of at least 0,20 per 100 words (when rounded to the closest second decimal). Due to this, the word list will vary in length from 32 word to 47 words. The limit was chosen for two reasons. 1. Words that occur with a frequency below 0,20 per 100 words are unlikely to be part of the core message of the speech and are therefore not

critical to this analysis. 2. The sheer number of words that occur with a frequency of less than 0,20 per 100 words is be overwhelming. For example, Clinton uses eleven different lexical words eight times, at a frequency of 0,18 per 100 words.

This cut off also means that the list of functions words in table 1 is sufficiently long to exclude all function words that exist in the text and which have a frequency higher than or equal to 0,20 per 100 words. The last word on the list, *cannot*, occurs only 17 times (0,1%) in the four speeches.

When it comes to the lexical words in the individual speeches, I have not looked at each of the lexical and included function words that have been collected with WordSmith. Instead, the focus is on the items that are relevant to this research. These words may vary from one speech to another, but what they all have in common is that they say something about power structure, identity and how they showcase values. Additionally, comparing the word list (and the speeches) allows me to see which words are prominent in the different speeches, if there are any common trends or if one speech clearly differs from the other.

The research starts by looking at frequencies of words within the speeches in question. This is an analysis technique which, according to Weisser, “allows linguists to investigate the occurrences and behaviour of different word forms in real-life contexts” (2015: 80). While Hunston (2006), as explained in chapter 3.2, cautions against frequency lists, I truly believe this is the best way of finding the most important items in the speeches. This approach would be supported by, amongst others, Mautner who writes that finding “high frequency patterns makes a good starting point” (2009b: 44). However, this should not dictate the whole research. It is a good starting point, nothing more. In the end, it will be the human analyst that has to do the job of analysing what these frequencies have to tell us.

After pinpointing the most frequently used features within each speech using frequency lists, the results are analysed to determine why these features are the most commonly used, and what this might say about the speaker. The speeches are analysed individually. However, comparisons between the speeches are also an important part of the analysis. This part of the analysis is featured in chapter 9, the discussion. While this research suffers from some of the inherent problems that critical discourse analysis displays in that it is dependent on the subjectivity of the researcher, the use of corpus linguistics should provide an indisputable foundation which I can base my research on.

Additionally, introducing corpus linguistics scales down the scope of the research and allows for a unbiased selection of what to focus on.

In the analyses of the individual speeches, there is a section on what I have chosen to call ‘value words’. These are words which, in one way or another, can be seen as closely connected to the candidates’ policies, slogans or campaign promises. As the words occur with a frequency of at least 0,20 per 100 words, it is already established that they are important to the candidate. However, how they are important and what meaning they carry might still be up for debate. It is also here that the subjectivity of the researcher is most prominently seen, as these value words are connected with my understanding of the candidate, their campaign promises and their election campaigns.

Collocates are a good way of understanding the context in which a word occurs and collocate-lists are featured frequently in the analyses. By using the Concord function in WordSmith, it is possible to create a list of collocates. In this collocate-list WordSmith includes the five word prefacing the keyword and the five words which follows it. If nothing is mentioned regarding which collocates are counted, it should be assumed that all collocates have been included. In cases where only a specific collocate is included, for example collocates directly in front of (L1 collocate) or immediately after the word (R1 collocate), this is mentioned. Only collocates that occur at least five times within the total range (five words before and five words after the keyword) have been included. This is mainly done to limit the research, but also because collocates that occur less frequently are unlikely to be important to the context of the keyword.

I have also performed a keyword analysis. The keyword lists have been created using the unedited wordlist from one of the speeches and a reference wordlist which includes the words in the remaining three speeches. The keyword analysis brings further insight into which words are overrepresented (or underrepresented) in the speeches. The keyword analysis is not presented on its own, instead it provides some additional information to the comparison between the speeches.

The analyses of each individual speech are found in chapters 5-8, one speech per chapter. These chapters do not contain any comparisons between the speeches. The comparisons, including references to the keyword analysis, is found in the discussion in chapter 9.

5. Clinton's 1992 Speech: "For People, for a Change"

The first speech is the speech delivered by William J. "Bill" Clinton at the Democratic National Convention in New York on the 16th of July, 1992. The speech in question consists of 4502 words (including function words).

Born in 1946 in Arkansas, Clinton is an alumnus of Georgetown University and Oxford University, as well as Yale University from where he received his law degree in 1973. Previous to being elected president in 1992, Clinton served as Arkansas Attorney General between 1976 and 1978. In 1978 he won the governorship of Arkansas. He lost the bid for a second term four years later but regained the office in 1986. Clinton remained in office as governor until he defeated incumbent president George H. W. Bush and the independent candidate Ross Perot (who up until this day still remains the most successful independent candidate in the history of US presidential elections) in the 1992 presidential election at the age of 46 (Freidel & Sidney 2006). His relatively young age and lack of connection with national politics in Washington D.C. made him into somewhat of an outsider, which might have appealed to the younger demographic as well as to those who were generally dissatisfied with how things had been under the Bush administration. Clinton also became the fifth president during the 20th century to defeat the incumbent president.

The 1992 election was one that took place in a time of change. The Soviet Union had crumbled a couple of years earlier, and the USA was undisputedly the only real superpower left in the world. The 1992 presidential campaign was also the first major national campaign to make use of the internet (Leuschner 2012). The impact which the internet might have had was minimal at best. However, there were indications that alternative forms of campaigning would become more and more important. This can be seen in Clinton's strategies, as he could be seen to be moving away from traditional venues of campaigning. For example, he took part both in talk shows and played saxophone on late night television.

Baum (2005) speculates that this engagement with popular culture helped shape Clinton's image as a young, fun and down-to-earth candidate that appealed especially to the younger demographic, a demographic which is famously hard to activate and which most candidates struggle to connect with (Tindell & Medhurst 1998). Even though these forms of alternative campaigning were in their infancy, they still represent the technological and societal changes that were to take place during the end of the 20th century and the beginning of the 21st. This is perhaps why Baum (2005) labels Clinton

and his Vice President, Albert “Al” Gore Jr., as a new generation in American political leadership. Clinton was re-elected in 1996, when he defeated republican senator Bob Dole and Ross Perot who this times was the candidate of the Reform Party.

5.1 Analysis

The lexical items that I will be looking at in this speech can be found in table 2. As we can see, the table does not contain any function words except the ones that were presented in chapter 4.3. In the speech, 47 different words are used with a frequency of at least 0,20 per 100 words; this is also the highest among the speeches. In total, the speech contains 4502 words.

Table 2: Lexical words and included function words in Clinton’s 1992 speech

Words by frequency rank	Frequency in occurrences within the whole text	Frequency per 100 words	Words by frequency rank	Frequency in occurrences within the whole text	Frequency per 100 words		
1	I	98	2,17	20	BACK	12	0,27
2	WE	78	1,73		CHILD	12	0,27
3	OUR	63	1,40		CHILDREN	12	0,27
4	YOU	53	1,18		COVENANT	12	0,27
5	IT	50	1,11		JOBS	12	0,27
6	AMERICA	41	0,91		PRESIDENT	12	0,27
7	HE	33	0,73		SHE	12	0,27
8	PEOPLE	31	0,69		THEIR	12	0,27
9	NEW	26	0,58	21	KNOW	11	0,24
	US	26	0,58		MAKE	11	0,24
10	ABOUT	24	0,53		SAY	11	0,24
11	GOVERNMENT	23	0,51	22	AMERICANS	10	0,22
12	THEM	20	0,44		BUSH	10	0,22
13	EVERY	19	0,42		HOPE	10	0,22
	FAMILY	19	0,42		TOGETHER	10	0,22
	YOUR	19	0,42		TONIGHT	10	0,22
14	WORK	18	0,40		VISION	10	0,22
15	COUNTRY	17	0,38	23	HEALTH	9	0,20
	THEY	17	0,38		HER	9	0,20
16	ME	16	0,36		LET	9	0,20
17	AMERICAN	15	0,33		MOTHER	9	0,20
	TIME	15	0,33		TAUGHT	9	0,20
18	AGAIN	14	0,31				
19	CARE	13	0,29				
	MUST	13	0,29				

As we can see, the words *I* (including occurrences of *I'm*, *I've* and *I'll*), *we* (including occurrences of *we're*, *we've* and *we'll*) and *our* are the words most commonly used by Clinton, with a frequency of 98 (2,17%), 78 (1,73%) and 63 (1,40%) respectively. This should tell us that Clinton first and foremost uses the speech to emphasize himself, and secondly tries to include the audience with himself, creating an idea of a unified front. A potential motivation for this has been discussed in chapter 4.2, where it was argued that one of the most important aspects of the speech is that it works as a reconciliatory action aimed at gathering support within the candidates' own parties. Shufeldt (2018) also claims that this would be of greater concern to a Democratic candidate. He found that Democrat voters are less likely than Republican voters to submit to peer pressure, and vote for a candidate they did not endorse in the primary elections just because he or she is the representative of the party.

It would seem like Clinton further expands on this idea by his frequent use of *you* (including *you're* and *you'll*), which is the fourth most common word with 53 occurrences and 1,18%, as well as the use of *us*, which ranks ninth with 26 occurrences and 0,58%. In total, the pronouns mentioned make up almost 6,5% of the total number of words in the speech.

In addition to Clinton's use of personal pronouns, we can also see that he is fond of using other words to show inclusiveness. With this I refer mainly to his use of *America* (41 occurrences, 0,91%), *American* (15 occurrences, 0,33%), *Americans* (10 occurrences, 0,22%), *country* (17 occurrences, 0,38%), *covenant* (12 occurrences, 0,27%) and *people* (31 occurrences, 0,69%). Wodak et al. (2009b) argue that speeches do not exclusively serve as platforms for linguistic self-presentation and self-promotion of the speakers, but also as a way of conveying political values and opinions. In the case of the nomination speeches, the question that arises is "whose"? Whose political values and opinions are represented, the candidates' or the parties'?

These speeches work as *a.* a first step towards reconciliation with the supporters of the candidates that lost the primaries, and *b.* as a first flirt with the undecided voters. Due to this I would argue that the speech is mainly for the benefit of the candidate, not the party, and that it is the candidates' political opinions, as well as their personal rhetoric, that is given the opportunity to shine on the stage. This argument is further supported by the fact that political speeches can also help to construct the common characteristics and identities which influence the creation of consensus, cohesion and a spirit of community (Wodak et al. 2009b, 71). Nevertheless, this would, as I see it, allow for the speeches to

work as a fundamental building block for further political endeavours undertaken by the speakers.

The most important, but far from the only one, among these endeavours is the presidential campaign itself. Other than the campaign, the image that the president-elect manages to cultivate during the campaign will influence how he (or perhaps in the future she) is regarded after the election. This also means that the image that the candidate manages to create is one that will be used to argue for his or her political policies after he or she has been elected. The president of the USA is ultimately someone, who beyond his or her formal powers, has the authority to influence the world's political discourse (how something is discussed). Additionally, the president also has the political clout to turn the publics' attention to issues he or she deems important, while disregarding issues of subjectively less importance. It would seem that perceived authority on an issue becomes important, more so than real knowledge of the subject matter.

Although Wodak et al. (2009b) discuss research on commemorative speeches by already elected politicians, I believe that much of what they have written can be applied to this case as well. They highlight what they call epideictic oratory, i.e. praise-and-blame rhetoric, which we will see further examples of in this speech and in the speeches following. The fundamental difference is that the praise-and-blame rhetoric in the speeches looked at by Wodak et al. (2009b) highlights historical moments in the nation's past. Contrary to this, the speeches in this study highlight the candidate's successful endeavours and the opponent's, as well as the predecessors' failures.

This brings us to the following focus point of Bill Clinton's speech: how he talks about that which we might label 'the other side'. As I see it, the other side is comprised of two radically different groupings. The first one is the political opponent, in this case first and foremost the incumbent president and his administration. The other group is the outsiders, the foreigners and the non-Americans. Looking at a wordlist, it might be hard to distinguish these two groups, as some words might be used to describe either. However, looking at the context in which the words in question occur does provide more information.

The words that I have identified that, in some form, are indications of this are *he* (33 occurrences, 0,73%, including occurrences of *he's*), *them* (20 occurrences, 0,44%), *they* (17 occurrences, 0,38%, including occurrences of *they've*) and *Bush* (10 occurrences, 0,22%). The word *she* (12 occurrences, 0,27%) might have been included in this if the circumstances had been different (i.e. if Mr. Clinton's opponent had been a woman). *They*

and *them* might refer to both of the previously mentioned groupings, the word *Bush* is most likely used as a direct reference to the incumbent president, whereas *he* might refer to both his opponent and the current president (which in this particular case is one and the same).

This is also where we might note a problem in the use of corpus-based word-lists. Without the context, some of the results become nearly meaningless, or even misleading. Fortunately, we do have the original transcripts, which we may use to find the context that the words occur in. In this case further analysis of the transcripts is needed. The contexts of *they* and *them* can be found in table 3. By tagging the pronouns it would be possible to find word clusters. However, in this study it is less work to determine the contexts manually.

Table 3: The context of *they* and *them*

	Them	They
Exclusive	0	5
Inclusive	19	12
Ambiguous	1	0
Total	20	17

When searching in the speech for the words *they* and *them* we find sentences like the following:

- (1) They've [the Republicans] run this big government for a generation, and they haven't changed a thing. They don't want to fix government, they still want to campaign against it, and that's all. (Clinton 1992)

There are four occurrences of *they* in these two sentences. We can also find instances where Clinton uses *them* to identify the supporters of a different candidate, for example:

- (2) I am well aware that all those millions of people who rallied to Ross Perot's cause wanted to be in an army of patriots for change. Tonight I say to them: join us, and together we will revitalize America. (Clinton 1992)

Nevertheless, we also find examples that are similar to the following paragraph, in which Mr. Clinton talks about his grandfather:

- (3) There were no food stamps back then, so when his customers -- whether they were white or black -- who worked hard and did the best they could came in with no money, well, he gave them food anyway. (Clinton 1992)

Here the function of *they* is inclusive, as *they* in example (3) clearly refers to Americans.

Other third person plurals can be used in the same manner, which can be seen in example

- (4). This is perhaps the most interesting *them* in the speech.

- (4) All of us -- we need each other. We don't have a person to waste. And yet for too long politicians have told the most of us that are doing all right that what's really wrong with America is the rest of us. Them. Them, the minorities. Them, the liberals. Them, the poor. Them, the homeless. Them, the people with disabilities. Them, the gays. We've gotten to where we've nearly themed ourselves to death. Them and them and them. But this is America. There is no them; there's only us. (Clinton 1992)

Here Clinton uses *them* to make a point which is the exact opposite of what we might expect it to be used as. Instead of singling out *them* as something different or as 'the other', he chooses to use the word to include *them* with *us*. Essentially emphasizing that no matter the background, sexual orientation or social status, every American counts. This is a clear example of the meaning of words only becoming clear in their contexts. This also gives rise to an interesting question: is this a universal use of the words, and will we see words used similarly in the speeches by the remaining candidates?

In table 4 we can see the referents of the word *he*, and in table 5 I have listed the words used directly in front of *Bush* (i.e. L1).

Table 4: Words that he refers to

	He
Bush	22
Grandfather	3
Al Gore	3
Other	5
Total	33

Table 5: Context words for Bush

	Bush
George	6
President	1
Candidate	1
Other	2
Total	10

Note that the those who have been classified as 'Other' in table 4 and table 5 only occur once and cannot be classifies as belonging to a group. As we can see, *he* refers mainly (as expected) to president Bush. There are some other uses of the word, mainly when Clinton refers to his grandfather and to Vice-President nominee Al Gore. However, it should be clear that the use of *he* is a deliberate attempt to put himself in opposition to the incumbent

president. An interesting strategy can also be seen in Clinton's use of *Bush*: in 60% of the instances he calls his opponent simply *George Bush*, and only once *President Bush*, the same number of times he uses *candidate Bush*. Why is this? I would argue that his use of *George*, instead of a frequent use of *President*, or perhaps *Mr.*, is an attempt by Clinton to make the listener not see George Bush as the current president, but as the opponent. It is likely that (unintentionally) strengthening the audience's connection between Bush and the presidency would make it harder for Clinton to be seen as a serious competitor and the better option.

The last grouping of words are the ones that I have chosen to call 'value words'. These are emotionally charged words that might give us an insight into the values that the candidate holds, and what subjects he chooses to focus on in his speech (and by extension, what he will focus on in his campaign). The words in Clinton's speech that can fit this description are: *new* (26 occurrences, 0,58%), *family* (19 occurrences, 0,42%), *work* (18 occurrences, 0,40%), *care* (13 occurrences, 0,29%), *child* and *children* (each occurring 12 times, 0,27%), *jobs* (12 occurrences, 0,27%), *hope* (10 occurrences, 0,22%) and finally *together* (10 occurrences, 0,22%).

Additionally, all the words that are used to show inclusiveness (*American*, *covenant* and so on) could be regarded as a part of this category as well. However, since these words, and how I have interpreted their use, have already been discussed, I have opted to not look into them further.

Looking at the words in the category of value words, we can argue that the words fall within two different themes. It is important to note that some of the words, without seeing their context, could fit within multiple themes. The two main themes that I have identified are *a.* the family and family values (with the words *family*, *child*, *children*, *care* and *together*) and *b.* employment (*work* and *jobs*). Connected to both of these are *hope* and *new*. These cannot fit neatly into one single theme. Instead they overlap with the different themes and support the emphasis in the phrases. Primarily they are used to indicate the future, and seems to be used as a way to talk about a coming change.

Once again, we turn to the full transcripts to gain an understanding on how, and not only how often, these words are used. Starting with theme *a.*, family and family values, we can see that Clinton makes use of it mainly in two slightly different ways. The first way that he uses these words is to refer to his own family or to his own childhood. For example, in the following sentence where he talks about his wife, Hillary Clinton:

- (5) So if you want to know why I care so much about our children and our future, it all started with Hillary. (Clinton 1992)

Possibly, this is done once again as a way of connecting with the audience, as it is easy to relate to someone when they are talking about something that is close to their heart and which triggers an emotional response (in this case, family). This phenomenon has been investigated by, among others, Brader (2005). Brader claims that connecting the political campaign with something the audience is enthusiastic about both motivates participation and activates existing loyalties (i.e. turns the potential voters into actual voters).

The following way that the words within the theme of family are used is when Clinton wishes to bring forth and explain his core values. One of the best examples of this is perhaps the following paragraph:

- (6) I want an America where ‘family values’ live in our actions, not just in our speeches. An America that includes every family. Every traditional family and every extended family. Every two-parent family, every single-parent family, and every foster family. Every family. (Clinton 1992)

Here Clinton manages to truly emphasize what he identifies as family values. Once again, we can see that he strives towards inclusiveness in his speech. As we can also see in the previous example, Clinton manages to incorporate the idea of the family with theme *b.*, employment, thus drawing a parallel between children (and family) and his vision of the future America that he represents. This is exemplified in the following sentences:

- (7) Somewhere at this very moment, a child is being born in America. Let it be our cause to give that child a happy home, a healthy family and a hopeful future. (Clinton 1992)
- (8) I want every person in this hall and every person in this land to reach out and join us in a great new adventure to chart a bold new future. Giving Children a Future Of Boundless Hope. (Clinton, 1992).

In example (8), Clinton also uses *new* and *hope* to indicate the bright future that he envisions. An additional benefit of using *new* is to indicate that there needs to be change to achieve a better future.

In Clinton’s speech, we also see an overlap between the two themes, for example when he refers to his mother in the following:

- (9) As a child, I watched her go off to work each day at a time when it wasn’t always easy to be a working mother [...] (Clinton, 1992).

I would argue that this is once again an attempt to relate to the audience using a familiar theme, his own family. Additionally, the sentence seems to indicate that he himself comes from a hard-working middle-class family, thus bringing him even closer to the average voter. While his mother is perhaps described as the most important role model, his grandfather (as seen in table 4) also plays an important part as his main male role-model.

This takes us firmly to theme *b.*, which as I have previously stated is represented mainly by the words *work* and *jobs*. These are used in a number of different ways. As previously mentioned, Clinton does use them to highlight his own and his family's work ethic (his mother going to work to feed the children, and his grandfather running a store where Clinton worked), but they are also used in different contexts. For example, the following two sentences:

(10) Tonight, 10 million of our fellow Americans are out of work. Tens of millions more work harder for lower pay. (Clinton 1992)

(11) People are working harder than ever, spending less time with their children, working nights and weekends at their job [...] (Clinton 1992).

Interestingly, the message here does not appear that Clinton laments the lack of jobs, but rather the lack of jobs where the worker can earn a decent living. This does not criticize the worker or the country, or label them as being lazy, but rather the previous administrations and the political establishment as a whole. Additionally, we can see that Clinton once again ties the issue with family, thus relating to the audience.

The critique of the previous administration's economic policies is seen throughout the speech, and Clinton chooses to anchor it in something that the average listener can relate to: wages (as previously seen) and jobs. This is exemplified by the following:

(12) What is George Bush doing about our [America's] economic problems? Well, four years ago he promised 15 million new jobs by this time, and he's over 14 million short. Al Gore and I can do better. (Clinton 1992)

(13) That's why I'll fight to create high-paying jobs [...] (Clinton 1992)

This technique is used with remarkable success throughout the speech. It grounds Clinton's accusations in something concrete that the voter has the ability to relate to and to agree on with Clinton. It is clear that the main villain in his story are the politicians in Washington (as previously mentioned, Clinton had previously been the governor of Arkansas and had had little to no associations with Congress or the Senate). This is also where we get a hint of us vs. them, although the words are not explicitly used:

- (14) He promised to balance the budget, but he hasn't even tried. [...] Even worse, he wasted billions and reduced our investments in education and jobs. We can do better. (Clinton 1992)

This is an interesting way to use the concept, and perhaps not one that we as readers would associate with the classic technique of creating a boogeyman. Here *us* (or *our* and *we*) is represented by Clinton and the audience, whereas *them* is not the unknown foreigner, but rather the extremely known incumbent president and his administration.

5.2 Final Notes on Clinton

As a recap, we can through the use of corpus linguistics and critical discourse analysis find the following general themes in the speech made by Clinton:

1. The strongest priority is given to creating a sense of inclusiveness. This is done through liberal use of words such as *American*, *country*, *people*, *we* and *our*. This choice of words is meant as a way of connecting the voting population to him, both those within the party and those outside of it. One goal of the speech is to work as an act of reconciliation.
2. Clinton also uses the speech to present and introduce himself (repeated use of *I*) as well as his campaign, while taking a small step away from the idea of being a candidate of the Democratic Party. Instead the speech focuses on him being presented as the American candidate.
3. Clinton is primarily not using the words *they* and *them* as a way of creating an opposition (which is what might have been expected). Instead, the words are used to indicate that Clinton is speaking of *us* and *Americans* in past tense.
4. There seems to be two main focal points in the speech. The first is an emphasis on family and a message that every American is included in Clinton's America. The second focal point is the economy, and specifically creating new jobs, jobs that one can make a living wage on. These are both strongly connected to the idea that there is a hope for new and better future for America, and that Clinton will be able to bring forth this change.

6. Bush's 2000 Speech: "Compassionate Conservatism"

The following speech is the one held by George W. Bush at the Republican National Convention in Philadelphia on the 3rd of August, 2000. This speech is the shortest of the speeches that are looked at and contains 4110 words (including function words). Bush, born in Newhaven, Connecticut, in 1946 (making him the same age as Bill Clinton), is the eldest son of President George H. W. Bush and is therefore the second president in the history of the USA who is the son of a previous president. After receiving a Bachelor's degree in history from Yale University in 1968, he served as a pilot in the Texas Air National Guard before joining Harvard Business School in 1973. He received his Master of Business Administration in 1975 and went on to work in the oil industry. During this time, he was also politically active within the Republican Party.

