

Charles University
Faculty of Education
Department of English Language and Literature

DIPLOMA THESIS

**Representation of Social Actors in New Year Speeches of British
Prime Ministers**

Prezentace společenských aktérů v novoročních projevech britských premiérů

Bc. Radek Hromuško

Supervisor: doc. PhDr. Renata Pípalová, CSc.

Study Programme: Teacher Training for Secondary Schools

Branch of Study: Training Teachers of General Subjects at Lower and Higher Secondary
Schools - English Language

Year of Submission: 2020/2021

DECLARATION

I hereby declare that I have worked on the diploma thesis *Representation of Social Actors in New Year Speeches of British Prime Ministers* independently with the help of the supervisor, using only the cited sources. I also declare that this diploma thesis has not been used to obtain any other degree.

Prague, 6 December 2020

PROHLÁŠENÍ

Odevzdáním této diplomové práce na téma *Prezentace společenských aktérů v novoročních projevech britských premiérů* potvrzuji, že jsem ji vypracoval pod vedením vedoucího práce samostatně za použití v práci uvedených pramenů a literatury. Dále potvrzuji, že tato práce nebyla využita k získání jiného nebo stejného titulu.

V Praze dne 6. prosince 2020

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

I would like to express my sincerest gratitude to my supervisor, doc. PhDr. Renata Pípalová, CSc., for her kind and patient guidance that proved invaluable for the completion of this diploma thesis. I would also like to thank my boyfriend for his immense support as well as to the rest of my family for always being there for me.

ABSTRACT

This diploma thesis, grounded in the theoretical framework of Critical Discourse Analysis, aims to analyse the textual representations of social actors in the New Year speeches of British Prime Ministers. The corpus consists of New Year speeches from the New Year of 2012 to the New Year of 2020. These textual encodings do not need to point directly to the social actors that actually exist in the social world. Instead, they tend to reveal certain ideas that the text-producers have about the social actors. Therefore, the way in which the text-producer portrays a social actor serves as a means of reproducing his or her ideology. In the theoretical part, the purpose of the thesis is considered from the position of Critical Discourse Analysis. Then, the ways of representing social actors in texts are explored together with their impact on ideology and its reproduction. Also, the characteristics of pronouns that can affect the portrayal of these actors are described. The practical part seeks to analyse the New Year speeches with respect to textual means of representing social actors. In doing so, it provides an explanatory critique which aims to reveal what ideas are encoded in textual representations, how they are communicated and how the portrayal of the social actors can affect the recipients. A particular focus is placed on the examination of noun phrases and pronouns.

KEY WORDS

CDA (Critical Discourse Analysis), ideology, social actors, textual representations, British Prime Minister, New Year speeches

ABSTRAKT

Tato diplomová práce vychází z teoretického rámce oboru Kritické analýzy diskursu a klade si za cíl provést analýzu textových prostředků, které prezentují společenské aktéry v novoročních projevech britských premiérů. Korpus tvoří všechny novoroční projevy od Nového roku 2012 až do Nového roku 2020. Textová prezentace nemusí zobrazovat společenského aktéra tak, jak skutečně existuje ve společenském světě. Spíše svědčí o tom, jaké představy má autor textu o těchto společenských aktérech. Proto se způsob, jakým autor textu společenské aktéry zobrazuje, může stát výrazem reprodukce jeho či její ideologie. Teoretická část nejprve promýšlí smysl a účel práce z pohledu oboru Kritické analýzy diskursu. Poté prozkoumává prostředky,

jakými jsou prezentováni společenští aktéři v textech společně s tím, jaký dopad mohou mít na ideologii a její reprodukci. Nakonec jsou popsány i vlastnosti zájmen, které mohou ovlivnit způsob zobrazování společenských aktérů. Praktická část se pak snaží analyzovat novoroční projevy s ohledem na textové prostředky, kterými jsou společenští aktéři vyobrazeni. Tato analýza je pak základem pro vysvětlující kritiku, která si klade za úkol odhalit jaké představy jsou zakódovány do textových prostředků, které autoři používají, jak jsou tyto představy přenášeny a jak může způsob zobrazení společenského aktéra ovlivnit příjemce textu. Bližší pozornost je přitom věnována hlavně nominálním frázím a zájmenům.

KLÍČOVÁ SLOVA

CDA (Kritická analýza diskursu), ideologie, společenský aktér, textové prostředky, britský premiér, novoroční projevy

Table of Contents

1	Introduction.....	7
2	Theoretical Part.....	8
2.1	Critical Discourse Analysis: Analysing Political Discourse	8
2.1.1	What is Critical Discourse Analysis?	9
2.1.2	Multidisciplinarity and Variety of CDA.....	11
2.1.3	CDA and Ideology.....	13
2.1.4	Representation of Social Actors and CDA	17
2.2	Textual Means of Representing Social Actors and their Ideological Impact	18
2.2.1	Linguistic Forms and the Operation of Ideology	19
2.2.2	Representing Social Actors in Texts	23
2.3	Personal Pronouns and their Semantic Variety	31
2.3.1	Pronominal Semantic Senses from Grammatical Perspective	31
2.3.2	Semantic Variation of Pronouns in Actual Use.....	33
3	Practical Part.....	39
3.1	Methodology of the Analyses.....	39
3.2	David Cameron’s Speech from the New Year of 2012.....	41
3.3	David Cameron’s Speech from the New Year of 2013.....	51
3.4	David Cameron’s Speech from the New Year of 2014.....	57
3.5	David Cameron’s Speech from the New Year of 2015.....	62
3.6	David Cameron’s Speech from the New Year of 2016.....	67
3.7	Theresa May’s Speech from the New Year of 2017.....	74
3.8	Theresa May’s Speech from the New Year of 2018.....	79
3.9	Theresa May’s Speech from the New Year of 2019.....	85
3.10	Boris Johnson’s Speech from the New Year of 2020.....	90

3.11 Discussion	100
4 Conclusion	106
Works Cited	110
List of Attachments	113

1 Introduction

The aim of this diploma thesis is to provide an explanatory analysis that focuses on the way that British Prime Ministers represent social actors in their New Year Speeches. In particular, the study seeks to reveal what ideas are encoded in these representations and how these ideas are communicated to their recipients. In this way, an ideological impact of these representations will be identified. The thesis is divided into two parts, a theoretical and a practical one.

The theoretical part begins with an attempt to ground this thesis in the field of Critical Discourse Analysis. The overview of CDA will help to clarify the purpose of this work as well as supply the terminology needed and provide the starting point for the methodology of the analysis conducted in the practical part.

The theoretical part then continues by trying to establish the means of investigating representations of social actors in texts. To this end, two works will be consulted. Jeffries' *Critical Stylistics: The Power of English* will help describe what ideological impact linguistic forms can have. Van Leeuwen's "The Representation of Social Actors" then charts in what way can social actors be represented in texts.

Nominal phrases and pronouns are likely to be the forms that are employed in the portrayal of social actors most frequently. The meaning of pronouns need not be always clear, which is why this issue will be explored in a separate chapter of the theoretical part.

In the practical part, an analysis of the New Year speeches of British Prime Ministers will be conducted. The focus will lie on the way that various social actors are portrayed, on the ideas that this portrayal contains, and on how this portrayal affects the recipients cognitively. The thesis explores the corpus of New Year speeches delivered by British Prime Ministers between 2012 and 2020 (speeches from the New Year of 2012 up to that of 2020 will be included). Specific linguistic instantiations will be isolated and their role with regard to ideology will be considered.

2 Theoretical Part

2.1 Critical Discourse Analysis: Analysing Political Discourse

This diploma thesis strives to provide an analysis of New Year speeches of British Prime Ministers. The New Year speech is a subgenre of the political speech, in which a politician addresses the public on the special occasion of one year ending and another beginning. As political discourse is one of the chief areas of interest to the field of study of Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA), it is this field that has been chosen as the theoretical basis for this thesis.

The New Year speech is a significant piece of political discourse. It is given in a festive period when people recapitulate the past and think about the future. Thus, the speaker usually summarises the previous year and presents their expectations for the one that lies ahead. However, it is not only the occasion that makes the speeches special. They are delivered by the Prime Minister, the head of the British government and a person who has the ability to influence the lives of the speaker's recipients. This is important at least for two reasons. On the one hand, the speech is relevant to a wider number of people. Not only do the speaker's supporters or opponents need to be interested in the speech. Not only do people who read political news need to listen to the politician. It is the whole electorate that may listen to or watch the speech as it may reveal how their lives will be affected by the Prime Minister's decision making in the future. On the other hand, the New Year speech can be attractive for the politician as well. It represents a welcome opportunity for him or her to sway the public opinion to his or her favour.

As has been mentioned, the speech features a disbalance of power. Not only is this disbalance of political nature, it is also the context of the speech that gives power in the hands of the speaker. Speeches are generally monological texts and as such, they require no input from the recipient. The politician is free to present his or her ideas and their arguments are relatively safe from being immediately challenged. As a consequence, they are more prone to be accepted as true by the recipient and serve as a means of persuasion in the hands of a politician. A careful analysis of the ideas that the speaker chooses to present and of the manner of their presentation has the potential to reveal that what can be hidden and what may act persuasively without being challenged.

Disbalance of power, persuasion, transmission of ideas and a scrutiny of those in power are all concerns which are a top priority to CDA's research, apart from the examination of political discourse itself. In this section, CDA and its principles will be considered in order to theoretically ground this diploma thesis in the field of study and to better understand the purpose of the analysis, which will be conducted in the theoretical part.

2.1.1 What is Critical Discourse Analysis?

In order to be able to consider this diploma thesis a CDA work, it is necessary first to establish what CDA actually is and what its basic assumptions are. In this regard, the term Critical Discourse Analysis itself can prove to be quite revealing. CDA is simply an approach whose proponents attempt to apply a critical stance to discourse analysis. What that actually entails becomes clearer when considering the definition that was put forward by Van Dijk:

Critical discourse analysis (CDA) is discourse analytical research that primarily studies the way social-power abuse and inequality are enacted, reproduced, legitimated, and resisted by text and talk in the social and political context. (Van Dijk 466)

This conception of CDA reveals some of its important features. Firstly, in studying "social-power abuse and inequality", it is apparent that social and political realities are at the forefront of CDA's interest. Focus on social context rests on CDA's primary assumption that language is considered a social practice (Wodak 1). Discourse is a form of language use, which constitutes social situations and actions that people participate in (I. Fairclough and N. Fairclough 81). Though discourse is a form of language that is embedded in the social reality, one of Fairclough and Wodak's CDA tenets specifically says that "CDA addresses social problems" (qtd. in Van Dijk 467). Therefore, CDA not only theoretically acknowledges the existence of social reality in analysing language, but it analyses social issues alongside issues of the textual world. Wodak even claims that the word "critical" suggests the actual social problems are the starting point for CDA instead of focusing on those that are theoretical or academic (1). The concern for political contexts also arises from the nature of discourse. As with social situations, Fairclough and Wodak also presume that "power relations are discursive" (qtd. in Dijk 467) as well and that discourse mediates ideology (467). Varying power relations are at the very core of

politics and therefore, any political discourse has to deal with them almost inevitably. This combined with the mediation of ideology makes political discourse one that is of great interest to CDA.

Secondly, in his definition, Dijk uses words that have negative connotations – “abuse”, and “inequality”. This is where the term “critical” also comes into play. Wodak mentions the word “critical” in relation to social problems – suggesting that CDA tries to identify what is wrong within the social reality. This is a result of the fact that CDA aims to “extend the critical tradition of social science to include discourse” (I. Fairclough and N. Fairclough 78). Critical social science does not seek a simple objective description of the workings of social life and institutions involved in it, but also evaluates them in terms of how they are beneficial to members of a society and what they should ideally be like (79). Van Dijk puts this fact simply and explains that “CDA is discourse study with an attitude” (468) as “it take[s] an explicit position and thus want[s] to understand, expose, and ultimately challenge social inequality” (468).

It might seem that the position that CDA takes is always that in opposition to those in power, who intentionally use discourse and language for malevolent purposes. However, there are also types of discourses that are beneficial to the society as a whole and because of that, CDA does not always need to be “critical” in the common-sensical use of the word. CDA research does not need to take a negative stance only (Allagbe and Amoussou 12). I. Fairclough and N. Fairclough point out that critique can be conducted either normatively, or explanatorily (79). Normative analysis usually has some notions of what constitutes a good society and as such, it is prone to focus on that which it perceives as negative in discourse practices (79). On the contrary, explanatory critique “seeks understanding of what makes a social order work, which is clearly necessary if it is to be changed to enhance human well-being” (79). Rather than trying to reveal any possible misuse of discourse on the part of the elite, this latter approach aims to describe and explain why and how discourses function and why they succeed in what they do (80). Explanatory analysis can result in a body of work that takes a stance, which is more neutral in its attitude toward the ruling elite.

So far, we can see that in analysing how New Year speeches of British Prime Ministers represent social actors, the diploma thesis adheres to the elementary principles of CDA. The choice of means of textual portrayal, which the politician makes, has a social significance because they concern the social interactions of the highest governmental representative with the

public. These culminate in the foundational political process in any democracy – in elections. These textual representations can be a source of unfair manipulation with the public. In such cases a normative critique should be employed in order to reveal such abuse of (both social and discursive) power. When no abuse or misuse of power is involved, explanatory critique can reveal how the piece of political discourse functions and thus be beneficial in allowing the public to make a more informed decision in regards to their political preference.

2.1.2 Multidisciplinarity and Variety of CDA

It has been established that conducting a CDA research starts with social problems. Nevertheless, it is language that is at the centre of any CDA analysis. However, when a potential researcher tries to look to CDA for a methodology and a set of steps to follow when conducting such an analysis, they will find out that CDA has surprisingly very little to offer. Indeed, when one examines the body of CDA work for any commonality, individual authors are likely to differ both in the types of texts that they analyse and even in the particular methods they employ to carry out their analyses.

The proponents of CDA define the field as multidisciplinary (Van Dijk 467). Not only does it mean that CDA borrows from other disciplines, multidisciplinary is also regarded as a core defining feature, which is necessary to any CDA work (Van Dijk 467). To highlight this fact, Fairclough uses the term ‘transdisciplinary approach’ instead in order to express that a CDA work should transcend a simple textual analysis and should instead entail “‘dialogues’ between theories, disciplines and frameworks” (4). What other frameworks enter the dialogue with textual analysis is entirely up to the researcher and the needs of a particular text. Accordingly, the methods employed will also vary from research to research.

The diversity found within the approach stems from the earliest conception of CDA. Though a precursory body of writing originates in the 1970s (Wodak 5), an organised CDA has only emerged in the 1990s (4) when its founding members met after a small symposium in Amsterdam and “confront[ed] each other with the very distinct and different approaches, which still mark the different [CDA] approaches today” (Wodak 4). Therefore, such CDA researchers as Teun van Dijk, Norman Fairclough, Gunther Kress, Theo van Leeuwen, and Ruth Wodak (4) each represent a specific way of conducting a textual analysis, though they all agree on the core assumptions of the broader field of CDA. Allagbe and Amoussou identify the three most

prominent directions within CDA today as Fairclough's socio-cultural approach, Van Dijk's socio-cognitive approach, and Wodak's discourse-historical approach (14-15). The first is interested in the relationship between discourse and social and cultural reality, the second focuses on forms of social cognition shared by the social collectives, and the third stresses the importance of a historical context when interpreting discourse (14-15). These subdivisions make CDA quite varied. This variation is the result of each of the strands selecting different disciplines that inform their respective critical analyses.

Multidisciplinarity is often regarded as an advantage and as offering a unique point of view when approaching a text, but it is also because of this that CDA is not unitary (Van Dijk 468) and lacks any common methodology (Wodak 4). So, is there anything that CDA can offer in terms of tools of analysis? Wodak summarises the core principles of CDA and what constitutes a CDA work as follows:

... CDA may be defined as fundamentally concerned with analysing opaque as well as transparent structural relationships of dominance, discrimination, power and control as manifested in language. (Wodak 2)

Power relations are woven into discourse. The purpose of a CDA research is to analyse texts with respect to how power relations and concepts associated with them are mediated through language. Such mediation can be realised explicitly, but it is more common for it to be implicit and not immediately identifiable by the recipient. When that is the case, the role of the analysis is all the more important as without it, one might not realise that any implicit transmission of notions of power and distribution of power in society is taking place at all.

