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Abstract

This study investigates the roles of personal pronouns 'I' and 'they' in constructing 'self' and 'others' in presidential announcement speeches. It also tries to identify differences in personal pronoun usage between seasoned politicians and newcomers. The analysis is conducted using Norman Fairclough's approaches to critical discourse analysis (CDA). The findings of this thesis show that the politicians in question use variant categories to show different sides of their personality and try to enhance their own positive image by making their opponents (the others) look less attractive. The analysis also suggests that there seems to be a difference between veteran politicians and novice politicians.

Keywords: personal pronouns, speeches, politics, critical discourse analysis
Table of Contents

1. Introduction........................................................................................................3
2. Data....................................................................................................................4
3. Background..........................................................................................................6
   3.1 The candidates..............................................................................................6
   3.2 Short summary of the elections.....................................................................7
4. Theoretical framework and methodology.........................................................8
   4.1 Critical discourse analysis..........................................................................8
   4.2 Application of CDA for this research.......................................................9
5. Analysis.............................................................................................................11
   5.1 Overview and statistics..............................................................................11
   5.2 Description...................................................................................................12
      5.2.1 I...........................................................................................................13
      5.2.2 They...................................................................................................17
   5.3 Interpretation.................................................................................................20
   5.4 Explanation....................................................................................................22
6. Conclusion..........................................................................................................25
7. References...........................................................................................................27
Appendix A...........................................................................................................30
Appendix B...........................................................................................................36
1. Introduction

The United States of America is one of the most influential countries in the world and their elections and political decisions affect us all. The last few years have been riddled with crises: the economical crisis, wars, ISIS, refugees and so on. Due to its status, the position that the US takes on these matters will impact the whole world. The decision was made to analyse the speeches of presidential candidates because the outcome of these elections is particularly important as it has an influence on more than just elements that affect American citizens. Foreign policies and the attitude towards globalisation are also to be re-evaluated by the new government.

This high impact that the United States has on the rest of world is based on its power. And the power of countries originates from the power of individuals. Politicians are the people who want the power and responsibility to decide on their countries' actions and strategies. At the center of this thesis is Norman Fairclough's (1989) idea: power cannot exist without language because language is the most important mean of communication. This deduction led to the topic of this thesis. It would be interesting to research the ways that politicians use language to affect their audience. When reading the speeches that were chosen as data, it could be clearly seen that the candidates make different linguistic choices. This realisation led to the hypothesis: there is a difference between the way that seasoned politicians speak when compared to the way that newcomers speak.

A choice was made to focus on the different functions that personal pronouns have. The analysis will focus specifically on pronouns 'I' and 'they' because they are not used only for the purpose of referencing to someone, like in the case of 'he' and 'she' (Schegloff (1996) cited in Bramley (2001) p. 19). Thus these pronouns are not necessarily neutral words but they carry different connotations in them. Bramley (2001) explains that pronouns are used to construct favourable images of the speaker and the 'others' will be presented in negative light to enforce the contrast between 'us' and 'them' (p. 86). The analytic section of this thesis will also seek to confirm this statement. The idea that personal pronouns function as a way of creating 'multiple selves' (Bramley, 2001) led to the research question: how are personal pronouns used to construct different identities?
2. Data

This chapter will introduce the materials and motivations for selecting them. The following research is based on three speeches, one from each candidate that was chosen. In these speeches, the chosen politicians first officially announce that they will be running for the office of the President of the United States. The transcriptions for all the speeches are from Time Magazine’s website www.time.com. Links to these transcriptions are listed under references. The written material was also compared to the videos of the speeches in order to be sure that the transcriptions are reliable and do not have any crucial meaning-changing errors. The result of this comparison was that the written speeches miss the occasional article or demonstrative pronoun but nothing is left out that holds an important meaning to the speaker’s message.

As there are dozens of candidates that are more or less serious about running for President in 2016, the focus point had to be narrowed down. After studying the most prominent candidates, it was an easy decision to take poll favourites from the two most popular parties: Hillary Clinton from the Democratic Party and Jeb Bush from the Republican Party. It is to be noted that poll favourites have changed since the writing of this thesis began. These two frontrunners were then contrasted with a different kind of candidate: Donald Trump. He is also a candidate for the Republican Party’s presidential nomination but he does not portray a traditional politician. Trump is a controversial character in the following elections because his opinions differ a lot from the other candidates and he advertises himself as being someone who says what he means. This statement already tells us that apparently Trump does not think that traditional politicians say what they mean.

The transcriptions are fairly long (Clinton 4687 words or ~46 minutes, Bush 2217 words or ~28 minutes, Trump 6334 words or ~45 minutes), which is why this thesis will include only samples of them in the analytic section. In these transcriptions, the focus was on the usage of personal pronouns, more specifically, the different meanings of pronouns ’I’ and ’they’ have been analysed in different contexts. In order to fully illustrate the findings in each speech, the clauses that include any of the personal pronouns mentioned above have been separated from the main body of the texts. The clause collections were then further divided into different categories so it would be easier to compare and analyse the
speech acts of the candidates relative to each other. These categories and text samples are presented in the appendices and examples can be found from the analytic section of this thesis to clarify the findings.
3. Background

3.1 The candidates

The chosen candidates will be briefly introduced in order to provide more insight to their motives and aims politically. This section will also clarify the reasons for choosing these specific politicians and hopefully also enforce the argument regarding differences between fresh and experienced politicians.

Hillary Clinton was raised in a middle class family but her mother suffered a tough childhood which later sparked Clinton’s desire to help children. She met her husband Bill Clinton in Yale Law School. After graduation, Clinton worked for Children’s Defense Fund. In 1975 she got married and five years later the Clintons had a daughter. Clinton co-founded Arkansas Advocates for Children and Families while her husband served as the governor of Arkansas. Bill Clinton was elected president twice (1992 and 1996). In 1992, mr Clinton was running against Jeb Bush’s father. Hillary Clinton was elected first female senator in the state of New York. She ran for president in 2008 but lost to Barack Obama in the primary elections. During President Obama’s reign, she served as his secretary of state. Both Clintons are Democrats. This backstory is from https://www.hillaryclinton.com/about/bio/ which means that it is written by herself or more probably by people running her campaign.

Jeb Bush was born in a politically active family. His father George Bush was a president (1989-1993) and his older brother, too, was a president (2001-2009). The whole family are Republicans. Jeb Bush taught English while he was in Mexico as an exchange student. Later he got his university degree in Latin American affairs. He served as governor of Florida for two terms (1999-2006). This backstory was retrieved from http://www.biography.com/people/jeb-bush-201294 .

Donald Trump’s father was a builder and a real estate developer. Trump studied in the New York Military Academy from the age of 13. He graduated from the Wharton School of Finance with a degree in economics. After graduation Trump worked for his father. He expanded the business and later was given control of the company. Trump was very successful in business and made many important deals. The Trump Organization has been involved with casinos, hotels, and public buildings. Trump has been married three times and has five children. He became world-known when he starred the hit show The
Apprentice. Trump considered running for president in 2012 but decided not to in the end. Trump’s backstory is from the same website as Bush’s: http://www.biography.com/people/donald-trump-9511238.