Bush made a bid for the House of Representatives in 1978, and even though he succeeded better than what was expected he still lost the election (Holmes, 1999). After this his political work was mainly focused on supporting his father, George H. W. Bush, during his political career, including the two presidential campaigns. In 1994, Bush challenged the sitting governor of Texas, he won this election and went on to be re-elected in 1998, becoming the first ever Republican governor to serve two consecutive terms in Texas (Baum 2005). Again, we see that there seems to be a certain appeal in having a candidate who is not "tainted" by the politics in Washington. Even though Bush, like Clinton, had been heavily involved in politics before being elected, he could play the outsider.

In August of 2000, Bush was announced as the republican candidate for the presidential election, where he and vice-president-to-be, Dick Cheney, went on to defeat the Democrat Al Gore (the vice-president of the Clinton administration) and Ralph Nader from the green party. Running a campaign which was centered on what Pomper (2001) calls "compassionate conservatism", he focused on education, healthcare and social security. It is also important to note that Bush took a far more lenient stance on moral issues, such as abortion, than previous republican candidates. As the exiting Clinton administration had accumulated a budget surplus, an important issue in the election race was what to do with the money. Gore, on one hand, sought to invest the surplus in a number of different government programs. The Bush/Cheney campaign was on the other hand arguing for across-the-board tax-cuts. (Pomper, 2001). The presidential election of 2000 became controversial, as Bush lost the popular vote with a margin of around half a million votes. However, he narrowly won the swing-state Florida (with around 500 votes

and after a recount with a prolonged court-battle) and therefore won the presidency (Baum 2005). The result of the election came as a surprise to many, and most analysts had expected Gore to win with a comfortable margin. Fiorina et al. (2003) provide further speculations as to why Al Gore failed to capitalize on this expected win. The campaign itself was characterized by the emergence of “new media” (a trend which continued from the 1992 and 1996 elections), as the internet and personal computers had become readily available in the years leading up to the election. In comparison with 1992 when the internet was in its infancy, the campaigns had the possibility to reach large masses online in 2000. In 2004, Bush was re-elected with a comfortable majority, beating Democratic candidate John Kerry.

Bush’s presidency was marred with the war in Afghanistan (2001-2014) as well as the 2003 invasion of Iraq, following the terrorist attacks on September 11, 2001, wars that the USA has, at today’s date, not managed to completely disengage from. Even though Bush declared that the mission in Iraq was accomplished in 2003, and official combat operations ended in Afghanistan in 2014, thousands of American troops still remain in advisory roles or partake in counter-terrorist operations in the countries. His legacy as a president is also characterized by the financial crisis of 2007-2008, which caused a global economic recession that would last for four years.

6.1 Analysis

The lexical items that I will be looking at in this speech can be found below in table 6. The table does not contain any function words except the ones that were discussed in chapter 4.3. Only 35 different words in the speech reach a frequency of at least 0,20 per 100 words; this is the lowest number among the speeches. The total number of words in this speech is 4110, making it the shortest of the four speeches in the analysis.

Table 6: Lexical words and included function words in Bush's 2000 speech

Words by frequency rank		Frequency in occurrences within the whole text	Frequency per 100 words	Words by frequency rank		Frequency in occurrences within the whole text	Frequency per 100 words
1	WE	81	1,96	11	GREAT	12	0,29
2	I	79	1,92		SIDE	12	0,29
3	OUR	72	1,74		TIME	12	0,29
4	IT	54	1,31	12	LIFE	11	0,27
5	MUST	22	0,53		NEW	11	0,27
	THEIR	22	0,53		PROMISE	11	0,27
	YOU	22	0,53		WORK	11	0,27
6	YOUR	18	0,44	13	BELIEVE	10	0,24
	THEY	18	0,44		CHANCE	10	0,24
	NATION	18	0,44		COUNTRY	10	0,24
7	AMERICAN	17	0,41		GIVE	10	0,24
8	ME	16	0,39		HIS	10	0,24
	HE	16	0,39	14	ADMINISTRATION	9	0,22
9	EVERY	14	0,34		CHARACTER	9	0,22
	CHILDREN	14	0,34		GENERATION	9	0,22
10	THEM	13	0,31		HAD	9	0,22
	AMERICA	13	0,31		LOVE	9	0,22
					US	9	0,22

The first thing we notice is that Bush emphasises the words *we* (81 occurrences, 1,96%, including occurrences of *we're*), *I* (79 occurrences, 1,92%, including occurrences of *I'm* and *I've*) and *our* (72 occurrences, 1,74%). This shows that Bush attempts to both present himself and create cohesion between the audience and himself. However, it would appear that the main focus in Bush's speech lies on him connecting with the audience. This is exemplified by his opening statement:

(15) Thank you for this honor. Together, we will renew America's purpose. (Bush 2000)

This is somewhat of an ambiguous statement, and might either mean that Bush and his administration, or that Bush and America as a whole would renew America's purpose. I would argue that it is the latter, as this is how Bush routinely seems makes use of *our* in the speech. For example, in the following sentences from the opening of the speech:

(16) Prosperity can be a tool in our hands used to build and better our country, or it can be a drug in our system dulling our sense of urgency, of empathy, of duty. Our opportunities are too great, our lives too short, to waste this moment. (Bush 2000)

(17) We will confront the hard issues, threats to our national security, threats to our health and retirement security, before the challenges of our time become crises for our children. (Bush 2000)

It is also interesting to see that Bush uses *us* rather infrequently, as it is only used nine times (0,29%) throughout the speech. This makes it only the 14th most frequently occurring word.

We is also being used by Bush to conclude his message, as the final part of the speech begins with:

(18) My fellow citizens, we can begin again. (Bush 2000)

With the use of *we* and *our*, Bush is most likely attempting to introduce the idea to continuing to build an America based on his idea of compassionate conservatism. This theme is something that I will revisit in a later part of the analysis. This is an idea which he appears to see as a direct inheritance from the economic growth of an America, which had emerged victorious from the second world war. Once again, the notion of connecting with the audience is an unspoken theme. So is the idea that the people, the administration and America should (ideally) be one and the same.

Interestingly, Bush's attempt to connect *we* and *our* with the idea of America rather than with the audience that is present suggests that there is not an overwhelming need to create a connection with the supporters of the other republican candidate. The reasons for this will be discussed later in this chapter. This reasoning is also supported by Bush's use of *you* (22 occurrences and 0,53%). Where *you* is used, it is also not directed at the audience, but rather used to talk about his family as in the following sentence where he talks about his daughters:

(19) And to our daughters, Barbara and Jenna, we love you a lot. We're proud of you. And as you head off to college this fall [...] (Bush 2000)

Or when he talks about his father, George H.W. Bush:

(20) Dad, I am proud to be your son (Bush 2000)

You is also, like *we* and *our*, used to connect with the American people as a whole and allows Bush to speak directly to certain groups of voters, which can be seen in the following extracts where he targets the elderly:

- (21) To the seniors in this country, you earned your benefits, you made your plans, and President George W. Bush will keep the promise of Social Security. (Bush 2000).

Bush also attempts to appeal to the younger voters with the following:

- (22) For younger workers, we will give you the option, your choice, to put part of your payroll taxes into sound, responsible investments [...] (Bush 2000)

This should be a sound strategy, as historically younger voters have been one of the harder groups of voters to activate. By delivering a message directly at this group, Bush attempts both to connect with them and to engage them in the coming election. The United States Census Bureau (2014) found that the 18-24-year-olds' voting rates in the 2000 presidential election was roughly 32%. This is a 10% drop compared to the corresponding number in the 1992 presidential election, and it is also one of the lowest since the 1960's (Us Census Bureau 2014). Evidently, Bush's did not manage to engage the young voters. This strategy by Bush is also evident in his story of meeting a young inmate. Here Bush uses *you* to talk about himself:

- (23) He seemed to be asking, like many Americans who struggle: Is there hope for me? Do I have a chance? And, frankly, do you, a white man in a suit, really care about what happens to me? (Bush 2000).

This does not appear to be an attempt to distance himself from this image (Bush is, after all, "a white man in a suit"), but rather to imply that he can be counted on to have the best interests of the young people in mind despite of this.

A similar theme can be found in how Bush chooses to use *your* (18 occurrences, 0,44%). An example of this can be found in extract (24) below, which is the full context of extract (22):

- (24) For younger workers, we will give you the option, your choice, to put part of your payroll taxes into sound, responsible investments. This will mean a higher return on your money in over 30 or 40 years, a nest egg to help your retirement or to pass on to your children. When this money is in your name, in your account, it's not just a program, it's your property. (Bush 2000)

Aside from speaking directly to the younger voters to convince them that his plan for them is the most beneficial to them, Bush is emphasizing the idea of ownership and that his policies will be enough to help the population help themselves.

One common theme for these extracts is that they in some way connect to Bush's idea of compassionate conservatism. This can also be seen in the next extract, where Bush once again uses *you* to talk about himself:

- (25) Social Security has been called the third rail of American politics, the one you're not supposed to touch because it might shock you. But if you don't touch it, you cannot fix it. And I intend to fix it. (Bush 2000).

There seems to be very little direct communication with the voters from the Republican Party. There are only two instances of Bush addressing the audience directly, and both times he might as well be interpreted as addressing undecided voters. However, the end of the following quote does seem to be reconciliatory:

- (26) As governor, I've made difficult decisions and stood by them under pressure. I've been where the buck stops in business and in government. I've been a chief executive who sets an agenda, sets big goals, and rallies people to believe and achieve them. I am proud of this record, and I am prepared for the work ahead. If you give me your trust, I will honor it. Grant me a mandate, I will use it. Give me the opportunity to lead this nation, and I will lead. (Bush 2000)

In this extract, Bush seems to be almost pleading with the audience to trust him and to give him a chance. Otherwise, Bush appears to be content in ignoring them. Could this have something to do with Bush representing the Republican Party? And does this mean that republicans are likely to vote for "their" candidate (the party's candidate) no matter who it is? A study conducted by Shufeldt (2018) suggests that this is the case. One of the groups that were surveyed in Shufeldt's study was the entirety of the delegates to the 2012 national conventions, i.e. Obama's second election (2018: 137). While this is not the exact assembly that Bush chooses to not target in this speech, they do belong to the same group. The second group that he looks at are voters which are not active within the parties, but still see themselves subscribing to one, the "rank and file voters" as Shufeldt (2018, 137) calls them. The last group that Shufeldt looks at (and perhaps the one with the biggest differences within the sample) was gathered from an online survey. Shufeldt found that

Republican identifiers appear predisposed to start at a higher level of party support than their Democratic counterparts. [...] Republican identifiers are more likely than Democratic identifiers to vote, contribute, and volunteer on behalf of their party candidate. The effect of cross-pressure is more pronounced for Republicans compared with Democrats. (Shufeldt 2018: 153).

Interestingly, this could be seen not only within the group of delegates, but in the two other groups as well, as Shufeldt claims that "[across] all samples, Republicans in the control group are more predisposed than Democrats to support their party candidate" (2018: 152). Directly linked with this, is that "absence of either a party- or group

endorsement has a larger effect among Republicans” (Shufeldt 2018: 153). Therefore, it should be clear the greatest hurdle for a Republican presidential nominee to overcome is to actually get nominated. Once that happens, voters who are loyal to the party (rather than the nominee in question) are expected to follow. This might indicate that the Republican Party is a more homogenous group with a somewhat rigid and clear structure when it comes to authority within the party. Democrats, on the other hand, could be considered to be a patch-work of different interest-groups, with supporters whose main loyalty is not to the party but to the candidates themselves. This also leads to the question of what would happen if there were to arise a larger split within the party. Would the party effectively be split into two factions, unable to cooperate, or would the Republican Party manage to continue functioning as they have up until this point?

The next feature in Bush’s speech is his use of *they* (18 occurrences, 0,43%), *them* (13 occurrences, 0,32%) and *their* (22 occurrences, 053%). As previously shown, *they* and *them* can be used both as an excluding indicator of something foreign (“the other side”) or inclusively as a way of indicating *us*. Additionally, there might be instances of ambiguous use, or where the meaning behind the words may be up for interpretation. Bush’s use of the words can be found below in table 7.

Table 7: The context of they, them and their

	Them	They	Their	Total
Exclusive	1	12	6	19
Inclusive	7	6	14	27
Ambiguous	4	0	2	6
Total	13	18	22	53

As we can see from the table, Bush uses *them* and *their* mainly inclusively, while *they* is more often used to refer to someone else. The one clear case where *them* is used to showcase ‘the other side’ is when he talks about inmates (not that this extract also contains one of the exclusive occurrences of *their*):

(27) Yet when I looked in their eyes, I realized some of them were still little boys.
(Bush 2000)

However, even in this case *them* is not used to condemn anyone. Rather, it is used to give the idea that there might still be hope for a lost generation. This is clear in the following extract as well, where he talks about the nation’s students:

- (28) [...] this administration did not teach our children, it disillusioned them. (Bush 2000)

When it comes to how Bush uses *they*, we can see that the word is mainly used in an excluding manner, most often to highlight the failings of the previous administration. An example of this can be seen in extract (29):

- (29) They had their chance. They have not led. We will. And now they come asking for another chance, another shot. Our answer: Not this time, not this year. (Bush 2000)

However, once again *they* is sometimes used in an inclusive manner, mainly to talk about Americans in the past, and past generations of Americans. This can be seen in the following two examples:

- (30) This is the vision of America's founders. They never saw our nation's greatness in rising wealth or in advancing armies [...] (Bush 2000)
- (31) They said, "We shall overcome." (Bush 2000)

Their is the most commonly used word of the three. Once again, the words are mainly used in an inclusive manner, although we here have a larger proportion which have been classified as excluding. We also have two instances which have been classified as ambiguous. However, there are some inclusive uses which possibly could have been seen as ambiguous, such as in examples (32) and (33):

- (32) American children are segregated into schools without standards, shuffled from grade to grade because of their age, regardless of their knowledge. (Bush 2000)
- (33) [...] no one in America should have to pay more than a third of their income to the federal government [...] (Bush 2000)

In the first example, there is no specific distinction between 'us and them', instead it is simply a statement meant to criticize the current administration's educational policies. The reason for counting it as an inclusive use of *their* is the combination with *American*. The same reasoning can be used on example (33).

Some of the instances of *their* are clearly and purely inclusive in nature. An example of this is seen when Bush talks about helping low-income families:

- (34) We will transform today's housing rental program to help hundreds of thousands of low-income families find stability and dignity in a home of their own. (Bush 2000)

This can also be seen in how he talks about those who might be seen as standing outside of society in one way or another. As in the following example:

- (35) [...] children without fathers in neighborhoods where gangs seem like friendship or drugs promise peace, and where sex sadly seems the closest thing to belonging. We are their country too. And each of us must share in its promise or the promise is diminished for all. (Bush 2000)

He also uses *their* when trying to reconcile with the other Republican candidates, as seen here:

- (36) I want to thank the other candidates who sought this office, as well. Their convictions have strengthened our party. (Bush 2000)

This is one of the few instances where he directly addresses the defeated candidates, and through them their supporters.

When *their* is used in a clear ‘us versus them’ setting, there are two main antagonists which Bush focuses on. The previous administration and as an extension of this the current opposition. Note that the candidate for the Democratic Party in the 2000 election was Al Gore, who had served as vice president in the Clinton administration. This clear antagonism can for example be seen in the previously mentioned statements, where Bush talks about the failures of the Clinton administration, as seen in extract (37):

- (37) But this administration, during eight years of increasing need, did nothing. They had their moment. They have not led. [...] And now they come asking for another chance [...] (Bush 2000)

This is connected with a reference to the current campaign by Gore, where Bush reminds the audience that opposition is a familiar face:

- (38) [...] this’ll be a tough race, down to the wire. Their war room is up and running, but we are ready. Their attacks will be relentless, but they will be answered. We are facing something familiar [...] (Bush 2000)

By comparing the campaign to a war, Bush creates an outside enemy in the opposing side in the election and not in any other group of people (for example, foreigners or minorities). This would allow the audience to unite against this perceived enemy regardless of their personal opinions and values.

It is also evident from the previous statements that the main theme of Bush’s speech is “compassionate conservatism”. This leads us to the category of value words, emotionally charged words that show which values the candidate emphasizes in his speech in an attempt to appeal to the audience.

The words in the speech by Bush that can be seen as part of this group are: *nation* (18 occurrences, 0,44%, including occurrences of *nation's*), *American* (17 occurrences, 0,41%), *children* (14 occurrences, 0,34%, including occurrences of *children's*), *great* (12 occurrences, 0,29%), *new* (11 occurrences, 0,27%), *promise* (11 occurrences, 0,27%), *work* (11 occurrences, 0,27%), *country* (10 occurrences, 0,24%), *generation* (9 occurrences, 0,22%) and *love* (9 occurrences, 0,22%).

These words can be divided into two different main themes; *a.* patriotism and *b.* the future and the next generation. In the appeal to patriotism and a patriotic ideal, Bush uses words such as *American*, *great*, *country*, *generation* and *work*.

The words belonging to theme *b.* in Bush's speech are *children* and *new*. The odd one out is *love*, which does not fit neatly into a category. While love expresses a positive feeling, and thus shows what the candidate values, there does not seem to be any one object or person which is overwhelmingly referred to using love. However, some of the main objects of Bush's love seems to be his family (his daughters as well as his mother), the country, America, the spirit of America and children. Because of this, the use of *love* does provide a personal connection between Bush and the two themes.

Starting with the theme of patriotism, it is interesting to note that while *American* ranks seventh, *America* does not register on the frequency list at all. Turning to the transcript, the way in which Bush uses *America* to appeal to patriotism is twofold. The first way Bush uses *American* is to talk about nationality, the second way is to retell what I like to refer to as *the American Story*. What the concept of the American story ultimately represents is challenging to define, but Polanyi sees it as a shared "system of notions, ideas, concepts, and values which taken together form our common world view." (1985, 75). Further developing this point, Polanyi (1985, 106) argues that the American story (or the stories that make up the American story) contains recurring cultural constructs. These are:

- a.* People should withstand pain,
- b.* People should want to know
- c.* People should be courageous
- d.* People should be able to "take it" well
- e.* people want to be respected

This means that, in its core, the American story is one of perseverance, of overcoming difficulties, and ultimately of triumph.

How *American* is divided between the American story and American as a nationality can be found in table 7 below.

Table 7: What theme American refers to

	American
Nationality	6
The American Story	11
Total	17

Looking at how *American* is used to simply denote nationality, we can find examples of this in

- (39) An American president [...] (Bush 2000)
- (40) [...] to defend the American people.” (Bush 2000)
- (41) Now is the time to give American workers security and independence [...] (Bush 2000)

Although these are factual, and mainly work as a means to describe the president, or the people, or the worker, they do carry a patriotic undertone. By specifying that *American* is the key distinctive feature, Bush distinguishes between *American* and the others, and creates an image of self. Graeff (1996) argues that the degree of congruence between the image of a brand (in this case Bush, and in extension the election campaign) and a consumer’s (in this case voter’s) self- image has noteworthy effects on how the brand is evaluated. Assuming that the audience (and the voters) see themselves as *Americans*, Bush creates a simple link between the “consumer” and the “brand” by continuously specifying the nationality.

The other reason to use *American* is to create a certain narrative, the American Story. Here the aim of using *American* is not necessarily to inform the audience of a specific nationality, but to show the nationality in a positive context. Wang (2007) describes the notion of an American Story as a valuable tool in public and foreign relations, and claims that it up until this day plays an important part in American foreign relations policy. The sentence which perhaps exemplifies this the best is the following:

- (42) Greatness is found when American character and American courage overcome American challenges. (Bush 2000)

However, it is also seen in a more negative light in the sentence:

- (43) We have seen a steady erosion of American power and an unsteady exercise of American influence. Our military is low on parts, pay and morale.” (Bush 2000)

Here Bush laments the failures of the previous administration. As we already have seen the similarity between the audience and the brand is paramount to how the brand is perceived.

Graeff (1996) also argues that the effects of brand images can be magnified by promoting a message that encourages the audience to examine their own self- image while they are evaluating the brand (*American*). As we already have seen, Bush uses *American* to connect his audience with the brand he is promoting. Through the telling of the American story as it ought to be and comparing it to what he feels to be reality of the present, Bush creates a powerful image which allows the audience to do exactly this. In extract (43), the America that is mentioned falls short of the American Story he promotes. In comparison, in example (42) Bush is actively trying to create a favourable image which the audience can evaluate. This is also seen in example (44), where he explicitly mentions the American Story:

- (44) We will write not footnotes but chapters in the American story. (Bush 2000)

This shows that Bush is very aware of the symbolism of using *American* in such a way and is consciously using it to promote his campaign.

Interestingly, Bush uses *generation* in a similar manner to how he uses and talks about *the American story*. Although Bush does use it to talk about and reflect on the current generation, he mainly uses it to refer to “the great generation” which built the country. What is not present are references to a future generation. Additionally, many times these two seem to be used almost interchangeably. Perhaps the best example of remembering “the good old days” is found in the following extract:

- (45) My father was the last president of a great generation, a generation of Americans who stormed beaches, liberated concentration camps and delivered us from evil. (Bush 2000)

Related to this, we have his statement on his own generation:

- (46) Our generation has a chance to reclaim some essential values [...] (Bush 2000)

This statement should be seen in the light of his praise of those who, in his opinion, laid the foundation for American hegemony. As should the following:

- (47) Our current president embodied the potential of a generation. So many talents, so much charm, such great skill. But in the end, to what end? So much promise to no great purpose. (Bush 2000)

The message here is quite clear. No matter how good it has been, we should be able to do better. Not only for the present generation and generations to come, but as a favour to those who have sacrificed so much to make America what it is.

In a similar manner we are able to look at what Bush chooses to refer to as *great*, and which attributes he prescribes to *country*, i.e. what are the context words. The context words for *great* were found manually through looking at the context of the words. I also found the possessive pronouns directly preceding *country* (the L1 collocates) manually. The results can be found in the tables below.

Table 8: Words referred to using great

	Great
Future	4
Nation	2
Past	2
Other	4
Total	12

Table 9: Possessive pronouns preceding country

	Country
Our	5
This	4
Their	1
Total	10

As we can see in table 8, there are only three main areas which are referred to as *great*. The future, the past and the nation. Additionally, *great* is used to refer to for example *skills* and *friends*. Occurrences such as these have been labelled as “Other”. Perhaps quite obviously, the present (i.e. America under the current administration), is not referred to as *great*. However, it needs to be said that these references are quite vague. This is illustrated by example (48), which refers to the past, while example (49) refers to the future:

- (48) My father was the last president of a great generation (Bush 2000)

- (49) Our opportunities are too great, our lives too short, to waste this moment.” (Bush 2000)

Bush also use *great* when he refers to goals of to hope, which clearly should be seen as allusions to a better future.

More interesting is the comparison of the context words placed in front of *country*. Here we can see that in five of the occurrences Bush refers to the *country* as *our*, and in

four of the cases he refers to it as *this country*. It is quite evident that Bush makes a conscious attempt to create a form of belonging. This is partially done directly, using *our*, as in:

(50) Our country is ready for high standards [...] (Bush 2000)

It is also done indirectly by using *this*. For example:

(51) I will not attack a part of this country because I want to lead the whole of it. (Bush 2000)

Even when Bush refers to the country as being *their country*, it is done to include a group of people:

(52) We are their country too. And each of us must share in its promise [...] (Bush 2000)

Using this technique, Bush shares a vision of the country being shared among the audience and the voters, not only those who vote for him.