This textual analysis and making apparent that which is hidden is regarded as essential in any CDA work, but the researcher is encouraged to go beyond the text itself (Fairclough, *Critical Discourse Analysis* 10). Because of that, Van Dijk defines two levels of analysis. The micro level of analysis is interested in the actual language use and the verbal interaction, but at the macro level, an analyst should have look at the social context and the workings of power, dominance, or inequality within it (468). The researcher's task is to bridge the gap between these two levels of analysis (468).

Though traditional approach to CDA stresses the importance of going beyond the text, Jeffries warns against CDA's tendency to deal with wider contextual matters. She asserts that in

consequence, the resulting analysis is always necessarily rather vague (1). Jeffries also observes that even though CDA claims that textual analysis should be at the centre, actual research in the field seems to have moved further away from it in recent years (2-3). Jeffries develops her own approach focusing on textual analysis “with the aim of uncovering and discovering the underlying ideologies” (6) – or that which is described as “opaque as well as transparent” by Wodak (2).

Similarly, the methodology of this diploma thesis focuses primarily on textual analysis and limits its comments on contextual factors only to such occasions when they are deemed necessary. Nevertheless, it has already been established that an analysis of representations of social actors pertains to the social and political reality because of its normative and explanatory potential. The concept that could bridge the gap between the micro and macro levels of analysis is that of ideology. Indeed, examining ideology and its workings can be considered central to CDA. For this reason, the concept of ideology will be dealt with in some detail in the paragraphs below.

2.1.3 CDA and Ideology

Eagleton remarks that general public has often some pre-existing notion of what a specialised term such as ideology means (3). They usually understand ideology as “judging a particular issue through some rigid framework of preconceived ideas which distorts their understanding” (3). Because of the supposed distortion that is taking place, the term came to be understood negatively as a malevolent force that makes people believe in something that is false. Moreover, in influencing people’s thoughts and through them, their conduct, ideology can be described as an instrument of power. It is for this reason that ideology is often at the centre of CDA research. But how does CDA understand ideology? Is it truly this evil force spreading falsity among people? And what is its connection to discourse and textual analysis?

Today, the understanding of what ‘ideology’ is seems not to be unitary. At the broadest level, CDA understands ideology to involve “ideas that are shared by a community or society” (Jeffries 5). This notion of ideology can be considered quite neutral and having only little connection to either those in positions of power as well as to any malevolent distortion of understanding. Other definitions, which were compiled by Eagleton, also agree that at their core, ideologies are indeed ideas, beliefs or ways of thinking (1-2). Others highlight that they are ideas

not only related to the social world, which would correspond to perceiving ideologies as shared ideas (1), but also a means of organising this social reality – they help “social actors make sense of the world” and “live out their relations to a social structure” (2). Still, other definitions specifically mention that ideologies have some connection to the dominant social or political power (1-2). Indeed, it is apparent that ideologies are not simple shared ideas, but also have some capacity to influence the social world. Some authors also take the more negative stance to ideologies, which coincides with the common-sensical one mentioned above, as they claim that ideologies are false ideas, distortions or confusions (1-3). In such conceptions, it is in the public interest that the workings of ideology are revealed and critically scrutinised in order to dispel the falsity they contain.

The belief that ideology is tied to the dominant social power seems to come from Marxism and Marxist literary criticism, from which CDA seems to have adopted the concept of ideology (Mazid 35). Marx himself used the term in the sense of ideology being “ideas and beliefs of the ruling class, which controls the means of production” (Castle 110). CDA takes note of the ability of ideology to legitimise the power of the dominant social group in society (Van Dijk, “Ideology” 117). In being critical, CDA also focuses on examining discourse produced by the ruling elite. Two conclusions can be drawn from this. Firstly, CDA appears to be in opposition to the ruling elite that uses ideology for their own purposes. However, we have already established that this does not always need to be the case. Apart from the explanatory function of a critique, Van Dijk also reminds us that it is not only those that rule that have ideologies, but other groups (such as those in opposition) use them as well (“Ideology” 115-117). Secondly, legitimisation of power is achieved through discourse, which is why CDA scrutinises it. Therefore, ideology represents a connection between the textual world and the social reality.

In the years that followed Marx’s writing, the conception of ideology evolved beyond that of ‘ideas and beliefs of the ruling class’. This added to the perceived malevolence that is supposedly present in ideologies. Lukács conceived of ideology as of “a form of false consciousness that arises whenever subjective consciousness of a specific class (typically, the ruling class) is taken to be the objective consciousness of society at large” (Castle 110). What Lukács describes is the pervasiveness of these beliefs, which came to be associated with ideology. Nevertheless, it is him describing ideology as “false consciousness” that seems to have spread the belief that

ideologies are distortions and composed of ideas that are false. Eagleton calls this an epistemological view of ideology as it pertains to the way one sees and understands the world (2-3). The theory of false consciousness maintains that ideologies make people see the world in an altered way, which is incorrect or illusory (2-3). They create a false layer of reality that makes people misguided. Any text that reproduces ideologies inevitably subjects its recipient to manipulation.

However, in accepting that ideologies create a 'false consciousness', one would also need to accept that there is a 'true consciousness' (Eagleton 10-11). In order to reveal a potential manipulation, everything that is supposedly incorrect according to this 'true' view of reality would need to be examined. This is why many consider false consciousness to be rather problematic and reject such view (11). CDA also does not believe that ideology is a form of false consciousness (Van Dijk, "Ideology" 117). Nevertheless, it has been established that a normative critique needs to have a notion of what constitutes a good society. Though it can be valuable in challenging the text producer's ideas, it also runs into the risk of reproducing an ideology of its own.

Eagleton believes that in opposition to the epistemological view of ideology, there exists a sociological one, which is "concerned more with the function of ideas within social life than with their reality or unreality" (3). CDA seems to lean more towards this conception of ideology. It does not try to determine which ideas making up an ideology are correct and which incorrect. Even if some of them were false, ideologies exist in the social world and within it, they perform a certain function. Fairclough explains it when he says that "ideological and discursive shaping of the real is always caught up in the networks of the real" (Critical Discourse Analysis 59). Because of this, explanatory critique seems better suited for an examination of what function an ideology performs and how it potentially influences the social reality.

Though Lukács's 'false consciousness' hypothesis is rejected, CDA was influenced by his describing ideologies as pervasive ideas. Gramsci further refined what Lukács believed (Castle 110) when he described that ideologies become pervasive because ideological beliefs come to be accepted as 'common sense' (Fairclough, Critical Discourse Analysis 67). This is how ideologies become naturalised in a society (Fairclough, Critical Discourse Analysis 67). Naturalisation is one of the most prominent features of ideologies. Because of this process, they are made to appear self-evident and inevitable (Eagleton 5). Any possible arguments made by the speaker that are in congruence with a naturalised ideology are much less likely to be contested by the

recipient. Fairclough explains that the efficiency of an ideology is the greatest when it works subtly and when those affected do not even realise that they might be under its influence (Language and Power 71). Ideology often achieves this by not being featured in a text as an explicit element, but as a background assumption (Fairclough, Language and Power 71). This is why CDA sets one of its aims as analysing not only transparent meanings, but the opaque ones as well (Wodak 2).

Ideologies and their common-sensical nature play their role in the sociological view in another way as well. We have established that ideologies are ideas that are shared. Van Dijk emphasises this point when he says that ideologies are beliefs that are never personal (“Ideology” 117). Instead, they fulfil one of their social functions by potentially serving as a foundation to an identity of a group (“Ideology” 116). Ideas making up an ideology and group identity are axiomatic within the group and as such they are rarely questioned (“Ideology” 116). Therefore, not only do certain groups try to transmit ideologies as common-sensical, these ideas can be accepted as ‘common sense’ within these groups as well. Moreover, ideologies are also action-oriented ideas (Eagleton 2) as they “allow members [of social groups] to organize and coordinate their (joint) actions and interactions in view of the goals and interests of the group as a whole” (Van Dijk, “Ideology” 115). Consequently, it can be said that ideologies play a significant part in cohesion of social groups. Ideologies often try to extend themselves to the whole society with the ideas of one group becoming the common sense of all (Castle 110) and arguably, many a ruling power would welcome such a united and cohesive society. However, Fairclough remarks that it is thanks to the existence of many social groups with their respective ideologies that a limit is set on one ideology actually becoming commonsensical in a society (Language and Power 73). The greater the ideological diversity the less commonsensical can a particular ideology be (Fairclough, Language and Power 73).

To summarise, ideology is understood to be a set of shared ideas in a particular social group. Social groups seek to extend these ideas to the whole society, which enables them to legitimise their own power and possibly even to justify their position on a particular issue. This extension of ideology is best achieved through the process of naturalisation, which makes the ideas of an ideology become ‘common-sensical’ and thus rarely questioned. Naturalisation strives to make ideas that are transparent opaque. We have learned that a CDA analysis seeks to reveal them again and thus, it works against the process of naturalisation. Therefore, a CDA

analysis unveils that certain ideas are being transmitted because under normal circumstances, the recipient of the message might not realise that any such transmission is taking place. CDA does not believe ideologies are necessarily false and an illusory part of false layer of consciousness. Instead, it argues that ideologies serve particular functions in society and it tries to explain what these functions are.

2.1.4 Representation of Social Actors and CDA

Through chapter, the diploma thesis has been established on the CDA theoretical framework. The study chiefly aims to conduct an explanatory critique to elucidate how the Prime Ministers' textual representations of social actors transmit their ideas about these actors. These ideas and their transmission are usually opaque and hidden. The ideas constitute the Prime Ministers' personal ideologies and it is one of the features of an ideology to become commonsensical and thus accepted by the society in a process of naturalisation. The analysis conducted in the practical part of this thesis seeks to make these personal ideologies transparent, which is in agreement with the core CDA principles, and in this way work against the process of naturalisation. This can help recipients decide whether they accept the textual representations as accurately describing the social world or not. However, we could also see that CDA itself does not provide specific tools for conducting analysis. These will be explored in further chapters of the theoretical part.

2.2 Textual Means of Representing Social Actors and their Ideological Impact

So far, it has been established that this diploma thesis is theoretically grounded in the approach of Critical Discourse Analysis. It seeks to examine a corpus of political discourse with respect to textual representations of social actors and to the ideological impact these representations can potentially have. In doing so, it tries to make the potentially “opaque structural relationships” transparent and performs an explanatory critique. It has also been mentioned that CDA approaches are varied and “bound together by research agenda rather than by some common theory or methodology” (Wodak 4). A researcher can adhere to CDA principles, but CDA does not offer any specific tools for linguistic analysis. Consequently, the aim of this section is to determine how the analysis will be conducted and what linguistic forms will be focused on.

For this purpose, the works of two authors are considered in some detail. Van Leeuwen extensively recounts all the various linguistic means by which social actors can potentially be represented within texts. There are numerous surface linguistic forms that can contribute to the way a social actor is depicted, including “transitivity, reference, the nominal group, rhetorical figures, and so on” (Van Leeuwen 298). From the description of his categories (267-298), it is apparent that the most common types of the linguistic forms are nominal phrases, which subsume nouns and their modifications (Eggs 68), and pronouns, which are often considered to substitute noun phrases (Quirk et al. 335). Therefore, we will primarily focus on these two types of realisations in the analysis. As Van Leeuwen’s categories are extensive and quite detailed, they will be primarily used to particularise the terminology used, which can potentially reveal the ideological function these forms serve.

Jeffries deals with the question of ideology in a greater detail and outlines ten general categories that can be used in determining the ideological impact that certain linguistic forms can have on the recipient’s cognitive processes. Her approach of Critical Stylistics is also “more linguistically oriented than much other CDA work” (Jeffries 3) and thus also allows for a researcher to focus on particular items. As two types of linguistic realisations – noun phrases and pronouns – are deemed dominant in representing social actors, this work is limited on only two of Jeffries’ categories. ‘Naming and describing’ focuses on the former group of items whereas ‘representing time, space, and society’ on the latter. Jeffries’ classification is broader and more

general, which is why it will be considered first in the description of the two systems below. It serves as an explanation of how textual encodings made by the speakers influence the recipients' perceptions of the social actors that are represented.

2.2.1 Linguistic Forms and the Operation of Ideology

Jeffries develops her Critical Stylistics as a reaction to the emphasis that CDA puts on the research of contextual factors rather than on actual textual analysis (1). The resulting “vagueness and lack of tools of analysis” (1) can only be seen as caused by the variety and multidisciplinary nature within the field. Still, she considers Critical Stylistics to be a subdiscipline of CDA (3). Jeffries adopts the definition of CDA as “a body of work which enables us to see the operation of ideology in language and which provides at least partial understanding of that operation” (Kress, qtd. in Jeffries 5). Her ten categories comprise a set of tools that are to serve that goal. Out of these, two have been selected as best explaining what ideological consequences can the representations of social actors have on the recipient.

Naming and Describing

‘Naming and describing’ is the first category that bears significant relevance to representing social actors in a text. It subsumes ways of referencing to entities in the world, including social actors (Jeffries 19). Consequently, it is most commonly realised by noun phrases, which may include pre-modifications and post-modifications expanding them (19).

Noun phrases can be powerful ideological tools at the disposal of the speaker. Jeffries lists three ways in which they can be used to influence the reader, two of which are relatively straightforward. The first is the choice of the head noun itself (Jeffries 20-21). The speaker has usually an almost unlimited number of alternatives by which they can refer to a social actor and each of them conveys different information about the social actor represented. The second way is the choice of modifications, which have the ability to add content to the noun phrase, which is not always objectively verifiable (21-25). Modification seems to be essential in “packaging up” additional information about the entity named (22).

Finally, the third way of influencing the recipient lies in the process of nominalisation (Jeffries 25). Nominalisation is a notable exception in that it does not represent social actors directly. Instead, noun phrases express certain processes or events which are otherwise reserved for verbal phrases (20). In doing so, the role of social actors can be significantly lessened (25-

26). Van Leeuwen takes note of this fact when he describes his category of deletion, which is explained below.

Apart from conveying information about social actors and downplaying their role in a verbal process, noun phrases are able to efficiently work as tools of ideology because they do not constitute the propositional content of an utterance (Jeffries 21). The role of the propositional content is to provide information about the relationship between entities and it is commonly expressed by a verbal phrase (21). As verbal phrases propose something, they are open to questioning from the recipient (21).

Noun phrases are exempt from the propositional content of a message and instead seem to be a part of what is presupposed and thus accepted instead (Jeffries 21). Consequently, they are shielded from the kind of questioning that threatens verbs. (21). Any definite noun phrase triggers existential presuppositions (Yule 27). By using these presuppositions, “the speaker is assumed to be committed to the existence of entities named” (Yule 27) and so appears to be the recipient as he or she is likely to accept that a social actor expressed by a noun phrase exists. However, it is the speaker who has the power to package information about the social actors into the noun phrase. Consequently, it is the text producer who has the power to influence how a social actor is perceived by the recipient via textual representations.

elements of the category of ‘naming and describing’	ideological impact
the choice of a head noun	selecting the basic information about a social actor
the choice of modification	selecting additional (even unverifiable) information about a social actor
nominalisation	lessening the role of a social actor in a verbal process
the noun phrase as a whole	content that is likely to be accepted by the speaker

Table 1: the ideological impact within the category of ‘naming and describing’

Representing Time, Space, and Society

The other category that is of interest to the aim of this thesis is that of ‘representing time, space and society’, which is linguistically predominantly realised by the means of deixis (Jeffries 147-148), which Yule defines as pointing or referring via language (9). As the exploration of the role of social actors is at the forefront of the thesis, the scope of this category will be limited to personal and social deixis. The former is textually instantiated mainly by personal pronouns whereas the latter by various formality markers such as titles or address forms (Jeffries 149). Ideology uses deixis rather intricately, affecting the recipient’s cognition as it constructs mental images of the world which may differ from the way the real world actually is (157). Jeffries describes two ways in which this is achieved.