3.2 Short summary of the elections

The presidential election in the US is conducted in two stages: first the candidates from the same party compete with one another as only one can be the presidential candidate in the second stage. (www.votesmart.org) Then the two winning candidates from both major parties, Republican and Democrat, compete with each other. The citizens of the United States are responsible for the voting in both elections. The first election consists of primary elections and caucuses that take place in all the states. The voting system in the US is complicated because all of the states vote separately and their conventions are different. Because of the complexity of the United States voting system, this thesis will not go further into it. The important part for the following analysis is the fact that the Democrats and Republicans actually compete within their own party at this point.

Figure 1. Election system.
4. Theoretical framework and methodology

Critical discourse analysis (CDA) will be utilized as a theoretical framework for this thesis. The reason this theory out of all the theories that analyse language was chosen is that CDA focuses on the hidden power relations and the social context of the produced speech or discourse. Therefore, it was concluded that the best possible way to truly discover the agendas that these presidential candidates have is through careful and critical analysis of their lexical choices. As experts often remind us, CDA is not truly a concept; it is to be viewed as an approach (Meyer, 2001 p. 14). As texts and social contexts surrounding us are always different, it is not practical to use the same methodology for every research project. Personal pronouns in political speeches have previously been studied using critical discourse analysis, e.g. in Bello (2013), other discourse studies have also been utilised: conversation analysis (Eramley, 2001) and a study method focusing on pragmatics (Fetzer, 2014). In this chapter, the concept of critical discourse analysis will be defined and the difference between it and other discourse-related study methods will be explained.

4.1 Critical discourse analysis

Critical discourse analysis takes a special interest in the relationship of language and power, which is why it is often used in studies that focus on institutional, political, media, and gender discourses (Wodak, 2001). Van Dijk (1993) describes CDA of being “a study of the relations between discourse, power, dominance, social inequality and the position of the discourse analyst in such social relationships.” (p. 248) The general principles and assumptions that CDA takes are the simplest way of finding the differences between it and other socio-linguistic approaches. CDA differs from other, perhaps more traditional methods, in the sense that it recognizes and embraces its own political biasness. Being impartial is often a given value in science, but CDA believes that it is impossible to analyse a text without letting the researcher’s own beliefs affect the results (Jäger, 2001). Another important characteristic of CDA is the concept that all discourses are bound to their time and place, thus they can only be properly understood if referenced to their correct context (Meyer, 2001). Different researchers have different ideas of what CDA is
and what it should be, but these two main characteristics form the foundation of this approach.

Now some further aspects of CDA will be introduced from the viewpoint of Norman Fairclough because this particular study is based on his research and ideas. CDA is relational, which means that it does not target entities or individuals but social relations. These relations occur everywhere: between individuals who read, write, and communicate; but also between languages, conversations, newspapers, and other media (Fairclough, 2013). Relations like these can further be defined as dialectical relations. This means: “—relations between objects which are different from one another but...not fully separate in the sense that one excludes the other.” (p. 4) Fairclough clarifies this idea with an example on the relations between power and discourse. Power and discourse are clearly not the same thing but a part of power is in discourse and, vice versa, there are always power relations present in every discourse (p. 4). Fairclough sees CDA as being an analysis of the dialectical relations of discourse and other elements. Because these relations are so widespread and complicated, CDA utilizes different methods from many fields (i.e. linguistic, sociology, politics, etc.). CDA is therefore an interdisciplinary form of analysis. The reason this theory is included in the thesis is that the analysis benefits from the interdisciplinary nature that CDA has, thus it is relevant to know the theoretical background for it. Another important term for this thesis is speech acts. Fairclough (1989) explains them to be a part of speech that shows “what the producer is doing by virtue of producing it – making a statement, making a promise, threatening, warning, asking a question, giving an order, and so on.” (p. 156) A speech act is simply the part of a sentence or speech that serves the purpose of delivering a message, e.g. an apology or a promise.

4.2 Application of CDA for this research

For this research, the application of Fairclough’s (1989) three-tier analytical framework was chosen. The framework is conducted in the following stages: description, interpretation and explanation. In the first stage, description, formal features are identified and labelled into categories. CDA is applicable to many aspects of text, i.e. vocabulary,
grammar, textual structures, punctuation and so on, but in this study the focus of the analysis is narrowed to personal pronouns. Step 2, interpretation, observes the relationship of the discourses and interaction. The interpretation analysis of the text pays attention to studying the production, consumption, and reproduction of the content. And finally, explanation analyses the relationship with interaction and social context. Interpretation and explanation stages occur after analysing the description of the text (personal pronouns). In these stages we will look at the discourses that the texts have with their audiences and milieu. These three stages are the essence of critical discourse analysis. It is not sufficient to analyse only the categories that the pronouns obtain (description). As the key feature of CDA is focusing on the context of the texts, it is of great importance to observe the connection that the texts have with society and audience. Hopefully the following figure better illustrates the interdependent nature of the analysis stages.

Figure 2. Fairclough's Dimensions of Discourse and Discourse Analysis. (From Locke, 2004, p. 42)
5. Analysis

5.1 Overview and statistics

First it should be noted that all the personal pronouns that have contained contractions of tense, I’m, I’ve, I’ll, and I’d, have been included in the analysis in order to get accurate results. This was necessary because the candidates often contracted tense when speaking. For the statistics, also the pronouns ‘you’ and ‘we’ were included. This is because they provide a contrast to ‘I’ and ‘they’ and a larger sample of pronoun use helps to see the results as a whole. We can see from table 1 that all the chosen personal pronouns appear most often in Trump’s speech.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>I</th>
<th>You</th>
<th>We</th>
<th>They</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trump</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>646</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinton</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bush</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

However, as we can see from table 2, Trump’s speech included 6334 words, Clinton’s 4687 words, and Bush’s 2217 words. The frequency percentages that the pronouns in focus obtained were then calculated and these are the results:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Length (min)</th>
<th>Word count</th>
<th>Pronoun frequency (%)</th>
<th>Words/minute</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trump</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>6334</td>
<td>10,2</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinton</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>4687</td>
<td>5,2</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bush</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2217</td>
<td>4,8</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There is only a 0.4 difference between Clinton and Bush, the seasoned politicians from both parties. This would support the hypothesis that there is a difference between traditional politicians and newcomers. More than every tenth word in Trump’s speech is ‘I’, ‘you’, ‘we’, or ‘they’. One major reason for this is the repetition that is often present in the speech:

Thank you. It’s true, and these are the best and the finest. When Mexico sends its people, they’re not sending their best. They’re not sending you. They’re not sending you. They’re sending people that have lots of problems, and they’re bringing those problems with us. They’re bringing drugs. They’re bringing crime. They’re rapists. And some, I assume, are good people.