The word *work* might seem somewhat out of place, but it does fit in the same narrative. *Work* is not used to describe employment, instead it is used when Bush talks about the American Story, and the work that went into building America. This can be seen in the following examples:

(53) Those who did put their medals in drawers, went to work and built on a heroic scale highways and universities, suburbs and factories, great cities and grand alliances, the strong foundations of an American century. (Bush 2000)

(54) There was a restless energy, a basic conviction that with hard work, anybody could succeed and everybody deserved a chance. (Bush 2000)

The first sentence is a reference to war-veterans from the second world war, who were not only heroes because of the war but because of what they created after it. The second is once again an allusion to the America Story, where anyone might succeed as long as they are willing to work hard for what they want, and as long as they live in a country where one is rewarded for hard work. The other way *work* is used is to describe the amount of work that Bush himself is prepared to do for the voters and for the country if he is elected, which can for example be seen here:

(55) I am eager to start on the work ahead, and I believe America is ready for a new beginning. (Bush 2000)

Looking at the words in group *b.*, i.e. *children* and *new*, we can see that they are over all used slightly less than the words in group *a.* The common theme for these words is that they are all a way of mentioning the future, which also was one of the themes that the words in group *a.* were used to talk about.

When it comes to *children*, the most telling feature is the possessive pronoun that is used to preface them, ha have only looked at the word directly preceding *children*. This tells us who Bush chooses to focus on, as well as the inclusiveness of his speech. When it comes to *new*, Bush mainly refers to new policies or, even more concrete, new beginnings. However, there are also some instances where *new* refers so completely unrelated themes.

Table 10: Possessive pronouns preceding children

	Children
Our/American	8
Your	1
None	1
Other	4
Total	14

Table 11: Nouns referred to using new

	New
Noun related to policy	4
Beginning/future	4
Other/unrelated	3
Total	11

Starting with table 10 and *children*, we can see that the table is quite self-explanatory. The overwhelming majority of times *children* are mentioned, Bush refers to them as *our children* or *American children*. I have decided to lump these together, as I would argue that *our* and *American* are synonyms in this case, as both of them both refer to Bush, the audience and the voters as a whole. Even when there is no distinct possessive pronoun, there are references to children being the responsibility of all of America. For example in extract (56), which was included under the category “Other” in table 10:

(56) So we improved our schools dramatically for children of every accent, of every background. (Bush 2000)

Here Bush does not directly refer to the *children* as America’s *children*, but the implication is still present. The same can be seen in most of the other sentences where *our* or *American* does not preface the word.

Table 11, over which nouns *new* is used to refer to, demands a somewhat longer explanation. Note that combinations such as *new shoes* and *New York* has been labelled as “Other/unrelated”, as these do not refer to policies or the future. Bush frequently uses

new to refers to one or more policies that he is presenting. Examples of this can be found in the following sentences:

(57) My administration will give taxpayers new incentives to donate to charity [...] (Bush 2000) (55)

(58) Our country is ready for high standards and new leaders [...] (Bush 2000)

A special group, which I would argue is closely related to the previous one, is the idea of new beginnings or a new future. For example:

(59) This is not the time for third chances; it is the time for new beginnings. (Bush 2000)

This is a direct reference to his opponent who had been the vice-president during Clinton's two terms in office. It is clear that the main reason for using *new* is to signal that it is time to do away with the old and to introduce something new. This is a risky strategy, as America had experienced economic growth during the Clinton administration. Additionally, this strategy is not something that has been looked at in depth. Instead, there have been studies done on introducing policy-changes during, or as a result of, political upheaval (for example, Hogan and Feeney 2012). To introduce radical changes in a time of prosperity seems like a risky strategy, but as Bush was elected it would appear that it was a risk worth taking.

6.2 Final Notes on Bush

In conclusion, the four main features of Bush's speech are the following:

1. Throughout the speech there are references to Bush's policy of compassionate conservatism, which is the main theme of his campaign.
2. There is an emphasis on Bush trying to connect with the audience, this is mainly done using *I*, *we* and *our*. *We* and *our* are mainly used to talk about America as a whole, not as a way of directly addressing a specific part of the audience. How *We*, *our*, *you* and *your* are used suggests that Bush is more concerned with catching undecided middle-ground voters than trying to attract the supporters of the defeated Republican candidates. A possible reason for this is that Republicans generally display a great level of loyalty towards the party, and are inclined to vote for their candidate no matter what.
3. *Them* and *there* are used in a including manner, whereas *they* is used to represent "those that are not us". However, in Bush speech "the other" does not refer to

foreigners, those who are different or some external threat. Instead, he uses *they* to target the previous administration and the Democratic campaign. In other words, the opposition.

4. The value words are mainly used to create a sense of patriotism. One of the main ways Bush attempts to do this is through the telling of the America Story. Interestingly, Bush does not use these words to attempt to create a sense of “us versus them”, instead he gives the impression of wanting to promote America as a whole, and to uphold American ideals.

7. Obama's 2008 Speech: "The American Promise"

The third speech in the study was held by Barack Hussein Obama at the Democratic National Convention in Denver, Colorado on the 28th of August, 2008 after he was nominated the previous day. This speech is the longest of the four speeches at 4792 words (including function words). Through this nomination, Obama became the first African-American to be nominated by the Democratic Party. Although he is not the first African-American to ever be nominated, the earlier ones are rarely mentioned since they have been nominated by what rightly can be labeled fringe parties (for example the Socialist party).

Born on Hawaii on the 4th of August, 1961, Obama almost exemplifies the 'American Story' (i.e. born with small means, but manages through hard work to rise to the very top). With a father from Kenya and a mother from Kansas, his maternal grandparents took a great part in raising him. During his childhood, Obama moved from place to place with his mother, settling for a number of years in Indonesia before he returned to Honolulu to finish his high school education. After graduating high school in 1979, Obama moved to Los Angeles, California to pursue a bachelor's degree on a scholarship at Occidental College. It was also during this time that Obama started to become involved in politics. In the beginning, this political activism was mainly aimed at the apartheid regime in South Africa (Gordon, 2007). In 1981 Obama transferred to Columbia University in New York City. He graduated from Columbia in 1983 with a degree in political science with a specialization in international relations. After graduating from Columbia, Obama became heavily involved in community activism, mainly in Chicago. It was perhaps here the theme of 'change' started (which we saw in his 2008 Presidential campaign), as he saw the grass-root movement as a first step towards renewing both the White House as well as the Congress (Boss-Bicak 2005).

After working with the community in Chicago through a non-profit organization for a number of years, Obama attended Harvard University's Law School at the age of 27. He graduated with honors in 1991, and returned to Chicago to teach at the University of Chicago. During this period he also worked as a public-interest lawyer for a firm which mainly specialized in civil rights cases (Adams 2007). In 1995 Obama began his political career in earnest, and in 1996 he was elected as state senator representing Illinois' 13th district (Boss-Bicak 2005). In 2000 he tried to secure a seat in the US House of Representatives, but was defeated. However, four years later 2004, he managed to win a landslide victory with 70% of the votes. It was during this time that Obama emerged as a

contender for the 2008 presidential election, where his supporters saw him as an ‘antidote’ to Hillary Clinton (who was his strongest opponent in the Democratic primary election) and as a fresh face which was ”untainted by the party’s failures during the Bush era”, especially as he had vocally opposed the Iraqi war, calling it a completely unnecessary war (Adams 2007).

In the 2008 Presidential election Obama and Vice-President nominee Joe Biden campaigned on a platform of change and hope, which seems reminiscent of his days as a community activist in the 1980’s. One of the main promises in his campaign was, according to The Interuniversity Consortium for Political and Social Research (ICSPR), the healthcare reform. His opponent, John McCain was by many seen as a direct link to the somewhat failed Bush administration, the ISPCR writes, and because of this Obama deliberately worked to connect McCain with the former administration. McCain seems to have realized this, and tried to establish himself as an alternative who was independent of the Bush administration (shown by choosing outsider Sarah Palin as Vice-President), while simultaneously showcasing his much larger political experience. He also worked to highlight his military career and ran on a platform which relied heavily on national security (ISPCR). Ultimately, this strategy failed to convince the voters. This is perhaps easy to understand, as Obama was elected in the middle of an economic recession (and inherited a budget deficit caused partially by the economic policies of the previous administration), and the public wished for something new, someone with new political ideas who had no connection to the past administrations. As with the two previous candidates, it is likely that the relative lack of involvement in national politics had a part in Obama winning the election.

One of the reasons, or perhaps the greatest reason, as to why a relatively new and unexperienced senator from Illinois (who had just served two turns in the Illinois state senate and one turn as a US senator in Washington D.C.) managed to gain the presidency was his success in activating the undecided masses. This was done, according to Stirland (2008), through an understanding of how to utilize the internet and social media. The internet played a crucial role in not only spreading Obama’s message and giving him the publicity he needed as a relatively unknown player, but it also helped Obama raise a large part of the money for his campaign. Interestingly, we can assume that this led to a large part of his funding coming from private citizens. While we saw the emergence of the internet and the importance of an online presence in the previous campaign, it culminated with the campaign of 2008. This was the election where internet campaigning not only

targeted the young and the internet savvy, but anyone who had a presence online (Stirland 2008). Another aspect which Stirland (2008) discusses was the possibility for fact checking. The internet, and the availability of materials from the campaigns, allowed for what she calls *citizen-journalists*. This citizen journalism made the candidates (both of them) more accountable for what they said, in any setting. The candidates had to get used to that they were being constantly scrutinized. However, this direct connection to the audience does not have to be a solely negative thing. Nah and Chung (2012) have shown that during the first decade of the 21st century, professional journalists were more likely to be trusted by the audience. However, they do conclude that with the right social trust and media credibility, citizen journalism can be an effective tool to amplify the message broadcasted by the traditional media. With the right strategy, citizen journalism could be utilized to reinforce the political message and allow for it to reach new groups or communities that previously might have felt overlooked or had a hard time receiving the message.

In 2012, Obama was re-elected as he defeated republican candidate Mitt Romney. The themes from the 2008 election were still prevalent, and the internet retained its importance as a campaign tool, and the candidates' comments and opinions were widely published, discussed and analysed. The latter was something Romney got to experience, as the now infamous comments on the 47 percent of the population (which comprises the bottom part of the socioeconomic scale), became publicly known. According to Romney at a private fundraiser, they, 47 percent of the public and the voters, are the ones who feel that they are entitled to things provided by the government, such as food and universal healthcare, and will vote for Obama no matter what. While the Obama administration tried to paint Romney as a rich guy who is out of touch with what is reality for a majority of Americans, this comment played straight in their hands. Obama left a legacy of economic growth and a country on the way back from a depression. Even though he failed to fulfill some of his campaign promises (e.g. closing the prison camp in Guantanamo Bay and decisively ending the American involvement in the middle east), he is still seen by many as symbol for the possibility of change in politics.

7.1 Analysis

The lexical items that I will be looking at in this speech can be found below in table 12. The table does not contain any function words except the ones that were presented in chapter 4.3. Obama uses 40 different words with a frequency of at least 0,20

per 100 words. The speech contains 4792 words, making it the longest of the four speeches in the research.

Table 12: Lexical words and included function words in Obama's 2008 speech

Words by frequency rank	Frequency in occurrences within the whole text	Frequency per 100 words	Words by frequency rank	Frequency in occurrences within the whole text	Frequency per 100 words		
1	I	86	1,78	14	KNOW	15	0,31
2	WE	80	1,66		ME	15	0,31
3	YOU	58	1,20		NEW	15	0,31
4	OUR	57	1,18	15	CARE	13	0,27
5	IT	33	0,68	16	HIS	12	0,25
6	PROMISE	31	0,64		MAKE	12	0,25
7	AMERICA	28	0,58		PRESIDENT	12	0,25
8	US	22	0,46		THEIR	12	0,25
	THEY	22	0,46	17	EVERY	11	0,23
9	MCCAIN	21	0,44		MUST	11	0,23
	HE	21	0,44		NEED	11	0,23
10	YOUR	19	0,39		PEOPLE	11	0,23
11	AMERICAN	18	0,37		WASHINGTON	11	0,23
12	TIME	17	0,35	18	ECONOMY	10	0,21
13	ABOUT	16	0,33		HER	10	0,21
	CHANGE	16	0,33		LET	10	0,21
	COUNTRY	16	0,33		LIVES	10	0,21
	JOHN	16	0,33		NEXT	10	0,21
	KEEP	16	0,33		THEM	10	0,21
	WORK	16	0,33		YEARS	10	0,21

The words that are most commonly used by Obama are *I* (86 occurrences, 1,78%, including occurrences of *I'll*, *I've* and *I'm*), *we* (80 occurrences, 1,66%, including occurrences of *we've*, *we'll* and *we're*), and *our* (57 occurrences, 1,18%). The frequent use of *we* and *our* suggests that one of Obama's main priorities in the speech is to create a sense of unity between him and the audience, and to gather support within his own party, especially among the factions of the party who had supported his opponents in the primary election. As previously mentioned, the reasons for this were discussed at length in chapter 4.2. Additionally, according to Shufeldt (2018) this reconciliatory action is especially important to Democrats, as they are less likely than Republicans to follow the party-line without question. For Obama, it is necessary to convince the Democratic audience that he is the right candidate. Examples of this can be found in

(60) You see, we Democrats have a very different measure of what constitutes progress in this country. (Obama 2008).

(61) [...] this election is our chance to keep, in the 21st century, the American promise alive. (Obama 2008)

You is also used as a way of connecting directly with the audience, to speak directly to them. This is especially evident in how Obama opens his speech, example (62), and how Obama seems to be using *you* to create a familiarity with the audience, which can be seen in example (63). Here, he recognizes the audience, and seems to speak directly to them.

(62) Thank you so much. Thank you very much. (Obama 2008)

(63) But I stand before you tonight because all across America something is stirring. (Obama 2008)

Another interesting detail is that Obama uses *You know*, as in examples (64) and (65). This way of addressing the audience ought to be regarded as quite informal, as it mimics the speech pattern of a conversation where the speaker and the listener have a close relationship, rather than a speech.

(64) You know, this country of ours has more wealth than any nation [...] (Obama 2008).

(65) You know, passions may fly on immigration [...] (Obama 2008)

Bello argues that the use of *you* is meant to create an “air of personal closeness and bond with the addressee with the sole aim of earning their confidence and friendship” (Bello 2013, 94). The examples (64) and (65) correspond extremely well to his findings, as Obama is addressing the audience as if they already were friends.

It is also evident that Obama is not only focusing on the audience that is present, but also on America as a whole. An example of this can be seen in the following sentence:

(66) Because next week, in Minnesota, the same party that brought you two terms of George Bush and Dick Cheney will ask this country for a third. (Obama 2008)

Here, Obama equates *You* with “this country”, as he first clearly addresses the listener, and then tells him or her that the Republican Party will plead to America to give them another chance. It is also implied that the problem that the addressed listener might have faced are also problems that the country as a whole has faced.

The frequent use of *I* indicates that for Obama the speech is a crucial tool to introduce both himself and his platform to the voters.

The platform that the convention provides is especially important to Obama, who at this point was a relatively recently elected senator for Illinois, serving his first term in Washington. It is therefore likely that Obama is rather unknown to the majority of the voters. Evidence of this can, for example, be found in how he introduces himself:

(67) Four years ago, I stood before you and told you my story [...] (Obama 2008)

I is also being used to bring an air of familiarity to the speech. This is especially evident in how Obama in example (68) recounts his political career and tries to explain what motivates him (example (69)):

(68) When I, when I listen to another worker tell me that his factory has shut down, I remember all those men and women on the South Side of Chicago (Obama 2008)

(69) And when I hear a woman talk about the difficulties of starting her own business or making her way in the world, I think about my grandmother, who worked her way up from the secretarial pool to middle management [...] She's the one who put off buying a new car or a new dress for herself so that I could have a better life. She poured everything she had into me. And although she can no longer travel, I know that she's watching tonight and that tonight is her night, as well. (Obama 2008)

However, perhaps the most important use of *I* is as a device of introducing the Obama administration's policies. Once again, Obama's role as a relatively unknown makes the speech an extremely important opportunity for him to introduce his ideas to the masses. It is also feasible to assume that this event is equally important to the Democratic Party, as it is an opportunity to introduce policies as counterweights to eight years of Republican rule under President Bush's administration. This linking between policy and persona can be seen in example (70).

(70) [...] let me spell out exactly what that change would mean if I am president. (Obama 2008)

In this example, Obama attempts to make the listener connect him (and especially him in the role of president) with the changes that his administration wishes to implement. This can also be seen in the examples (71) through (73).

(71) You know, unlike John McCain, I will stop giving tax breaks to companies that ship jobs overseas, and I will start giving them to companies that create good jobs right here in America. (Obama 2008)

(72) I will, listen now, I will cut taxes cut taxes for 95 percent of all working families [...] (Obama 2008)

(73) [...] as president, I will tap our natural gas reserves, invest in clean coal technology, and find ways to safely harness nuclear power. (Obama 2008)

In the three examples above, Obama uses *I will* to make a personal promise to the listener on behalf of his administration. In my opinion, there are two main reasons for this. The option to use *I* is specifically chosen, because *I* is very often connected with “positive realities of achievements” (Bello 2013: 94). In this speech that would mean promises of achievements that are conditional on Obama’s victory, but the principle is the same. Instead of using *we* or *my administration*, Obama puts himself in the center of the voters’ consciousness with the promise that he (and he alone) is the solution to all of America’s problems. The second reason concerns the use of *will*. As *will* is a function word it was excluded in the frequency wordlists. However, in this setting and in combination with *I* it does bring some explanations to the analysis. Using *will* turns the administration’s policies into promises made directly to the voter by Obama himself. *Will* in combination with *I* is also frequently used throughout the speech, which can be seen in table 13.

Table 13: Occurrences of *I will* and *I’ll*

<i>I will</i>	18
<i>I’ll</i>	8
Total	26

I is used as a stand-alone word 86 times in total, as shown in table 12. As seen in table 13, the combination *I will* occurs a total of 18 times. Additionally, there are eight instances of Obama opting to use the contraction *I’ll*, as seen in example (74). This means that combinations *I will* and *I’ll* account for roughly a third of the total number of occurrences.

(74) *I’ll* invest in early childhood education. *I’ll* recruit an army of new teachers, and pay them higher salaries [...] (Obama 2008)

Interestingly, there does not appear to be any system as to when Obama chooses to use *I’ll* instead of *I will*. Although *I will* is more frequently used, *I’ll* is used enough that it is likely not a mistake. An analysis on how Obama chooses to emphasise different words through intonation might give further insight in how and why he chooses one over another.

This use of *will* is also representative of the values expressed in the speech, in that Obama uses the word to make extremely concrete promises on behalf of his administration.

The following feature of the speech that will be looked at is how Obama uses *they* (22 occurrences, 0,46%, including one occurrence of *they'd*), *their* (12 occurrences, 0,25%) and *them* (10 occurrences, 0,21%). Without seeing the context of the words and in what sentences they occur, *they* is on its own used as many times as the *their* and *them* together. By looking at how *they*, *their* and *them* are used, we can find suggestions about how the candidate views the world. Especially, in how he talks about the other side, or 'us versus them'. This is most easily done by looking at if the words are used to express inclusiveness or to exclude any one group of people. Table 14 shows the distribution between inclusive, exclusive and ambiguous statements.

Table 14: The context of *they*, *their* and *them*

	They	Their	Them	Total
Exclusive	2	1	2	5
Inclusive	19	9	5	33
Ambiguous	1	2	3	6
Total	22	12	10	44

As we can see. Obama overwhelmingly uses these words to show inclusiveness. Starting with the least used word, *them*, we can find the following examples of inclusiveness.

(75) It's a promise I make to my daughters when I tuck them in at night and a promise that you make to yours, a promise that has led immigrants to cross oceans [...] (Obama 2008)

(76) I'll recruit an army of new teachers, and pay them higher salaries, and give them more support. (Obama 2008)

In example (75) Obama talks about his daughters and uses *them* both to connect with the audience and as a way of praising the idea of America. I have also opted to count example (76) as inclusiveness, as this is a promise to the audience regarding the American education system. Although Obama talks about teachers as *them*, it is in no way an attempt to see them the as opposition. The two instances where *them* is used in an excluding manner are more interesting, and have very different targets.

(77) [...] we must take out Osama bin Laden and his lieutenants if we have them in our sights. (Obama 2008)

In example (77), Obama talks about Osama bin Laden and Al Qaida, painting them as the important enemy, the enemy that must be dealt with. In this, Obama shows a very clear division between *us* and *them* where *them* is the very real external threat.

(78) [...] he's subscribed to that old, discredited Republican philosophy: Give more and more to those with the most and hope that prosperity trickles down to everyone else. In Washington, they call this the "Ownership Society," but what it really means is that you're on your own. [...] Well, it's time for them to own their failure. It's time for us to change America. And that's why I'm running for president of the United States. You see, you see, we Democrats have a very different measure of what constitutes progress in this country. (Obama 2008)

In this extract, *them* refers to Republicans in general and John McCain in particular, whereas *us* refers to Democrats. Here it is even clearer that there are two sides, and what Obama essentially is saying, is that the Republicans through their economic policies have broken the country and continues to break it through their unwillingness to change. And now it is up to the Democrats (we) to step up and make the necessary changes to create a functioning America. Similarly to how bin Laden (and his lieutenants) are described as an enemy, the Republicans are described as the opposition. However, instead of having to eliminate them, it is the consequences of their actions that need to be erased.

Looking at *their*, the first thing of note is that it is used rather infrequently, and in a very limited context. Half of the total number of occurrences can be found in the following two extracts:

(79) I've seen it I've seen it in the workers who would rather cut their hours back a day, even though they can't afford it, than see their friends lose their jobs (Obama 2008)

(80) Tell that to the military families who shoulder their burdens silently as they watch their loved ones leave for their third, or fourth, or fifth tour of duty. These are not whiners. (Obama 2008)

I have chosen to label these as inclusive for the simple reason that they are used to indirectly refer to segments of the American people. More specifically, the idea of what America is at its core: hardworking, honest and persevering. The same can be seen in the following example as well:

(81) [...] through hard work and sacrifice each of us can pursue our individual dreams, but still come together as one American family, to ensure that the next generation can pursue their dreams, as well. (Obama 2008)

In this extract, there are also hints towards the American Dream, the idea that Hochschild (1995) describes as an almost utopian idea of a nation where anything can happen and anyone can succeed, no matter their background.

Looking at the instances where *their* is used to exclude a group, we can see that it is used in a manner which is similar to how *them* was used. This is exemplified in extracts (82) and (83) below:

(82) Well, it's time for them to own their failure. It's time for us to change America. (Obama 2008)

(83) It's a promise that says the market should reward drive and innovation and generate growth, but that businesses should live up to their responsibilities to create American jobs, to look out for American workers, and play by the rules of the road. (Obama 2008)

The first extract was discussed in reference to *them*, and I will therefore not go into further details when it comes to this sentence. However, the second brings up a new point similar to the American Dream, the American Promise. The importance of the American Promise will be discussed further on in the analysis. Here, Obama seems to make a distinction between (American) businesses and American behaviour. Simply being a business which operates in America is not enough to make it 'one of us' in the same sense that the workers are American workers. Instead, the 'Americanness' (and therefore not being the opposition) becomes conditional of working towards the American promise.

Continuing with the most commonly used word of the three, *they*, we can see that this one is also overwhelmingly used to express inclusiveness. Nineteen out of a total number of 22 occurrences have been classified as inclusive, with two being excluding and another one ambiguous. Starting with the ones labeled as inclusive, we can see that Obama mainly uses *they* when talking about America and Americans, as in the following examples:

(84) Change happens -- change happens because the American people demand it, because they rise up and insist on new ideas and new leadership, a new politics for a new time. (Obama 2008)

(85) Tell that to the military families who shoulder their burdens silently as they watch their loved ones leave for their third, or fourth, or fifth tour of duty. These are not whiners. They work hard, and they give back, and they keep going without complaint. These are the Americans I know. (Obama 2008)

- (86) The men and women who gathered there could've heard many things. They could've heard words of anger and discord. They could've been told to succumb to the fear and frustrations of so many dreams deferred. (Obama 2008)

Example (84) is quite self evident, here *they* directly refers to *the American people*. Interestingly, the *American people* that Obama in this sentence refers to is in reality likely not all of the American people, but rather the part of the public that would vote for him. Instead of labeling it as such, Obama chooses to also incorporate those who would not vote for him and allow these to be included in the praise by making them part of the idea of a unified American community. In the following example, example (85), Obama chooses a very specific group of people (military families) and ascribes to these some traits that are universally seen as 'good': hardworking and persevering. By naming these as Americans, Obama implies that these are common attributes shared by all (or at least the majority of) Americans. This becomes even clearer, as Obama in his speech also speaks of workers in American car factories in the same vein, also giving these the same positive attributes. In the last of these examples, number (86), Obama reflects on the civil rights movement and the speeches by Dr. King. Here *they* is probably not only an allusion to the audience that was present at his rallies, but also all those who at that time (similarly to Obama at this point) were working for change.