Firstly, ideology utilises a feature that is intrinsic to deixis – the potential to construct a deictic centre, or “a focus on the particular time, place and social circumstance of the interaction which is underway” (Jeffries 148). From social perspective, the deictic centre tends to be identified with the position of the speaker (148). It is constructed through proximal indexical, which refer to things close to that position, and through distal items pointing to things that are remote (148). However, human cognition stands behind the phenomenon of deictic projection, which can be characterised as “the ability to recognise the deictic centre of others” (148). Therefore, while speakers weave their point of view through their speech, deictic projection can cause the hearer to assume the speaker’s position and their point of view with it. As a result, deictic projection makes hearers cognitively predisposed to be more accepting of the ideology transmitted by the speaker.

Although, “the capacity to bring the reader into [the speaker’s] point of view” (Jeffries 147) is a powerful one, it is not the only route of using deixis ideologically. The speaker may select a deictic centre, which is different from their own position, for the hearer to project into, making them see different points of view (149-151). In political speeches, which are monological, this shift of reference can occur when speakers represent speech and thought of others, such as in indirect speech. The personal pronoun “I” can then refer to the speaker as well as to another person in the course of one text. Not only can the reference shift, but the semantic characteristics of personal pronoun indexicals is not always clear either (155). For instance, two forms of a first-person plural pronoun can be recognised – inclusive “we” includes the addressee in its reference, whereas exclusive “we” does not (Yule 11). Again, both can occur in the course

of one text, which can potentially lead to ambiguity. As the roles of pronominals can be quite complex, a subsection is devoted to them below.

The second way in which deixis can serve ideology is by naturalising it through the Principle of Minimal Departure described by Possible Worlds and Text World theories (Jeffries 153-157). Jeffries describes how texts construct their own textual worlds, which exist alongside the real one (153-154). The Principle then says that “in the absence of explicit information to the contrary, the recipient of a text will assume that the world of the text is identical in all respects to the actual world (that of the recipient him/herself)” (154). In other words, recipients of a text tend to consider the textual world to be the actual world unless something within the text breaks this assumption. Deictic expressions tend to create a mental image that is deictically centred at a certain point of view and ideology. The recipients have a tendency to accept such images as representative of the actual world, unless they “find the text’s claims do not match their experience of the actual world” (156).

There is also a third element that is relevant in relation to the reproduction of ideological content and its acceptance by the recipients which is not specifically described by Jeffries. Linguistic choices that authors make, including the system of pronouns they employ, perform two major functions – expressing stance and engagement (Dontcheva-Navratilova 10). The former simply states that a text-producer assumes a particular point of view that is expressed through the text (10). However, the latter is “associated with the alignment of the author with the readers” (10). Engagement seems to position the reader towards the author and create some kind of relationship, or a “dialogic space” (10) that can potentially make it more likely for the reader to accept the views transmitted.

elements of the category of ‘representing time, space, and society’	ideological impact
deictic projection	the recipient sees the world from the perspective of the text-producer
Principle of Minimal Departure	the recipient accepts the worldview as true unless he or she notices a notable deviation

expressing engagement	the text-producer establishes a relationship with the reader that helps the transmission of an ideological content
------------------------------	--

Table 2: the ideological impact within the category of ‘representing time, space, and society’

2.2.2 Representing Social Actors in Texts

Noun phrases and pronouns have been shown to be linguistic instantiations that most readily represent social actors in texts. So far, we could see that a text-producer has a complete power over what information he or she chooses to convey about social actors. This depiction of social actors does not need to be objective or accurate. Rather, it can illustrate the speaker’s way of seeing the world and the social actors in it. Therefore, a textually represented actor and an actual social actor existing in the social world could be found to be as two distinct entities that differ from one another despite seeming to be identical to an ordinary recipient. Van Leeuwen notices this lack of bi-uniqueness of language, or that “there is no neat fit between sociological and linguistic categories” (269). A social actor can be represented by a multitude of noun phrases and pronouns with potentially different interpretations.

Van Leeuwen sets out to develop a categorisation that would serve as a “sociosemantic inventory of the ways in which social actors can be represented” (268). As his categories are sociosemantic, they can provide insight into the possible interpretations of the meanings that are “packaged up” in noun phrases or pronouns. In terms of the ideological impact that has been described above, they are predominantly relevant to the category of “naming and describing” and the selection of information, or the semantic content, by the text-producer.

The sociosemantic categories can be divided into three broadest groups of deletion, rearrangement, and substitution based on transformational process that is applied (Van Leeuwen 298). Transformational grammar describes these transformations as changes applied to kernel (or basic) sentences, which results in sentences that are derived (Nilsen 696). In a linguistic context, deletion transforms sentences by choosing not to employ certain linguistic units that are present in the kernel sentence. Similarly, rearrangement involves the change of position of linguistic forms within a sentence and substitution exchanges one linguistic form for a different one that cannot be found in the kernel sentence. When we apply this to the analysis of repre-

sentations of social actors, the kernel structures would describe the social world absolutely accurately and portray how social actors exist in it. The transformations of deletion, rearrangement, and substitution then alter these accurate depictions so that the representations no longer correspond to the actual social world and actors, but only to their textual modifications.

Before moving on to introduce each of the categories, it needs to be stated that the transformations are not realised only by noun phrases and pronouns. Van Leeuwen summarises other linguistic processes that contribute to the portrayal of social actor as follows:

Deletion involves voice, and also nominalisation and adjectivalisation, rearrangement principally involves transitivity, while substitution is initially realised by aspects of the structure of the nominal group – the Deictic and Postdeictic... and the Numerative... and then by lexis, different classes of noun, including aspects of morphological structure... (298)

Furthermore, such figures of speech as metaphor or metonymy are also involved (298). Though a textual analysis of all of the processes involved would yield a comprehensive account of all the ways social actors can be potentially represented, it is apparent that the role of noun phrases and pronouns (with their deictic function) is dominant. Therefore, this diploma thesis focuses on the analysis of these two types of linguistic instantiations.

Deletion

The transformation category of deletion can be considered to be the most general one that can be described and as such, it takes the hierarchically highest place in van Leeuwen's system (299). In terms of linguistic forms involved, deletion requires the author to either represent (include) a social actor as being engaged in a process, or to exclude them (298).

In social situations, different actors play different roles. Textual depictions of the same situations can acknowledge the role these actors played by including them in the representation. However, when a text-producer opts for exclusion, they either downplay or deny this role. This corresponds to two types of exclusion. The most radical is suppression, which leaves no traces of the actors in the text and can be identified by the absence of any linguistic realisation referring to the actor (Van Leeuwen 275). The other type, backgrounding, contains such linguistic traces,

but they are not necessarily mentioned in relation to the activity described. Instead, their linguistic representation can be found elsewhere in the text and in relation to a different activity (276). The social actors are not so much excluded as de-emphasised (276).

All in all, it can be said that these means of exclusion of social actors add to opaqueness of a text. Text-producers might or might not intend for the social actors not to be retrievable by the reader (Leeuwen 276). Consequently, exclusion can become a convenient means of potential deception and manipulation in the hands of a politician. When social actors are not suppressed or backgrounded, they are always included.

A purely linguistic analysis seems to be often able to reveal both types of exclusion when an actor is notably missing from the textual context. One process is notable in achieving this effect – that of nominalisation (Van Leeuwen 275). It has already been established that nominalisation downplays the role of social actors as it transforms verbal processes into noun phrases (Jeffries 20-26).

However, there can also be instances when the absence of an actor is not apparent in the text even though their part was significant in an actual social situation. This can be reminiscent of an award acceptance speech when one does not mention all the people who collaborated on the project, which is being awarded. These exclusions call for a deeper contextual analysis that would examine the social situation itself. However, as this thesis focuses on the linguistic aspect only, such situations will not be considered in the analysis.

the category of deletion		
<u>INCLUSION</u> <i>social actors are represented in a text</i>	<u>EXCLUSION</u> <i>deletion of social actors</i>	
the subtypes of inclusion are included in the categories of rearrangement and substitution	suppression <i>no traces of social actors in a text</i>	backgrounding <i>social actors mentioned in relation to different activity</i>

Table 3: overview of social actor representations in the category of ‘deletion’

Rearrangement

The second transformation category of rearrangement has the potential to make “representations ... reallocate roles [of social actors], rearrange the social relations between participants” (Van Leeuwen 278). It primarily subsumes the choice between activation and passivation. Activation puts social actors in the role of an ‘agent’ and “occurs when social actors are represented as the active, dynamic forces in an activity” (278). In contrast, passivation assigns the role of a ‘patient’ to social actors, highlighting them as undergoing the activity (Leeuwen 278). Most commonly, the reallocation of the participant roles is realised through the inversion of a subject and an object (Nilsen 697). The subject is active in the verbal process and bears more responsibility for it than the actor represented in the position of the object.

Though the participant roles – that of ‘agent’ in the position of the subject and that of ‘patient’ in the position of the object – are the chief means by which a text-producer realises both activation and passivation, they are not the only ones (Van Leeuwen 279). When nominalisation is involved, the pre-modification or post-modification can activate social actors that these modifications refer to (279). Where ‘my teacher’ expresses a passive role of the first person, ‘our intake’ transforms the first person into an active participant (279). The category of circumstantialisation says that the so-called ‘prepositional circumstantials’, which include such prepositions as ‘from’ or ‘by’ can activate social agents expressed by the noun or noun phrase that follows them (279).

Where modifications and the process of circumstantialisation can activate social actors, there are also two sub-categories that transform them into ‘patients’. On the one hand, when subjectivation is involved, the social actors are “treated as objects in the representation” (Leeuwen 279) as they are subjected to the verbal process (279). On the other hand, beneficialisation “forms a third party [from the social actors], which positively or negatively, benefits from [an action]” (279).

the category of rearrangement	
<u>ACTIVATION</u> the role of an ‘agent’ – active and dynamic	<u>PASSIVATION</u> the role of a ‘patient’ – passive

through modification e.g. ‘public protests’	circumstantialisation e.g. ‘by William Shakespeare’	subjectivation e.g. ‘a man has been arrested’	beneficialisation e.g. ‘gifts were brought to him’
---	---	---	--

Table 4: overview of social actor representations in the category of ‘rearrangement’

Substitution

Substitution is a transformation category that enables a text-producer to make a choice of what item to use in a given position in a clause structure (Johnson 16). This enables the producer to make a selection from a wide variety of linguistic options to characterise the role of a social actor in their text. Therefore, Van Leeuwen can be seen as detailing what selection of linguistic forms is available within Jeffries’ category of ‘Naming and Describing’ by developing his category of substitution. The number of options is truly extensive and this is reflected in the complexity of Van Leeuwen’s system. The following distinction has been slightly simplified to the most important and conspicuous features.

The first choice a text-producer can make is that between personalisation and impersonalisation. Items that personalise social actors actually depict them as human beings, which is the default mode of representation (Van Leeuwen 292). However, impersonalisation is quite noteworthy as an author considers different ways of characterising them. On the one hand, nouns used can be examples of abstractions, which denote certain qualities that are associated with the actors, such as when referring to ‘the poor’ (292). On the other hand, they can be representative of the sub-category of objectivisation, they identify the social actor by referring to a place (spatialisation), to an instrument (instrumentalisation), to a body part (somatisation), or to an utterance (utterance autonomisation) (292-293). All of these are in some way associated with the impersonalised social actor who is not represented as a human being (292). Impersonalisation “can background the identity and/or the role of social actors” (293). It can also endow an utterance with an impersonal authority or force (293), which could be used to raise the credibility of a politician’s statement.

Next, text-producers can choose to use generic reference in the category of genericisation (Van Leeuwen 280), which represents social actors as “generalised essences, classes” (281). As social actors are not referred to specifically, their identity is indetermined as they appear as largely anonymous entities in the text (285). Or text-producers may utilise specific reference to

talk about social actors as identifiable individuals under the category of specification, which can manifest in two ways (280). On the one hand, individualisation treats them as single individuals (282). On the other hand, assimilation identifies them with a group of individuals (282). It is mainly specific reference which distinguishes assimilation from genericisation. When assimilation is used in the phrase ‘the people of Australia’, the group talked about is quite specific, whereas in the phrase ‘explain it to people’, ‘people’ are so generalised that a particular group of them cannot be identified.

Van Leeuwen highlights some functions of genericisation and specification. These functions can be related to aspects of tenor as described by Hasan. Within tenor of discourse, one can give agent roles, dyadic relations, and social distance. Social distance is a continuum where the minimal end of spectrum suggests a closer relationship between participants, whereas the maximal implies only very formalised encounters (Halliday and Hasan 57). Genericisation and specification can potentially allude to the fact that social distance is closer to the maximal or minimal end of the spectrum respectively. This stems from the fact that different discourses cater to some social groups by specifying them, but at the same time increase social distance by genericising others (Van Leeuwen 281). Van Leeuwen gives the example of working-class newspapers referring to ordinary people specifically, but to higher classes or the government generically (281).

Representations of groups can be subject to the processes of association and dissociation, which can occur several times throughout one text (Van Leeuwen 285). Association refers to textual groupings of social actors with these formed groups never being referred to explicitly by the text (284). Associated individuals perform the verbal action in a unified fashion, such as in the example ‘children and adults believe in fairies’ (285). However, the textual grouping can be dissociated immediately after when the author claims that ‘children believe more firmly’ (285).

When an individual’s or a group’s identity is determined, we can often speak of the occurrence of differentiation (Van Leeuwen 286). Group identities are often formed or strengthened by pointing out their differences to other existing groups. This process gives basis to some very common textual distinction. The most prominent of them is the ‘us and them’ distinction, but when an individual is involved instead of a group, it becomes the ‘self and other’ distinction (286). In using differentiation, the text-produced can easily create a feeling of opposition between groups and individuals.

Individualised, specified, and personalised actors are often named directly. Van Leeuwen calls this category nomination and we can often distinguish the type of nomination according to degrees of formality – that is whether the actor is referred to by given name, surname, their combination or the addition of honorifics (286-287). Assimilated and specified social actors are less likely to be named in such a way. There are also options for either their functionalisation, which can define their identities in terms of what they do (such as ‘mountaineers’, or ‘teachers’), by identification, which tells us what the actors relatively permanently are, or by appraisal, which chooses evaluative items instead (such as ‘the bastard’, or ‘the darling’) (288-299). Identification can be realised by classification, relational identification, and physical identification (288). The first selects major descriptors by which a society distinguishes between groups of its population; these include age, gender, ethnicity, or sexual orientation (such as ‘women’ or ‘the young’) (288). The second identifies social actors by their relations – be it personal (‘friend’), kinship (‘brother’), or occupational ones (‘colleague’) (289-290). The third category picks a unique physical feature to represent the social actor (such as ‘a blonde’ or ‘a cripple’) (290-291).

The final category that Leeuwen presents is that of overdetermination, which pertains to a social actor’s engagement in social practices (Van Leeuwen 294). The term ‘social practice’ as used by CDA is adapted from Anthony Giddens’s structuration theory (Fairclough 548). Giddens defines it as “an ongoing series of practical activities” (qtd. in Whittington 146). These continued and repeated activities “bring together people into social systems, which are reproduced over time through continued interaction” (Whittington 147). For example, a continued religious practice places an individual into a particular religious system. Van Leeuwen then defines overdetermination as representing social actors as “participating, at the same time, in more than one social practice” (294). He gives an example of a child named “Magnus” in a story who is overdetermined by virtue of his name – as a child, he belongs to the social system of childhood, but the semantics of his name also implies him being engaged in social practices associated with adulthood (294).