Example 1. Trump’s speech.

Repetition is commonly used as a rhetorical device. It can be seen as both effective and "sloppy behavior" (Shimanoff & Brunak 1977 cited in Fung 2007 p. 224). Erickson (1989) cited in Fung (2007) argues that “repeating oneself adds precision and leads to greater persuasiveness and dominance in the conversation.” (pp. 224-225) In this extract it could be argued that the repetition of ‘they’re bringing’ is used to give impact to Trump’s message.

Another interesting finding from figure 3 is that Clinton’s and Trump’s speeches lasted almost the same time but Trump used 1647 words more than Clinton. The reason for this peculiarity is that Trump did not stop for applause while he was speaking, whereas the other candidates did. He filled the pauses in his speech with self-repetition and this habit increased the word count in his speech.

5.2 Description

The description analysis of this thesis will focus on pronouns ‘I’ and ‘they’ because they showed well the constructing of ‘self’ in contrast to ‘otherness’. As the research question is concerned with ‘selfness’ and ‘otherness’, these pronouns are the most important and interesting for the analysis. Wilson (cited in Bramley 2001) argues that “‘they’ is part of a pronominal scale which is the most distant of all the pronouns from ‘I’ which represents
the individual "self". (p. 182) Thus 'I' and 'they' contrast each other well and bring variety to the analysis.

5.2.1

The first focus of this thesis will be 'I' because "apart from the usual grammatical words like 'the' and 'to' the next most occurred word is 'I'." (Bello, 2013, p. 87) Also, 'I' was the most popular pronoun in Trump's and Clinton's speeches and a close second in Bush's. The first person singular is quite ambiguous because it is a term of self-referencing, not a substitute for a noun or a name (Comrie 1981, Halliday and Hasan 1976, Lyons 1977, cited in Bramley 2001, p. 27). Self-referencing in political speeches is a tool for constructing 'multiple selves' (Bramley, 2001). This simply means that the speakers refer to themselves in order to show different sides of their person. 'I' can emphasize a personal opinion, action, or experience. In the following categories, the different identities constructed with 'I' in the announcement speeches will be analysed.

Table 3. 'I' in different actions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Accomplishments</th>
<th>Power</th>
<th>Personality</th>
<th>Promises</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clinton</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bush</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trump</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reporting accomplishments

Perhaps the best way to convince one's future voters that he/she is an effective and active politician is to talk about accomplishments. Accomplishments are concrete actions that suggest that the politician in question has been making a difference in the past, thus the presumption is that they will make a difference in the future. Achievements also indicate that the candidate has leadership and decision-making skills. When applying for any job, one will certainly benefit from experience in that area. But speaking about achievements can easily be considered as bragging, and thus the speaker needs to be careful not to sound too egocentric. It could be argued that the failure of mentioning
one's accomplishments in an announcement speech at all might be harmful. It might lead to the illusion that the candidate cannot pertain to concrete actions.

The full list of accomplishments in relation to 'I' can be found from the Appendix A. When looking at the list of speech acts, it can be seen that all of the candidates address their strengths and show their priorities and agendas. For Clinton they are children (with disabilities), the poor, and veterans. For Bush it's taxes and for Trump it's business and money. Bush and Clinton mention their achievements that relate to politics but Trump, as a newcomer, talks about the thing that he believes he does better than anyone in his competitors: business.

Utilizing power and experience

The category of power and experience differs a little from accomplishments. For example, a speech act would be placed into the accomplishment category if it was phrased: "I, as a leader, founded a hospital", because that is a material action. Whereas: "I, as a leader, supervised hospital staff as they did important research", would be placed in the power and experience category. The difference is that the first example emphasizes the action and the second the leadership.

Clinton’s speech is the most straightforward one in this category. She uses three ways to remind the audience of her power:

1. I + supervised/represented/etc.
2. As a + powerful position
3. Doing something + after coming from a place where I'm in a powerful position

Bush, once again, has the least speech acts in the category. He, too, refers to his position as a governor. This category turned out to be quite problematic when attempting to place Trump's utterances into it. As we can see from the extract in Appendix A, it is very difficult to even understand the sentences when taken out of context. Longer examples had to be taken because the element of power can only be seen when looking at a larger sample. When conducting this analysis, the preliminary presumption was that most of Trump's 'I' occurrences would be placed here because when watching the speech, it feels like Trump is talking a lot about his power. That was not the case. His power acts, not surprisingly, are mostly related to his position as a businessman. But what made the
categorizing of his speech so difficult is that he often talks about him doing or having this and that, and the power element is in the concept that no one else can/has achieved that position. For example, there is a moment when Trump casually mentions that when he builds hotels, he must pay taxes (number 4 in Appendix A, under "Trump: power and experience"), he is exercising his power by talking about the things that he is able to do because he is so successful.

**Depicting personality and individuality**

The candidates want to present themselves as professional individuals with skill to use power as a tool for furthering the causes that are important to themselves and their voters. But politicians also need to be the kind of people that the audience can identify themselves with. Therefore, the candidates need to add personal touches from their lives to their speeches in order to be 'human' and relatable. This is where the concept of constructing 'multiple selves' becomes particularly noticeable as the candidates show a 'softer' side of themselves.

America is known to be quite a secular country and family is considered one of the most important values. Therefore, it is not surprising that all of the personal history that these politicians share are tied to their families (Appendix A). Clinton talks about her childhood, her mother, and her daughter. Talking about the important women in her life might be a tactical move as that emphasizes Clinton’s position as a part of a minority (women). Her choice of topic emphasizes the difference between her and the other frontrunners. Bush also talks about his family, first he mentions his mother in the audience, then talks about his parents, and then his wife. Trump is the least willing to share the sensitive and meaningful moments in his life. He states twice that he has a great family without going into details and then once talks about his father in relation to his work. This unwillingness to humanize oneself might lead to voters not relating to him.

**Making promises**

This is a category that was expected to get most content. Giving promises is arguably the most important part of giving an announcement speech. When running for office, politicians are expected to want to improve the current situation. The candidates tell the public what they will/wish to do if they win the election.
Promises show the differences between the values of the candidates. This is one of the main reasons for choosing these precise candidates’ speeches to be analysed: they represent the political variety rather well. One is rooting for the poor, minorities, and women; one is for the conservative and rich; and one is against immigration and globalization, but for military. There are two kinds of promises in this category: actual promises of concrete matters and rhetoric. For example: Clinton mentions that she will “rewrite the tax code so it rewards hard work and investments here at home, not quick trades or stashing profits overseas” (direct promise) and that she is not “running for some Americans, but for all Americans” (rhetoric). Clinton and Trump both have a high ratio of concrete promises compared to rhetoric whereas Bush’s promises are mostly just the goals he wishes to achieve, not the means of how he’s going to achieve them: “I will campaign as I would serve, going everywhere, speaking to everyone, keeping my word, facing the issues without flinching, and staying true to what I believe”. This promise is full of idioms (e.g. staying true, keeping my word) that could be considered as clichés that do not hold any real meaning in them. Again, voters might shy away from evasive and indefinite promises.