Although *they* is mainly used as a synonym for Americans (when used inclusively), there are a couple of instances where it is used differently.

- (87) The men and women who serve in our battlefields may be Democrats and Republicans and independents, but they have fought together, and bled together, and some died together under the same proud flag. They have not served a red America or a blue America; they have served the United States of America. (Obama 2008)

In example (87), *they* is used in a reconciliatory fashion. Here Obama refers to Democrats, Republicans and independents as *they*, and in extension equating all three of these to Americans. This is one of the few truly reconciliatory actions that can be found in how Obama uses *they*, *them* and *their*. Interestingly, he chooses to specifically focus on the three aforementioned groups serving together in the military, perhaps to show that ultimately, they are only facets of a single unified America and that in the end the idea of a united 'us' should triumph over differentiating political ideologies.

- (88) [...] but surely we can agree that our gay and lesbian brothers and sisters deserve to visit the person they love in a hospital and to live lives free of discrimination. (Obama 2008)

The example above is the only time where Obama uses *they* to talk about a group that might be labeled as outsiders, the LGBT-community. Interestingly, this is the same theme that have been seen previously. The focus is on bridging the divide between what the audience might see as “normal” (us) and “abnormal” (they). By claiming that although there might be differences in what we consider to be a marriage, this does not diminish the value of those holding a different opinion. By appealing to feelings, Obama shifts the focus from what differentiates (i.e. sexuality) to what unites (that everybody should have the same basic security).

There are also two instances of when *they* is used in an excluding manner.

These can be found below:

(89) I know there are those who dismiss such beliefs as happy talk. They claim that our insistence on something larger, something firmer, and more honest in our public life is just a Trojan horse for higher taxes and the abandonment of traditional values. (Obama 2008)

(90) In Washington, they call this the ”Ownership Society,” but what it really means is that you’re on your own. (Obama 2008)

In both of the above extracts, the same target can be identified. Obama does not identify an external opposition or threat, instead what he has identified as “the others” (*they*) is the political opposition. Interestingly, it appears that he both attacks the republicans and what we might label as ‘the establishment’. In example (89), it is quite evident that Obama targets the Republican Party. Although this is never explicitly mentioned, it should be clear that “higher taxes” and a fondness for “traditional values” is the calling card of the Republican Party and its core-voters. As previously mentioned, Obama equates *us* and *we* with *Americans*. In extension, this brings into question who *they* are. Nationality-wise they are of course Americans, he brings into question if they ideologically are so.

Ideological differences can also be found in example (90), where Obama differentiates between his campaign (and his administrations policies) and what, according to him, is commonplace in American national politics. The difference between these two extracts is the target. In the second one, it might very well include not only Republicans, but also Democrats. By doing so, he offers himself as an alternative not only to undecided voters, but to voters that might have lost faith in the Democratic Party. This tactic goes hand in hand with his campaign strategy, as one of the main themes for the election campaign (as previously mentioned) was his promise of change. By identifying

the opposition (*they*), and by describing their way of thinking in a simplified way, Obama seems to attempt to set himself apart as a candidate.

Moving on to the value words in the speech, I have identified the following as the most frequently used ones: *promise* (31 occurrences, 0,64%), *America* (28 occurrences, 0,58%, including occurrences of *America's*), *McCain* (20 occurrences, 0,42%), *American* (18 occurrences, 0,37%), *John* (16 occurrences, 0,33), *change* (16 occurrences, 0,33%), *work* (16 occurrences, 0,33%), *country* (16 occurrences, 0,33%) and *economy* (10 occurrences, 0,21%).

These can be divided into four different themes. The first one relates to the future, with the words *promise* and *change*. The second is the words concerning nationality, *America*, *American*. The third theme concerns employment, *work* and *economy*. The final clear group is the one containing words relating to the opposition, *John* and *McCain*.

Starting with the words denoting future, *promise* and *change*, it is clear that this theme is extremely important to Obama and to his campaign. These two words alone account for roughly 1% of the total number of words. Looking at *change*, it is interesting to note that there is a clear indication that the word is often used in a very specific setting, as can be seen in table 15 below. All collocates occurring at least five times within a range of five words (before and after *change*) have been included.

Table 15: Collocates to change

	Total	Left	Right
The	10	7	3
That	9	5	4
We	5	1	4

Some of the examples of these collocates are:

(91) [...] the change we need doesn't come from Washington. Change comes to Washington. (Obama 2008)

(92) And next week, we'll also hear about those occasions when he's broken with his party as evidence that he can deliver the change that we need.

In both of these sentences, Obama speaks of a change that is desperately needed, and that is coming because of him (and in extension the voters in the audience. Interestingly, it

does appear that all instances of *change* are references to either America (as a nation) or the direction of American politics. This can be seen in the following extracts:

(93) It's time for us to change America. And that's why I'm running for president of the United States. You see, you see, we Democrats have a very different measure of what constitutes progress in this country. (Obama 2008)

(94) Change means a tax code that doesn't reward the lobbyists who wrote it, but the American workers and small businesses who deserve it. (Obama 2008).

No matter the target of the change, be it America as a nation or political policies, it is delivered as a promise from Obama (and his administration) to the audience. This leads to the following word denoting the future, *promise*, which is the most commonly used non-pronoun word in the speech.

Again, it seems like this value word is frequently used in a very specific setting, as can be seen from the assortment of collocates in table 16. The table contains collocates to *promise* that occur at least five times. The collocates within a range of five words (before and after *promise*) have been included.

Table 16: Collocates to promise

	Total	Toatal left	Total right
That	27	14	13
The	17	10	7
A	10	8	2
Keep	9	8	1
American	8	6	2
America('s)	6	5	1
We	5	3	2
In	5	2	3
It	5	5	0

As previously mentioned, Obama seems to emphasize what he calls “the American promise”. This can also be seen in table 16, as both *American* and *America's* are featured prominently. The American promise is not a term minted by Obama, and I would argue not even made popular by Obama. In 1965, Lyndon B. Jonson held a speech titled “The American Promise”. In this speech, Jonson decries the inequality concerning voting-rights of coloured people in the southern states, calling it an American problem. Here, he also states that “All men are created equal” and that America is based on an idea of “government by consent of the governed”, which lies at the core of the American

Promise. While the American Dream says that one could become anyone and succeed with anything, the American Promise means that everybody should have the same possibilities to fulfil the American Dream. As can be seen in table 17 below, this is how Obama mainly makes use of the word *promise*.

Table 17: Referents of promise

The American Promise	28
Promise made by Obama	3
Total	31

In 28 out of 31 occurrences, Obama directly or indirectly refers to the idea of an American Promise. An example of each can be found below:

(95) What is that American promise? It's a promise that says each of us has the freedom to make of our own lives what we will, but that we also have obligations to treat each other with dignity and respect. (Obama 2008)

(96) That promise is our greatest inheritance. It's a promise I make to my daughters when I tuck them in at night and a promise that you make to yours, a promise that has led immigrants to cross oceans and pioneers to travel west [...] (Obama 2008)

In example (95), Obama refers to it as the American promise when trying to define it. The voters might have their own idea of what the American promise is, but Obama still chooses to give his own, very brief, description. This is also seen in example (96), where Obama describes what the American promise means, rather than trying to define it even further.

In three cases Obama talks about his (and his campaign's) promises to the voters and the American people, but even in these cases he draws parallels to the American Promise. However, I have opted to separate these from the rest, since these specifically refer to things Obama vows to do for America and for coming generations. In a sense, these are promises to America. This can be seen in extract (97) below.

(97) And we will keep our promise to every young American: If you commit to serving your community or our country, we will make sure you can afford a college education. Now, now is the time to finally keep the promise of affordable, accessible health care for every single American. (Obama 2008)

By vowing to take actions that give the American promise a possibility of being fulfilled, it appears that Obama tries to contrast the American promise with his promises to the

voters. Obama's choice to use *we* is also an interesting, as this might refer to three different entities. The context of the sentence does not make it clear which one. The first possibility is that *we* is used to refer to the Democratic Party and Obama's campaign. Secondly, *we* may refer to himself and Michelle Obama, as she has been previously mentioned in the speech. However, I would argue it is most likely that *we* is used to mean Obama and the audience, thus creating another connection to them. Instead of being something vague and idealistic, it becomes tangible and accessible to everybody in the audience. This would mean that *we* is used to show inclusion.

The second grouping are the words which refer to nationality, *American*, *America* and *America's*. The American promise will make up a great part of these occurrences, but as this has already been discussed the focus will lie on other uses for the words. Table 18 and table 19 (on page 75) respectively show what *American* and *America* (as well as *America's*) refer to. Since it is hard to understand what the word refers to without seeing the context, the data was collected manually.

Table 18: Referents of American

The American people	9
Promise	5
Other noun (nationality)	4
Total	18

In table 18, I have opted to differentiate between occurrences where *American* refers to Americans as a group of people, and where it refers to a non-person noun that is described as American. From the table it becomes clear that Obama makes a conscious effort to emphasize the nationality of those he talks about. This point becomes even clearer when looking at the individual examples, as can be seen in extracts (98) and (99).

(98) [---] I'll make it easier for the American people to afford these new cars. (Obama 2008)

(99) It should ensure opportunity not just for those with the most money and influence, but for every American who's willing to work. (Obama 2008)

In these extracts, Obama refers to both "the American people" and "every American". It is likely that this is a strategy to engage the audience. Talking about something that the audience can identify with, can make them feel that the message is directed at them. The

same strategy can be found in the following sentence, which is an example of *America* being used in combination with a non-person noun.

- (100) We are more compassionate than a government that lets veterans sleep on our streets and families slide into poverty, that sits, that sits on its hands while a major American city drowns before our eyes. (Obama 2008)

Here Obama again draws attention to the fact that the city drowning is American (likely New Orleans during Hurricane Katrina), and how the current government mismanaged the catastrophe. By connecting the city with the audience through its nationality Obama is likely trying to create the feeling that the government has not only let New Orleans down, but America as a whole. No matter what *American* is referring to, people or material things, the reason behind using it remains the same. It is an attempt to create a united front, which anyone can get behind as it is perhaps the most common denominator for anyone who is able to vote in the election. They are all American.

America and *America's* are with a total number of 28 occurrences in the speech more common than *American*. However, these occurrences are even easier to group than *American*, as they are used similarly throughout the speech. This can be seen below in table 19.

Table 19: Referents of *America* and *America's*

Country	23
Promise	5
Total	28

The results are unsurprising, as they reflect what was already shown in the section on the value-word *promise*. Any time Obama mentions *America's* (in total four times), he does so to talk about the American promise. Additionally, he once uses *America* to refer to the same.

More interesting is to look at what Obama attempts to achieve when using *America* to refer to the country. As has already been shown, Obama has so far focused on two main points. Attempting to create a united label which every voter can get behind (as Americans), and to turn this label against the current administration. I have therefore opted to look at the same trends regarding how *America* is used, the results are found in table 20 in the next page. This comparison was done manually, as it is highly dependent

on the context the word occurs in. In this, I have not counted the occurrences of the American promise, as this was already included in table 19.

Table 20: Contexts of America

America as a nation	12
To address the audience	7
America as an ideology	4
Total	23

Perhaps not surprisingly, the most common way that Obama uses America is to refer to the nation as geographical area. This occurs 12 times throughout the speech. For example:

(101) But I stand before you tonight because all across America something is stirring.
(Obama 2008)

From a discursive standpoint, the more interesting occurrences are those where Obama does not use America to refer to the nation in a geographical sense. The second most common use of *America* (with seven occurrences) is to directly address the audience. This way of using *America* can be seen in the following extracts:

(102) America, we cannot turn back. We cannot walk alone. At this moment, in this election, we must pledge once more to march into the future. (Obama 2008)

(103) Tonight, tonight, I say to the people of America, to Democrats and Republicans and independents across this great land: Enough. (Obama 2008)

These occurrences are slightly different in nature. In example (102) Obama directly addresses the audience. Of course, this would demand that the listener identifies him- or herself as part of America. Interestingly, Obama also makes sure to include himself in in this group by using *we*. By doing this, Obama strengthens his connection to the audience by presenting himself as one of them, facing the same tasks and responsibilities. In example (103), Obama addresses the people of America. Likely, he makes this division (between America and people of America) because he in the latter example refers to himself as I. Here it would seem that Obama chooses to emphasise his actions, rather than those of the community.

The last context of *America* is as a unifying theme. A great example can be found in example (104):

(104) They have not served a red America or a blue America; they have served the United States of America. So I've got news for you, John McCain: We all put our country first. (Obama 2008)

As first glance, this might be classified as Obama would be speaking of America in a geographical context. However, I argue that Obama uses *America* to express the idea of a unified America, thus making it a question of ideology. Once again, the aim seems to be to create a common *we*, and to integrate himself with the audience.

The third group are the words concerning employment, *work* (16 occurrences, 0,33%) and *economy* (10 occurrences, 0,21%). It would be reasonable to assume that when Obama speaks about *work*, he would be talking about employment. However, as can be seen in table 21, this does not appear to be the case.

Table 21: Contexts of work

Employment	5
Other	11
Total	16

As shown in the table above, only five of the occurrences concern work as employment. In eleven cases *work* is used to mean making an effort, to function or to work towards something. Because this is not a coherent group, this category will be discounted. To briefly mention *economy*, the mere number of times it is mentioned makes it clear that this is an important feature of the speech. All of the occurrences of the word concern the American economy, which is quite understandable as the financial crisis had struck in 2007 and America was still fighting through a depression. This can for example be seen in the following extracts:

(105) [...] in an economy like this, the last thing we should do is raise taxes on the middle class. (Obama 2008)

(106) He said that our economy has made great progress under this president. He said that the fundamentals of the economy are strong. (Obama 2008)

As can be seen in these examples, Obama uses the economy as way of attacking the current administration. Mainly, this is done by connecting the Bush administration with the state of the economy, as can be seen in (106). However, the economy is also used as a starting point for explaining Obama's policies concerning economy and taxation, as seen in (105).

The fourth and final grouping concerns his opponent, John McCain, and is quite logically represented by the words *John* (16 occurrences, 0,33) *McCain* (20 occurrences, 0,42%). In 15 out of the 16 occurrences, Obama uses *John* in reference to his opponent John McCain, once it is used to talk about John F. Kennedy. All of the 20 occurrences of *McCain* are references to John McCain.

Looking at the collocates directly preceding *McCain* (i.e. L1 collocates), we can find the following:

Table 22: Collocates preceding McCain

John	15
Senator	5
Total	20

As the total number of 15 occurrences where *John* refers to John McCain, this would mean that any time *John* is used, it is also followed by *McCain*. The reason for this can only be speculated on, but it is likely an attempt by Obama to avoid being seen as too familiar with McCain. There are also five instances of *McCain* being prefaced by *Senator*. The connection between *John* and *McCain* means that it is enough to look at the word *McCain* to gain an understanding of how Obama refers to and addresses his opponent.

Table 23: Context of Obama using John/Senator McCain

Referring to	19
Directly addressing	1
Total	20

As seen in table 23 above, Obama is overwhelmingly using the *McCain* (prefaced by *John* or *Senator*) to refer to his opponent. Only once throughout the speech does he address him directly. There does not appear to be any connection between when Obama chooses uses *John* or *Senator* and what he is talking about, except that he opts for *John McCain* when addressing him directly, as in:

(107) So I've got news for you, John McCain: We all put our country first. (Obama 2008)

When Obama refers to McCain, he seems to be introduced as a counterweight to the policies that Obama wishes to implement. This is primarily done by presenting McCain as connected to the Bush administration and as a part of the political establishment in Washington DC. This is quite clear in the two following extracts:

(108) If John McCain wants to follow George Bush with more tough talk and bad strategy, that is his choice [...] (Obama 2008)

(109) But the record's clear: John McCain has voted with George Bush 90 percent of the time. (Obama 2008)

(110) Washington, Washington has been talking about our oil addiction for the last 30 years. And, by the way, John McCain has been there for 26 of them. (Obama 2008)

In extracts (108) and (109), Obama draws clear parallels between the current administration and John McCain, this is done both on what might be labeled as an emotional level (that McCain wants to continue with a harsh rhetoric but not really bring forth any new ideas) and on a factual level (that McCain has voted to support Bush's policies 90% of the time). By connecting his opponent with the current administration in this way, Obama proposes himself as the only option to get something new. The same strategy can be seen in extract (110), where Obama explicitly mentions McCain's long tenure in the senate, and hints at lack of efficiency on his part. Once again, Obama is setting himself up as the new option and the option for the future.

However, it ought to be mentioned that Obama does not personally attack John McCain. Instead he manages to focus his attacks on his policies, and even praise him as a person. This can for example be seen in:

(111) I love this country, and so do you, and so does John McCain. (Obama 2008)

(112) The Republican nominee, John McCain, has worn the uniform of our country with bravery and distinction, and for that we owe him our gratitude and our respect. (Obama 2008)

By refraining from personal insults, Obama steers the audience towards the questions of policies. The implication is not that McCain as a person is unfit to be president, but that his policies, and in extension the policies of the Republican Party, are not the progress that is needed to facilitate change.

7.2 Final notes on Obama

Based on these findings, five main features can be identified in the speech held by Obama.

These are:

1. Obama's frequent use of *we* and *our* suggests that one of the main objectives of the speech is to create a sense of unity between him and the audience and to gather support within his own party. Directly addressing the audience with *you* can be seen as an attempt to achieve the same effect. *We*, *our* and *you* are also frequently used to refer to America and Americans as a whole.
2. *I* is used by Obama to introduce both himself and his policies. It is evident that to Obama, this is one of the most important aims of the speech as he at this point is relatively unknown by many of the voters.
3. Obama mainly uses *they*, *them* and *their* to show inclusiveness, and not to create an 'us versus them' mentality or to exclude a group of people. The main adversary that can be identified is the opposite side in the upcoming elections.
4. The most important theme of the speech is the future. This is mainly represented by the idea of the American promise (i.e. that everybody should have the opportunity to succeed) and that the time for change is now.
5. Obama frequently refers to his opponent in the upcoming election, Republican presidential nominee John McCain. However, the criticism is not aimed at McCain, but rather concerns his policies and closeness to the current administration.

8. Trump's 2016 Speech: "Make America Great Again!"

The fourth and final speech is the one held by Donald J. Trump at the Republican National Convention in Cleveland, Ohio, on the 21st of July, 2016. This last speech consists of 4350 words, including function words. Donald Trump was born in 1948 in New York City, making him considerably older than the previous three candidates. After graduating from the New York Military Academy, Trump entered Fordham University in New York City in 1964. He later transferred to University of Pennsylvania from where he received his Bachelor's degree in economics in 1968 (Viser 2015). He began his career in his father's real-estate company, which he gained control of in 1971; this company is currently known as the Trump Organization. Even though he has made other economic ventures (for example vacation resorts and golf-clubs), the real-estate business seems to remain Donald Trump's number one priority and main income source (Kelly 2015).

Trump did partially run on a platform of self-promotion, painting himself as the business executive and CEO that America desperately needs to get its economy going, comparing the country to a company. This was primarily done through citing his own success with his real estate business (and elsewhere), calling himself a self-made billionaire. His claims of his economic prowess have however been disputed multiple times. For example by Ehrenfreund (2015), who cites numbers from both Forbes and Bloomberg, claims that Trump is not a billionaire because of his career in real estate, but rather in spite of it. Naturally, we cannot find out about the true state of Trump's finances, as he has so far only released a financial disclosure and refuses to release his tax returns. However, Ehrenfreund (2015) goes even further and claims that the only reason for Trump's limited success is his reliance on others. Although a number of his businesses have gone bankrupt, Trump has never personally taken a great financial hit, which have instead been absorbed by lenders and taxpayers. However, another large part of his reputation as an executive, according to Ehrenfreund (2015), is both his and his father's success in securing taxpayer subsidiaries. Nevertheless, and despite the evidence to the contrary, Trump still argues that his skills as a businessman (and as a negotiator) are essential for boosting the American economy.

Trump's previous experiences of politics are minimal, even compared to the other candidates discussed in this study (although they rightfully should be considered political outsiders, all of them have some political experience). In 2000, Trump attempted to receive a nomination to run in the presidential election for the Reform Party, a party which he had joined the previous year. Ultimately, he failed to gain this nomination and

withdrew his candidacy (Kelly 2015). During the Obama administration, Trump started to take the role of an agitator and an outspoken critic of the Obama administration. Kelly (2015) explicitly mentions his insistence that Obama's birth certificate was falsified, which shows that he created a role for himself as an agitator.

The presidential election campaign of 2016 was considerably less focused on policies than the previous ones discussed, which might have been a conscious strategy by Trump and his campaign team. It should be clear to most that Trump's opponent, Hillary Clinton, had a clear advantage in political experience. This meant that, as the self-proclaimed outsider, Trump had to focus on something else than political experience. Due to this, the campaigns (especially the one run by Donald Trump), came to focus on the personalities of the candidates and their accomplishments outside of politics. Cosgrove (2016) calls this phenomenon emotional branding. According to him, this type of branding has a high probability to build deep brand loyalty. If we transfer this brand loyalty to this setting, we get an audience which is highly loyal to their candidate, almost cheering on as if he or she were a sports star. Additionally, this type of branding has the power to *go viral* on social media. When this happens, the spread of the message increases exponentially, while the cost of advertisement would remain relatively stable. In any case, it would not increase at the same rate as the spread.

In addition to his self-promotion and the failing American economy, Trump's election campaign focused on national security and immigration (for a discussion on the wall to Mexico, see for example Winders 2016). The war on terror was also featured prominently in Trump's campaign. Here, according to Reese (2016), he effectively appealed to fear and managed to link the fear of terrorism to the fear of 'the others'. In connection with the issue of the American economy, Trump almost as an afterthought focused on the climate policies of the United States, but once again he mainly connects these to their harmful effects on the US economy. For example, Trump has sought to cancel the Paris Climate Agreement (and is at the time this thesis is being written attempting to withdraw the USA from it). Additionally, he has expressed a wish to stop all payments to the U.N. global warming programs (Hudson 2016). One explanation to Trump's unwillingness to focus on climate change might have to do with the previous administration. As Boussalis (2016) explains, the Obama administration made a conscious effort to treat climate change as a key question and as a legacy issue. By distancing himself from this issue, Trump also automatically distances himself from the previous administration. Additionally, not prioritizing climate change as an issue might

get him financial backers from industries that would be harmed by stricter regulations. For example, the car and coal industries.

As with the previous speeches, we should also consider the effects of the media and the online (digital) campaigns of the candidate(s). One feature, which seems to be somewhat unique for this campaign, is that the media failed to stay objective, especially when it came to discussing Mr. Trump. For example, Carlson (2016) writes that many news outlets supporting the Democratic Party treated him not as a legitimate candidate, but rather as some sort of entertainment and an impossible candidate right up until he was nominated by the Republican Party. This behaviour might however have its own explanation, as the campaign has also been called a fact-free one. Van Aelst (2016) argues that the media has no idea how to treat Trump, and in combination with voters finding "the real truth" in settings where confirmation bias is widespread, the role of traditional media is diminished. Carlson and Lewis (2016, 78) label this phenomenon as a "filter bubble election". However, Kreiss (2016) claims that social media has given these fringe groups a new space to gather and share ideas but did not create the audience for this. However, he does concede that it may "increase the speed of half-truths, rumors, and outright lies" (Kreiss 2016, 75).