<u>the category of substitution</u>			
<u>social actor</u>	<u>PERSONALISATION</u>	<u>nomination</u>	
		<u>functionalisation</u>	

		<u>identification</u>	classification
			relational identification
			physical identification
		<u>appraisement</u>	
		<u>association / disassociation</u>	
		<u>differentiation</u>	
		<u>overdetermination</u>	
both personalised and impersonal- ised actors		<u>genericisation</u>	
		<u>specification</u>	individualisation
	assimilation		
<u>IMPERSONALISA- TION</u>		<u>abstraction</u>	
		<u>objectivisation</u>	spatialisation
			instrumentalisation
			somatisation
	utterance autonomisa- tion		

Table 5: overview of social actor representations in the category of ‘deletion’

2.3 Personal Pronouns and their Semantic Variety

As we have seen, there are many elements of the textual world that can be used to reproduce an ideology. Out of these, nouns and pronouns have been selected as means that represent social actors textually the best. When analysing a text with respect to ideology, it tends to be the lexical component of a linguistic element that is most commonly investigated (Fairclough, *Critical Discourse Analysis* 60). The lexical side of nouns is relatively straightforward as they typically refer to people, items or substances (Dušková 35). Thus, when investigating nouns and noun phrases and how they represent social actors, their meaning often identifies the extra-textual referent directly. However, the same straightforwardness does not apply to pronouns just as readily. As a morphological category, pronouns do not seem to possess any lexical meaning and express only general categorical meanings relating to person, things, place, time and others (Dušková 101). Therefore, in being semantically less loaded, they seem to be more prone to ideological manipulation in discourse. For this reason, some semantic aspects of predominantly personal pronouns, which are most directly connected to social actor representations in texts, will be explored in this section.

2.3.1 Pronominal Semantic Senses from Grammatical Perspective

Though it has been established that pronouns possess no lexical content on their own, it does not mean that they are always entirely semantically empty. Quirk et al. identify three elementary semantic uses of personal pronouns. Firstly, they are able to replace another word or phrase (335). This replaced word or phrase becomes the pronoun's textual referent and thus, the pronoun attains its semantic content indirectly through this textual referent. We speak of anaphoric reference when the referent follows the pronoun and of cataphoric reference when it precedes the referent (347). Secondly, they realise specific reference when "a reference is being made to something which is given or known within the linguistic or situational context" (335). The referent does not need to be identifiable in the text, but its identity is derivable from the context. And thirdly, pronouns can function as generic reference when "standing for a very general concept" (335), for broad categories subsuming unspecified members. Though context is once again required to determine whether a pronoun is used generically (335), the referent cannot be identified as a singular and concrete entity.

Whether used as a replacing word, specifically or generically, pronouns always attain their semantic content by pointing to something else within the linguistic or extralinguistic context. It is this inherent semantic vagueness that allows them to function as deictic items, or 'pointers'. Through deixis, further semantic characteristics of personal pronouns can be arrived at. The first-person pronoun refers to the position of the speaker (Halliday and Hasan, qtd. in Wales 50-51). In terms of deixis, this position is also the default deictic centre. The addressee's position is then identified with the second person pronoun (50-51). The third person pronouns are usually the most distal items and therefore, are reserved for third parties in an exchange (51).

This distinction applies to an ideal speech situation of there being an addresser, an addressee, and potentially a third party, which does not participate in the exchange (Wales 50-51). Therefore, this account of semantic characteristics of personal pronouns can be considered to be a purely grammatical construction. However, when we look at the use of personal pronouns in actual speech, we will find that this distinction does not apply so easily.

Semantic uses of pronouns (according to Quirk et al.)	
1. a “replacing” word	referent can be found in the text itself → anaphoric, or cataphoric reference
2. specific reference	the identity of the referent is known → from the context of situation / anaphorically, or cataphorically
3. generic reference	the identity of the referent cannot be known

Table 6: semantic uses of pronouns (Quirk et al. 335-347)

The Semantic Content of Pronouns in a Typical Speech Situation		
the speaker	I	we
the addressee	you	you

a third party	he (masculine)	they
	she (feminine)	
	it (impersonal, neutral)	

Table 7: semantic content of pronouns in a typical speech situation (Halliday and Hasan, qtd. in Wales 51)

2.3.2 Semantic Variation of Pronouns in Actual Use

However, Wales points out that traditional grammar favours simple denotational meaning of pronouns and ignores rhetoric and social connotations (50). If one looks at actual uses of pronouns in real-life exchanges, they will discover that the semantic senses of many of them are much more varied. Wales says that the pronouns' referents “have a variety of social and political roles and stances, so that interpersonal pronouns are rarely ‘neutral’ in their reference” (50). We have seen that textual representations of social actors do not need to correspond to actual social and political roles they perform. Therefore, in not being 'neutral', pronouns' varied senses can be used subtly as instruments of reproduction of ideology.

The pronoun ‘we’, or the 1st person plural pronoun, demonstrates such variety most extensively. In its many uses, it can be potentially ambiguous, which can be useful in political discourse as it increases the opaqueness of the unfolding text. Wales remarks that “the pronoun ‘we’ complicates inter-personal picture even in the most denotational and decontextualised meanings” (58). This stems from the fact that regardless of what its grammatical categorisation might suggest, ‘we’ does not always refer to plurality of addressers (58). Instead, it bears the connotation of the referent being 'more than one of the same' (59). Therefore, it can suggest a group of people working together or sharing an opinion (59). It stresses commonality between its members (59).

This can especially be the case with using the pronoun ‘we’ inclusively, so that it includes the addressee (58). In such instances, the addressee is considered to be participating in the same action or event denoted by the verb as the speaker and in such a way, it can enhance the feeling of having something in common. Contrarily, exclusive 'we' excludes the addressee from its reference (58). The addressee is left out of a particular group with a shared goal or identity. But this shared group identity is at the same time strengthened by the contrast with that of the

addressee. Though 'we' does not refer to multiplicity of text-producers very often, such cases can happen. This is why Quirk et al. add a subtype of an exclusive 'we' to this binary distinction – that of a collective 'we', which refers to multiple speakers or writers (341).

However, semantic variations of 'we' do not end here as the pronoun can be used in many other specialised senses, which potentially reflect the social and political roles of their referents. All the examples of these special senses can be seen in the table below together with examples. Inclusive 'we' is often used as an authorial 'we' (Quirk et al. 350). It is employed by authors of scientific or academic texts and “seeks to involve the reader in a joint enterprise” (350), which is unfolded throughout the text. There is also a rhetorical 'we', which is “used in the collective sense of ‘the nation’, ‘the party’ etc.” (350). Other uses of 'we' defy the pronoun's grammatical characterisation as a plural by referring to a singular speaker (Wales 63). These uses could be called an egocentric 'we' as it is easily substituted by 'I' (63-64). They include an editorial 'we', which is also used in scientific or academic writing by a single author out of the desire to avoid a subjective and egocentric 'I' (Quirk et al. 350), or a royal 'we' is no longer in fashion, but was popularised by Queen Victoria (Wales 64). Furthermore, some uses of 'we' can even go against their characteristics of referring to the 1st person and refer to the 3rd person and even more commonly to the 2nd person (Quirk et al. 350-351). Workshop 'we' is used in procedural contexts of instructive texts, lectures or demonstrations (Wales 65-66). Medical 'we' is used by doctors and nurses in encounters with their patients (67-68). Similar uses of 'we' can be used by mothers in their caretakerese talk (67) or by teachers toward their students (Quirk et al. 350). We can see that the number of potential referents of 'we', a single pronoun, is quite vast, and these are not the only types that can be identified. There may be situations when the addressee is unsure of who exactly the referent is. A politician may use this potential ambiguity to his or her advantage and subtly manipulate the addressee in such a way.

The shifting and ambiguous reference does not need to be the only way of exploiting personal pronouns in a political discourse. 'We' often tends to enter into an antonymic relation of binary opposition with a generalised use of 'they', resulting in an 'us vs. them' dynamic, which is often exploited in political texts (Wales 61). As 'we' implies that the referents have something in common, generalised 'they' becomes easily perceived as something other and not like us (60-61). Moreover, as 'they' is generalised, it does not need to refer to any social actor in particular. For this reason, in “being a 3rd person pronoun and excluding the reference to the speaker or

the addressee, it tends to designate the mysterious forces, which appear to control the ordinary citizen's life: 'the authorities', 'the media', 'the government', etc." (Quirk et al. 354). Wales also notes that not only does 'they' often refer to groups in positions of power, but linguistically, the referents of 'they' are active agents (60). As a result, the speaker and his or her group referred to by 'we' all too easily comes to feel as 'passive victims' of potential actions of 'they', which might polarise these antagonistic attitudes even further (60).

Nevertheless, it is not only 'we' and 'they' that can mislead the public. The 2nd person plural 'you' is peculiar in that its form does not reflect the number of the referent (Wales 73). The same form, 'you', is used in singular and plural sense in English. This results in a potential ambiguity that can be exploited to a text-producer's advantage. Thus, the singular sense is employed "so frequently in direct if simulated 'personal' address" (Wales 74). Thus, it can be found in advertising and even in politics, such as when the politician addresses the singular listener directly. Its function is to bring the speaker closer to the listener. As the form is ambiguous with respect to number, it often cannot be determined whether the speaker actually addresses a single individual or a collective of individuals. Therefore, the speaker is protected from appearing as too blunt and impolite. Wales remarks that the ambiguity pertains not only to number, but also to obscuring differences in social standing of an exchange's participants (73).

There are also some important features of singular pronouns that bear relevance to the political discourse as well. In political speeches, the use of the first person 'I' is notable because it is always egocentric (Wales 89) and has the ability to draw attention to the speaker. In some instances, like when giving advice, 'I' can also be interpreted as 'you' (89). Third person singular pronouns are notable for their distinction of gender. 'He' can be seen as particularly problematic because as a masculine pronoun, it is often considered to be an unmarked form of the 3rd person pronoun (Quirk et al. 342-343). Contrarily, 'she' is considered to be marked by the meaning 'feminine' and usually cannot replace its masculine counterparts in many contexts. English does not have a gender-neutral pronoun in its system (342-343) and for this reason, debates over gender neutrality of language have been sparked in recent years and continue to this day. As gender equality is a very prominent contemporary political issue, it can be interesting to take note of the politician respecting rules of gender-neutral language. Lastly, a new personal pronoun, the use of which has been rising in the 20th century, has to be mentioned (Wales 80).

‘One’ is often used in generic senses and in more formal contexts, where it usually replaces ‘you’ and ‘I’ (80).

In this chapter, it has been shown that despite their grammatical definitions, pronouns can attain various types of semantic content in actual use. This is due to their characteristic of having a shifting reference (Dušková 101). As a result, pronouns become quite a flexible tool at the disposal of ideology and are relevant in terms of representing social actors in political speeches. The ambiguity of meaning that they potentially introduce has the power to make opaque that which the public considers to be quite transparent. Therefore, the use of pronouns should be paid special attention to in an analysis.

Selected types and subtypes of personal pronouns based on their reference in actual use		
we	<u>inclusive ‘we’</u> <i>We fight for a common cause.</i> (including the addressee)	<u>authorial ‘we’</u> <i>We can see that conflict can be beneficial.</i> (about both the author and the reader)
		<u>rhetorical ‘we’</u> <i>We will make this country great again.</i>
	<u>exclusive ‘we’</u> <i>Here, we say a prayer before we start eating.</i> (excluding the addressee)	<u>collective ‘we’</u> <i>We can conclude that our theory was correct.</i> (in a text by multiple authors)
	<u>egocentric ‘we’</u>	<u>royal ‘we’</u> <i>We do not find this amusing.</i> (when uttered by a single royal)
		<u>editorial ‘we’</u> <i>We have introduced our hypothesis above.</i> (in a text by a single author)
	<u>‘we’ in reference to an addressee</u>	<u>workshop ‘we’</u> <i>We need to sprinkle the salt like this.</i> (in a video-recorded recipe)
		<u>caretakerese ‘we’</u>

		<i>We are so cute, aren't we?</i> (an aunt to a baby)
		<u>medical 'we'</u> <i>Have we been sleeping well today?</i> (a nurse to a patient)
	<u>'we' in reference to a 3rd party</u> <i>We are feeling a little grumpy today.</i> (about someone not present)	
you	<u>singular sense</u> <i>You've already brushed your teeth this morning.</i>	
	<u>plural sense</u> <i>You need to work together.</i>	
they	<u>generic 'they' – the sinister forces</u> <i>Since the time they were elected, they have been only increasing the divide between the rich and the poor.</i>	
I	<u>egocentric 'I'</u> <i>I can guarantee that the face masks will be available next week.</i>	
	<u>'I' in reference to an addressee</u> <i>I wouldn't eat anything looking so suspicious.</i>	
he / she	<u>gender differences and gender-neutral language</u> <i>Everybody should contribute his fair share.</i> <i>Everybody should contribute his or her fair share.</i> <i>Everybody should contribute their fair share.</i>	

one	<p style="text-align: center;"><u>impersonal 'one'</u></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>One can never predict the future.</i></p>	
------------	--	--

Table 8: overview of selected types and subtypes of personal pronouns based on their reference in actual use (based on Quirk et al. 342-354 and Wales 50-89)

3 Practical Part

3.1 Methodology of the Analyses

In the practical part of this diploma thesis, a corpus of New Year speeches of British Prime Ministers will be analysed with respect to representations of social actors. The specialised corpus includes the transcriptions of the spoken speeches from the New Year of 2012 until the New Year of 2020. The aforementioned texts were assembled in the corpus because of the unified format. From 2012 onward, the messages have been delivered as pre-recorded videos that were published online. This format is suitable for the analysis and mutual comparison. The video recording itself may be briefly commented on since the visual aspect can provide additional information to the textual message itself.

The procedure of the analysis included the identification and isolation of the textual representations with focus being placed on nominal phrases and on pronouns. These were then placed to the rightmost column of a table while the table columns on the left side contained labels that tried to suggest the actual social actors that exist in the social world. The layout of the left side of the table attempts to draw a very generally outline in the hierarchical order in which the social actors exist. However, it should be noted that even these labels do not correspond to actual groups or individuals that can act in a unified way. For instance, it is not clear which individuals are precisely included when the unemployed are talked about. Still, the labels try to point to those who might feel affected by such a representation because it pertains at least partially to their identity.

When it comes to graphical markings within the tables, two kinds of representations are distinguished. The direct ones correspond to those that are provided in the standard font with no mark-ups. The referent of such a representation corresponds to the label in the left column. This can be the case when the social actor “United Kingdom” is talked about as “this country” by the speaker. Then, there are the indirect ones, which are written in italics and delivered in the green colour. The referent of these does not need to correspond to the labels in the table and therefore, the social actors may be talked about in terms that do not directly point to them. Nevertheless, these representations convey such information that can affect the recipient’s perception of the social actor. For example, when “our economy” is used, economy cannot be said to function as a synonym of the country of the United Kingdom. By using this representation,

the speaker not only conveys ideas about the country, but also depicts it in terms of its economic features such as production, trade, and so on.

Furthermore, certain representations are underlined. This means that the representation can correspond to two or more social actors. Sometimes, this can result in an ambiguity and the recipient might not realise which actor is represented. We could see that the pronoun “we” can easily refer to the recipient as well as to the speaker. This can happen in the course of one text and may result in the recipient being misled. Lastly, the number of sentence in which an item can be found is given in brackets after the corresponding representation. If two instances of the same expression appear in one sentence, their position is specified by another number, which follows the number of the sentence and which is divided by a slash. Thus ‘we (18/2)’ means that the pronoun ‘we’ corresponds to the second pronoun ‘we’ in sentence 18.

The texts of the individual sub-chapters comment on the findings that have been noted down in the table. The main concern lies in the attempt at revealing what ideas are encoded in the representations, how they are communicated and what effect they can have on the cognition of the recipient. At the end of the practical part, a summarising sub-chapter 3.11 attempts to recapitulate the main findings of the analysis while also trying to outline personal tendencies and interpersonal differences of the speakers.

3.2 David Cameron's Speech from the New Year of 2012

The New Year of 2012 was the first New Year when a British Prime Minister chose to deliver his speech via a pre-recorded video message that was published online. The video recording sees Cameron sitting as he is giving the speech. The location and the overall visual message can be considered quite neutral; Cameron is sitting in a white-painted room with a window behind him. The recording is static and uninterrupted with its length totalling 4 minutes and 10 seconds.