**Other**

Now one might look at the statistics and ask where all the other appearances of ‘I’ are if not in the categories above. One main group that was left out was ‘conversation and engaging’. In this group, the candidates directly engage with the audience that is physically present and with the audience that is watching the announcement from somewhere else. The initial idea was to analyse these speech acts in the ‘you’ section but due to the restricted length of this thesis, the idea was impossible to execute. This section includes utterances like “And you’re lucky I didn’t try singing that, too, I’ll tell you!” (Clinton’s speech) The analysis of the speeches suggests that the use of conversational tone is common. Malone (cited in Bramley 2001) describes “the referent of generic ‘you’ as “people such as ourselves””. (p. 129) The use of second person singular therefore diminishes the formality of the speech.

Trump had hundreds of self-references in his speech but he is not overpowering in any of the categories. The reason for this is that he mainly talks about how he feels, what he does, and what he thinks. This is only a small sample:
I like them...And I hear their speeches...And I watch the speeches...I watch the speeches of these people...China comes over and they dump all their stuff, and I buy it. I buy it, because, frankly, I have an obligation to buy it...I love China, I love China. No, I love them...I'm not even saying that's the kind of mindset, that's the kind of thinking you need for this country...I love the Saudis...I think I am a nice person...I don't think it's gonna happen.

Example 2. Trump's thinking and doing.

The self-repetition and thinking/doing consumes most of the staggering amount of the first person singulars that appear in his speech. There are also few instances that cannot be placed in any of these categories but they are a minor part of the speeches and thus not important for this analysis.

5.2.2 They

According to Bramley, 'they' has received little attention in political research (2001, p. 182). Nevertheless, 'they' is very interesting in this context because it reveals the agendas of the candidates from a different perspective than 'I'. As mentioned before, people tend to use 'they' to refer to 'others'. The results of this study suggest that the usage of 'they' has often negative connotations. Håkansson (2012) argues that creating a negative image of the opposition is a way to make 'them' seem like unreliable leaders (p. 8). Thus ‘they’ points to those who are not we, and is used to form an oppositional relationship between him or her [the speaker] and others, often with negativity towards the others.” (Håkansson, 2012, p. 17) 'I' is commonly used to construct positive images of oneself whereas 'they' does the opposite. The full list of 'they' occurrences in the speeches is listed in Appendix B.

Table 4. The different contexts of 'they'.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Internal threats</th>
<th>External threats</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clinton</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bush</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trump</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
External threats

The term 'external threats' in this context means the negatively connotated speech acts that include the pronoun 'they' and an object that is outside the United States. This category includes threats such as foreign countries or unnamed objects that pose threats to the society of the candidates and their audiences. The full list of these occurrences is listed in Appendix B. The difference between the traditional candidates and Trump is clear (table 4). Bush and Clinton do not use 'they' to refer to threats outside the US at all. Trump, on the other hand, has most of his speech acts of 'they' in this category. This clearly shows that his strategy is to contrast himself with others. Trump had surprisingly few categorized speech acts in section 'I', especially if taken account the number of times he used the first person pronoun in his speech. But he clearly places much of his focus on creating negative images with 'they'. The figures of table 4 include all the instances where 'they' was used. If we focus strictly on the separate speech acts and ignore the repetition of 'they', there are 39 different aspects that Trump addresses with this pronoun.

Trump does not focus on just a few countries that he views as threats. Appendix B shows that there is a massive list of different places in Trump's speech. For him, the countries pose threats to different areas of interest:

a) Economy

1. —let's say, China in a trade deal? They kill us.
2. When did we beat Japan at anything? They send their cars over—

b) Security

17. We get Bergdahl, they get five killer terrorists that everybody wanted over there.
18. We get a no-good traitor, and they get the five people that they wanted for years—

c) Immigration

5. Mexico sends its people, they're not sending their best. They're not sending you. They're not sending you. They're sending people that have lots of problems, and they're bringing those problems with us. They're bringing drugs. They're bringing crime. They're rapists.

These speech acts show what Trump's values are. He is against global world, if global world is defined by its co-operation and openness. He wishes to shift part of the blame to
other countries. Trump's suggestion is that (at least part of) all the negative things that the United States has faced, i.e. crime, rape, economic crisis, and drugs, are someone else's fault. He is contrasting 'us' with 'them' with 'us' meaning the US and its citizens.

**Internal threats**

Internal threats are other politicians or political parties that the candidates view as threats to themselves. As explained previously, the candidates actually compete within their party in the primary elections. Their real competition at this stage is inside their own party. Yet both Clinton and Bush criticize only the opposing party. Trump is the only candidate that expresses any concern for the competence of his current competitors. Out of these three candidates, Clinton was the first to announce her campaign on 12.4.2015. Bush announced 15.6.2015 and Trump the day after Bush. Clinton was also the first to announce in her own party and that might be one of the reasons why she does not address any of her fellow Democrat candidates. This thesis argues that it's more likely that the candidates criticize only the opposing party because it's a tradition that is to be followed. Perhaps this way the party seems more unitary.

Trump is clearly not interested in strengthening the consistency of his party. He does not care about party lines, he claims that no traditional politician will ever "make America great again." Here is one example taken from the full list available in Appendix B:

3. Politicians are all talk, no action. Nothing's gonna get done. They will not bring us—believe me—to the promised land. They will not.

Trump sees Bush as a major competitor and also, perhaps, a politician that embodies the things that he most dislikes in the world of politics. This is his comment on Bush:

14. But all of these politicians that I'm running against now, they're trying to disassociate. I mean, you looked at Bush, it took him five days to answer the question on Iraq. He couldn't answer the question. He didn't know. I said, "Is he intelligent?"

When addressing enemies that are referred to by 'they', there is definite evidence that suggests that there is a difference between traditional politicians and the newcomer. Clinton and Bush seem to follow an unwritten rule that puts the reputation of the party before the candidate's wishes. In other words: it is more important that the party as a
whole seems coherent than it is to criticize the views of the other candidates of the same party.

Neutral

The neutral category was included in the analysis because it is important to note that not all of the 'they' occurrences are necessarily hostile. In fact, Clinton and Bush mostly use 'they' as a mean of referencing to someone or something that they have mentioned before. This is a common way to avoid repetition. For example, one of Clinton's neutral 'they' sentences is: "Our country’s challenges didn't begin with the Great Recession and they won’t end with the recovery." (Appendix B) It is more natural to refer to "country’s challenges" with 'they' instead of repeating "country’s challenges" again. Trump also has many neutral speech acts in this category but his threat/neutral ratio is much higher than the other politicians'.

5.3 Interpretation

According to Fairclough (1999), the interpretation stage is defined by the following questions:

What is going on (activity, topic, and purpose)?

Who is involved and in what relations?

What is the role of language in what’s going on?