8.1 Analysis

The lexical items that I will be looking at in this speech can be found below in table 24. The table does not contain any function words except the ones that were presented in chapter 4.3. 38 different words reach a frequency of at least 0,20 per 100 words. The speech contains 4415 words.

Table 24: Lexical words and included function words in Trumps 's 2016 speech

Words by frequency rate	Frequency in occurrences within the whole text	Frequency per 100 words	Words by frequency rate	Frequency in occurrences within the whole text	Frequency per 100 words		
1	OUR	94	2,13	19	CLINTON	11	0,25
2	I	72	1,63		EVERY	11	0,25
3	WE	61	1,38		MAKE	11	0,25
4	AMERICA	30	0,68		NATION	11	0,25
5	IT	29	0,66		VIOLENCE	11	0,25
6	THEIR	28	0,63		YOUR	11	0,25
7	COUNTRY	25	0,57	20	HILLARY	10	0,23
8	YOU	21	0,48		HE	10	0,23
9	GOING	17	0,39		OPPONENT	10	0,23
10	THEY	16	0,36		PRESIDENT	10	0,23
11	AMERICANS	15	0,34		TONIGHT	10	0,23
12	PEOPLE	15	0,34		WORK	10	0,23
13	AMERICAN	14	0,32		WORLD	10	0,23
	SHE	14	0,32	21	CITIZENS	9	0,20
	THEM	14	0,32		IMMIGRATION	9	0,20
14	HER	13	0,29		LAW	9	0,20
	TRADE	13	0,29		NEW	9	0,20
18	AGAIN	12	0,27		SYSTEM	9	0,20
					TIME	9	0,20
					YEAR	9	0,20

In the speech by Trump, the three most commonly used words are *our* (94 occurrences, 2,13%), *I* (72 occurrences, 1,63%, including occurrences of *I'm* and *I've*) and *we* (61 occurrences, 1,38%). Combined, these three words make up roughly five percent of the total number of words. This would appear to be a disproportionately large amount, and the impact these words have on the tone and content of the speech cannot be overstated.

Starting with the far most commonly used word, *our*, it is possible to find out what Trump refers to as *our* by looking at the collocates to the word, primarily collocates directly following *our* (i.e. R1 collocates). The results are found in table 25 below:

Table 25: Collocates directly following our

Country	17
Nation	5
Citizens	4
Laws	4

The table shows a clear pattern that is emerging. It is quite evident that Trump is focused on emphasizing nationality, with 17 occurrences of *our country*, five occurrences of *our nation* and four occurrences of *our citizens*. Table 25 shows the all of the R1 collocates among collocates that occurred at least five times. Examples of these occurrences can be found in the following extracts:

- (113) Together, we will lead our party back to the White House, and we will lead our country back to safety [...] (Trump 2016)
- (114) Our Convention occurs at a moment of crisis for our nation. The attacks on our police, and the terrorism in our cities, threaten our very way of life. Any politician who does not grasp this danger is not fit to lead our country. (Trump 2016)
- (115) I only want to admit individuals into our country who will support our values and love our people. (Trump 2016)

From these examples, it is quite evident that Trump attempts to cultivate a sense of community. Interestingly, his definition of who should be included is *our* seems to be quite narrow. This is for example expressed in extract (113), where Trump explicitly talks about *our party*, in other words, the Republican Party. It is likely that this is of crucial importance to Trump, as he is in fact a quite new member of the Republican Party. Similarly, in extract (114) Trump specifically mentions *our convention*. Further on in the speech, Trump also twice mentions *our movement*, which should bring additional support this hypothesis. Trump's focus on integrating himself with the voters of the Republican Party will be revisited at a later stage of the analysis.

Another effect of the use of *our*, and especially the repeated use of it, is that it establishes a picture of 'us versus them', and that which is ours is under attack. While he does not specifically name the opposing side, he hints at it in extract (115), where he proposes to only let people (foreigners) in who share the same values and who love the American people.

This frequent use of *our* also allows Trump to invite the audience and let them feel like they are a part of his campaign, and because of this be a part of the solution that he is promising. Interestingly, this use of *our* does not necessarily encompass all Americans, but instead it seems to target a specific group of voters. He gives a voice to those that already feel as if the very idea of America is threatened, and through this speech Trump tries to further integrate himself with this group.

A similar eagerness in how Trump seeks to include the audience can also be found in how he opts to make use of *we*. This is quite clearly shown in table 26 below.

Table 26: Collocates directly following *we*

Will	22
Are	12
Must	7
Have	3

As in table 25, only collocates that occur at least five times in total have been counted. The combination with *we* that is most commonly used by Trump is *we will*. In total, there are 86 occurrences of *will*, these were not included in table 24 as *will* was labeled as a function word. Nevertheless, it is interesting to note that roughly 25% of the occurrences of *will* are prefaced by *we*. This combination can for example be found in extract 110. This is especially interesting, as it can be found in the second sentence of the speech. This means that right from the beginning of the speech, Trump is likely actively working to include the audience in his actions. This interpretation is supported by Sheibman's (2004) research, where she claims that an inclusive interpretation of *we* most often relates to the future, and future actions taken by the speaker. Looking for further occurrences of *we will*, the following examples can be found:

- (116) We will build the roads, highways, bridges, tunnels, airports, and the railways of tomorrow. (Trump 2016)
- (117) We will completely rebuild our depleted military [...] (Trump 2016)
- (118) We Will Make America Strong Again. We Will Make America Proud Again. We Will Make America Safe Again. And We Will Make America Great Again. (Trump 2016)

Extracts (116) and (117) are interesting in how extremely concrete the promises are that Trump makes audience. These are concepts that are easy to understand, to build and rebuild. Additionally, Trump makes sure to include the audience in these promises and makes them part of the solution. By building on this relationship, Trump gives the impression that the audience's votes will count towards the change that Trump envisions. In extract (118), Trump utters the almost iconic slogan *Make America Great Again*, which he begun trademarking in 2012 (Tumulty 2017). While this is a potent slogan on its own, in the light of this speech it becomes even more so. While critics have accused it of being backward looking and divisive (Tumulty 2017), it serves its function well. In combination with the frequent use of *our* and *we*, it becomes less of a statement or an urging, which it

is as a stand-alone sentence. Instead, Trump turns *Make America Great Again* into promise as to what Trump and his supporters will achieve during his time in office.

It is also beneficial to contrast how Trump uses *we* with how he uses *I*. When looking at the pattern connected to *I*, the following emerges:

Table 27: Collocates to I

	Directly preceding	Directly following
And	4	
That	3	
It	1	
Have		16
Will		14
Take		13
Am		6
'm		4

Due to the limited scope of this analysis, Table 27 only shows the words directly before and after *I* (i.e. the L1 and R1 collocates) and as previously only collocates that occur at least five times in total have been counted. Nevertheless, there are four collocates which stand out, these are *have*, *will*, *take* and *am/'m*. These all occur directly after *I*, and in contrast to the collocates directly preceding *I*, make up a sizeable percentage of all collocates. I have therefore opted to focus on these, and on the lack of collocates prefacing *I*. This will be discussed further on in the analysis.

Starting with *I will*, it is evident that this is being used in a manner which is similar to how *we will* is used. The difference between these two, is that when Trump opts to use *I will*, he makes a promise directly to the audience. This can be shown by looking at the collocates of *I will*. *You* is the most common collocate, with a total of two occurrences before and five after *I will*. This can for example be seen in the extracts below:

(119) Tonight, I will share with you my plan of action for America. (Trump 2016)

(120) I'm With You, and I will fight for you, and I will win for you. (Trump 2016)

It would appear that when there is a clear counterpart (in these examples *you*) Trump chooses to make personal promises using *I*, whereas when he makes a more general statement regarding policies, he prefers to use *we*. This strategy might be explained by

Bull and Fetzer, who write “[through] *we*, mass speakers can display participation and commitment by the pragmatic strategies of over-inclusion” (2006: 15). This over-inclusion can be seen quite clearly throughout the speech by Trump, as it allows him to make promises on behalf of the audience, while he is in fact talking about things he (and his administration) will work towards.

The small variety of collocates preceding *I* is also interesting, and can be explained by the fact that Trump seems to use *I* as a way of starting a sentence or a clause, as can be seen in extract (121):

(121) [---]. I am your voice. I have embraced crying mothers who have lost their children because our politicians put their personal agendas before the national good. I have no patience for injustice, no tolerance for government incompetence [...] (Trump 2016)

In this extract, the three sentences all start with *I*. This is likely a conscious choice by Trump, as it puts him at the forefront of the statement. Old information is generally placed at the beginning of a sentence, which might explain this. In the example above, *I* is the old information (as the audience logically would assume that Trump is talking about and introducing himself and his policies), while what he has done and achieved is presented as new information. The same structure can be found in extract (122) below:

(122) I have made billions of dollars in business making deals [...] (Trump 2016).

Once again, the known information (*I*) is presented at the beginning of the sentence, whereas the new information (that he has made billions of dollars) is presented as new information. Extracts (121) and (122) are also excellent examples of how Trump chooses to use *I have*. *I have* is used by Trump in two similar ways; to emphasise his personal actions, as in extract (121), and to highlight his personal achievements, as in extract (122). These instances should both be seen as Trump introducing himself to the audience and the voters by introducing a more personal side of himself.

As could be seen in Table 27, there are a total of ten occurrences of Trump using *I am* or *I'm*. I have opted to not differentiate between uses of *I'm* and *I am* as these essentially carry the same meaning. There does appear to be two distinct ways in which Trump employs *I am* and *I'm*, which can be found in extracts (123) and (124).

(123) In this race for the White House, I am the Law And Order candidate. (Trump 2016)

(124) I have made billions of dollars in business making deals – now I’m going to make our country rich again. I am going to turn our bad trade agreements into great ones. (Trump 2016)

In example (123), Trump uses *I am* to directly talk about himself and his credentials (in claiming that he is the law and order candidate). In contrast to *I have*, *I am* is not used to present Trump’s personal achievements, but to display his values. In extract (124), Trump uses *I’m going to* and *I am going to* to make a promise of how he personally will develop the economy. This promise becomes even more personal, as he first mentions his success as a businessman, with the implication that the same skill can be applied to benefit the country as a whole.

The next feature from Trump’s speech that will be looked at is how he chooses to indicate exclusiveness and inclusiveness using *their* (28 occurrences, 0,63%), *they* (16 occurrences, 0,36%), *them* (14 occurrences, 0,32%). The results are can be seen in table 28 below:

Table 28: Contexts of *their*, *they* and *them*

	Their	They	Them	Total
Exclusive	9	7	0	16
Inclusive	16	5	11	32
Ambiguous	3	4	3	10
Total	28	16	14	58

Starting with the most commonly used word of these, *their*, it is clear that while Trump primarily uses this word to show inclusiveness, it is also frequently used to indicate or showcase ‘the other side’. When *their* is used to show inclusiveness, it is mainly done as a way of talking about groups of Americans, as can be seen in the examples below:

(125) These wounded American families have been alone. But they are alone no longer. Tonight, this candidate and this whole nation stand in their corner to support them, to send them our love, and to pledge in their honor that we will save countless more families from suffering the same awful fate. (Trump 2016)

(126) My pledge reads: “I’m with you, the American people.” I am your voice. So to every parent who dreams for their child, and every child who dreams for their future, I say these words to you tonight [...] (Trump 2016)

In extract (125), Trump talks about American families who have been affected by violence committed by, according to Trump, illegal immigrants. Apart from using *their*

to emphasise Americans, this also contributes to a setting in which Trump specifically and emphatically targets a certain group, painting them as the opposition. In extract (126), the emphasis on American is perhaps even more obvious. Trump clearly talks about American parents and American children.

Looking at the occurrences of *their* that are used to indicate exclusion, the following examples can be found:

- (127) This includes stopping China's outrageous theft of intellectual property, along with their illegal product dumping, and their devastating currency manipulation. (Trump 2016)
- (128) Big business, elite media and major donors are lining up behind the campaign of my opponent [...]. They are throwing money at her because they have total control over everything she does. She is their puppet, and they pull the strings. (Trump 2016)
- (129) So if you want to hear the corporate spin, the carefully-crafted lies, and the media myths the Democrats are holding their convention next week. (Trump 2016)

In these three extracts there are three different entities which Trump labels as "the others". The first one of these is found in extract (127), where Trump specifically mentions China's theft of intellectual property, and China's product dumping. That Trump specifically targets China is less important than the fact that he names and targets a country at all. By specifically mentioning a country that, allegedly and according to Trump, is harming American interests, he creates an extremely tangible and recognizable enemy which the audience can blame. In the following extract, extract (128), Trump attacks businesses, media and donors who support his opponent, Hillary Clinton, by claiming that she is a puppet to these. By doing this, Trump suggests that Mrs. Clinton, big business and the elite media are one and the same. And naturally these are all on the opposing side from what Trump has labeled as *we*, i.e. (as previously discussed) true Americans who will fix the country. The last opponent that can easily be identified from these examples can be found in extract (129), where Trump targets the Democratic Party as a whole, who he labels as corporate shills (i.e. someone who publicly gives credibility to an organization without disclosing that they have an affiliation with said organization) who in collusion with the media will lie to the public. Through these examples, it is easy to see that Trump identifies both domestic and international entities as what he sees as 'the other'.

Looking at how Trump uses *they*, it becomes clear that it is primarily employed to show exclusion, with seven such occurrences against five to show inclusion and four ambiguous. Starting with the inclusive *they*, it is once again clear that Trump uses it to indicate a select group of Americans, as can be seen in the example below:

(130) We will take care of our great Veterans like they have never been taken care of before. (Trump 2016)

In the extract above, Trump specifically mentions veterans, and since he specifically mentions *our veterans* this should be understood as American veterans. The same goes for the rest of the occurrences of *they*: American is never specifically mentioned, but can be understood from the context which they occur in.

When Trump uses *they* to express exclusion, there seem to be two different targets. The first can be found in extract (128) on the previous page, and the second one in (131) below.

(131) [...] there's no way to screen these refugees in order to find out who they are or where they come from. (Trump 2016)

Extract (128) concerned, as previously mentioned, the opposition in the election and the interest that (according to Trump) is behind it. This furthers strengthens the picture of a divided America, where Trump labels the opposition as decidedly un-American. In extract (131), Trump finds a new target in immigrants. In this extract, he names them *refugees*, and while the choice of words could otherwise be seen as an attempt to convey compassion for their plight, this time it is used to show that *they* are different from Americans. Additionally, as they are different and their background is unsure, they are also unsafe.

In contrast with the previous words discussed, *them* is used primarily to show inclusiveness, and not at all to indicate exclusion. Looking at the occurrences of *them*, the word is mainly used to indicate a segment of the American society that Trump is proclaiming to be working for or with. Examples of this can be found below:

(132) I've been honored to receive the endorsement of America's Border Patrol Agents, and will work directly with them to protect the integrity of our lawful immigration system. (Trump 2016)

(133) This Administration has failed America's inner cities. It's failed them on education. It's failed them on jobs. It's failed them on crime. It's failed them at every level. (Trump 2016)

In extract (132), Trump talks about his endorsement by the border patrol agents of America, who he swears that he will work closely with. In this case, *them* refers to a very specific group of Americans. Arguably the most important part of this is that they work close to an issue Trump feels strongly about, immigration, and through this Trump likely seeks to show the audience and the voters that he and ‘the professionals’ stand united on the issue. In extract (133), *them* is used to refer to the inner cities of America. Although the inner cities are not physically a group of Americans, the statement should be understood as the inhabitants of said inner cities, inhabitants who Trump will work for. In this extract, Trump again reaches out to a specific group (similarly to extract (122), where he reaches out to those who have been negatively affected by immigration). Once again the message is that he (in contrast to his opponent and previous administrations) will work for them. This creates a sense of community and belonging, where Trump tells the group that they are his priority, and that a victory for him will be a victory for them.

As it has been made clear that Trump chooses to clearly define ‘us and them’, i.e. true Americans and the rest, it is logical to continue by looking at how he employs the words *America* (30 occurrences including five occurrences of *America’s*, 0,68%), *Americans* (15 occurrences, 0,34%), and *American* (14 occurrences, 0,32%). While these words rightfully should be included in the part on the value words, due to their prominence they deserve to be treated as a group of their own in regard to inclusiveness and exclusiveness. In connection with this, I have also briefly looked at how Trump uses *country* (25 occurrences, 0,57%) and *nation* (11 occurrences, including two occurrences of *nation’s*, 0,25%).

Starting with *America*, the following collocates can be found:

Table 29: Collocates to America

	Total	Left	Right
To	12	8	4
We	9	5	4
And	9	3	6
Will	8	8	0
The	7	4	3
Of	7	3	4
Make	6	6	0
Is	5	5	0

Table 29 shows the collocates occurring at least five times, located one to five words before or after *America*. The words that immediately stand out are *we*, *will* and *make*. As previously shown in the analysis of *we*, the utterance *we will make America* is used frequently. This pattern becomes even clearer when looking at clusters surrounding *America*. The cluster *we will make* occurs six times, whereas *will make America* occurs five times. This shows that Trump primarily uses *America* as a concept which he can rally the voters around. This becomes even more evident when looking closer at the individual examples, as can be seen in extract (134):

(134) It is time to show the whole world that America Is Back – bigger, and better and stronger than ever before. (Trump 2016)

In this extract, Trump describes America as being on the way back to the top. Although this sentence does not contain the urging to make America great again, it does propose that America is something that each and every American can be proud of.

When looking at *American* and *Americans*, the following collocates can be found:

Table 30: Collocates to American

The	9
People	5

Table 31: Collocates to Americans

All	8
For	5

In table 30, it becomes evident that the most commonly used collocates (located one to five words before or after) of *American* are *the* with nine occurrences, and *people* with five occurrences. This would mean that when using *American*, Trump primarily talks about the American public. This is further supported by the cluster *the American people* which occurs five times. However, there are also other instances where *American* is used to refer to a certain part of the audience, as can be seen in (135) and (136):

(135) These wounded American families have been alone. (Trump 2016)

(136) My opponent would rather protect education bureaucrats than serve American children. (Trump 2016)

In these extracts, Trump specifically mentions *American families* and *American children*, this allows him to further emphasize ‘Americanness’. In extract (135) Trump contrasts the American families who have been affected by violence done by immigrants with all immigrants, and in (136) he contrasts American children with Hillary Clinton and

bureaucrats. This means that not only is Trump promoting Americanness, but he is also once again singling out those who he deems to be un-American.

When it comes to *Americans*, there is an interesting shift in Trump's rhetoric. Table 31 shows that the most common collocate is *all* with a total number of eight occurrences, six of these occur directly in front of *Americans*. This would mean that, in contrast to what was found in table 30, Trump directly refers to and tries to reach all Americans. This can for example be seen in the following extract:

(137) This new wealth will improve the quality of life for all Americans [...] (Trump 2016)

In this, Trump seems to be speaking to all Americans, regarding what he will provide for them once he is elected.

When speaking about *country*, Trump is also evidently using it as a synonym for America. This can be seen by the collocates, of which *our* is the most commonly used one with a total number of 19 occurrences. In 18 occurrences of these *our* is located directly in front of *country*, forming the cluster *our country*. Additionally, Trump also uses *country* as a synonym for Americans, as seen in extract (138) below:

(138) We will be a country of generosity and warmth. But we will also be a country of law and order. (Trump 2016)

Once again, Trump deliberately tries to engage with the audience by indirectly addressing them to include them in the speech. This can be seen both in the extract above, and in that he opts for using *our country* to mean America.

The same strategy can be seen in how Trump uses *nation* to represent America. *Our* is used five times as a collocate, and directly precedes *nation* on every occasion. An example of this can be found below:

(139) Our Convention occurs at a moment of crisis for our nation. (Trump 2016)

This extract is especially interesting, as Trump seems to be using *our* to mean two different things. As previously discussed, *our convention* is used to refer to the Republican Party and the Republican voters. However, in *our nation* Trump might also include all Americans. This interpretation is also strengthened by the fact that Trump seems to be keen on including all of America in *nation*, as can be seen below:

(140) Tonight, this candidate and this whole nation stand in their corner to support them [...] (Trump 2016)

Here, *nation* is used to signify Americans and the American people, further emphasizing a united America under his rule.

Lastly, let's look at the value-words used by Trump. These can be divided into three different categories. These are: *a.* the Opponent, *b.* the Economy and *c.* Law and order. The first of these categories, the opponent, concerns Trump's tactic of targeting Hillary Clinton, and is represented by the words *she* (14 occurrences, 0,32), *her* (13 occurrences, 0,29%), *Hillary* (10 occurrences, 0,23 %), *Clinton* (11 occurrences, including two occurrences of *Clinton's*, 0,25 %) and *opponent* (10 occurrences, 0,23%). The following category, the Economy, is represented by the words *trade* (13 occurrences, 0,29%) and *work* (10 occurrences, 0,23%). The final grouping, Law and order, contains the words *violence* (11 occurrences, 0,25%), *immigration* (9 occurrences, 0,2%) and *law* (9 occurrences, 0,2%).

Additionally, *make* could have been included as a fourth stand-alone category, but I have opted to not include it as this word already has been discussed in connection with the personal pronouns.

As already has been shown (for example when looking at *they*), Trump is actively referring to his opponent, Hillary Clinton, throughout the speech. The sheer number of such references makes this an important feature.

It is an assumption that *she* and *her* are being used to refer to Hillary Clinton. However, who the words refer to can only be distinguished by looking at the context which they appear in. The results can be found in table 32 below:

Table 32: Contexts of she and her

	She	Her
Hillary Clinton	10	12
Trump's mother	3	
Sarah Root	1	1
Total	14	13

As can be seen from table 32, *she* and *her* are overwhelmingly used by Trump to refer to Hillary Clinton. *She* and *her* are also used to talk about Sarah Roote, a Nebraska student who was killed by an illegal immigrant, presumably to include a sense of familiarity to the debate and to appeal to the audiences feelings. It allows the listener to imagine themselves in a negative situation caused by immigration. Therefore, the next step is to

look at how Trump refers to Clinton. Due to the (relatively) limited number of occurrences, it is not feasible to look at collocates to see where or how these words occur. Instead, it becomes necessary to delve deeper into the text, and look at the context in which the words occur, and, this comparison has to be done manually. The same also applies to *Hillary*, *Clinton* and *opponent*, as these also occur quite unfrequently. Only the occurrences of *she* and *her* which are references to Mrs. Clinton have been included. The occurrences of *Hillary* and *Clinton* have been combined into one, as these always occur together when *Clinton* is used to refer to Trump's opponent. Note that *Clinton* is also used once to refer to Bill Clinton, and that this is not included in the table below. The results from this contextual comparison can be found below in table 33.

Table 33: *The context of she, her, Hillary, Clinton and opponent*

	Her	She	Hillary Clinton	Opponent
Negative	12	10	10	10
Positive	0	0	0	0
Neutral	0	0	0	0
Total	12	10	10	10

As show, Trump refers without exceptions to his opponent in a negative context. It is not a surprise that Hillary Clinton would mainly be referred to in this way, but that she is being portrayed solely in a negative light is quite extraordinary.

Looking at how Trump talks about Mrs. Clinton, some common denominators can be found in how she is described. Starting with *her*, the following examples can be found:

- (141) Her bad instincts and her bad judgment, something pointed out by Bernie Sanders [...] (Trump 2016)
- (142) My opponent asks her supporters to recite a three-word loyalty pledge. It reads: "I'm With Her". (Trump 2016)

As can be seen in extracts (141) and (142) the focus seems to be on highlighting (what Trump sees as) negative attributes or personality traits, not on her political track-record. This is especially evident in example (141), where Trump discusses Clinton's instincts and judgement. However, he also takes a swing at her campaign slogan, *I'm with her*, which he undermines by describing it as a way for Clinton to make the voters pledge allegiance to her. While this use of *her* is meant to be seen in a positive light, as it is her

campaign slogan, Trump manages to distort the meaning of it and show it in a negative light. Out of 12 occurrences of *her*, the pronoun is used only once to strictly refer to Clinton's policies or political agenda.