The dominant social actor that is represented is "Britain" as its textual instantiations run throughout the whole text. "Britain" could be seen as subsuming two distinct characterisations. One of them is "Britain" in the sense of the United Kingdom, the country. It is a social actor that is impersonalised. Its actions are apparent in international contexts, but also in the way they affect the lives of the country's citizens on the national level. The citizens of the United Kingdom constitute the second, personalised way in which "Britain" is represented. Such textual instantiations presuppose living individuals, even though they act as a collective. Sometimes, the line between these two characterisations can become blurred to an extent. When Cameron talks of "British dedication, British duty, British steadiness, British tradition", these qualities could be considered both inherent to the country itself and as such coming to light when the United Kingdom acts as a national and international body, and as qualities which are exemplified by the generalised collective of individuals.

Social actors that are at the hierarchically highest position could be described as international agents. They are usually countries whose actions can be witnessed at the international level in dealings with other countries or at national level when governing their own territory. They are impersonalised social actors and are very likely to subsume other social actors, be it social groups, collectives, or individuals. Social actors of this order can be represented quite neutrally through nomination, that is by using their proper name. This is the case with "Libya" and "Afghanistan" (both in sentence 33). Though "Europe" (or European countries excluding the UK) is also similarly nominated, its portrayal is not equally neutral because it is often related to terms associated with economy. These depict Europe as a cautionary tale for Britain in terms of economic matters. This includes such expressions as "Europe's economy is struggling" (sentence 18) and "the worst debt storms now battering the Eurozone" (sentence 13). We could see Van Leeuwen's process of dissociation at play as the United Kingdom is not included in the

representations of Europe. Britain is dissociated from the social actor in the text even though it is part of it in the social world. “Europe” is then also put into opposition with “other parts of the world” (sentence 18) which “are growing” (sentence 18) in terms of their economy. Therefore, through this claim regarding the supposed economic weakness of “Europe”, Cameron tries to distance his country from “Europe” and tries to associate the United Kingdom with the rest of the countries of the world instead.

“The world” is then another social actor that subsumes different countries at different points in the text. Thus, the processes of association and dissociation are significantly at play in regards to this social actor. For instance, in “the global drama of the Olympics” (sentence 3), the UK is associated with “the world” in the expression “global”. However, in “Britain sees the world and the world sees Britain” (sentence 1), the UK is not included in the representation of “the world” and could be seen as dissociated from it. In the latter example, we can see that “the world” and “Britain” are represented in a mutually interactive relationship. The nature of the relationship is that of noticing one another, which is evident from the verb “sees” (sentence 1). Moreover, we can also see “the world” being objectivised through instrumentalisation in “cameras and TV channels around the planet”, which further highlights this relationship of ‘noticing’.

“Britain” is the most common of social actors appearing in the text. Though it might appear as being only one social actors, two distinct representations can be identified in the text – one type depicts the country as a whole, as a uniform social group, and the other as a collective of individuals. Having described the former sense of the word as the United Kingdom, this social actor is commonly represented by the proper noun “Britain” (sentence 1), by the adjective “British” (sentence 31), and also by common nouns like “country” (sentence 2), “society” (sentence 25), “nation” (sentence 31), “culture” (sentence 33), and even “the spirit” (sentence 33). Each of the common nouns differs in its meaning and in this way, Cameron can shape how the listener perceives the country. In sentence 3, the Prime Minister chooses two events as stand-ins for the United Kingdom – the Olympics and the Diamond Jubilee. These events can effectively substitute “Britain” in sentence one. Moreover, Cameron is unafraid to praise the country he helps to govern – which is why he talks about the Jubilee as “the glory” (sentence 3), about the Olympics as “the best... ever” (sentence 31) and he eventually describes the United Kingdom as “this fantastic country” (sentence 35).

Out of the common nouns used, it is predominantly the expression “the spirit” that is important in influencing how the United Kingdom is perceived. It subsumes a notable series of adjectives, which appear as one-word utterances in sentence 32. Therefore, Cameron reproduces the notion of the United Kingdom as espousing such values resilience, curiosity or inventiveness, making them appear as inherent to the country. Other such adjectives can be found elsewhere in the text as well. In sentence 14, “bold, confident, and decisive” connects to the citizens of the United Kingdom (expressed by the pronoun ‘we’), and in sentence 31, such items as “dedication”, “duty”, “steadiness”, and “tradition” are all pre-modified by “British”. All of these items can be considered as means by which differentiation is achieved. By making social actors espouse these values, the speaker creates a contrast that differentiates them from other social actors. Moreover, these expressions also have the capacity to influence how the actors perceive themselves, modifying or strengthening their identities.

Another manner of representing the United Kingdom as a social actor is by referring to it by such expressions as “deficit” (sentence 13), “economy” (sentence 16), “infrastructure” (sentence 14), “public services” (23) and others. In terms of the sense relation between these and the United Kingdom, we could see a meronymy employed, or a part-of-the-whole relationship, as most of these expressions refer to various sectors (or parts) of the country as a whole. By naming these specific sectors, Cameron prioritises them and inevitably backgrounds or even deletes those that are omitted from the speech, such as the judiciary system, legislation, or the environment. Of course, some such sectors are mentioned in relation to other social actors who act on their own. For instance, education is tied to Cameron’s words about “our schools” (sentence 22) or “our universities” (sentence 33).

As opposed to “Britain” in the sense of the United Kingdom, “Britain” when referring to the collective of individuals, or citizens of the country, is personalised. This personalisation is projected in the text through the use of the pronoun “we”, which can be found throughout the whole text. This ‘we’ is a type of what Quirk et al. term a rhetorical ‘we’ (350), which is classified as an inclusive ‘we’. Nevertheless, as this is a very distinctive use of ‘we’ which so commonly represents the British people as a collective, it could rather be called a national ‘we’, as it is equivalent to ‘us, the nation’ or ‘us, the people’. The national ‘we’ also includes the possessive pronoun ‘our’ (e.g. in sentences 2, 16, or 31) and the reflexive pronoun ‘ourselves’ (in sentences 31 or 34). The national ‘we’ is a very convenient means of expressing commonality between the

Prime Minister and the recipients of his speech. It expresses that the Prime Minister governs with the help of the people and that his endeavours are at the same time the endeavours of the public. It also serves as a means of activation of the British public – in such instances as “the spirit... has made... our scientists Nobel Prize winners” (sentence 33), the recipient can easily feel as participating in winning the Nobel Prize, to a certain degree.

Apart from these pronouns, the citizens are also represented by “the British people” (sentence 30) and by the adjective “British” (sentence 31). In the latter example, in the expressions “British duty, British steadiness, British tradition” the adjective can refer to both the country and to the people of the country at the same time. These are values that are connected to the ‘Britishness’ of the nation and are exemplified by the ‘Britishness’ of the nation’s citizens.

Apart from the national ‘we’, another type of the pronoun can also be identified. Though Quirk et al. would also label it as a rhetorical ‘we’, it refers to a different social actor – the government. The governmental ‘we’ includes the speaker, David Cameron, and his government, but it excludes the public. It is identifiable in sentences 11, 13, and 24. Since these have the same form, it may be sometimes difficult to determine whether the national ‘we’ or the governmental ‘we’ is employed, which results in ambiguities that can potentially add to the opacity of the text. In Cameron speech, instances of such ambiguity can be found in sentences 16 and 28. In sentence 16, it is unclear whether Cameron reflects that his government could have been more active in the matters of improving economy, or whether he intends for the statement to be understood as mere words of encouragement aimed at the public. Here, the context suggests the former, which makes the sentence in question less contentious.

The last notable use of a personal pronoun in the text is the employment of the egocentric ‘I’. We can see that it is the use of national ‘we’ that exceeds both the use of ‘I’ and the governmental ‘we’. Therefore, it can be concluded that the speech is not overly egocentric. Rather, in dwelling on commonality with the public, it can be considered to be relatively humble. ‘I’ appears exclusively in the position of the subject and the verb can thus reveal what position the speaker situates himself. Two positions dominate. When the verb ‘know’ is employed and in the instance of “I get that” (sentence 10), Cameron represents himself as sympathising with the recipients. Contrarily, when expressions like “I lead” (sentence 2), “I am determined” (sentence 21) or “I will be bold” (sentence 25) are used, the Prime Minister highlights his role as an efficient leader instead.

Dissociation causes the citizens of the United Kingdom to belong to several independently acting groups. The representation of a group described as “many worried people” appears to call out to those who might not be entirely convinced by Cameron’s leadership. By acknowledging their concern about economic matters, he attempts to quench their fears. “Households” and “young people” are mentioned in relation to this economic uncertainty. The expression “the problems of our society” (sentence 25) also relates to social actors. It subsumes two disfavoured groups – “a few at the top” (26) and “many others stuck on benefits” (sentence 26). When he portrays these groups, Cameron uses generic reference. This genericisation makes the specific identity of these groups unknown. It is predominantly the former group that is represented similarly to one of the “mysterious forces which appear to control ordinary citizen’s life” (Quirk et al. 354). These are often referred to by a generic ‘they’ and are often part of the ‘us vs. them’ dynamic. Indeed, even Cameron positions “our society” in this antagonistic relation to both of these groups but as their identity remains “mysterious”, the recipient can get only a very vague idea of who these people are.

“Public services” (sentences 21 and 23) have been mentioned as being a representation of one of the sectors of the United Kingdom. The actors “our schools”, “our hospitals”, and “our police” are subsumed under this group. The national ‘we’ suggests that these should be a concern to the citizens of the UK as well. All three are described rather negatively as not performing their essential functions. Cameron goes on to distinguish two kinds of public services – the “brilliant and committed people” (sentence 23), who are talked about in positive terms that contrast those used in relation to “public services” in general, and “the system” which “stops them doing their job” (sentence 23). A similar dichotomy as that of the United Kingdom, the country, and the United Kingdom, the people, is established. The people working there are not responsible for the “system”. However, the impersonalised “public services” are a meronymic representation of the United Kingdom, the country governed by Cameron. When Cameron talks about “the system”, he backgrounds both his and the government’s roles in the public services not working as properly as he desires.

Lastly, the representation of Queen Elizabeth II needs to be mentioned. In sentence 31, the expression ‘our Queen’ is used. Again, the national ‘we’ is used to express commonality. Thus, Cameron suggests that the Queen is the embodiment of this commonality. She is also referred to as “the mirror” two times – “the mirror of ourselves” (sentence 31), and “the mirror

of the nation” (sentence 31). Therefore, the Queen unites the impersonalised “Britain” (or the United Kingdom, the country) with the personalised “Britain” (the United Kingdom, the people). This is reflected in the fact that “British dedication, British duty, British steadiness, British tradition” (sentence 31) potentially refer to both of these actors and the Queen is their “finest and most famous example” (sentence 31).

To summarise, we can see many processes being involved in the representation of social actors in the first speech that has been analysed. The social actor labelled as “Britain” is the one that is featured the most. It is portrayed as the United Kingdom, the country, as an impersonalised social actor acting on the national and international level, and as the citizens of the United Kingdom, or the country personalised by its citizens. We can see the listing of values, predominantly in sentence 32, as a way of differentiating both from other social actors. We can also see the Queen being described as an embodiment of several of such values. The United Kingdom can be at various points associated to or dissociated from other countries of the world. The UK is not included in the representations of Europe. Rather, Cameron depicts European countries only in terms of their economy, which serves as a cautionary tale to the UK. Many other independently acting social actors belong to either the United Kingdom, such as British universities or public services, or to the citizens, such as young people or problematic people. We have also remarked on the use of pronouns. Cameron uses the pronoun ‘I’ several times, but the speech is not deemed as overly egocentric as it is balanced out by the representation of citizens through the use of the national ‘we’. This ‘we’ is an inclusive form of the pronoun that highlights what the speaker shares with the public. Apart from it, a governmental ‘we’ has been identified, which excludes the public and suggests actions common to the government and to the speaker.

social actors		representations of the social actors
“Britain”	United Kingdom * (an impersonalised social actor, representing the United Kingdom as the country)	Britain (1), Britain (1), (our) country (2), <i>the global drama of the Olympics</i> (3), <i>the glory of the Diamond Jubilee</i> (3), <i>these magnificent events</i> (4), <i>jobs</i> (7), <i>paying the bills</i> (7), <i>search for work</i> (8), <i>rising prices</i> (9), <i>both fronts</i> (10), <i>(our) deficit</i> (13), <i>(our) economy</i> (16), <i>(our) infrastructure</i> (14), <i>public services</i> *** (21), <i>public services</i> (23), (our) society (25), <i>welfare</i>

		(27), <i>the best Olympics ever</i> (31), <u>British dedication</u> (31), <u>British duty</u> (31), <u>British steadiness</u> (31), <u>British tradition</u> (31), the nation (31), <i>resilient</i> (32), <i>realistic</i> (32), <i>intelligent</i> (32), <i>curious</i> (32), <i>enterprising</i> (32), <i>inventive</i> (32), <i>unswerving</i> (32), the spirit (33), (our) culture, (our) music and (our) television (33), <i>famous everywhere</i> (33), this fantastic country (35)
	citizens of the UK ** (the country personalised by its citizens)	we (2), our (country) (2), us (5), (to look) our (best) (5), <i>pride</i> (5), who we (are) (5), we (5), we (12), our (deficit) (13), us (13), we (14), we (14), <u>we</u> (16), our (economy) (16), our (infrastructure) (17), our (businesses) (19), our (schools) (22), our (hospitals) (22), our (police) (22), our (society) (25), <u>we</u> (28), the British people (30), we (30), we (31), our (Queen) (31), <u>British dedication</u> (31), <u>British duty</u> (31), <u>British steadiness</u> (31), <u>British tradition</u> (31), ourselves (31), <i>resilient</i> (32), <i>realistic</i> (32), <i>intelligent</i> (32), <i>curious</i> (32), <i>enterprising</i> (32), <i>inventive</i> (32), <i>unswerving</i> (32), our (universities) (33), our (scientists) (33), our (athletes) (33), our (culture) (33), our (music) (33), our (television) (33), our (armed forces) (33), we (34), <i>honest</i> (34), <i>practical</i> (34) ourselves (34), we (35), our (35), we (35), <i>stronger</i> (35), <i>better balanced</i> (35), <i>focused</i> (35)
“the world”	the UK and other countries (i.e. ‘the world’ includes ‘Britain’)	the global (drama of the Olympics) (2), the world (33), everywhere (33)
	countries other than the UK (i.e. ‘the world’ excludes ‘Britain’)	the world (1), the world (1), <i>Cameras and TV channels around the planet</i> (4)

	countries other than Europe (i.e. 'the world' excludes European countries)	other parts of the world (18), all over the planet (19)
	“Europe” – European countries other than the UK	the Eurozone (13), Europe’s (economy) (18)
	the government	the coalition government (2), we (11), we (13), <u>we</u> (16), we (17), we (24), <u>we</u> (28), the government (29)
	David Cameron (the speaker)	I (lead) (2), I (know that) (6), I (get that) (10), I (know) (12), I (also know) (12), I (know) (15), I (?m determined) (20), I (am determined) (21), I (will be bold) (25), I (profoundly believe) (28), (what) I (mean) (29), I (know) (35)
* United Kingdom	British businesses	our businesses (19)
	British universities	<i>resilient</i> (32), <i>realistic</i> (32), <i>intelligent</i> (32), <i>curious</i> (32), <i>enterprising</i> (32), <i>inventive</i> (32), <i>unswerving</i> (32), our universities (33)
	representatives of British culture	our culture (33), our music and our television (33)
	British armed forces	<i>resilient</i> (32), <i>realistic</i> (32), <i>intelligent</i> (32), <i>curious</i> (32), <i>enterprising</i> (32), <i>inventive</i> (32), <i>unswerving</i> (32), our armed forces (33), they (showed last year) (33), they (continue to show) (33), <i>dedication and professionalism</i> (33)
** citizens of the UK	“many worried people”	many people ... who are worried about what else the year might bring (6), <i>fears (about jobs and paying the bills)</i> (7), <i>the search for work has become difficult</i> (8), <i>household budgets</i> (9)
	“young people”	(the search for work has become difficult, particularly for) young people (9)
	“households”	household (budgets) (9)

	problematic citizens of the United Kingdom ****	the problems of our society (25)
	“families of the UK”	(support) families (27)
	British scientists	<i>resilient</i> (32), <i>realistic</i> (32), <i>intelligent</i> (32), <i>curious</i> (32), <i>enterprising</i> (32), <i>inventive</i> (32), <i>unswerving</i> (32), our scientists (33), Nobel Prize winners (33)
	British athletes	<i>resilient</i> (32), <i>realistic</i> (32), <i>intelligent</i> (32), <i>curious</i> (32), <i>enterprising</i> (32), <i>inventive</i> (32), <i>unswerving</i> (32), our athletes (33), gold medal winners (33),
*** public services	public services	public services (21), public services (23)
	British schools	our schools (22)
	British hospitals	our hospitals (22)
	British police	our police (22)
	individuals working in the public services	brilliant and committed people (23)
	“the system of public services”	the system (22)
**** problematic citizens of the United Kingdom	“a few at the top”	a few at the top (26), they (26), they (26), excess in the City (27)
	“those stuck on benefits”	many others (26), stuck on benefits (26), <i>without hope or responsibility</i> (26)
Queen Elizabeth II		her (reign) (31), our Queen (31), the finest and most famous example of British dedication, British duty, British steadiness, British tradition (31), a mirror of ourselves (31), a mirror of the nation (31)
criminals		criminals (22)
Libya		Libya (33)

Afghanistan	Afghanistan (33)
--------------------	------------------

Table 9: representations of social actors in David Cameron's speech from the New Year of 2012

3.3 David Cameron's Speech from the New Year of 2013

The format of Cameron's second speech delivered via a pre-recorded video message remains largely unchanged from the previous year. The Prime Minister is sitting in the same room with the video consisting of a static image of the speaker delivering the message. Thus, the tone can be once again considered to be quite neutral again.