As the core aim of giving an announcement speech is promising the audience actions and improvements in return of their votes, the analytic section presented now will concentrate on those specific actions. Next, the purpose and participants of giving promises will be inspected. The relationship of promises and votes will also be analysed in the next paragraph.

Weber's (2013) definition of this action is the following: "The act of making promises is critical to the communication strategy of any organisation that wants to differentiate its offering from that of the competition." (p. 117) Weber is talking about promises in the field of business but the primary purpose of promises is similar in politics: to stand out from competition. Why do the candidates then want to give promises? The purpose of that is
two-sided: 1. The candidates want to receive the most appreciated occupation in their country. They actually want to influence matters that they are not content with. I claim that these two sides can be found in every politician but the ratio differs. It is impossible to know which side is more important to the candidate as no one is willing to admit that they want to become president for the status. Giving promises can be simplified as making a trade: the voters and the candidate negotiate the terms and then exchange goods (the vote for a promise of action). The promises in announcement speeches can be seen as the initiation of this negotiation. The candidates start by introducing the general ideas that they wish to execute. Then the public can ask questions through interviews and respond to the candidates via polls. The campaigns then adjust their aims and clarify them. Votes are symbols of trust, they are the public's way of saying: "I trust you to commit to these promises that you give, I agree with you, and I am willing to let you decide what is best for me on a larger scale." Giving a vote is therefore a huge acknowledgement of confidence.

Promises also show the values that the candidates have. No candidate is willing to fight for, e.g. the fair distribution of capital gains if they are not that concerned with the working class. The candidates want to be identified with people that share the same values and through examples they want to convince voters to agree with them. The role of pronouns in making promises is crucial. The reason why candidates use 'I' when introducing promises is because they want to emphasize that they are the one person who holds those values important, and they are the right person to make a difference. They are the right choice. When observing a promise such as "So, you have to wonder: "When does my hard work pay off? When does my family get ahead?" "When?" I say now." (Appendix A, Clinton's promises) it is clear that the candidate tries to identify with a citizen that has had these thoughts. Through voicing these worries that a voter has had, the candidate shows that she too has thought about the issues. The ending sentence "I say now." sums up the candidate's power and gives a promise of change that is directly linked to the responsibility of the candidate. Thus, the use of 'I' does not only suggest that the specific candidate has the will and power to make a change, but it also brings about responsibility. If the candidate does get elected and fails to fulfill a promise, they will often be blamed personally. There is a significant difference in making a promise that starts with "I will" and with a promise such as this:
Save Medicare, Medicaid and Social Security without cuts. Have to do it. Get rid of the fraud. Get rid of the waste and abuse, but save it. People have been paying it for years.

*Example 3. Trump’s promises.*

Without the first person pronoun, this promise is not a promise but a command. It can be argued that a promise without it being tied to the speaker is not as effective because the speaker does not take the responsibility of making it happen. Naturally there is no way of knowing if Trump used this tool of responsibility avoidance on purpose. The argument here is that these linguistic (pronoun) choices affect our opinions without us even realising it. Therefore, we might not be as convinced about this promise as a promise that includes 'I'.

5.4 Explanation

The final stage of this analysis will observe the relationship between the discovered and recurring speech acts and the social context of these speeches. According to Fairclough (1989), the explanation stage should follow these topics and questions:

- **Social determinants:** what power relations at situational, institutional and societal levels help shape the discourse?

- **Ideologies:** what elements of members’ resources drawn upon have ideological character?

- **Effects:** how is this discourse positioned in relation to struggles at the situational, institutional and societal levels? Are these struggles covert or overt? Is the discourse normative or creative? Does it contribute to the sustenance of existing power relations or in their transformation?

The interpretation stage focused on a category linked to the first person pronoun (promises), so this final analysis will address the second part of the description section: opponents. This decision was made to ensure that the analysis of this thesis has variety. The most important question for this part of the analysis is whether the candidates are trying to sustain the existing power relations or change them. In addition to this, the
overtness of these attempts will also analysed. The final analysis stage is thus adapted from Fairclough's questions to serve best the needs of this study and its hypothesis.

The concept of changing the power relations can be considered from two angles:

1. The Democrat/Republican power relations

2. The whole political system

The Democrats are now considered to be 'in power' as they hold the office of the president. The Republicans naturally want to change these relations to their favour. Bush is very open about this and shows it by pointing out all the mistakes that he thinks the Democrats have made during Obama's reign. He states his stand at the beginning paragraph of his speech:

The party now in the White House is planning a no-suspense primary, for a no-change election. To hold onto power. To slog on with the same agenda under another name: That's our opponents' call to action this time around. That's all they've got left.

Example 4. Bush and opponents.

The interesting aspect in this is that Bush blames the Democrats for greedily holding onto power but never counters that allegation with a statement such as "I/we want/need/deserve the power!". He is very overt about wanting to diminish Democrat power but, at the same time, covert about wanting the power to himself.

Clinton, the leading candidate of the Democrats, naturally does not agree with Bush. She does not want to change the power relations when it comes to the relations between Democrats and Republicans, she wants to change the whole political system for the better (with Democrats in charge, of course).

Our political system is so paralyzed by gridlock and dysfunction that most Americans have lost confidence that anything can actually get done. And they've lost trust in the ability of both government and Big Business to change course. Now, we can blame historic forces beyond our control for some of this, but the choices we've made as a nation, leaders and citizens alike, have also played a big role. Our next President must work with Congress and every other willing partner across our entire country. And I will do just that — to turn the tide so these currents start working for us more than against us.
Example 5. Clinton and power relations.

She openly acknowledges that the political system needs change and co-operation. The means and reality for this to happen are still mystified.

Trump is the only candidate who does not really care for the struggles between the two major parties. He openly demands for a change in the political system. He wants more openness, less negotiations and more action.

Well, you need somebody, because politicians are all talk, no action. Nothing’s gonna get done. They will not bring us — believe me — to the promised land. They will not.

Example 6. Trump and politicians.

There is no debate about the overtness of Trump’s statements and his aims but the means he is going to use to make a change are hidden. The interesting factor in his situation is that he wants the political system to be more progressive and simple so he can use it to take the country back to the age of the "American dream". Simultaneously, Trump glorifies history and wants to renew politics.

Sadly, the American dream is dead. But if I get elected president I will bring it back bigger and better and stronger than ever before, and we will make America great again.

Example 7. Trump’s American dream.
6. Conclusion

The aim of this thesis was to analyse the methods that politicians use to present themselves in a positive light and, vice versa, how they belittle their opponents in relation to themselves and their goals. The construction of 'multiple selves' and 'others' can be clearly seen from the analytic section of this study and it answers the research question: how are personal pronouns used to construct different identities? This thesis categorizes the different 'selves' and 'others' but the reasons behind these speech acts could be further analysed later. Why have the candidates chosen these specific speech acts and why do all of them utilize the same categories of self-referencing? Are there other ways of promoting oneself with the pronoun 'I'? The contents of the speeches and the values of the politicians could also be researched later as this thesis only begins to introduce this subject. It would also be very interesting to compare the announcement speeches to speeches that the candidates have given later on and see whether they use the same tools of self-representation as they have here. If their poll success is to decline, do they change their manner of speaking? All in all, there is a lot more that could be done relating to this research.