Contrary to how Trump used *her*, *she* appears to mainly be used to talk about Clinton's perceived professional failures, as seen below:

- (143) She supported the job killing trade deal with South Korea. She has supported the Trans-Pacific Partnership. The TPP will not only destroy our manufacturing, but it will make America subject to the rulings of foreign governments. (Trump 2016)

In this extract, Trump connects Hillary Clinton with the Trans-Pacific Partnership, which in his opinions will be extremely harmful to American interests. The question is not whether the TPP truly is harmful or not, and many in the audience might not even know what the TPP is, the main point is that Trump labels it as harmful. However, there are also some instances where *she* is used to refer negatively to Clinton in a fashion which is not connected with her political track record. This concerns the controversy regarding Clinton's handling of her e-mails and, as seen in the segment below, accusations of her being a puppet for Wall Street:

- (144) They are throwing money at her because they have total control over everything she does. She is their puppet, and they pull the strings. (Trump 2016)

The words *Hillary* and *Clinton* will not be looked at separately, as these two always occur in connection with each other. This is in itself interesting, as it is likely an attempt by Trump to distance himself from his opponent by not referring to her using solely her first name. Once again, it appears that Trump's main focus lies on discrediting Hillary Clinton's political background and career, which can be seen in the extracts below:

- (145) We must abandon the failed policy of nation building and regime change that Hillary Clinton pushed in Iraq, Libya, Egypt and Syria. (Trump 2016)

- (146) While Hillary Clinton plans a massive tax increase, I have proposed the largest tax reduction of any candidate [...]

Extract (145) concerns her previous tenure as Secretary of State, to which Trump appears to credit the current instabilities in Middle East and North Africa. Additionally, in extract (146) Trump criticizes Clinton's campaign promises and contrasts these to his own plans. In this way, Trump attempts to further set himself apart from Clinton and her campaign and present himself as the safe alternative. Although the criticism using *Hillary*

Clinton is mainly focused on Clinton's policies and track-record, the harshest condemnation of Clinton can also be found in this group:

(147) This is the legacy of Hillary Clinton: death, destruction and weakness. (Trump 2016)

While he does not provide any proof for this development, by labeling Clinton's legacy as one of death and destruction Trump clearly appeals to the emotional side of the audience. This also makes it hard to define whether this is an attack on Clinton's policies or on her as a person. While this perceived American decay must come from the Clinton administration's policies, the statement is ultimately an attack on Clinton herself.

The final word, *opponent*, is also primarily used by Trump to highlight Clinton's campaign promises, as can be seen in the segments (148) and (149) below. Additionally, *opponent* is also used by Trump to talk about Clinton's previous political engagement.

(148) My opponent wants to essentially abolish the 2nd amendment. I, on the other hand [...] (Trump 2016)

(149) My opponent, on the other hand, wants to put the great miners and steel workers of our country out of work, that will never happen when I am President. (Trump 2016)

Another common feature of these extracts, which can also be found in a number of other places, is Trump's clear attempt to set Hillary Clinton up as the antithesis to himself. Primarily, this can be seen in his use of *on the other hand*, where he presents both his own and Clinton's campaign promises, while naturally painting his own in a more favourable light. *Opponent* is in itself also an emotionally charged word, as it presupposes that there are two sides.

Category *b.*, the Economy, is represented by the words *trade* and *work*. Although these are used quite infrequently, their presence is important due to the fact that much of Trump's campaign revolves around how he will revitalize the American economy and renegotiate unfavourable trade deals. Once again, the limited number of occurrences hinders the use of patterns, clusters or collocates. Instead, a manual check of the occurrences is needed.

Starting by looking at *trade*, Trump's emphasis on trade agreements becomes quite clear. In eight out of the total number of 13 occurrences *trade* is used to refer to either a trade agreement, a trade deal, or a trade policy, for example in the extracts below:

- (150) Our horrible trade agreements with China and many others, will be totally renegotiated. (Trump 2016)
- (151) America has lost nearly-one third of its manufacturing jobs since 1997, following the enactment of disastrous trade deals supported by Bill and Hillary Clinton. (Trump 2016)

These two examples are quite typical of how Trump chooses to present the current trade situation. The premise is primarily that America is suffering due to unfair trade agreements. In other words, Trump once again finds an external enemy (for example, China in extract (150)). However, he does not lay the blame squarely on America's trading partners, as the main culprit is identified in example (151), namely previous Democratic administrations. Naturally, these agreements will be re-negotiated to benefit America once Trump is elected. Once again, the idea of "making America great again" is clearly visible.

The second word in this category, *work*, is primarily not used to mean employment. Out of ten occurrences, *work* is only once used to mean employment. When it is used in this way, Trump is describing people who (due to bad trade agreements) have lost their jobs. Instead, the word is primarily used to describe the job Trump will do, and who he will *work with* and *work for*.

The final category, category *c.*, Law and order, is talked about using the words *violence*, *immigration* and *law*. Similarly to the words concerning the economy, these words occur relatively few times. However, they are important because of the Trump campaign's focus on immigration and security.

Let's start with the most commonly used word of the three, *violence*. By looking at the individual occurrences of *violence* in the speech, there are two main arguments that are brought forward by Trump. These are that violence is plaguing America, and that the cause of this violence can be found abroad. Examples of this rhetoric can be found in extracts (152) and (153) below:

- (152) Americans watching this address tonight have seen the recent images of violence in our streets and the chaos in our communities. Many have witnessed this violence personally, some have even been its victims. (Trump 2016)
- (153) We are going to build a great border wall to stop illegal immigration, to stop the gangs and the violence [...] (Trump 2016)

In extract (152), Trump seems to try to bring the violence to the audience by focusing on the communities affected, and by claiming that many have fallen victim to this violence.

This seems to be an attempt to cultivate a notion of a country in decline. In extract (153) Trump identifies the causes of this perceived rise in violence as immigration and open borders. Once again, Trump creates a narrative where America, and the American people, must unite against an outside enemy.

This puts focus on the following word within the theme, *immigration*. Here, Trump brings up one main point of concern: unchecked immigration, made possible by an outdated system. This can be seen in the following example:

(154) My plan is the exact opposite of the radical and dangerous immigration policy of Hillary Clinton. Americans want relief from uncontrolled immigration. (Trump 2016)

As previously seen, Trump readily connect his opponent with the problems which he is describing. What he proposes is an end to uncontrolled immigration. However, he does not provide any clear proposal for how this ought to be implemented. Instead, Trump simply claims that:

(155) We are going to have an immigration system that works, but one that works for the American people. (Trump 2016)

As can be seen in extract (155), there is no clear explanation as to how the immigration policy will be fixed. However, it is strongly implied that this change will not come about unless Trump is elected.

This clear focus on prevailing violence and failed immigration policies are connected in Trump's insistence on being seen as the solution for all of America's problems. This is also exemplified by the word *law*. The foremost example of this is how Trump seems to emphasize *law and order*, as in the examples below:

(156) There can be no prosperity without law and order. (Trump 2016)

(157) In this race for the White House, I am the Law and Order candidate. (Trump 2016) While law as a concept seems to be important, the goal in Trump's speech is to offer himself as the alternative for delivering the orderly and functioning society which he (and likely those who would vote for him) envisions. By first establishing what is needed (in example (156)), and then declaring that he is the one who will bring about this change (as in (157)), Trump gives disgruntled voters a means to change. Whether this change truly is necessary is less important than that there is a threat which the nation must band together against.

8.2 Final Notes on Trump

The common theme throughout Trump's speech seems to be to cultivate a sensation of "us versus them". Based on this analysis, there are four main features that can be found in the speech, and all of them are in some way connected to this narrative. These are:

1. Trump is extremely keen on emphasizing nationality and 'Americanness'. This is done through a frequent use of *our*, for example by continuously referring to *our country*. However, *our* is also frequently used to indicate loyalty to the Republican Party, thus creating a quite narrow definition of who should be counted as belonging to *our*.
2. *We* is used as a replacement of *I* while Trump is talking about his campaign promises and his administration's goals. This can be seen as an attempt to engage with the audience and allow them to feel like they are a part of the campaign. *I* is used when addressing the audience directly, and when Trump seeks to highlight his own achievements and credentials.
3. *Their*, *they* and *them* are mainly used to show inclusiveness. This is mainly done as a way of talking about (or praising) certain groups of Americans. *Their* and *they* are also used to show exclusiveness. These contribute to a setting in which Trump specifically and emphatically targets certain groups, painting them as the opposition or even the enemy. The three main adversaries are: foreign powers and foreigners (including refugees), corporations and the media (i.e. 'the establishment'), and the Democratic Party and his opponent in the upcoming election. What these have in common is that they are all labelled as un-American, with the implication that they are a serious threat to the American way of life.
4. Throughout the speech, Trump frequently refers to Hillary Clinton, his opponent in the upcoming election. Trump, without exceptions, mentions Clinton within a negative context. This is primarily done by criticizing Clinton's political views, political background and political career. However, there are also frequent personal insults, including disparaging remarks about Clinton's qualities and her personality traits.

9. Discussion

As seen in the analyses for the four different speeches, there seems to be four different themes which occur no matter who is holding the speech. Because of this, the nomination speeches seem to have four different functions. The functions that can be identified in all of the speeches are:

1. The speeches serve as a platform for the candidates to introduce themselves.
2. The speeches allow the candidates to present their core values and campaign promises.
3. The candidates use the speeches to try to create a sense of community (i.e. inclusion).
4. The candidates use the speeches to identify the opposition (i.e. exclusion).

That all of the speeches contain the same functions suggests that the Presidential Nomination Acceptance Speeches form their own genre. Fairclough claims that genres are “best distinguished at the level of social practices that are relatively stable and durable over time and particular concrete events” (2006: 33). The nomination speeches fulfil this criterion, as the same core functions can be found in speeches held over a duration of 24 years. The objective of political speech is to convince the audience that the speaker holds the correct opinions (Dediac 2006). However, as the list above suggests the nominations speeches all contain supplementary objectives. While they are part of the broader genre of political speeches, their additional functions suggest that they should be treated as a separate subgenre within the broader genre of political speeches.

There is not conclusive evidence as to which function should be the most important one, as the candidates all emphasize the themes slightly differently. The differences between the speeches are found in how these themes are talked about, and which opinions the candidates express.

As discussed by Fairclough (1995), the goal of CDA should be to locate, observe and explain power-relations within the text. In these speeches, this allusions to a hidden power-structure seems to be found primarily in what the candidate decides should be included in the speech. This behaviour will be discussed for each of the four functions.

9.1 The Candidates' Personal Presentation

As previously established, the Presidential Nomination Acceptance Speeches provide the candidates with a platform to introduce themselves as well as their campaign promises. Additionally, these speeches are the first chance the candidates have of presenting themselves as the candidates of the party in question.

All of the candidates frequently use *I* to introduce not only themselves but also their campaign. Interestingly, *I* is the most commonly or second most commonly used word for all of the candidates. A likely explanation to this is that all of the candidates could in some way or another be seen as political outsiders. As discussed in the presentations on the candidates and their speeches, the candidates all had a limited experience when it came to national politics. While Donald Trump is famous in his own right, and probably a household name for many Americans, his lack of political experience does put him in the same position as the rest of the candidates when it comes to the need to introduce himself.

The need to introduce themselves becomes even more apparent when considering who the candidates were running against, and what their backgrounds were. Bill Clinton was running against incumbent president George H.W. Bush, who for obvious reasons had an advantage in being known by everybody. George W. Bush was up against Al Gore, who had served as vice-president for eight years within the Clinton administration. Barack Obama's opponent was John McCain, a veteran within the Republican Party who served as a senator from 1987 to his death in 2018. Finally, Donald Trump, the candidate without any real political experience what so ever was running against Hillary Clinton, who in addition to being the wife of Bill Clinton had served as a senator and secretary of state in the Obama administration.

Due to the strong and well-known opposition, it also becomes important for the candidates to introduce themselves as something new. This is often done by bringing up the failures of the previous administration. This can for example be seen in how Clinton talks about the administrations failed campaign promises in extract (12), or how Bush in extract (37) talks about the Clinton administration's inability to enact reforms. Trump also similarly highlights the failures of the previous administration, as seen in extract (133). Obama goes even further and equates himself with *change*, as seen in example (70). This would mean that the candidates are not only presenting themselves as something new, they are also introducing themselves as a needed change. As will be seen, the same tendency can also be seen in the other functions of the speech.

This is also a great example of why critical discourse analysis is an important tool in analysing political discourse. To be able to understand why a candidate chooses to introduce himself in a specific way, the context of the speech needs to be taken into account. In this case, who are they indirectly comparing themselves to, and what credentials do these have? This factor will be revisited in the discussion on exclusion.

As mentioned in chapter 2, Machin and Mayr (2012), among others, have argued that critical discourse analysis should highlight power structures both in the discourse and in society. In regard to this function of the speech (i.e. to serve as an introduction of the candidates) the main statement seems to be “This is why I am qualified to lead you”. In other words, the presentation serves as a way of introducing the power structure.

Another important factor in the presentations is the candidates’ tactic of emphasizing a connection between policy and persona. Especially Obama and Trump seem to favour this tactic. For Obama this can be seen in examples (71), (72) and (73), where he uses *I* to introduce the administration’s policies, thereby making personal promises to the voters and strengthening the connection between himself and his policies. Because of this, the change that Obama promotes becomes dependent on him. In contrast to this, Donald Trump uses *I* to introduce himself and his previous actions, as seen in example (122), where he talks about being a billionaire. Interestingly, *I* is almost exclusively used by Trump when he addresses the audience directly, or when he seeks to highlight his own achievements and credentials. This might indicate that instead of focusing on his administration’s policies, and in contrast to for example Obama and Bush, Trump relies more on his personal achievements to give credibility to his campaign. This is likely done because his political background is almost non-existing. Because of this, to give credibility to his campaign promises he needs to establish himself as a viable alternative.

The candidate who seems to be the least interested in introducing himself to the audience is George Bush, and there are no real indications to why this tactic was chosen. However, one explanation might be that he wishes to focus on his policies of compassionate conservatism (as this was a new direction within the Republican Party) instead of his personality; this will be further discussed in the following section.

9.2 The Candidates’ Core Values and Campaign Promises

Wodak et al. (2009b) see political speeches as a way of presenting political values and opinions. This also becomes obvious when looking at not only the core values but also,

as will be shown in the discussions on inclusiveness and inclusiveness, how the candidates identify their supporters and the opposition.

In addition to power structures, Machin and Mayr (2012) also claim that by using critical discourse analysis it should be possible to identify ideologies which are hidden in the text. This is also where critical discourse analysis shines due to its dependence on outside factors and context. Without understanding or knowing anything about the candidates (for example party affiliation) it would be an almost impossible task to identify what ought to be included in this. This becomes especially evident as the so called value words (which can directly or indirectly be linked to the candidates proposed policies) all occur rather infrequently. For example, the word *immigration* occurs only nine times in the speech by Donald Trump (as seen in table 24). However, the promise of stopping illegal immigration was still a major theme in Trump's election campaign and therefore the word *immigration* carries connotations which make it an integral part of Trumps campaign.

As mentioned in chapter 4.3, I have also performed a keyword analysis on the speeches to find out if there are any words within the individual speeches that stand out when compared to the remaining three. This keyword analysis does provide some extra information when it comes to locating the so called value words, and in extension the candidates' values. For Clinton, the one word which stands out is *covenant* which both alludes to Clintons focus on family, but also to how he stresses inclusion. This was also identified in the critical discourse analysis, but the keyword analysis gives further credibility to the choice of including it in the analysis. *Promise* is the only value word among the keywords in the speech by Obama, this will be discussed more in depth at later in this chapter. Interestingly, no value words can be found among the keywords from Bush's speech. This might indicate that Bush is the least innovative candidate, as he does not emphasize any new theme compared to the other candidates.

The keywords in the speech by Trump are *going*, *trade* and *will*. Once again, these are words that have already been identified and discussed in the in the critical discourse analysis. Interestingly, Trump's 'core values', for example *law and order*, *immigration* and so on did not stand out when compared to the other speeches. However, as shown in the analysis, these themes do occur and are important parts of Trump's campaign. A reasonable explanation is that these words to some extent also occur in the speeches by the remaining candidates. Here it is not a question about what these is discussed, but how it is talked about and referred to, as seen in the analysis.

When it comes to the core values, the power-structure is similar to the presentation of the candidates, in that it is primarily the setting which facilitates the candidates being in a position of power. While the power-structure is somewhat hidden, it allows the candidates to decide which issues to focus on, as there is no real interaction with the audience, and they can therefore not change the subject.

In the speech by Clinton there is an emphasis on a better future for all of America. This has been exemplified by his reliance on words such as *family*, *child*, *children*, *new*, *work* and *jobs*. These themes are in no way unique, as in the speech by Bush there are numerous references to compassionate conservatism. Additionally, alongside 'patriotism', the most important theme in the speech by Bush was identified as 'the future and the next generation'. Interestingly, the same words (for example *children*, *new* and *work*) can also be found in the speech by Bush. This would point towards a common theme which transcends party lines. Additionally, Bush frequently uses *great*, *promise* and *generation* which carry the same connotation. While the patriotic theme is a shift from the speech by Clinton, the focus on the future is not. Patriotism is primarily discussed using the idea of 'the American Story' (i.e. the values that define an American, primarily concerned with perseverance and triumph). Regarding the theme of 'the future and the next generation', Bush seems to focus on new policies and new beginnings.

Comparing the speech by Bush and the speech by Obama, it is possible to find a multitude of similarities. As in the speech by Bush (and Clinton), there is a focus on the future and change. For Obama this was even a slogan for his campaign. Interestingly, the same words can be found among the value words, specifically *promise* and *change*. *Promise* was also found among the keywords in the keyword analysis performed on the speech by Obama. Here, exactly like Bush, Obama talks about a change in the direction of American politics. In addition to this, *work* and *economy* are also featured frequently and used in largely the same way that they were used by Clinton and Bush. The difference is found in what measures the different candidates wish to take. The end goal is to reduce unemployment and boost the economy, but the ways of doing so correspond to what might be expected of representatives of the Republican and Democratic Party respectively (i.e. Obama argues for higher taxes to balance the budget while Bush proposes lower taxes to stimulate the economy).

Another interesting contrast between Obama and Bush, is Obama's focus on 'the American Promise'. While 'the American Story' told by Bush tells the audience that through hard work anyone can become anything, 'the American Promise' is a concept

that everyone should have the possibility to become anything. While they are similar, they vary slightly. Both concepts challenge the listener to become the very best they can, but ‘the American Promise’ seems to imply that the government has a responsibility to facilitate this opportunity, and to provide the freedom to succeed. Here the difference between Republican and Democrat values become evident, as Bush in a sense seems to argue for a comparatively smaller government with less interference, precisely in accordance with Republican standards.

The odd one out in this comparison is Donald Trump. While he does focus on the same themes as the previous candidates, he also brings forth completely new values in his campaign. The theme which is presented most similarly to the previous candidates is the economy and questions revolving around it. Exactly like the other candidates, Trump argues for a stronger economy. However, while Clinton, Bush and Obama seem to focus on creating new jobs for the American people Trump finds the issues in non-viable trade policies. Interestingly, employment is hardly mentioned at all. While there are very few occurrences of words indicating economic policies, as critical discourse analysis is concerned with the context of the discourse and outside information on the text, the few occurrences that do exist can be picked up on and analysed.

Trump is (as all of the other candidates) advocating change and a revitalization of America. However, the message presented is different from what can be found in the previous speeches. Trump’s version of change is to “make America great again”, and a more direct rhetoric compared to previous candidates. This was for example seen in extract (118). This will be discussed further in the section on *inclusion*, as he presents very few facts and seems to be mainly interested in creating an emotional response and a concept which is used to gather supporters. The final concept in the speech by Trump, and which is completely new, is the focus on law and order. This is seen in two different areas. Firstly, Trump explicitly puts himself forward as the candidate for law and order, going so far as to use those words. Secondly, he aggressively targets immigration and immigrants. By doing this he highlights (or creates) a problem which, according to him, he is the only one able to solve.

In conclusion, all of the campaigns primarily concern the economy, the future (including allusions to a needed change) and family values. Clinton, Bush and Obama have very similar messages and express similar values concerning family, children and how to move forwards. Differences are primarily found on economic policies that can be explained by party affiliation. Trump sets himself apart, both when it comes to what

issues he focuses on and how these are talked about. Trump's speech contains relatively few concrete ideas for change, instead he seems to be interested in painting a picture of a country in crisis, where drastic measures are needed to bring it on the right track again. It is also here where Fairclough's (1995) ideas of a hidden power relationship becomes most visible. Trumps clearly sets himself up as the one who should have the authority to deal with the issues plaguing America.

It should be noted that for this theme, corpus linguistics was primarily used as a tool for finding facts to support the analysis of the speech. Due to relatively few occurrences of each individual word there, is a heavier focus on understanding the context and the circumstances in which they occur. While it would be possible to locate the themes just by reading the texts, as long as enough background information is available, this would leave the analysis open to the risk of being criticized for being subjective. By being able to show that the words do occur frequently enough to be included in the list, the use of corpus linguistics mitigates accusations of a biased interpretation.

9.3 Inclusion

Perhaps the most prominent theme in all of the speeches is the attempt to create a sense of community, i.e. inclusion. This also includes attempts by the speaker to relate to the audience or any other group. In the speech by Clinton, the strongest priority is given to creating a sense of inclusiveness. This is done through the use of words such as *American, country, people, we* and *our*. This choice of words is meant as a way of connecting the voting population to him, both those within the party and those who do not identify as Democrats. One main goal of Clinton's speech seems to be to reconcile with those within the Democratic Party who did not support him in the primary election.

A common occurrence which can be seen throughout the speeches, and which also has been described by De Cock (2011), is a deviation from the default assumption that the speaker is represented by a 1st person singular pronoun, and the hearer (or addressee) is represented by a 2nd person singular pronoun. This occurs because the personal pronouns derive their meaning from the nouns which they replace and in which context they occur. Due to this, we can find what Petersoo (2007: 429) calls "wandering we", which is a contradictory use of *we* where the implied meaning of it shifts throughout the paragraph or sentence. Both De Cock's and Petersoo's concept can be applied to other pronouns, as is evident in how the candidate use for example *they* and *our*.

In the speech by Bush, there is also an emphasis on trying to connect with the audience. This is mainly done using *I*, *we* and *our*. *We* and *our* are mainly used to talk about America as a whole, not as a way of directly addressing a specific part of the audience. This is also supported by the keyword analysis that was performed. *America* in Bush's speech seems to be underrepresented compared to how often it is used in the other speeches. The keyword analysis gives *America* a comparative score of -30,3, which means it was used much less frequently in this particular speech. Instead, as shown in the analysis, Bush uses *we* and *our* to indicate America. How *we*, *our*, *you* and *your* are used, suggests that Bush is more concerned with catching undecided middle-ground voters than trying to attract the supporters of the defeated Republican candidates. This will be revisited further along in the analysis.

The way in which Obama uses of *we* and *our* also suggests that one of the main objectives of the speech is to create a sense of unity between him and the audience as well as to gather support within his own party. Directly addressing the audience with *you* is used in an attempt to achieve the same effect. *We*, *our* and *you* are also frequently used to refer to America and Americans as a whole. In a similar vein, *we* is used by Trump as a replacement of *I* while he is describing his campaign promises and his administration's goals. This can be interpreted as an attempt to engage with the audience and allow them to feel like they are a part of the campaign. Additionally, *our* is used by Trump to indicate loyalty to the Republican Party. This is a tactic which is almost completely unseen in the other speeches. Furthermore, the interest in integrating himself to the Republican Party should on Trump's part be seen as an attempt to appeal to the supporters of the losing Republican candidates.