When it comes to social actors and their representations, some featured in the previous speech can be identified. At the position that is hierarchically the highest, the dichotomy between "the world" and the United Kingdom can be found. In his previous speech, the United Kingdom and other countries were not always included in such expressions as 'global' or 'the world'. In the case of the United Kingdom, there was a relationship of mutual interaction where one was observing the other. This changes in this speech as the representations of "the world" include the UK. For instance, when Cameron talks about 'global race' (sentences 21 and 32), the UK is a part of that race. However, most of these expressions are connected to the noun 'race'. Therefore, instead of mutual observation, the dichotomy of "the world" and the United Kingdom attains the relationship of competition. In being included in the portrayal of "the world", Cameron considers UK to be a player equal to the other countries of the world in this international competition.

Once again, the depictions of "Britain" can be categorised to expressions that represent the impersonalised United Kingdom as a country and to those that stand for the citizens of the country as personalised agents. The United Kingdom is once again exemplified by such nouns as 'Britain' or 'country', or by expressions pointing to the country's different sectors like 'debts' (sentence 23) or 'tax system' (sentence 29). These are in a part-of-the-whole (meronymic) relationship with the United Kingdom, the country.

The representations of the country's citizens involve the national 'we' almost exclusively. In the first analysed speech, only few of the forms could have been potentially confused with the governmental 'we', the number of potential ambiguities is significantly higher in this speech. These ambiguities can add to the sense of a common goal and endeavour that the citizens and the government share. For example, sentence 17, "Well, this New Year we've got more than 1,000 academies open than last year," can be understood both as the Prime Minister praising

his government and as a perk that benefits all the citizens, including the speaker and the government. A similar situation occurs in sentence 35, but with a different pronoun. A genericised 'you' is normally understood as 'everyone' (or 'no one' in a negative clause). However, in this specific occurrence, 'you' can also be viewed as effectively replacing a first-person pronoun, the governmental 'we'.

The first-person plural pronoun is the dominant linguistic form that can relate to both the citizens of the country and the government in office, and the egocentric 'I' is used only on rare occasions. For this reason, it can be said that Cameron shows a tendency toward representing himself as a part of a larger collective. On the one hand, he gives credit to the individuals that constitute the government, highlighting his and their common work. On the other hand, he also involves the citizens, building upon the shared interest in the country, its future, and presenting the achievements of the governmental work as the achievements of the citizens as well. Cameron uses the singular pronoun 'I' in only four instances throughout the whole speech.

In sentence 8, the Prime Minister uses the pronoun 'I' in what could be termed a 'me-to-you' interaction. By using 'I', he closes the social distance between himself and the recipient and the message becomes much more intimate. However, it is not only the speaker who is addressed by a singular pronoun. When he uses the expressions "to anyone starting this year with questions...", he does not speak to a collective, but to individuals who have been selected out of this collective of 'the people', or citizens of the country. In Van Leeuwen's terms, he dissociated these singular representatives of 'the people' from the collective. The speaker then continues to address a single person directly by the second person pronoun 'you'. Usually, 'you' has formally no grammatical difference in number. But as because of the dissociation of the individual through 'anyone starting this year with questions', it can be said to be used in its singular sense in this specific instance. This 'me-to-you' interaction results in a greater intimacy with the singular recipient, which Cameron uses to "reassure" him or her. Such reassurance is arguably much more successful than if the tone remained as formal and socially distant as in the rest of the speech.

Next to the pronouns described above, we can also identify a common noun that has almost pronoun-like qualities. The genericised 'people' stands in for several social actors, which makes its reference shifting, a notable feature of pronouns. Also, it can be easily used as a replacing word. What demonstrates these features nicely is the sentence 25: "When people say

we've got to stop our welfare reforms because somehow it is cruel to expect people to work, we are saying no.” The genericised ‘people’ is used two times in the same sentence, but it is clear that each time, it refers to a different social actor. The first points to a very unspecific group of those who doubt the government’s actions in terms of its welfare reform. The second one refers to the unemployed, whom the government expects to get a job. The unspecific reference of the noun muddles the identity of the actual social actors so that it is not immediately apparent. At the same time, both groups – the doubters and the unemployed – can feel affected by such statement and be put in opposition to the government’s policy.

As has been mentioned above, the Prime Minister talks chiefly about the government in office. However, he includes representations of the previous government as well, although all of them suppress the actual social actor. There are three linguistic instantiations of the previous government – ‘a huge budget deficit’ (sentence 10), ‘a welfare system’ (sentence 12), ‘an education system’ (sentence 15). All of these are post-modified by subordinate clauses which add further negative information to the head expressions. The previous government as a social actor is suppressed because it is not mentioned directly at all. Instead, the three linguistic instantiations represent it through the results of their work in the sectors of fiscal, welfare, and education policies respectively. As a result, the criticism that Cameron makes is far less direct, much more opaque, and appears rather unaccusatory. The suppression lets him focus on the improvements that he himself with the government he leads achieved.

From the minor groups featured in the speech, we can see that all generations of British citizens are able to find themselves included. The Prime Minister shows concern for the younger generation by mentioning ‘children’ two times and for the older generation by thinking about ‘pensioners’ and their economic situation in sentence 31. When he talks about ‘families’ and their welfare (sentences 7 and 32), he considers the productive generation who have the responsibility to take care of the families. Then, Cameron also represents the employed and the unemployed. He clearly favours the former group, which is mostly mentioned in relation to “work”. Sentences 25 and 26 show the negative attitude he assumes towards the unemployed, wishing for them to change their situation. The unemployed can feel affected by this characterisation as Cameron creates a pressure on them to find employment. Lastly, education is a prominent sphere the Prime Minister talks about while he puts academies on a pedestal, representing them as models all other schools should aspire to become.

To summarise, the Prime Minister’s depiction of social actors suggest that he puts emphasis on the governments and its work on the country’s citizens and what they share not only amongst themselves, but also with the political representatives. When talking about Britain, he focuses much more on exemplifying it by the personalised citizens as opposed to representing it as the impersonalised actor on the national and international scene. When it comes to the political scene, he downplays his own personal role in what has been achieved. He also indirectly criticises the previous government for the state of affairs that the current one found themselves in, but only to show the progress that Cameron’s government made. From the various groups of citizens of the country, he selects few to mention. He shows concern for all the generations, he shows a clear preference for the employed citizens and dislikes the situation of the unemployed. Out of the impersonal actors, he mentions only schools while preferring the model embodied by the academics.

social actors		representations of the social actors
“Britain”	United Kingdom (i.e. an impersonalised social actor, representing the United Kingdom as the country)	(our) country (1), Britain (3), Britain (9), (our) country (9), Britain (21), <i>(our) debts</i> (23), (our) country (28), <i>(our) tax system</i> (29), <i>state pension</i> (31), Britain (32), (our) country (38)
	citizens of the UK * (i.e. the country personalised by its citizens)	our (country) (1), we (2), our (Queen) (2), we (3), <u>we</u> (5), <u>we</u> (6), we (8/1), <u>we</u> (8/2), <u>we</u> (9), <u>we</u> (12), people (12), <u>we</u> (15), <u>we</u> (16/2), <u>we</u> (23/1), our (debts) (23), we (24), our necks (24), all of us (26), <u>our hands</u> (27), our (schools) (27), our (children) (27), our (country) (28), our (tax system) (29), our (pensioners) (31), <u>our people</u> (32), the country (33), we (34), <u>you</u> (35), we (37/1), we (37/2), our (country) (38), our (children’s future) (38)
	a citizen of the UK (i.e. the country personalised by a singular citizen)	anyone (starting this year with questions...) (8), you (8)

Cameron's government		<u>we</u> (5), <u>we</u> (6), <u>we</u> (8/2), <u>we</u> (9), this government (10), that deficit (11), we (11), <u>we</u> (12), we (13), <u>we</u> (15), we (16/1), <u>we</u> (16/2), a government (in a hurry) (20), <u>we</u> (23/1), we (23/2), we (25/1), our (25), we (25/2), <u>our hands</u> (27), we (28), we (28), we (29), we (30/1), we (30/2), we (31), this government (32), <u>you</u> (35), we (38)
the previous government		<i>a huge budget deficit (that was dragging our country down)</i> (10), <i>a welfare system (that was frankly out of shape and that paid people not to work)</i> (12), <i>an education system (where too often mediocre was deemed good enough and discipline in many schools was slack)</i> (15)
David Cameron (i.e. the speaker)		I (8), I (9), my (33), I (36)
"the world"	the UK and other countries (i.e. 'the world' includes 'Britain')	global (race) (21), (race) with countries like China, India and Indonesia (22), a world-class (education) (27), this world (27), global (league table) (28), global (race) (32)
* citizens of the UK	families	many families (7), (their) families (32)
	"the newly employed"	almost half a million more people (13)
	students of sciences and languages	the numbers (studying science and languages) (18)
	teachers	teachers (19)
	those who doubt the government's actions	people (23), people (25/1)
	the unemployed	people (25/2), people (26), them (26)
	the younger generation of British citizens	(our) children (27), (our) children's (future) (38)
	the employed	anyone who likes to work hard and get on in life (28), those people (29),

		24 million workers (29), them (30), <u>our people</u> (32), the people (who work hard and aspire to a better life for their families) (32)
	British pensioners	(our) pensioners (31)
schools	British schools	(our) schools (27), <i>a world-class education</i> (27)
	“schools with slack discipline”	many schools (15)
	academies	more academies (16), those schools (16), more than 1,000 academies (17)
British local councils		the council (tax) (30)
Queen Elizabeth II		(our) Queen (2)
China		China (22)
India		India (22)
Indonesia		Indonesia (22)

Table 10: representations of social actors in David Cameron’s speech from the New Year of 2013

3.4 David Cameron's Speech from the New Year of 2014

The third Cameron's speech that is analysed changes its video format. The recording sees Cameron standing in a factory while delivering his message. This marks a difference in tone as it shifts from a rather neutral setting to one that focuses on economy, businesses and industry. The image is static. Though the machines behind the Prime Ministers appear to be running, no people can be seen in the shot, which support the formal nature of the speech as opposed to a more personal one. When compared to the previous speeches, the video is slightly shorter as it is only 3 minutes and 8 seconds in length.

Representations of the United Kingdom as the country are prominent in this speech. In the first part, they are associated with the country's economy. Where Cameron featured some kind of interactive relation between "the world" and the United Kingdom in his previous speeches, it is not so in this one. The only representation of "the world" excludes the United Kingdom and is passivated by being sold British goods to. Cameron's focus on the country's economy also stands behind the fact that he elects to include two other closely related social actors – British businesses (that is all the businesses of the country) and British small businesses (as a specific subgroup of British businesses). Like the United Kingdom, these two are also impersonalised social actors. But the Prime Minister also personalises the latter and praises the owners of the small businesses, calling them "heroes and heroines" in sentence 14 and "the backbone of our economy" in sentence 15. Cameron clearly shows his preference by including these social actors. Contrarily, social actors belonging to all other sectors of the country are notably excluded, which can send the message of their work not being as much appreciated as that of the small business owners.

In the second part, Cameron's focus shifts from representing the country in terms of its economy to referring to it as the "United Kingdom". Despite this being the official designation of the country, the speaker did not use it in the previous speeches and has not used it in this one up to sentence 20. The Prime Minister is about to address the matter of the upcoming Scottish independence referendum. Thus, depicting the country as "united" is convenient as he aims to persuade the Scottish people to vote to stay in the union. Cameron further highlights this unity by using such expressions as "our family of nations" (sentence 24), "together" (sentences 24 and 25), "shared" (sentence 24), and "common" (sentence 24). In sentence 25, he acknowledges the special situation of Scotland by first dissociating it from England, Wales, and

Northern Ireland before uniting it again in “an even stronger United Kingdom”. In this section, Cameron also uses the pronoun “we” for the impersonalised actor of the United Kingdom. Where in the previous speech Cameron incorporated a ‘me-to-you’ interaction, he does something similar in this one. Plural pronouns are used as ‘we’ refers to the countries of England, Wales, and Northern Ireland (impersonalised actors) and ‘you’ to the personalised social actor of the collective of Scottish citizens. Similar to the previous speech, this interaction enhances the intimacy of the message and the plea to stay is more likely to affect the Scottish recipients.

When other uses of pronouns are analysed, we can see that the national and governmental ‘we’ dominate once more. In this speech, there are no points where the two uses could be confused and an ambiguity could arise. It is also worthy to note that the speaker significantly limits his use of the first-person singular pronoun ‘I’ and thus notably suppresses the egocentricity that accompanies it. The only two instances of its use are in sentence 27 where he thanks the members of the Conservative Party, and in sentence 29 where he wishes the people a happy new year. Both occasions call for the Prime Minister to be more personal. In previous speeches it became clear that Cameron likes to present himself as a part of a wider collective of working people. This tendency continues in this speech as he even highlights the work that the party members have done, which is why he repeats the pronoun ‘you’ several times in sentences 27 and 28.