This thesis also attempted to show that there is a difference between experienced politicians and newcomers. This research is only a small sample, hence generalisations cannot be made to include the whole political field, but for these specific politicians the hypothesis is accurate. There are many significant differences throughout the findings when comparing Trump to Clinton and Bush. When looking at plain statistics, Trump's speech stands out with a staggering number of personal pronouns. His speech differs from others with both its structure and its content. With such a small sample, it is impossible to definitely know whether the differences derive from the order of political seniority or from simply being different individuals. This thesis argues that Trump's wishes to demolish the power relations in politics stem from the fact that he is just starting his political career and therefore he is not yet closely tied to the community of his party. He is not as loyal to political standard behaviour because he does not feel attached to it as a newcomer. Thus, Trump is not afraid to address his opponents in his own party. For Clinton and Bush it might be a lot more difficult to criticize their own respective parties as
they have such strong connections to them. Bush and Clinton are tied to their parties through their families. Trump has a strong focus on his opponents and America’s opponents whereas Bush’s and Clinton’s speeches seem to be following a pattern that is very different from Trump’s. In the future, it would be very interesting to study if there is a recognizable pattern in the experienced politicians’ speeches.

Fairclough’s framework was a great tool for this thesis. It helped find the ways that the politicians used demonstrations of power to seem like ‘good politicians’ (term from Bramley, 2001). Analysing these speech acts was sometimes rather difficult and the interdisciplinary nature of CDA became crucial for the analysis. In order to understand the politicians in question, it is of importance to know some social and historical context to conduct an accurate analysis. This is why the background for both the candidates and the election system were introduced. All in all, the conclusion based on the findings of this thesis is that there are in fact many different sides of personality that the candidates wish to highlight in their speeches. Bramley’s argument about ‘otherness’ serving as a contrast to ‘self’ also seems to be accurate in this study. Hence, despite this being just a small sample of analysis, the results are clear and consistent with previous research.
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Appendix A

'I' in speech acts:

Accomplishment

Clinton:

1. I advocated for Congress to require better working and living conditions for farm workers whose children deserved better opportunities
2. I walked door-to-door to find out how many children with disabilities couldn’t go to school
3. I defended the right of poor people to have a lawyer
4. I’ll see to it that they get not just the thanks of a grateful nation, but the care and benefits they’ve earned

Bush:

1. I also used my veto power to protect our taxpayers from needless spending

Trump:

1. I beat China all the time
2. I was responsible for the convention center on the west side
3. I did a lot of great deals, and I did them early and young
4. And now I’m building all over the world, and I love what I’m doing
5. I’m proud of my net worth

Power and experience

Clinton:

1. I supervised law students who represented clients in courts and prisons
2. To be right across the water from the headquarters of the United Nations, where I represented our country many times
3. I served as Secretary of State...I had the honor of representing brave firefighters, police officers, EMTs, construction workers, and volunteers who ran toward danger on 9/11 and stayed there
4. As a Senator from New York, I dedicated myself to getting our city and state the help we needed to recover
5. And as a member of the Armed Services Committee
6. I worked to maintain the best-trained, best-equipped, strongest military, ready for today’s threats and tomorrow’s
7. I’ve stood up to adversaries like Putin and
8. reinforced allies like Israel
9. I was in the Situation Room on the day we got bin Laden
10. That’s something I did as Senator and Secretary of State
11. But President Obama asked me to serve, and I accepted because we both love our country
12. I’ve seen it up close and personal
13. I’d come home from a hard day at the Senate or the State Department

Bush:
1. I know we can fix this. Because I’ve done it
2. I was a governor who refused to accept that as the normal or right way of conducting the people’s business
3. I will be that president because I was a reforming governor, not just another member of the club

Trump:
1. I’m not doing that to brag, because you know what? I don’t have to brag. I don’t have to, believe it or not
2. I’m doing that to say that that’s the kind of thinking our country needs [Trump’s kind of thinking]
3. I speak to border guards and they tell us what we’re getting
4. When I have to build a hotel, I pay interest
5. I have so many websites, I have them all over the place
6. I hire people, they do a website
7. Obama is going to be out playing golf. He might be on one of my courses. I would invite him, I actually would say
8. I have the best courses in the world, so I’d say, you what, if he wants to
9. I have one right next to the White House, right on the Potomac
10. Hey, I have lobbyists. I have lobbyists that can produce anything for me
11. I sell apartments for— I just sold an apartment for $15 million to somebody from China. Am I supposed to dislike them?
12. I own a big chunk of the Bank of America Building at 1290 Avenue of the Americas
13. that I got from China in a war
14. I know the smartest negotiators in the world. I know the good ones. I know the bad ones. I know the overrated ones... But I know the negotiators in the world, and I put them one for each country

15. But I wouldn’t even waste my time with this one. I would call up the head of Ford, who I know

16. Because I don’t need anybody’s money. It’s nice. I don’t need anybody’s money. I’m using my own money. I’m not using the lobbyists. I’m not using donors

17. I don’t care. I’m really rich

Personality

Clinton:

1. I didn’t learn this from politics. I learned it from my own family
2. I asked what kept her going
3. I signed up at my Methodist Church to babysit the children of Mexican
4. I won’t get everything right. Lord knows I’ve made my share of mistakes. And I certainly haven’t won every battle I’ve fought
5. I got this from my mother
6. When I was a girl
7. I can still hear her saying
8. and I often think about all the battles she witnessed
9. I wish my mother could have been with us longer. I wish she could have seen Chelsea become a mother herself
10. I wish she could have met Charlotte
11. I wish she could have seen the America we’re going to build together

Bush:

1. She’s watching what I say – and frankly, with all these reporters around, I’m watching what she says
2. I knew I was blessed to be their son
3. And they didn’t mind at all that I found my own path
4. I was ahead of my time in cross-border outreach
5. Across a plaza, I saw a girl

Trump:

1. I have a wonderful family
2. I’m very proud of my family
3. I started off—thank you—I started off in a small office with my father in Brooklyn and Queens, and my father said—and I love my father. I learned so much. He was a great negotiator. I learned so much just sitting at his feet playing with blocks listening to him negotiate with subcontractors. But I learned a lot

Promises

Clinton:

1. So, you have to wonder: “When does my hard work pay off? When does my family get ahead?” “When?” I say now
2. I’m running to make our economy work for you and for every American
3. I’m not running for some Americans, but for all Americans
4. And I will do just that—to turn the tide so these currents start working for us more than against us
5. I believe that success isn’t measured by how much the wealthiest Americans have, but by how many children climb out of poverty
6. That’s why I believe with all my heart in America and in the potential of every American
7. I believe we can do all these things because I’ve seen it happen
8. I want to be her champion and your champion
9. I’ll wage and win Four Fights for you
10. I will rewrite the tax code so it rewards hard work and investments here at home, not quick trades or stashing profits overseas
11. I will give new incentives to companies that give their employees a fair share of the profits their hard work earns
12. That’s why I will propose that we make preschool and quality childcare available to every child in America
13. I believe you should have the right to earn paid sick days
14. I believe you should receive your work schedule with enough notice to arrange childcare or take college courses to get ahead
15. I believe you should look forward to retirement with confidence, not anxiety
16. That you should have the peace of mind that your health care will be there when you need it, without breaking the bank
17. I believe we should offer paid family leave so no one has to choose between keeping a paycheck and caring for a new baby or a sick relative
18. I will support a constitutional amendment to undo the Supreme Court’s decision in Citizens United
19. I want to make it easier for every citizen to vote
20. That’s why I’ve proposed universal, automatic registration and expanded early voting
21. I'll fight back against Republican efforts to disempower and disenfranchise young people, poor people, people with disabilities, and people of color.

22. I want to help Washington catch up.

23. Now, I'll always seek common ground with friend and opponent alike.

24. But I'll also stand my ground when I must.

25. And it's something I will always do as your President.

26. I've spent my life fighting for children, families, and our country. And I'm not stopping now.

27. I will be the youngest woman President in the history of the United States!...

28. I want to be a President for all Americans.

29. I'm running to make our economy work for you and for every American.

30. I'm not running for some Americans, but for all Americans.

31. I'm not running to be a President only for those Americans who already agree with me.

32. I'll propose specific policies to:

33. I'll do whatever it takes to keep Americans safe.

---

Bush:

1. And if I am elected president, I'll show Congress how that's done.

2. I will not accept it as the standard in Washington.

3. If I am president, we will take the power of choice away from the unions and bureaucrats and give it back to parents.

4. They have my word – I will do it.

5. I will rebuild our vital friendships.

6. And I am ready to be that president.

7. Because I am certain that we can make the decades just ahead the greatest time ever to be alive in this world.

8. I will give it my all.

9. I will campaign as I would serve, going everywhere, speaking to everyone, keeping my word, facing the issues without flinching, and staying true to what I believe.

10. I will take nothing and no one for granted.

11. I will run with heart.

12. I will run to win.

---

Trump:

1. I will be the greatest jobs president that God ever created.

2. I'm going to bring money in, and we're going to save it.

3. So I would say, "Congratulations:

4. I would do various things very quickly."
5. I would repeal and replace the big lie, Obamacare
6. I would build a great wall, and nobody builds walls better than me, believe me, and
7. I’ll build them very inexpensively, I will build a great, great wall on our southern border
8. And I will have Mexico pay for that wall
9. I will find — within our military, I will find the General Patton or I will find General MacArthur, I will find the right guy. I will find the guy that’s going to take that military and make it really work. Nobody, nobody will be pushing us around
10. I will stop Iran from getting nuclear weapons
11. I won’t be doing that...And I promise I will never be in a bicycle race
12. I will immediately terminate President Obama’s illegal executive order on immigration, immediately
13. But if I get elected president I will bring it back bigger and better and stronger than ever before, and we will make America great again
Appendix B

'They' in speech acts:

External threats

Clinton:
-

Bush:
-

Trump:
1. Let's say, China in a trade deal? They kill us
2. When did we beat Japan at anything? They send their cars over
3. In Tokyo? It doesn't exist, folks. They beat us all the time
4. Beat Mexico at the border? They're laughing at us, at our stupidity. And now they are beating us economically. They are not our friend, believe me. But they're killing us
5. Mexico sends its people, they're not sending their best. They're not sending you. They're not sending you. They're sending people that have lots of problems, and they're bringing those problems with us. They're bringing drugs. They're bringing crime. They're rapists. And some, I assume
6. They're sending us not the right people
7. The Middle East. They've become rich
8. They just built a hotel in Syria. They built a hotel. They don't have to pay interest, because they took the oil that
9. So now ISIS has the oil, and what they don't have, Iran has
10. Iran is taking over Iraq, and they're taking it over big league
11. And every time we give Iraq equipment, the first time a bullet goes off in the air, they leave it
12. 2,300 sophisticated vehicles, they ran, and the enemy took them
13. Mexico has our jobs. They all have jobs
14. Putin and all of the other people that look at us and they say, "That is a group of people, and that is a nation that truly has no clue
15. They're devaluing their currency to a level that you wouldn't believe. They're killing us
16. Japan more than that. So they come in, they take our jobs, they take our money, and then they loan us back the money
17. We get Bergdahl, they get five killer terrorists that everybody wanted over there
18. We get a no-good traitor, and they get the five people that they wanted for years,
19. China comes over and they dump all their stuff, and I buy it. I buy it, because,
    frankly, I have an obligation to buy it, because they devalue their currency so
    brilliantly, they just did it recently, and nobody thought they could do it again
20. with Russia, with all our problems with everything— everything, they got away with
    it again
21. “I can’t get it into China. They won’t accept it. I sent a boat over and they actually
    sent it back. They talked about environmental, they talked about all sorts of crap
    that had nothing to do with it.”
22. “Yeah, they do it all the time with other people.”
23. I said, “They send it back?”
24. “Yeah. So I finally got it over there and they charged me a big tariff. They’re not
    supposed to be doing that. I told them.”
25. Now, they do charge you tariff on trucks, when we send trucks and other things
    over there
26. Ask Boeing. They wanted Boeing’s secrets. They wanted their patents and all their
    secrets before they agreed to buy planes from Boeing
27. Hey, I’m not saying they’re stupid
28. They are ripping us. We are rebuilding China. They have bridges that make the
    George Washington Bridge look like small potatoes
29. We could turn off that spigot by charging them tax until they behave properly
30. Now they’re going militarily. They’re building a military island in the middle of the
    South China sea. They built it in about one year, this massive military port
31. They’re building up their military to a point that is very scary
32. Saudi Arabia, they make $1 billion a day. They make a billion dollars a day.
    Whichever they have problems, we send over the ships. They’ve got nothing but
    money
33. If the right person asked them, they’d pay a fortune. They wouldn’t be there except
    for us
34. Yemen was a great victory. Everybody got out— and they kept our equipment
35. They always keep our equipment. They always keep our equipment
36. ? Saudi Arabia without us is gone. They’re gone
37. they were smarter than our leaders. They were smarter than our leaders
38. who’s making a horrible and laughable deal, who’s just being tapped along as they
    make weapons right now
39. China and I come in from Qatar and I come in from different places, and they have
    the most incredible airports

Total: 75 in 39 speech acts
Internal threats

Clinton:

I’ll fight back against Republican efforts to disempower and disenfranchise young people, poor people, people with disabilities, and people of color
1. -> What part of democracy are they afraid of?
2. Now, there may be some new voices in the presidential Republican choir, but they’re all singing the same old song
3. They believe in yesterday
4. Ask many of these candidates about climate change, one of the defining threats of our time, and they’ll say: “I’m not a scientist.” Well, then, why don’t they start listening to those who are?
5. They pledge to wipe out tough rules on Wall Street, rather than rein in the banks that are still too risky, courting future failures. In a case that can only be considered mass amnesia
6. They want to take away health insurance from more than 16 million Americans without offering any credible alternative
7. They shame and blame women, rather than respect our right to make our own reproductive health decisions
8. They want to put immigrants, who work hard and pay taxes, at risk of deportation.
9. And they turn their backs on gay people who love each other
10. Fundamentally, they reject what it takes to build an inclusive economy

Total: 11 in 10 speech acts

Bush:

1. To hold onto power. To slog on with the same agenda under another name: That’s our opponents’ call to action this time around. That’s all they’ve got left
2. They have offered a progressive agenda that includes everything but progress.
3. They are responsible for the slowest economic recovery ever, the biggest debt increases ever, a massive tax increase on the middle class, the relentless buildup of the regulatory state, and the swift, mindless drawdown of a military that was generations in the making
4. From the beginning, our president and his foreign-policy team have been so eager to be the history makers that they have failed to be the peacemakers. It will go on automatically until a president steps in to rebuild our armed forces and take care of our troops and our veterans
5. They have my word – I will do it
Total: 5 in 5 speech acts

Trump:

1. And, I can tell, some of the candidates, they went in. They didn’t know the air-conditioner didn’t work. They sweated like dogs.
2. They didn’t know the room was too big, because they didn’t have anybody there. How are they going to beat ISIS? I don’t think it’s gonna happen.
3. Politicians are all talk, no action. Nothing’s gonna get done. They will not bring us— believe me— to the promised land. They will not.
4. ––my fellow Republicans. And they’re wonderful people. I like them. They all want me to support them. They don’t know how to bring it about. They come up to my office. I’m meeting with three of them in the next week. And they don’t know.
5. And they don’t talk jobs and they don’t talk China.
6. I watch the speeches of these people, and they say the sun will rise, the moon will set, all sorts of wonderful things will happen.
7. Politicians -> They will never make America great again. They don’t even have a chance. They’re controlled fully— they’re controlled fully by the lobbyists.
8. lobbyists: Yes, they control them.
9. How stupid are our leaders? How stupid are these politicians to allow this to happen? How stupid are they?
10. announces they’re not going to Tennessee. They’re gonna spend their $1 billion in Mexico instead.
11. They’re not so stupid. They know it’s not a good thing, and they may even be upset by it. But then they’re going to get a call from the donors or probably from the lobbyist for Ford.
12. They’re going to build in Mexico. They’re going to take away thousands of jobs. You know, they want to be a little cool.
13. and they have zero chance at convincing me, zero.
14. That’s it. They have no choice. They have no choice.
15. But all of these politicians that I’m running against now, they’re trying to disassociate. I mean, you looked at Bush, it took him five days to answer the question on Iraq. He couldn’t answer the question. He didn’t know. I said, “Is he intelligent?”
16. How are these people gonna lead us? How are we gonna— how are we gonna go back and make it great again? We can’t. They don’t have a clue. They can’t lead us. They can’t. They can’t even answer simple questions.
17. So Ford will come back. They’ll all come back.
18. What they do is unbelievable, how bad.
19. They throw down asphalt, and they throw.
20. But they all said, a lot of the pundits on television, “Well, Donald will never run…”

Total: 44 in 20 speech acts
Clinton:

1. Two Democrats guided by the — Oh, that will make him so happy. They were and are two Democrats guided by the fundamental American belief that real and lasting prosperity must be built by all and shared by all
2. Our country's challenges didn't begin with the Great Recession and they won't end with the recovery
3. Advances in technology and the rise of global trade have created whole new areas of economic activity and opened new markets for our exports, but they have also displaced jobs and undercut wages for millions of Americans
4. It took years of effort, but Congress finally approved the health care they needed.
5. Customers will have a better chance to actually get where they need and get what they desire with roads, railways, bridges, airports, ports, and broadband brought up to global standards for the 21st century
6. Too many of our kids never have the chance to learn and thrive as they should and as we need them to
7. So let's staff our primary and secondary schools with teachers who are second to none in the world, and receive the respect they deserve for sparking the love of learning in every child
8. In America, every family should feel like they belong
9. And, we should ban discrimination against LGBT Americans and their families so they can live, learn, marry, and work just like everybody else
10. And when our brave men and women come home from war or finish their service, I'll see to it that they get not just the thanks of a grateful nation, but the care and benefits they've earned
11. Our political system is so paralyzed by gridlock and dysfunction that most Americans have lost confidence that anything can actually get done. And they've lost trust in the ability of both government and Big Business to change course
12. You know the one — all our troubles look as though they're here to stay... and we need a place

Total: 13 in 12 speech acts

Bush:

1. The stakes for America's future are about as great as they come
2. Think of what we all watched not long ago in Baltimore where so many young adults are walking around with no vision of a life beyond the life they know
3. We put them first in line because they are not a problem. They are a priority
4. And they didn’t mind at all that I found my own path. It led from Texas to Miami by way of Mexico
5. Campaigns aren’t easy, and they’re not supposed to be

Total: 6 in 5 speech acts

Trump:
1. But I speak to border guards and they tell us what we’re getting
2. We have wounded soldiers, who I love, I love — they’re great
3. They can’t get jobs, because there are no jobs
4. Even our nuclear arsenal doesn’t work. ->It came out recently they have equipment that is 30 years old. They don’t know if it worked
5. [Self-reference] They don’t know what they’re doing. They don’t know what they’re doing
6. I hire people, they do a website
7. They had a plan that was good. They have no plan now
8. [Lobbyists] They’re great
9. They’re saying, “Dad, you’re going to do something that’s going to be so tough.”
10. We have people that have no incentive to work. But they’re going to have incentive to work, because the greatest social program is a job. And they’ll be proud, and they’ll love it, and they’ll make much more than they would’ve ever made, and they’ll be— they’ll be doing so well
11. [Bridges] And they’re all over the place
12. [Negotiators] They’re not good. They think they are. They get good stories, because the newspapers get buffalooed. But they’re not good
13. They’re a great family
14. This is going to be an election that’s based on competence, because people are tired of these nice people. And they’re tired of being ripped off by everybody in the world. And they’re tired of spending more money
15. They’re right about that, but I’m doing it
16. it’s big and complex, and they’ve put together a statement, a financial statement, just a summary
17. So they put together this
18. And it was even reported incorrectly yesterday, because they said
19. But in two seconds, they give me whatever I wanted
20. According to the economists— who I’m not big believers in, but, nevertheless, this is what they’re saying
21. and nobody knows where they are
22. Services, who are terrific people, by the way, and talented people, they wanted to do a great job. And they wanted to make sure it got built

Total: 39 in 22 speech acts