As previously mentioned, while Clinton and Obama actively try to appeal to the supporters of the losing candidate, Bush does not. His attempt to connect *we* and *our* with the idea of America rather than with the audience that is present, suggests that the speech is not primarily meant to create a connection with the supporters of the other Republican. A possible explanation to these behaviours can be found in what the party the candidate belongs to. As mentioned in chapters 5.1 and 6.1, Shufeldt (2018) found that Republican voters are more likely to vote for the designated party candidate than Democratic voters. This means that appealing to the voters of the losing candidates becomes more of an issue to Democratic candidates, as they cannot be sure of the support. Interestingly, and in contrast to these claims, Donald Trump does try to appeal to the Republican Party and its members. This might be explained by the fact that Trump is a relatively new figure within

the party, and he therefore does not have the guaranteed backing a ‘regular’ Republican candidate would have. In this detail, both power-relationships and ideologies can be identified. Once again, the relationship between the speaker and the audience is brought forth. In this case, there does seem to be a difference whether the speaker is Democrat or Republican. This could be studied further, for example by comparing Trump’s attempts to appeal to Republican voters and integrating himself with the party, with the nomination speeches by previous Republican candidates to see if he really stands out as much as my analysis suggests.

There are however, very good explanations as to why Clinton, Obama and Trump seem to treat the speech as a reconciliatory act towards supporters of opposing candidates and as means of refocusing the attention of the party. The parties have experienced a long and exhausting pre-election process and feelings are running high. In a country where the primary elections are almost as dividing and polarizing as the “real” presidential elections, the need to gather the supporters within the own party is overwhelming. Therefore, there is a clear need for coherent and attractive discourse, which manages to reconnect the candidates’ supporters from the primary campaigns with the opponents within the party. For example Hirano et al. (2010) have discussed this phenomena. The article in question mainly focuses on the congressional elections and the effects these have on the cohesion within the parties. However, they also shows that there is an overwhelming risk of polarization within the party no matter the election.

Another extremely important target are the undecided voters. Due to the polarization between the political parties, candidates will have an extremely hard time to attract supporters of the opposing party. For example, Mutz (2007), found that how the candidates behave has little to no impact on their closest supporters and their willingness to vote for them. It would be fair to conclude that we should follow the same reasoning when it comes to the content of the speech. The minds of these supporters are already made up, and very little will change their way of thinking. This means that hardcore supporters of the opposing party are extremely unlikely to switch party allegiance. As previously mentioned, they might not vote for ‘their’ candidate, but they are even less likely to vote for a candidate of the opposing party. This challenging division has been researched by, amongst others, King (2003) and Layman et al. (2006). This means that the presidential candidates do not compete over the other party’s voters, but rather over the indecisive middle voters and those that are not inclined to vote at all. This would mean that voter engagement, and in turn voter turnout, is what makes or breaks an election

campaign. The candidate who manages to interact with the undecided mass has a great chance of winning the election.

The candidates all attempt quite similar tactics to achieve this effect (i.e. to speak directly to undecided voters). However, once again Trump differs slightly from the majority. An interesting finding is that all four candidates primarily use *they*, *them* and *their* to indicate inclusion, not (as one might expect) to describe the opposing side. As mentioned in chapter 4.3, the third person personal pronouns generally indicate a group which neither the speaker nor the listener belong to. However, this analysis shows that the candidates deviate from this assumption. Clinton is using the words *they* and *them* as a indicating one or more groups of Americans, in other words, *they* and *them* become synonyms to *us*. Obama also mainly uses *they*, *them* and *their* to show inclusiveness, similarly to Clinton and Bush, and does not seem interested in creating an ‘us versus them’ narrative. Bush also tries to cultivate the same feeling of belonging. However, the difference is that he seems to mainly use subjective values to create a sense of patriotism; a good example of this is Bush’s attempts to retell ‘the America Story’. While this tactic could easily be used to facilitate the ‘us versus them’ mindset, Bush does not seem interested in doing so. Instead, he takes care to promote a unified America, and uphold American ideals for everybody.

The same tactic can be found in the speeches by Clinton and Obama, who also seem to attempt to take a step away from the idea of being a candidate of the Democratic Party. Instead Clinton, Bush and Obama all focus on presenting themselves as the American candidate who all Americans can vote for. This also means that their definition of *American* is inclusive. For example, both Bush and Obama use the idea of America as something to gather the voters around. Additionally, words such as *America* and *Americans* are used by the candidates in a similar manner to show inclusiveness.

In contrast to the previous three candidates, Trump’s is not as outspoken when it comes to inclusiveness and creating a sense of community. He seems to be extremely keen on emphasizing nationality and ‘Americanness’, and this is mainly done by frequently referring to *our*, for example by continuously referring to “our country”. While this might look similar to the rhetoric used by Clinton, Bush and Obama, Trump’s definition of *our* makes it quite unclear who he considers to be American. On one hand, he connects *our* to the Republican Party, while on the other he links it with the idea of America. This is another version of Petersoo’s (2007) wandering we. Here the meaning of *our* (i.e. who is included in *our*) seems to change depending on who Trump tries to

engage with. This creates a narrow definition of who *our* really is referring to. In this his behaviour is the complete opposite of the previous candidates, who specifically seemed to be interested in being seen as the candidate for all Americans, not only Democrats or Republicans.

Trump mainly uses *their*, *they* and *them* to show inclusiveness, primarily as a way of talking about (or praising) certain groups of Americans. By focusing on a specific group, Trump seems to give the impression of caring for the disenfranchised (for example families negatively affected by immigration or people living in inner cities). While this can be found in other speeches as well, as Bush targets young voters and Obama talks to the working class, the tactic is most prominently found in Trump's speech. While Clinton, Bush and Obama seemed to be using inclusion as something all Americans can get behind, Trump seems to use the same concept as a way of defining not only what is American, but also what is not. This will be revisited in the section on tactics of exclusion.

There are also clear allusions to *change* when the candidates express inclusion. This can primarily be found in how they talk about how the lives of certain groups will be change for the better. In the speech by Obama, this can for example be seen in extract (97) where he promises young Americans an affordable college education. Trump also utilizes the same tactic in example (130) where he talks about taking care of veterans. Naturally, the condition for these changes to take place is them winning the election.

In comparison with the previous themes (introduction and presentation of values) a further layer of the power structures can be found in the parts on inclusion. While it already has been established that the setting itself favour the candidates over the audience, the message in this part seems to enhance this. While all of the candidates, some less than other, emphasize inclusiveness, the common assumption seems to be that it is the speaker (in his future role as President) who will make all the executive decisions. At this stage the speaker is already setting himself up as the *de facto* leader of the country, and the one who should be granted the power.

9.4 Exclusion

Exclusion in political discourse might take many different forms. However, the common assumption seems to be that the norm regarding exclusion is that speakers try to refrain from "overt, blatant expressions of prejudice" (Van Dijk 1997b: 36). Although the previous quote by Van Dijk primarily refers to expressions of prejudice against minorities, the same basic reasoning can be applied to other forms of exclusion. Because

of this, many of the same strategies of exclusion can be employed. Van Dijk (1997b) identifies the two primary ones as positive self-representation and negative other-representation. Positive self-representation can be seen in all of the three previous functions of the speech, either positive representations of the candidates, their values or of those the candidates include in the idea of 'us'. This is also quite self explanatory, as there would be no point in not emphasizing positive values. Negative other-representation is harder to identify but can be seen, as will be shown, in how the candidates identify 'the other side'.

While exclusion generally appears to be the least frequent function in the speeches, it is also the function where one of the candidates stands out the most when compared to the rest.

The primary goal of exclusion in all of the speeches is to identify the opposition, i.e. the opposing candidate, and to show why he or she is unfit to lead the country. This is most often done by contrasting themselves to the opposing candidate, and by distancing themselves from them. This is for example seen in how none of the candidates appear to talk about their opposition in terms that might be seen as familiar (for example by referring to them using their first name). Another reoccurring strategy to distance themselves from the opposing candidate is by connecting them to the previous administration. This is naturally used by Clinton and Bush, as their opponents were the incumbent president and the previous vice-president respectively, but the same parallels are also drawn by Obama and Trump. Obama emphasized John McCain's long history in the Republican Party as well as his support for the previous administration, and Trump connected Hillary Clinton not only with the administration in which she served as secretary of state, but also with the Clinton administration.

When it comes to identifying the opposition, there are two candidates that stand out: these are Obama and Trump. Although both Clinton and Bush identified and referred to their opponents, the sheer frequency, as seen by the key-word analysis, makes Obama stand out. The two most overrepresented words in the speech by Obama are *John*, *McCain*. That Obama uses these words more than average is not a surprise, as this was also seen in table 12. However, it is interesting that the opponents cannot be found among the keywords used by Clinton, Bush or Trump. As shown in the analyses, neither Clinton nor Bush referred very frequently to their opponents. In contrast to this behaviour, Trump did frequently refer to Hillary Clinton. A probable explanation as to why these words are not found within his keywords is that she has been a part of American politics since the

early 1990's, and it is therefore likely that the other candidates have referred to her in one form or another.

Obama frequently refers to his opponent in the upcoming election, Republican presidential nominee John McCain. However, the criticism is not aimed directly at McCain, but rather concerns his policies and closeness to the current administration. Indeed, Obama frequently praises McCain for his character and his services to America. Clinton and Bush do not employ the same level of praise, but all of their criticism is aimed at their opponents' political opinions or professional failures. For example inabilities to fulfill their campaign promises.

In contrast to quite civil identification and targeting opponents, Trump chooses a quite different way of talking about the opposition. Throughout the speech, Trump frequently criticizes Hillary Clinton, his opponent in the upcoming election. This is not only done by criticizing Clinton's political views, political background and political career. Instead there are also frequent personal insults, including targeting Clinton's qualities and her personality. Interestingly, there is not one single reconciliatory action towards Clinton by Trump. This is in sharp contrast to the other candidates, primarily Obama. Trump also frequently uses *their* and *they* to target those who he seems to identify as the opposition. Trump uses *their* and *they* to target a number of groups, painting them as the opposition or even the enemy. In doing so, these words do contribute to creating a rhetoric of 'us versus them'.

Aside from Hillary Clinton and the Democratic Party, the two main adversaries are found in foreign powers (Trump specifically mentions China) and corporations and the (liberal) media. Additionally, Trump also finds a target in immigrants. While Bush tells 'the American Story' and Obama describes 'the American Promise', Trump excludes foreign nationals. The common theme for all those criticized and attacked in Trump's speech is that they are labelled as 'un-American', with the implication that they are a serious threat to the American way of life. In short, they are dangerous. This is an implication which is completely unseen in the other three speeches. Instead, Clinton, Bush and Obama all stress that they are the candidate for all Americans. Who is not American is not discussed by any of these candidates. The difference between how Trump and the rest of the candidates talk about the opposition cannot be explained by which party the candidates belong to, as Trump without a question stands alone. Further research could shed light on, for example, whether the other candidates in the 2016 Republican

primary election used the same rhetoric. If so, this might indicate a shift in the rhetoric within the Republican Party.

I would argue that the function of exclusion in the speeches is closely connected to the power-structure and the ideologies that the candidates present. No matter who the candidate paints as the opposition, and in which terms this is done, the common denominator is that they are not fit to rule, and they are not fit to wield power. The ideological standpoint can in turn be seen in which groups the candidate decides to exclude.

9.5 The Case for a Mixed Methodology

All of the analyses done in this research points toward the necessity of introducing corpus linguistic methodologies as a way of supporting critical discourse analysis. The combination of critical discourse analysis and corpus linguistics work, and it definitely makes the research more manageable.

Critical discourse analysis is in itself an excellent tool when it comes to analysing political discourse. This is, as discussed in previous subchapters, because political discourse in general and these speeches in particular are inherently ideological. Additionally, the speeches in question contain power-relationships. This is seen both in the speeches themselves, and in which setting the discourse is delivered. As discussed in chapter 2, these are issues which critical discourse analysis is meant to bring to light.

Corpus linguistics did greatly help in choosing what to look at. The speeches were too long to intuitively find any evidence, although just by reading the transcripts it was possible to gain an understanding of the general themes of the speech. Corpus linguistics contributes to the objectivity of the research. Choosing which lexical item to look at based on a list of the most frequently occurring items creates a system which can be replicated in further research. Instead of basing the results on the researchers' feelings and subjective preconceptions, they are based on statistical facts. This makes it easy to argue for why a certain lexical item ought to be looked at in detail. In connection with this, corpus linguistics allows for a predetermined way to gather data. Again, this is done in a way which can be replicated.

Additionally, it should obviously be understood that corpus linguistics would in itself be unfit to analyse political discourse. This study shows that there needs to be an understanding not only of the context the word in question occurs in, but also an understanding of the context and society the discourse takes place in.

10. Conclusions

Combining critical discourse analysis and corpus linguistics works as a method for analysing longer texts containing political discourse. Critical discourse analysis focuses on critical questions regarding ideologies and power-relations. Corpus linguistics allows for an unbiased gathering of data and a replicable way of selecting the critical parts of the discourse. At the same time, the analysis of political speeches must be context-driven and critical discourse analysis bring a necessary extra-linguistic perspective to the research.

Nomination speeches form a subgenre within the genre of political speeches. Political speeches are described by Dedaic (2006), who claims that the main objective of the political speech is to convince the audience that the speaker or whoever he or she is representing holds the correct opinions and the correct solutions to problems that are presented. This can be clearly seen in all of the speeches, especially when it comes to the value words which represent the aims of the candidates' campaigns. The nominations speeches also fulfil Fairclough's (1995) criterion of remaining relatively unchanged over time. However, as the speeches have additional important functions in presenting the candidate, as well as to establish what the candidate defines as 'us' and what is 'them' (i.e. inclusion and exclusion), it makes sense to label them as a genre of their own.

The same functions are present in all of the speeches, and many of the same values are found in all of the speeches. They are, for example, generally inclusive towards those who might be labelled as 'the others'. There is also a strong incentive to be seen as the candidate which all Americans can vote for. Another important theme which can be found in all of the speeches is that the candidates stress the importance of change and a new beginning for America. Naturally, for this new beginning to take place they need to win the election, as they are the only ones who will be able to take the actions which are necessary to bring about change.

Differences are mainly found in the candidate's campaign promises. While the goal is to make America a better place, the road towards this differs depending on the candidate, and it is here where the party division is the strongest (for example, Republican candidates are unlikely to argue for higher taxes). Apart from policies that are central to the individual parties, there does not appear to be any differences between how a Republican and a Democratic candidate uses the speech. Differences can be explained by societal changes and a changed geopolitical setting (for example, terrorism would be a more frequently used theme in 2008 than in 2000). However, in the case of Trump the differences cannot solely be explained by these factors.

The candidates all attempt to identify the opposition, i.e. the opposing candidates in the upcoming election. This is primarily done in a civil manner by targeting the candidates' political opinions and by attempting to distance oneself from the opposition and what they represent.

The speech by Trump stands out when compared with the other candidates' speeches. This is not only seen when comparing Trump with the two Democrats (Clinton and Obama), but also when comparing him to the Republican Bush. This suggests that Trump's differences lie on a personal level. The most similarities between Trump and the rest can be found in how they present themselves and how they introduce their campaigns. While Trump might have less concrete suggestions, the idea of changing America into a better place resonates throughout the speeches.

The main differences between Trump and the earlier candidates can be found in how Trump defines 'us and them'. While all candidates emphasize America and Americanness, Trump's definition of America seems to be narrower than the definitions provided by Clinton, Bush and Obama. The biggest difference is found in how Trump defines 'the others'. Here, he targets not only his opponent on a personal level, which is unseen in the other speeches. He also targets other nations, foreigners and even American institutions, such as banks and the media. The common denominator seems to be that Trump suggests that these entities are un-American and dangerous.

All of this suggests that Trump does bring a new form of tougher rhetoric to the political debate. However, he might also be the most visible symptom of a more polarized political system in general. Based on this study, it is not possible to say which effect Trump has on the political rhetoric overall. Can the same shift be seen when comparing other political discourse, or when looking at forms of entertainment media? Further research could also determine whether this shift towards a harsher rhetoric can be seen throughout society as a whole.

11. Swedish summary

Ett Amerika i förändring: en analys av det amerikanska presidentvalets nomineringstal genom en kombination av kritisk diskursanalys och korpuslingvistik

Det verkar tas som en allmän sanning att Donald Trumps deltagande och vinst amerikanska presidentvalet år 2016 har gett upphov till ny, mera extrem retorik inom politik. Men är Trump den ytterlighet han upplevs vara? I avhandlingen har fyra presidentkandidaters nomineringstal analyserats för att se om det finns någon sanning i de här påståendena. Avsikten har varit att undersöka om det i talen finns gemensamma teman och fokusområden samt om det finns gemensamma drag i hur kandidaterna redogör för dessa teman. Därtill uppstår den naturliga följdfrågan (oavsett om gemensamma nämnare hittas eller inte) om det finns något som kan förklara det beteende som analyserna visar på.

De tal som har analyserats, det amerikanska presidentvalets nomineringstal, är det första talet kandidaten håller på sitt partis konvent efter att hen har vunnit primärvalet och blivit nominerad till partiets presidentkandidat. Talet kan därmed ses som startskottet för kandidatens egentliga valkampanj. De tal som analyseras i avhandlingen är Bill Clintons tal från 1992, George Bushs tal från 2000, Barack Obamas tal från 2008 och Donald Trumps tal från 2016. De här talen valdes främst för att de alla hölls av vinnarna i respektive presidentval, men också för att de ger en jämn fördelning mellan tal som hållits av republikaner och demokrater. Dessutom har talen hållits under en relativt kort tidsperiod, vilket också gör det lättare att jämföra dem med varandra.

Som grundmetod för analyserna valdes kritisk diskursanalys (Critical Discourse Analysis, CDA). Genom att tillämpa kritisk diskursanalys är det möjligt att hitta explicita och implicita maktstrukturer samt dolda ideologier i den text som analyseras (Fairclough 1995). Det här gör att metoden lämpar sig ypperligt för att undersöka politisk diskurs. Ett annat viktigt drag i kritisk diskursanalys är att texten i sig själv inte ses som en egen helhet, utan som en reflektion av samhället i övrigt. Det här tankesättet leder till att man exempelvis också måste beakta den omgivning i vilken texten har sitt ursprung, samt vem som har gett upphov till texten (det här fallet vem som håller talet). Kritisk diskursanalys är ett relativt nytt begrepp, och metodologin anses ha uppkommit under den första delen av 1990-talet (Wodak och Meyer 2009). Det här betyder att den fortfarande är en metodologi under utveckling.

Kritisk diskursanalys har två svagheter vilka kan ge upphov till svårigheter i samband med den används för att utföra analyser. De problem som lyfts fram av Wodak

och Meyer (2009) är att kritisk diskursanalys saknar en klar modell för hur data ska samlas in inför analysen. En följd av detta, och på grund av att kritisk diskursanalys är en kvalitativ metod, sätts även begränsningar på den mängd text som kan behandlas i en analys. Förutom problem med datainsamling finns det också en risk för att den som utför analysen väljer att medvetet betona de delar av texten som skulle stöda en viss tolkning.

De transkriberade texterna i analysen är relativt långa, vilket gör att det skulle ha varit svårt att enbart genom kritisk diskursanalys hitta de väsentligen delarna av talen. Dessutom finns det alltid en risk att vissa förutfattade meningar skulle ha blivit uppenbara om talen skulle ha analyserat enbart med manuella metoder. För att komma runt de här problemen utnyttjades korpuslingvistik, vilket gör det möjligt att arbeta med betydligt större datavolymer (Mautner 2009a). Dessutom gör korpuslingvistik det möjligt att ta fram data i en text på ett opartiskt sätt (Baker 2006), i det här fallet genom att mäta ordfrekvens för att hitta centrala teman i talen. Kombinationen av kritisk diskursanalys och korpuslingvistik är inte helt etablerad. Detta även om många språkvetare, till exempel van Leeuwen (2005) och Baker (2006), argumenterar för fördelarna av en kombination av de två. På grund av detta är avhandlingen också ett steg framåt mot en mera etablerad gemensam metodologi.

För att identifiera vilka ord i talen som förekom mest frekvent användes WordSmith Tools 5.0. Det första steget var att skapa en lista på de funktionsord som inte skulle ingå i analysen. Eftersom vissa funktionsord ingick i den slutliga ordlistan, till exempel *you* som är ett personligt pronomen och därmed kan ge insikt i hur kandidaten tilltalar sin publik, fanns det behov av att skapa specialanpassad lista. Det här gjordes genom att samtliga tal kombinerades till en korpus. Med hjälp av WordSmith var det möjligt att ta fram en lista på alla ord som ingick i korpusen, och de funktionsord som inte skulle ingå i den slutliga analysen identifierades. Efter detta användes WordSmith igen för att rangordna de ord som förekom i talen från mest använt till minst använt. En ordlista per tal togs fram. Slutligen samkördes ordlistorna med listan på de funktionsord som tidigare identifierades. Slutresultatet var en ordlista som endast bestod av innehållsord och de funktionsord vilka skulle ingå i analysen. Längden på ordlistorna begränsades också, och enbart ord som förekom med en frekvens på minst 0,20 per 100 ord togs med i den slutliga listan. Till detta fanns två orsaker: ord som förekom färre gånger kan inte anses vara en väsentlig del av talet, och mängden individuella ord vilka skulle bli tvungen att beaktas om gränsen varit lägre skulle göra ordlistorna längre än vad som är möjligt att hantera.

Efter att frekvenslistorna skapats analyserades talen enskilt och oberoende av varandra. Alla ord som ingick i frekvenslistorna analyserades inte i detalj, utan i enlighet med metodiken för kritisk diskursanalys analyserades de ord som utgående från den kontext i vilket talet i fråga fanns kunde identifieras som betydelsefulla. Ett exempel på det här är ordet *trade*, som bör ses som en viktig del av Donald Trumps tal på grund av att han i sin kampanj lägger ett starkt fokus på ekonomiska frågor och handel, framför allt USA:s handelsunderskott. I det här fallet fungerar *trade* som ett värdeord med speciellt stark anknytning till kandidaten och presidentvalskampanjens nyckelfrågor.

Vissa teman återfanns i alla tal. Detta betyder att alla tal innehåller samma funktioner. Alla kandidater använder sitt tal för att introducera sig själv samt för att presentera sina politiska värdering och kampanjlöften. Dessutom används talen för att identifiera tillhörighet genom inkludering och exkludering. Mer det här menas att kandidaten använder vissa specifika ord eller termer för att identifiera vilka grupper som ska klassas som *vi* och vilka grupper som är *de andra*. Fastän det finns stora likheter mellan talen när det kommer till vad de innehåller och vilka funktioner de har, går det också att hitta olikheter mellan kandidaterna. Det här gäller främst hur de väljer att lyfta fram sina åsikter eller hur de definierar ett visst tema.

När det kommer till att presentera sig själva är talet ytterst viktigt för alla kandidater. Det här beror främst på att de i det här skedet av valkampanjen endera är relativt okända personer eller på att de inte har en lång erfarenhet av nationell politik. Deras motståndare är i regel däremot både välkända och vana politiker. Det här temat består delvis av att kandidaterna konkret introducerar sig själva och redogör för sina tidigare prestationer. Dessutom är presentationen en möjlighet för kandidaterna att skapa en koppling mellan sig själva och den politik de vill bedriva. Utöver detta består presentationen också av att kandidaterna indirekt jämför sig själva med motståndarkandidaten i det kommande valet. Eftersom deras motståndare oftast kan kopplas till en tidigare administration ger det här kandidaterna en möjlighet till att introducera sig som ett nytt alternativ och som ett alternativ för förändring.