To summarise, in the first part of the speech, Cameron focuses on the economy of the United Kingdom and represents the country in economic terms. This is why he chooses to feature social actors most important to the economy as well, namely businesses and business owners. The Prime Minister excludes social actors from all other sectors of the country who may feel that they have been forgotten about or that their work goes unappreciated as a result. In the second part, Cameron addresses Scotland as the country and the Scottish people directly because of the choice that they are to make in the referendum for independence, which is planned for that year. Scottish citizens are addressed in a manner similar to the ‘me-to-you’ interaction, which is more likely to affect the recipients. Cameron continues to show his preference to present the work of the collectives he leads rather than his work as an individual. This is why he significantly limits the use of an egocentric ‘I’ and spends time praising the members of his political party.

social actors		representations of the social actors
“Britain”	United Kingdom * (i.e. an impersonalised social actor, representing the United Kingdom as the country)	Britain (2), (our) country (3), (<i>our</i>) <i>economy</i> (4), <i>jobs</i> (6), British (6), the whole country (8), <i>the deficit</i> (9), (<i>our</i>) <i>economy</i> (10), (families across) Britain (10), Britain’s (amazing small businesses) (13), <i>income taxes</i> (12), <i>field duty</i> (12), <i>jobs</i> (13), (<i>our</i>) <i>roads and railways</i> (13), <i>lower jobs taxes</i> (13), (<i>our</i>) <i>economy</i> (15), <i>welfare</i> (16), <i>immigration</i> (16), <i>welfare</i> (17), <i>immigration</i> (17), <i>economy (for people who...)</i> (17), (<i>our</i>) <i>economy</i> (18), <i>education</i> (18), (<i>our</i>) <i>economy</i> (19), <u>our</u> United Kingdom (20), the UK (22), (our) country (23), <u>our</u> family of nations (24), <u>we</u> (24), we (25/2), an even stronger United Kingdom (25)
	citizens of the UK ** (i.e. the country personalised by its citizens)	our (country) (3), our (economy) (4), we (5), we (6), everyone (8), our (economy) (10), families across Britain (10), our (roads and railways) (13), our (small businesses) (14), our (economy) (15), our (children) (18), our (economy) (19), <u>our</u> (United Kingdom) (20), all of us, wherever we live in the UK (22), our (country) (23), <u>our</u> (family of nations) (24), <u>we</u> (24), our (children and grandchildren) (25), everyone (29)
Cameron’s government		<i>the long-term plan</i> (3), we (4), we (8/1), <i>the plan</i> (8), we (8/2), our (8), <i>it</i> (8), we (9), we (10/1), we (10/2), we (11), we (13), we (15), we (16), our (16), we (17/1), we (17/2), we (18), our <i>long-term plan</i> (26), we (27), <i>that plan</i> (27)

“the world” (i.e. countries of the world excluding the UK)		the world (6)
members of the Conservative Party		all members (of our party who are watching this) (27), our (party) (27) you (27/1), you (27/2), you (28/1), you (28/2), you (28/3), our (party) (28)
David Cameron (i.e. the speaker)		I (27), I (29)
the Conservative Party		(our) party (27), (our) party (28)
* the United Kingdom	British businesses	the businesses (6), the factories (that are making British goods and selling them to the world again) (6)
	British small businesses	Britain’s amazing small businesses (13), (our) small businesses (14)
	Scotland	<i>the referendum vote</i> (21), <i>the biggest decision</i> (21), Scotland (21), <i>the outcome</i> (22), <i>not a vote for the next few years</i> (23), <i>a vote that could change our country forever</i> (23), (everyone in) Scotland (25)
	England	England (25), <u>we</u> (25/1)
	Wales	Wales (25), <u>we</u> (25/1)
	Northern Ireland	Northern Ireland (25), <u>we</u> (25/1)
** the citizens of the United Kingdom	newly employed people	the people who are getting decent jobs (6)
	workers (the employed)	hardworking people (11), people who work hard and play by the rules (17)

	owners of small businesses	those who run our small businesses (14), heroes and heroines (14), they (15), the backbone of our economy (15), them (15)
	the younger generation	(our) children and young people (18), they (18/1), they (18/2), (our) children and grandchildren (25)
	Scottish citizens	everyone in Scotland (25), you (25)

Table 11: representations of social actors in David Cameron's speech from the New Year of 2014

3.5 David Cameron's Speech from the New Year of 2015

Looking at the recording of the fourth Cameron's speech that is analysed, it is apparent that the message is significantly shorter than the previous ones, with the video being only 2 minutes and 26 seconds long. Once again, we can see Cameron standing in a factory as he delivers his speech. However, this time, the hall is not empty and instead, we can see the factory's labourers intensely focusing on their work. This is the first time that other social actors apart from the speaker himself are represented not only textually, but visually as well. Moreover, the image is not static, but shifts to show the workers themselves being immersed in their manual activity. Therefore, the tone can be said to be centred not only on economy, business, and industry (as was the case in the previous speech), but on the people, or rather the individual worker as well.

Like in the video recording, Cameron continues to represent personalised social actors in the very text of his speech itself. The reason for this could possibly be the general election that was going to be held in the United Kingdom in 2015. Being aware of that, the Prime Minister could have wanted for the speech to be much more personal in tone. In the first part (sentences 1-9), he represents people collectively by using expressions such as 'hard-working people' (sentence 5), 'home owners' (sentence 7), or 'those who are retiring' (sentence 8). However, it is in the second part (sentences 10-16) that Cameron gets unusually personal by addressing individual actors. The use of the second person pronoun 'you' is clearly in its singular sense. It is used generically to talk about a typical member of the society or a social group. Sentences 12, 16, and then even 28 represent an unspecified member of the society, a prototypical citizen of the United Kingdom. In sentence 13, he speaks to an unemployed person looking for a job, and in sentence 14 to an employed worker who is able to save money. Finally, in sentences 15 and 17, a parent and a pensioner are addressed respectively. In sentence 28, a 'me-to-you' interaction is used to wish the recipient a happy new year. Focus is clearly placed on the recipient again as the singular 'you' is repeated three times. Like with a typical 'me-to-you' interaction, these uses of the singular sense of the second person pronoun increase intimacy and are more likely to affect the individual recipient.

Catering to a singular citizen also goes hand-in-hand with the decrease of first-person representations. Therefore, referring to the government in office by a governmental 'we' is much scarcer when compared to previous speeches. Though he still presents a list of achievements,

the role of the government is backgrounded in order to express how the citizen benefits from them. The use of the national 'we' also drops significantly. Like in his previous speech, Cameron employs the egocentric 'I' only twice. In sentence 25, it is to show his personal resolve by connecting it with the verb 'say'. As was mentioned above, in 28 it is used for the purposes of a 'me-to-you' interaction as he wishes a happy new year.

What also speaks of the coming election is the representation of the current government as 'the competence that got us this far' (sentence 24). Moreover, Cameron tends to list the things that his government achieved in his speeches. The expression 'the competence that got us this far' then perfectly summarises how he wishes for the government to be perceived by the recipients, with the 'this far' part referring to the lists of achievements he makes. What also supports his wanting for the government to be perceived as 'the competence' is his depicting his political opponents as 'the chaos of giving it up, going backwards and taking huge risks' (sentence 24). Though his actual political opposition does not necessarily need to be backward, chaotic, nor take huge risks, Cameron selects such characteristics that would contrast with the representation of his own government and in this way increase its perception as 'the competence'. The opponents become a sinister force that has power to affect the citizens' lives negatively. Therefore, such characterisation is reminiscent of an 'us and them' attitude as described by Wales (58-63). It should also be noted that the recipient is deictically projected to the speaker's position and is often unaware of the distinction of the inclusive 'we' (appearing as the national 'we' in speeches) and exclusive 'we' (the governmental 'we'). For this reason, the recipient is more likely to find himself or herself situated in the 'us' position with the 'them' position threatening him or her.

Despite focusing on people more, Cameron still relies on talking about the economy and economic progress extensively. When he represents the United Kingdom as the impersonalised social actor, he often selects economic terms to do so. This is most apparent in sentences 12-18 where the noun 'country' is modified by a series of clauses that are linked to the country's economy. Similarly, whether he talks about collectives or individuals, he connects them to the economy in most instances as well. Thus, pensioners become 'those who are retiring after a life of work' (sentence 8), other citizens are "willing to save" (sentence 16), and the lowest paid workers do need to pay "no income tax whatsoever" (sentence 6). When looking at the international scene, Britain is given as a shining example when it comes to its economy whereas "the

world” is represented as “uncertain” (sentence 23) in economic matters, whose “many countries continue to struggle” (sentence 23).

In summary, the coming general election of 2015 seemingly influences how the Prime Minister portrays social actors. On the one hand, he limits first-person references as he focuses on the recipient. For this purpose, he addresses them collectively by certain nominal expressions and directly as singular agents, which is evidenced by the use of the second person pronoun ‘you’ in its singular sense. Such representation is possibly selected to affect the recipient more. On the other hand, he exploits ‘us and them’ attitudes when he connects the ‘us’ side to his current government and refers to it as ‘the competence’, and he associates the ‘them’ side to Cameron’s political opposition, depicting it as the malevolent ‘the chaos’, which contributes to the latter being perceived as a sinister power that could potentially impact the citizen’s lives negatively. Furthermore, representations of most social actors are affected by Cameron’s economic outlook. Thus, those actors that are included in the speech are talked about in economic terms.

social actors		representations of the social actors
“Britain”	United Kingdom * (i.e. an impersonalised social actor, representing the United Kingdom as the country)	(our) country (2), <i>new tax cuts</i> (5), <i>no income tax</i> (6), <i>new security</i> (8), <i>the state pension</i> (8), Britain (9), <i>(our) economy</i> (9), a country where if you put in, you’ll get out (12), where if ..., there are decent jobs (13), where if..., you keep more of your money (14), where if..., you can expect they’ll get a proper education (15), and where ..., you can buy your own home (16), and of course, where when you retire, you’ll have dignity and security in old age (17), (our) country (19), Britain (23), (our) country (27)
	citizens of the UK ** (i.e. the country personalised by its citizens)	our (country) (2), our (classrooms) (4), ours (12), our (country) (19), us (24), our (resolution) (25), <i>the plan</i> (26), <i>the important long-term work of securing a better</i>

		<i>future</i> (26), our (country) (27), we (27), <i>the right choices</i> (27)
	a citizen of the UK *** (i.e. the country personalised by a singular citizen)	you (12/1), you (12/2), you (16/1), you (16/2), (a home) of your own (16), you (28), your (28/1), your (28/2)
“the world” (i.e. other countries of the world exclud- ing the United Kingdom)	the world (excluding the UK)	the world (9), the global economy (22), many countries (22),
	developed nations	any other major developed nation (9)
Cameron’s government		<i>new tax cuts</i> (5), <i>no income tax</i> (6), our Help to Buy scheme (7), <i>new security</i> (8), we (11), <i>a long-term plan</i> (11), <i>values</i> (11), our (18), let us (20), <i>the competence that got us this far</i> (24), <i>the plan</i> (26), <i>the important long-term work of securing a better future</i> (26), <i>the right choices</i> (27)
Cameron’s political opponents		<i>the chaos of giving it up, going backwards and taking huge risks</i> (24)
David Cameron (i.e. the speaker)		I (25), I (28)
* the United King- dom	British businesses	<i>two million new private sector jobs</i> (3)
	British schools ****	<i>new spirit</i> (4), (our) classrooms (4)
** the citizens of the United King- dom	workers (the employed)	over 24 million hard-working people (5),
	workers with low income	three million of the lowest paid (7)
	new home owners	tens of thousands of new home own- ers (7)
	pensioners	those who are retiring after a life of work (8)
	the younger generation	over one million more children (4), children (15), they (15)
*** a citizen of the UK	an unemployed person look- ing for a job	you (13)

	a worker	you (14/1), you (14/2), your own (money) (14)
	a parent	you (15/1), your (children) (15), you (15/2), you (15/3)
	a pensioner	you (17/1), you (17/2)
**** good British schools		schools that are good or outstanding (4)

Table 12: representations of social actors in David Cameron's speech from the New Year of 2015

3.6 David Cameron's Speech from the New Year of 2016

In the last of Cameron's speeches, we can see a static image of the Prime Minister as he speaks to the public. The background in the video recording is blurred so that the details of the room that the Prime Minister is sitting in are mostly unidentifiable. We can only discern the blurred lights of a Christmas tree, which adds to the festive tone of the occasion. The speech is longer than the two previous ones with the recording being 4 minutes and 19 seconds long. Overall, we can say that the tone of the video has shifted from the economic focused previous speeches back to a neutral and possibly slightly more festive one.

The content of the speech changes as well, which is reflected in what social actors are represented and in the manner of their characterisation. The United Kingdom is associated far less with its economy, but significantly more with 'security'. When we look solely at the respective words, 'economy' and 'security', we can see that 'economy' is used twice in relation to the social actor United Kingdom and 'security' three times. The choice of social actors to be included is similarly affected by this lowered concern with economy, but it is still apparent in some instances. For example, Cameron depicts workers in relation to how much they are paid in sentence 7 and he talks of the poor when he uses the impersonalised abstraction 'poverty' in sentence 30. When he comes to the topic of discrimination of women, 'the glass ceiling' (sentence 30) is related to economic discrimination as well. Nevertheless, this decline in economic representations and depictions of security are related to Cameron's choice to include an actor that he has not been featured in any of the previous speeches.

2015 was the year that saw several terrorist attacks. In January, the terrorist attacks at Charlie Hebdo, a French satirical magazine, by Islamist extremists occurred and affected the international scene intensely as many adopted the "Je suis Charlie" phrase to show sympathy and support freedom of expression. Another attack that was widely covered by Western media was the one that took place in November in Paris. These could have inspired Cameron to include the social actor that could be labelled as 'Islamic terrorists'. These terrorists are portrayed negatively by such expressions as "seething hatred" (sentence 22), "the violence" (sentence 24) and "the terror" (sentence 24), and by "grievance and resentment" (sentence 25). Apart from all these negative associations, these "murderous extremists" (sentence 22) are also characterised by them having an "ideology" (sentence 30) or "narrative" (sentence 25). Cameron also appears to consider them not only a threat from the outside, a danger directed at the United Kingdom

from other countries, but also as a threat from within. This is suggested by Cameron labelling them as “another social problem” (sentence 21) when he was dealing with problems of the UK specifically. Conversely, he also characterises the terrorists by their “seething hatred of the west” (sentence 22), suggesting that they come from countries other than the western ones. The existence of these terrorists influences the manner of other actors’ depictions as well. Not only is Britain represented by its security, but also certain values are selected to contrast with those of the terrorists. These can be found in sentence 28. They are used for the purpose of differentiating Britain from the terrorists. The citizens of the United Kingdom are also associated with “our mettle” in sentence 29 to characterise them as resilient in the face of the terrorist threat.

When the use of pronouns is investigated, we can see that Cameron represents them by the distal ‘they’, which suggests an opposition to ‘us’, as well as by ‘you’. In sentence 23, this ‘you’ can be understood to be used in both plural and singular sense. Regardless, he addresses this social actor directly. He does so again in sentence 28, which is reminiscent of a me-to-you interaction where the ‘you’ is used in a singular sense. In previous speeches, this was used with a member of the British public to create a sense of intimacy in order for him or her to be more accepting of what Cameron says. In this speech, the social distance is brought from maximal to rather minimal again. As a result, the message becomes more intimidating and threatening to the individual “terrorist” that is listening to the speech.

Indeed, Cameron’s government is faced with the threat of Islamic terrorism. Because of that, it is convenient for the Prime Minister to portray it as strong, stable and helpful. Such depiction is supported by the fact that Cameron won the general election in 2015. As the government gained a new legitimacy, Cameron can be confident to represent it as “a strong, majority government in power”. Security that the government brings about is mentioned in sentence 17. In the following sentences (from 18 to 20), he expresses it by other means. Again, he addresses a singular member of the British public by ‘you’ in the singular sense. He includes such social actors that have some kind of problems and can be helped. Their representations appear in the ‘if clause’ of the sentence. Then, he refers the government by a governmental ‘we’ in the second clause of the sentence and expresses that they will solve these problems. Through such interaction, the government is depicted as helping each and every individual, which makes it much more reliable and helpful, but also as being strong and having power over the life of the citizen.

Nevertheless, he betrays such portrayal in sentence 19 when he unintentionally uses the expression “state failure”, which the government will solve. Arguably, this “state failure” is also a representation of the government because the government is a part of the state and Cameron’s government has been in power since 2010.

As has been mentioned above, the changed tone of the speech also transforms what social actors are included and how they are characterised. An example of the change in the manner of representation can be found in sentence 19 when Cameron talks about an unemployed person. In the speech from the New Year of 2013, Cameron says the government is accused of cruelty because they expect the unemployed to find a job. To make them do so, he introduces welfare reforms, which supposedly take away money from the unemployed to make them find a job as quickly as they can. Thus, pressure is put on the unemployed for them to act. A dislike for the unemployed could be discerned whereas clear preference for the opposite – the employed – could be identified. In this speech, the unemployed are passivated to a large extent by the interaction between the governmental ‘we’ and the singular ‘you’ described above. Cameron admits a “state failure” in sentence 19, which suggests that it is not the unemployed that can be blamed for their condition, and vows to help them instead. Consequently, instead of cruelty, the government could be only blamed for compassion this time around.