Talen fungerar också som en plattform där kandidaterna kan presentera sina politiska mål och vallöften. Här kan man urskilja vissa skillnader mellan kandidaterna, men primärt kretsar vallöftena kring tre olika teman: ekonomi, framtiden och familjevärderingar. De här kan framför allt identifieras av vilka värdeord som kandidaterna väljer att använda. Clinton, Bush och Obama för fram liknande vallöften när det gäller familj och framtiden. De lyfter alla upp familj som något viktigt, och precis

som i den personliga introduktionen för de fram behovet av förändring. När det gäller ekonomiska frågor skiljer sig Bush från Clinton och Obama, vilket kan förklaras av att Bush är republikan medan Clinton och Obama är demokrater. På grund av detta är det naturligt att de skulle förespråka olika ekonomiska lösningar. Trump är den kandidat som skiljer sig mest från resten, både när det kommer till vilka teman han fokuserar på och hur han talar om dessa. Även i Trumps valkampanj är ekonomi ett viktigt tema, men i motsats till de övriga kandidaterna (som fokuserade på budgetanvändning och vikten av att skapa nya arbetsplatser) väljer Trump att fokusera på handel och på att hitta utomstående syndabockar till den försämrade ekonomin. Något som inte alls har syns i de tidigare talen, men som är ett viktigt inslag i Trumps, är hans fokus på lag och ordning samt immigration. Trumps tal innehåller relativt få lösningar eller förslag till hur USA ska kunna förändras mot det bättre. Istället verkar hans mål vara att ge en bild av en nation i kris där det krävs drastiska metoder för att få landet på fötter igen. Trump introducerar sig själv som lösningen till landets problem.

Den kanske viktigaste uppgiften som talen har är att de låter kandidaterna skapa en inkluderande atmosfär. Med andra ord, genom talen kan de direkt relatera till en eller flera grupper. Det här görs främst genom att använda ord som *vi* och *vår*, men kandidaterna använder även *de* och *dem* flitigt för att specifikt tala om vissa grupper av amerikaner. Kandidaterna är framför allt angelägna om att tilltala två specifika grupper av väljare. Den första gruppen är de väljare som stödde en annan kandidat inom det egna partiet i primärvalet. Den här taktiken syns främst i talen av Clinton, Obama och Trump. republikanska väljare är mera trogna sitt parti, och är därför mera beredda att rösta på partiets kandidat än demokrater (Shufeldt 2018). Det här leder till att Bush inte på samma sätt behöver fokusera på den här gruppen av väljare. Orsaken till att Trump ändå väljer att fokusera på gruppen är troligtvis för att han är relativt ny inom det republikanska partiet, och har ett behov av att först och främst etablera sig som republikan. Den andra viktiga gruppen som kandidaterna riktar in sig på är de röstberättigade utanför det egna partiet som har en stark partitillhörighet, och som inte ännu har bestämt sig för vem de ska rösta på. När det gäller den här gruppen använder sig alla kandidater av en liknade taktik, de försöker tala direkt till väljaren genom att lyfta fram exempel på hur just deras liv kommer att förbättras om de ”väljer rätt”. Trump skiljer sig något från de övriga kandidaterna. Hans definition av vad som ska räknas som ”vi” är snävare än någonting som Clinton, Bush eller Obama presenterar. Medan Clinton, Bush eller Obama inte

specifikt definierar vem som ska inkluderas i deras definition av Amerika, väljer Trump att definiera både vad som är och vad som inte är amerikanskt.

Den funktion eller tema som används minst av kandidaterna i talen är exkludering, men det är också här som de största skillnaderna individuella skillnaderna hittas. Alla kandidater identifierar sin motståndare i det stundande presidentvalet. Clinton, Bush och Obama gör det här på ett sakligt sätt och fokuserar endast på motståndarens politiska svagheter, medan de oftast talar gott om motståndarens personliga egenskaper. Trumps taktik är väldigt annorlunda. Han angriper Hillary Clinton både på ett personligt och ett professionellt plan, därtill identifierar han utlänningar och media som fiender, vilka beskrivs som oamerikanska och rent av farliga.

Studien belyser också behovet av att stöda kritisk diskursanalys med korpuslingvistik. Det här krävs dels för att talen var för långa för att man intuitivt skulle ha kunnat hitta vad som är relevant i texterna, men den främsta orsaken är att man med hjälp av korpuslingvistiska metoder gör datainsamlingen objektiv och replikerbar. Det här gör det möjligt att objektivt argumentera för varför en viss del av ett tal har analyserats. Eftersom kritisk diskursanalys beaktar omgivningen är det en fungerande metod för att analysera maktstrukturer och ideologier. För att förstå politisk retorik krävs det att man också förstår den omgivning som den existerar i. De problem kritisk diskursanalys lider av, beträffande datainsamling och objektivitet, kan avhjälpas genom att introducera korpuslingvistiska metoder.

De slutsatser som kan dras av analyserna är att nomineringstalen bildar en egen genre. Detta på grund av att de alla innehåller gemensamma teman och funktioner. Skillnader mellan kandidaterna finns främst i hur de behandlar dessa teman, samt vilka värderingar som lyfts fram med hjälp av värdeord. De här skillnaderna kan ofta förklaras av att kandidaterna tillhör olika partier samt att talen reflekterar förändringar som har skett i samhället. Trump skiljer sig från mängden, och delar av den kritik som riktas mot honom kan rättfärdigas. Skillnaderna mellan Trump och de övriga kandidaterna hittas främst i hur han uttrycker sig och vilka värderingar han lyfter fram, hans tal innehåller ändå liknande funktioner och teman som Clinton, Bush och Obama. Utan ytterligare studier går det dock inte att slå fast om själv Trump ger upphov till en hårdare retorik, eller om han endast är en produkt av ett förändrat politiskt läge.

Bibliography

Adams, Richard. 2007. "Barack Obama". In *The Guardian*, May 9, 2007. Available: <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2007/may/09/barackobama.uselections20081> [May 20, 2017].

Baker, Paul. 2006. *Using Corpora in Discourse Analysis*. London: Continuum.

Baker, Paul (ed.). 2009. *Contemporary Studies in Linguistics: Contemporary Corpus Linguistics*. London: Continuum.

Baum, Matthew. 2005. "Talking the vote: why presidential candidates hit the talk show circuit". In *American Journal of Political Science*, Vol. 49: 213-234.

Bayley, Paul. 2012. "Terror in Political Discourse: from the Cold War to an Unipolar World". In Fairclough, Cortese and Adrizzone (eds.): 43-72.

Biber, Douglas, Connor, Ulla, and Upton, Thomas A. 2007. *Discourse on the Move: Using corpus analysis to describe discourse structure*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Biber, Douglas, Leech, Geoffrey and Conrad, Susan . 2002. *Longman student grammar of spoken and written English*. Harlow, United Kingdom: Pearson Education Limited.

Blommaert, Jan. 2005. *Discourse: a Critical Introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Boss-Biack, Shira. 2005. "Cover story on Barack Obama '83". In *Columbia College Today*, January 2005. Available: http://www.college.columbia.edu/cct_archive/jan05/cover.php [May 20, 2017].

Boussalis, Constantine. 2016. "Dark days ahead for our climate". In Lilleker, D. et al. (eds.): 51.

Brader, Ted. 2005. "Striking a Responsive Chord: How Political Ads Motivate and Persuade Voters by Appealing to Emotions". In *American Journal of Political Science*, Vol. 49, Issue 2: 388-405.

Brown, Keith (ed.). 2006. *Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics, 2nd edition*. Oxford: Elsevier Ltd.

Simon Berg

Carlson, Matt. 2016. "The question of objectivity in the 2016 Presidential Election" In Lilleker, D. et al. (eds.): 11.

Chilton, Paul and Schäffner, Christina (eds.). 2002. *Politics as text and talk: analytical approaches to political discourse*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Chilton, Paul. 2005. "Missing links in mainstream CDA: Modules, blends and the critical instinct." In. Wodak, R. and Chilton, P. (eds.): 19-51.

Cosgrove, Ken. 2016. "The emotional brand wins". In Lilleker D. et al. (eds.): 27.

Crystal, David. 2004. *Language and the Internet*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Culpeper, Jonathan. 2009. "The Metalanguage of IMPOLITENESS: Using Sketch Engine to Explore the Oxford English Corpus". In: Baker, P. (ed.): 64-86.

De Cock, Barbara. 2011. "Why *we* can be *you*: The use of 1st person plural forms with hearer reference in English and Spanish." In: *Journal of Pragmatics*, Vol. 43: 2762-2775.

Dedaic, Mirjana N.. 2006. "Political Speeches and Persuasive Argumentation." In Brown, K. (ed.): 700-707.

Duguid, Alison. 2012. "Soundbites Bit. Contracted Dialogistic Space and the Textual Relations of the No. 10 Team Analysed through Corpus Assisted Discourse Studies". In Fairclough, Cortese and Adrizzone (eds.): 73-94.

Ehrenfreund, Max. 2015. "The real reason Donald trump is so rich". *The Washington Post*, September 3, 2015. Available:

<https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/wonk/wp/2015/09/03/if-donald-trump-followed-this-really-basic-advice-hed-be-a-lot-richer/> [May 22, 2017].

Fairclough, Norman. 1989. *Language and Power*. London: Longman.

Fairclough, Norman. 1995. *Critical Discourse Analysis: the Critical Study of Language*. New York: Routledge.

Fairclough, Norman & Graham, Philip W. 2002. "Marx as Critical Discourse Analyst: the Genesis of a Critical Method and its Relevance to the Critique of Global Capital". *Estudios de Sociolingüística*, Vol. 3, No. 1: 185-229.

Simon Berg

Fairclough, Norman Cortese, Giuseppina Ardizzone, Patrizia (eds.). 2012. *Discourse and Contemporary Social Change*. Bern: Peter Lang AG, Internationaler Verlag der Wissenschaften.

Fairclough, Norman. 2006. "Genres in Political Discourse". In Brown, K. (ed.): 33-38.

Fiorina, Morris, Abrams, Samuel and Pope, Jeremy. 2003. "The 2000 U.S. Presidential Election: Can Retrospective Voting be Saved?". In *British Journal of Political Science*, Vol. 33, No. 2: 163-187.

Foucault, Michel. 1977. *Discipline & Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. New York : Pantheon Books

Fowler, Anthony George. 2013. Five Studies on the Causes and Consequences of Voter Turnout. Doctoral dissertation, Harvard University. Available: <https://dash.harvard.edu/handle/1/11156810> [March 13, 2017].

Freidel, Frank and Sidney, Hugh. *The President of the United States*. Washington D.C.: White House Historical Association.

Giddens, Anthony. 1984. *The Constitution of Society: Outline of the Theory of Structuration*. Cambridge: Polity.

Gordon, Larry. 2007. "Occidental recalls 'Barry' Obama". In *Los Angeles Times* January 29, 2007. Available: <https://web.archive.org/web/20100524102944/http://articles.latimes.com/2007/jan/29/local/me-oxy29> [May 20, 2017].

Gurian, Paul-Henri, Burroughs, Nathan, Atkenson, Lonna Rae, Cann, Damon, Hayes, Audrey A. 2016. "National Party Division and Divisive State Primaries in U.S. Presidential Elections, 1948–2012". In *Political Behavior* Vol. 38: 689-711.

Graeff, Timothy R. 1996. "Using promotional messages to manage the effects of brand and self- image on brand evaluations". In *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, Vol. 13 Issue 3: 4-18.

Graham, Phil, Keenan, Thomas and Dowd, Anne-Maree. 2004. "A call to arms at the end of history: a discourse-historical analysis of George W. Bush's declaration of war on terror." *Discourse & Society* Vol. 15 No. 2–3: 199–222.

Hirano, Shigeo, Snyder, James M., Ansolabehere, Stephen and Hansen, John. 2010. Primary elections and partisan polarization in the U.S. Congress. *Quarterly Journal of Political Science* 5(2): 169-191.

Hochschild, Jennifer. 1995. *Facing Up to the American Dream: Race, Class, and the Soul of the Nation*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Hoffman, Donna R. and Howard, Alison D. 2009. "Auditioning for the Rhetorical Presidency: Presidential Nomination Acceptance: Speeches as "Presidential" Documents". In *Collected Faculty Scholarship, Paper 3*. Available: <http://scholar.dominican.edu/all-faculty/3> [April 27, 2017].

Hogan, John and Feeney, Sharon. 2012. "Crisis and Policy Change: the Role of the Political Entrepreneur". In *Risk, Hazards & Crisis in Public Policy*: Vol. 3, Issue 2, Article 6.

Holmes, Michael. 1999. "Bush Wasn't Always a Front-Runner". In *The Washington Post*, October 16, 1999. Available: http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-srv/aponline/19991017/aponline114059_000.htm [April 28, 2017].

Huddleston, Rodney and Pullum, Geoffery. 2005. *A Student's Introduction to English Grammar*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hudson, Marc. 2016. "President Trump and climate change". In Lilleker, D. et al. (eds.): 50.

Hunston, Susan. 2006. "Corpus Linguistics". In Brown, K. (ed.): 234-248.

ICPSR, The Interuniversity Consortium for Political and Social Research. "Campaign Themes, Strategies and Developments". <https://www.icpsr.umich.edu/icpsrweb/instructors/setup2008/campaign-strategies.jsp> [May 21, 2017].

Jonson, Lyndon B. 1965. "107 - Special Message to the Congress: The American Promise". Available: <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/?pid=26805> [June 15, 2018]

Jäger, Siegfried and Maier, Florentine. 2009. "Theoretical and Methodological Aspects of Foucauldian Critical Discourse Analysis and Dispositive Analysis". In Wodak, R. and Meyer, M. (eds.): 34-61.

Jørgensen, Marianne and Phillips, Louise. 2002. *Discourse Analysis as Theory and Method*. London: SAGE Publications Ltd.

Kelly, Conor. 2015. Meet Donald Trump: Everything You Need To Know (And Probably Didn't Know) About The 2016 Republican Presidential Candidate. ABC News. Available: <http://abcnews.go.com/Politics/meet-donald-trump-2016-republican-presidential-candidate/story?id=32108595> [May 23, 2017].

King, David C. 2003. Congress, Polarization and Fidelity to the Median Voter. Unpublished manuscript, Harvard University. Available: https://www.hks.harvard.edu/fs/dking/Extreme_Politics.pdf [March 16, 2017].

Kreiss, David. 2016. "Social media did not give us Donald Trump and it is not weakening democracy". In: Lilleker, D. et al (eds.): 75.

Layman, Geoffery C., Carsey, Thomas M. & Menasce Horowitz, Juliana. 2006. Party Polarization in American Politics: Characteristics Causes and Consequences. In: *Annual Review of Political Science* Vol.9: 83-110.

Leuchner, Katherine E. 2012. "The Use of the Internet and Social Media in U.S. Presidential Campaigns: 1992-2012". Undergraduate project, James Madison University. Available: http://www.academia.edu/1510408/The_Use_of_the_Internet_and_Social_Media_in_U.S._Presidential_Campaigns_1992-2012 [April 27, 2017].

Lewis, Seth & Carlson, Matt. 2016. "The dissolution of news: selective exposure, filter bubbles, and the boundaries of journalism". In: Lilleker, D. et al. (eds.): 78.

Lilleker, Darren; Jackson, Daniel; Thorsen, Einar and Veneti, Anastasia (eds.). 2016. *US Election Analysis 2016: Media, Voters and the Campaign*. Poole, England: The Centre for the Study of Journalism, Culture and Community.

Machin, David and Mays, Andrea. 2012. *How to do Critical Discourse Analysis*. London: SAGE Publications Ltd.

Mannheim, Karl. 1936. *Ideology and Utopia*. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company.

Mautner, Geraldine. 2009a. "Checks and Balances: How Corpus Linguistics can Contribute to CDA". In Wodak, Ruth and Meyer, Michael (eds.): 122-143.

Simon Berg

Mautner, Geraldine. 2009b. "Corpora and Critical Discourse Analysis." In: Baker, Paul (ed.): 32-46.

Mills, C. Wright. 1956. *The Power Elite*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Muntigl P. 2002. "Politicization and depoliticization: employment policy in the European Union." In Chilton and Schäffner (eds.): 45–79.

Mutz, Diana C. 2007. "Effects of "In-Your-Face" Television Discourse on Perceptions of a Legitimate Opposition". In: *The American Political Science Review*, Vol. 101, No. 4, pp. 621-635.

Nah, Seunganh & Chung, Deborah S. 2012. "When citizens meet both professional and citizen journalists: Social trust, media credibility, and perceived journalistic roles among online community news readers". In: *Journalism*, Vol. 13, No. 4: 714-730.

Orwell, George. 1946. *Politics and the English Language*.

http://www.orwell.ru/library/essays/politics/english/e_polit/ [February 23, 2017].

Partington, Alan. 2003. *The Linguistics of Political Argumentation: The Spin-doctor and the Wolf-pack at the White House*. London: Routledge.

Petersoo, Pille. 2007. "What Does 'We' Mean? National deixis in the media". In: *Journal of Language and Politics*, Vol. 6, No. 3: 419-436.

Pew Research Center. 2016. "2016 Campaign: Strong Interest, Widespread Dissatisfaction". Available:

https://www.clingendael.nl/sites/default/files/Pew_Centre_report_2016_Campaign.pdf [April 26, 2017].

Polanyi, Livia. 1985. *Telling the American Story: A Structural and Cultural Analysis of Conversational Storytelling*. New Jersey: Ablex Publishers Corporation.

Pomper, Gerald M. 2001. "The 2000 Presidential Election: Why Gore Lost". In *Political Science Quarterly* Vol. 116, No. 2: 201-223.

Renouf, Antoinette and Keohe, Andrew. *Corpus Linguistics: Refinements and Reassessments*. Amsterdam and New York: Rodopi.

Reese, Stephen. 2016. "Trump's global war on terror". In Lilleker, D. et al. (eds.): 45.

- Riggins, Stephen (ed.). 1997. *The Language and Politics of Exclusion: Others in Discourse*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Sauer, Christoph. 2002. "Ceremonial text and talk: a functional-pragmatic approach." In Chilton and Schäffner (eds.): 111–142.
- Seider, Maynard S. 1974. "American Big Business Ideology: a Content Analysis of Executive Speeches". In: *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 39, No. 6: 802-815.
- Sheibman, Joanne. 2004. "Inclusive and exclusive patterning of the English first person plural: evidence from conversation." In: Archard, M., Kemmer, S. (eds.), *Language, Culture and Mind*. CSLI, Stanford: 377-396
- Shufeldt, Gregory. 2018. "Party–group ambivalence and voter loyalty: results from three experiments". In: *American Politics Research*, Vol. 46, No. 1: 132-168.
- Sutton, Frances X., Seymour E. Harris, Carl Kaysen, and James Tobin. 1956. *The American Business Creed*. New York: Schocken.
- Stirland, Sarah. 2008. "The Obama Campaign: A Great Campaign, Or The Greatest?". *Wired*, November 30, 2008. Available: <https://www.wired.com/2008/11/the-obama-campa/> [May 21, 2017].
- Tenorio, Hidalgo. 2011. "Critical Discourse Analysis, an Overview". In: *Nordic Journal of English Studies*, Vol. 10, No. 1: 183-210.
- Tindell, John and Medhurst, Martin. 1998. "Rhetorical Reduplication in MTV's Rock the Vote Campaign". In *Communication Studies*, Vol. 49, No. 1: 18-28.
- Tumulty, Karen. 2017. "How Donald Trump came up with 'Make America Great Again'". *The Washington Post*, January 18, 2017. Available: https://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/how-donald-trump-came-up-with-make-america-great-again/2017/01/17/fb6acf5e-dbf7-11e6-ad42-f3375f271c9c_story.html?noredirect=on&utm_term=.0158dd62a1db [June 20, 2018]
- United States Census Bureau. 2014. "Young-Adult Voting: An Analysis of Presidential Elections, 1964–2012". <https://www.census.gov/prod/2014pubs/p20-573.pdf> [January 22, 2018].

- Van Aelst, Peter. 2016. "The 2016 election and the success of fact free politics." In Lilleker, D. et al. (eds.): 16.
- Van Dijk, Teun. 2005. "Contextual knowledge management in discourse production: A CDA perspective." In: Wodak, R. and Chilton, P. (eds.): 71-110.
- Van Dijk, Teun. 2009. "Critical Discourse Studies: a Sociocognitive Approach". In Wodak, R. and Meyer, M. (eds.): 62-86.
- Van Dijk, Teun. 1997a. "What is Political Discourse Analysis". In Blommaert, Jan. & Bulchaen, Chris (eds.), *Belgian Journal of Linguistics*, Vol. 11: 11-52.
- Van Dijk, Teun. 1997b. "Political Discourse and Racism: Describing Others in Western Parliaments". In Riggins, Stephen (ed.): 31-64. *The Language and Politics of Exclusion: Others in Discourse*
- Van Leeuwen, Theo. 2005. "Three models of interdisciplinarity." In: Wodak, R. and Chilton, P. (eds.): 3-18.
- Vander, Viana, Zyngier, Sonia and Barnbrook, Geoff . 2011. *Perspectives of Corpus Linguistics*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Virtanen, Tuija. 2009. "Discourse Linguistics Meets Corpus Linguistics: Theoretical and Methodological Issues in the Troublesome Relationship". In Renouf, Antoinette et al. (eds): 49-65.
- Viser, Matt. 2015. "Even in college, Donald Trump was brash". *The Boston Globe*, Aug 28, 2015.
- Wang, Jian. 2007. "Telling the American story to the world: The purpose of U.S. public diplomacy in historical perspective". In *Public Relations Review*, Vol. 33, Issue 1: 21-30.
- Weisser, Martin. 2015. *Practical Corpus Linguistics: An Introduction to Corpus-Based Language Analysis*. Chichester, UK: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Widdowson, H. 1995. "Discourse Analysis: a Critical View". In *Language and Literature*, Vol. 4, No. 3: 157-72.
- Widdowson, H. 1998. "The Theory and Practice of Critical Discourse Analysis". In *Applied Linguistics*, Vol. 3, No. 1: 136-151.

Winders, Jamie. 2016. "Picking up the pieces: the 2016 US Presidential Election and immigration". In Lilleker, D. et al. (eds.): 42.

Wodak, Ruth and Chilton, Paul (eds.). 2005. *A New Agenda in (Critical) Discourse Analysis: Theory, methodology and interdisciplinarity*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Wodak, Ruth and de Cillia, Rudolf. 2006. "Politics and Language: Overview". In Brown, K. (ed.): 707-719.

Wodak, Ruth and Meyer, Michael (eds.). 2001. *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis, 1st Edition*. London: SAGE Publications Ltd.

Wodak, Ruth and Meyer, Michael (eds.). 2009. *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis, 2nd Edition*. London: SAGE Publications Ltd.

Wodak, Ruth and Meyer, Michael. 2009. "Critical Discourse Analysis: History, Agenda, Theory and Methodology". In Wodak, R. and Meyer, M. (eds.): 1-33.

Wodak, Ruth, de Cillia, Rudolf, Reisigl, Martin, Liebhart, Karin, Hirsch, Angelika and Mitten, Richard (eds.). 2009b. *The Discursive Construction of National Identity*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Zhu, Z. 2011. "After Paradim: Why Mixing-methodology Theorising Fails and How to Make it Work Again". In: *Journal of the Operational Research Society*, Vol. 62, No. 4: 784–798.

Appendix

Bush, George W. August 3, 2000. "Address Accepting the Presidential Nomination at the Republican National Convention in Philadelphia."

Online by Peters, Gerhard and Woolley, John T., The American Presidency Project.

<http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/?pid=25954> [12.4.2017]

Clinton, William J. July 16, 1992. "Address Accepting the Presidential Nomination at the Democratic National Convention in New York."

Online by Peters, Gerhard and Woolley, John T., The American Presidency Project.

<http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/?pid=25958> [12.4.2017]

Obama, Barack. August 28, 2008. "Address Accepting the Presidential Nomination at the Democratic National Convention in Denver: 'The American Promise'."

Online by Peters, Gerhard and Woolley, John T., The American Presidency Project.

<http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/?pid=78284> [12.4.2017]

Trump, Donald J. July 21, 2016. "Address Accepting the Presidential Nomination at the Republican National Convention in Cleveland, Ohio."

Online by Peters, Gerhard and Woolley, John T., The American Presidency Project.

<http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/?pid=117935> [12.4.2017]