Apart from this change in representation, Cameron features actors from other sectors than economy and education, which dominated in the previous speeches. The most notable of these are members of an unspecified minority group in sentence 20. They are characterised by being discriminated, but Cameron does not specify whether he talks about a racial discrimination, gender discrimination, or discrimination because of sexual orientation. Because of this lack of specification, he could be seen as talking to representatives of all these groups at once. Also, it has been already mentioned that he also shows some concern for women when he mentions “the glass ceiling” in sentence 30. Lastly, Cameron newly includes an actor that has been labelled as “a low-life” in the table below. This group is deemed helpless, a situation similar to that of other actors, which has been mentioned above. This is evidenced by the expressions “trapped”, “addiction”, “abuse”, and even “chaos”. Helplessness is highlighted because it makes the government able to help them.

Finally, the European Union has already been represented in the first speech analysed from the New Year of 2012. In it, the EU was associated with terminology relating to its economy and was given as a cautionary tale rather than an example. In this speech, its portrayal points to an uncomfortable position that Cameron finds the United Kingdom to be in relation to other European countries. That is why he talks about a better deal in sentence 31 and why the EU is also depicted in terms of “an in-out referendum” in sentence 11. Although the referendum stands for a power of the British citizens to affect the relationship with Europe, they are passivated by Cameron in sentence 9 by being given “a say on Europe” by the government.

To conclude, the last of Cameron’s speeches marks a significant change. Though he continues to deal with an economic aspect of the United Kingdom, this subsides and new concerns arise. The threat of terrorism causes him to represent social actors in a different way. He talks to the terrorists directly to show off how strong Britain is and also characterises his government as strong and stable and as one on which the people can rely. He also notices other social issues and includes women and other groups that are subjected to discrimination. The last noteworthy social actor that appears in the speech is the European Union, which is represented in terms of its relationship with the United Kingdom and in relation to an upcoming referendum, which would decide whether the country would remain in or leave the Union.

social actors		representations of the social actors
“Britain”	United Kingdom * (i.e. an impersonalised social actor, representing the United Kingdom as the country)	(our) <i>economy</i> (2), Britain (2), <i>renewed strength</i> (2), <i>security</i> (4), (our) <i>history</i> (5), <i>free childcare</i> (8), <i>rising pensions</i> (8), (the law of) the land (11), the national (interest) (13), (our) country (13), (our) <i>economic</i> and national <i>security</i> (14), <i>deep social problems</i> (15), ones (15), (our) country (15), <i>them</i> (16), <i>state failure</i> (19), (our) national <i>security</i> (22), <i>(our) way of life</i> (27), (our) society (28), (our) <i>streets</i> (28), (our) <i>values: freedom; tolerance; responsibility; loyalty</i> (28), Britain (31), (our) country (31)

	<p>citizens of the UK ** (i.e. the country personalised by its citizens)</p>	<p><u>your</u> (3), our (history) (5), millions more (8), <u>you</u> (9), <i>a say on Europe</i> (9), British people (12), our (relationship with the EU) (12), our (country) (13), <u>you</u> (14), <u>we</u> (15), our (country) (15), <u>we</u> (16), everyone's lives (17), our (national security) (22), we (27/1), we (27/2), our (way of life) (27), <i>greater confidence (... in our way of life)</i> (27), our (streets) (28), our (schools) (28), our (society) (28), our (values) (28), our (nation) (29), our <i>mettle</i> (29), <i>families</i> (31), <i>they</i> (31), our (country) (31), everyone (33)</p>
	<p>a citizen of the UK *** (i.e. the country personalised by a singular citizen)</p>	<p><u>your</u> (4), <u>you</u> (9), <u>you</u> (14)</p>
	<p>Cameron's government</p>	<p>a strong, majority government in power (2), us (3), <i>an ongoing resolve</i> (3), we (3), our (manifesto) (3), <i>sentences 5, 6, 7, and 8</i>, we (8), our (manifesto) (8), our <i>long-term economic plan</i> (8), we (9/1), our (manifesto) (9), we (9/2), <u>we</u> (15), <u>we</u> (16), (17), <i>social reform</i> (17), we (17), <i>(make everyone's lives) more secure</i> (17), we (18), we <i>(will deliver the homes)</i> (19), <i>(sweep away) state failure</i> (19), we (20), <i>(fight) discrimination</i> (20), <i>(deliver) real opportunity</i> (20), <i>to help lay your path to success</i> (20) we (21), us (23), <i>very clear</i> (23), we (24), we (25), we (26), we (31/1), we (31/2)</p>
	<p>David Cameron (i.e. the speaker)</p>	<p>I (am negotiating hard) (12), (drives) me (13), I (want) (16), I (want us to be very clear) (23), (let) me (wish) (33)</p>
<p>* the United Kingdom</p>	<p>British schools</p>	<p>good or outstanding school (6), new academies (8), <u>extra apprenticeships</u> (8), (our) schools (28)</p>

** the citizens of the United Kingdom	the younger generation	six million children (6)
	workers	over 31 million people (5), more than any in our history (5), more than half a million workers (7), everyone apart from the very best paid (7)
	low paid workers	the lowest paid (7)
	potential terrorists	people (22), their (country) (22), them (22)
	poor people	poverty (30)
	women	the glass ceiling (30), it (30)
*** a citizen of the UK	a person who cannot afford to buy a home	you (18/1), one of the many hard-working young people locked out of the housing market (18), you (18/2), your own (door) (18), the tenant (30), (make) them (a homeowner) (30)
	a young person who no longer attends any school (either because of drop-out or as a graduate)	<u>you</u> (19/1), off school (19), <u>you</u> (19/2)
	an unemployed person	<u>you</u> (19/1), out of work (19), <u>you</u> (19/2),
	“a low-life”	<u>you</u> (19/1), trapped in an underworld of addiction, abuse, crime, and chaos (19), <u>you</u> (19/2)
	a member of a minority group	your (dreams) (20), who you (are) (20), your (path to success) (20)
European Union	Europe (9), <i>an in-out referendum</i> (11), the EU (12), Europe (31)	
“the world”	a dangerous world (14), our (age) (29),	
Islamic terrorists (i.e. representation of a collective)	<u>another social problem</u> (21), a <i>seething hatred of the west</i> (22), <i>one that turns people against their country and can even turn them into murderous extremists</i> (22), murder-	

	ous extremists (22), <u>you</u> (23), <i>the violence</i> (24), <i>the terror</i> (24), their <i>underlying, poisonous narrative of grievance and resentment</i> (25), those who create the conditions for that narrative to flourish (26), their <i>ideology</i> (30)
“the west” (i.e. certain European, Northern American, and Eurasian countries, including the UK)	the west (22)
an Islamic terrorist (i.e. representation of an individual)	<u>you</u> (23), you (28/1), you (28/2), the extremist (30)

Table 13: representations of social actors in David Cameron’s speech from the New Year of 2016

3.7 Theresa May's Speech from the New Year of 2017

The first of May's New Year speeches keeps the format of the video recording very similar to that of Cameron's from the previous year. She is standing in a room with a Christmas tree in it and the background is slightly blurred, making the speaker herself the focus of the recording. The image is once again static and does not shift or cut to another. The video totals 4 minutes and 2 seconds in length, which is comparable to the last speech made by Cameron.

Looking at how social actors are portrayed, it is noticeable that some key features differ from Cameron's speeches. May almost does not represent the government at all. The only time she could be said to be using a governmental 'we' is in sentence 4. However, even here, the use is ambiguous as the pronoun might also refer to the public in a message of encouragement instead of expressing that the government is going to deliver Brexit. She uses the pronoun 'I' slightly more often than Cameron, but the use still cannot be considered overly egocentric. On the contrary, her sequence of sentences (5-7), all of which begin with 'I know', suggests an empathetic use of 'I'. At different places, she uses it to present herself as a skilled negotiator, as in sentences 7 and 12. Unlike Cameron, May does not focus on economy as much, which can be seen in her depiction of the United Kingdom and in her selection of impersonal social actors to include in sentence 16. Out of these, only 'businesses' are directly connected to the economy. May also significantly decreases the number of representations of impersonal actors and focuses on the personal ones. This also applies to the ratio of depictions of Britain. The Prime Minister refers to the citizens much more than the impersonalised country. She acknowledges such a tendency when she says that "it isn't just big, global events that define a year – it is the personal things" (sentence 17).

In 2016, the citizens of the United Kingdom decided that the country would leave the European Union. The vote polarised the British public and May is keenly aware of this. She reflects on how the citizens are divided when she represents both of the poles. On the one hand, she directly points to the results of the referendum as she talks about "the 52% who voted Leave and the 48% who voted remain" (sentence 11). On the other hand, she also observes the division between the wealthier groups of people and the poorer ones. Consequently, when it comes to representing social actors in the text, both of these divisions are examples of a dissociation. The citizens of the United Kingdom are dissociated into "the Leavers" and "the Remainers" as well as into "the poorer people" and "the wealthier people". However, even though there are

two pairs of social actors, there is only one textual dissociation as the pairs are linked through the referendum. The extratextual context would point to “the wealthier” being associated with the “Remainers” and “the poorer” with the dissatisfied “Leavers”, but May herself does not make such a link explicit in her speech.

When May acknowledges the divisions existing among the people, it is because her ultimate focus lies on representing them united. Her numerous uses of the national ‘we’ help her to reach this effect. She often explicitly uses the words “unite” (sentences 11 and 15), “unity” (sentence 16), or “union” (sentence 16). Therefore, she first used dissociation to acknowledge the polarisation of the people before using association to deliver her ultimate message of unified citizens of the country. The peak of this portrayal can be found in sentence 16 and mainly in the expressions “our union of people” and “our union of communities and families”.

In the same sentence, she also represents such union in relation to the impersonalised actors of all the four countries of the United Kingdom. She talks about “our precious union of nations – England, Scotland, Wales, and Northern Ireland” (sentence 16). Previously, Cameron used such appeal to the union when the Scottish people were to decide whether to become independent. In 2016, it was Northern Ireland and Scotland who voted to remain in the European Union whereas England and Wales wanted to leave. Thus, talks about a new Scottish independence referendum were sparked. Consequently, May could be appealing to this union for a purpose very similar to Cameron’s.

The last of the noteworthy representations is that of Jo Cox. Her inclusion itself is peculiar as not only is it the first time that a singular concrete person was included, but she was also a member of the Parliament from the Labour Party and thus a political opponent of May’s. However, as Cox’s murder was associated with the issue of the European union, the inclusion could stand for another attempt to bridge the divisions and unite the people. May characterises Cox first by the phrase “the fantastic MP Jo Cox”. Van Leeuwen would label such depiction a semi-formal nomination (287) as May uses the given name and surname, but without any honorifics. She only precedes it by her professional status (“MP”) and praises her personality by speaking of her as of a “fantastic” person. This semi-formal nomination allows May to both show respect while at the same time not coming off as stiffly formal. Then, Cox is also represented by direct speech, which is the first instance of a speaker doing so in the analysed speeches. Cox’s own

words reiterates May’s prevalent message of unity. Using direct speech is an instance of utterance autonomisation (Van Leeuwen 293), which makes Cox to be perceived as a unifier as well.

To sum up, May’s speech is heavily influenced by the referendum which resulted in the decision of Britain to leave the European Union. May is not interested in representing impersonal actors and focuses on people instead. She acknowledges the division of the people into two large camps, but on the whole, she tries to textually unify them in her speech. For this purpose, she predominantly uses the national ‘we’ as well as association. She includes the late MP Jo Cox for a similar purpose as she bridges the gap of partisan politics with her inclusion. Cox is praised and also represented by an utterance autonomisation as a unifier, which helps to further May’s goal to deliver a unifying message to her divided public.

social actors		representations of the social actors
“Britain”	United Kingdom * (i.e. an impersonalised social actor, representing the United Kingdom as the country)	Britain (that is stronger...) (8), a country (that is fairer...) (9), a nation (that is safe and secure...) (10), one great union of nations (11), <i>a proud history</i> (11), <i>a bright future</i> (11), (our) country (13), a truly united Britain (15), (our) citizenship of this great nation (15), (our) precious union of nations – England, Scotland, Wales, and Northern Ireland (16), this country (22), (our) <i>politics, economy</i> and society (22)
	citizens of the UK ** (i.e. the country personalised by its citizens)	we (3), ourselves (3), you (4), <u>we</u> (4), not everyone (6), we (7), us (7), our (shared interests) (7), us (together) (7), we all (8), we all (9), everyone (9), we all (10), our (children and grandchildren) (10), (unite) us (11), (no longer) <u>the 52% who voted Leave and the 48% who voted remain</u> (11), one great union of people (11), <i>a proud history</i> (11), <i>a bright future</i> (11), not just for <u>those who voted to Leave</u> – but for <u>every single person in this country</u> (12), some further divisions (13), our

		(country) (13), people (14), ordinary, working people (14), we (15), our (citizenship) (15), <i>united</i> (15), all our people (15), <i>unity</i> (16), our union of people (16), our union of communities and families (16), us, whoever we are (20), us (21/1), we (21), us (21), we (22), our (politics, economy and society) (22), we (23)
	a citizen of the UK *** (i.e. the country personalised by a singular citizen)	<u>every single person in this country</u> (12), your (talent and hard work) (15), your future (15), the personal things (17), you (18), your (first job) (18), your (first home) (18), your (children) (19), you (19), <i>these things</i> (20), <i>life's milestones</i> (20), whoever you (are) (22), wherever you (live) (22), (for) you (22), you (23), your (family) (23)
May's government		<u>we</u> (4)
Theresa May (i.e. the speaker)		I (consider) (2), I (believe) (2), I (know) (5), I (know) (6), I (know) (7), I (sit around the negotiating table) (12), I (am there to get the right deal) (12), (let) me (wish) (23)
* the United Kingdom	sports teams	sports teams (16)
	armed forces	armed forces (16)
	businesses	businesses (16)
	charities	charities (16)
	schools	schools (16)
	hospitals	hospitals (16)
	the younger generation	our children and grandchildren (10), (your) children (19)

** the citizens of the United Kingdom	“the Leavers” (i.e. those who voted to leave the European Union)	<u>the 52% who voted Leave</u> (11), those who voted to Leave (12)
	“the Remainers” (i.e. those who voted to remain in the European Union)	<u>the 48% who voted remain</u> (11)
	“the wealthier people”	those who are prospering (13), those who can easily buy their own home, send their children to a great school, find a secure job (13), those for whom the country works well (13), (not) just the privileged few (22)
	“the poorer people”	those who are not (13), those who cannot (13), those for whom it does not
“the world”		big, global events (17)
Jo Cox		the fantastic MP Jo Cox (21), who was so tragically taken from us ... (21), “We are far more united and have far more in common than that which divides us.” (21)

Table 14: representations of social actors in Theresa May’s speech from the New Year of 2017

3.8 Theresa May's Speech from the New Year of 2018

When we have a look at the video recording of the New Year speech from 2018, the format does not change significantly from the previous ones. May delivers it standing in a room, with the video being static and the background slightly blurred, and the recording being 4 minutes and 49 seconds long, which is slightly more than the others so far. However, 2017 was the year when Brexit negotiations with the European Union got well underway. It could be for this reason that the blurred Christmas tree with its festive lights on was exchanged for a negotiating table, which appeared behind May in the background. This changes the tone of the speech slightly as the focus is placed on these diplomatic talks.

Indeed, Brexit is not represented only visually, but also textually. Because it is a process where both the United Kingdom and the European Union interact in order to readjust their mutual relationship, the textual instantiations relating to the process could be said to be representing both social actors at once. Moreover, the European Union is entirely subsumed in the textual realisations of Brexit. It is only in sentence 4 when May makes a direct reference to the EU when she calls European countries “our European partners”. This suggests that though Britain seeks to break away from the Union, May does not seek to abandon all diplomatic relations to it and would possibly like to cooperate in the future. When it comes to other references to Brexit, May focuses predominantly on the process of negotiating – she mentions it directly in sentences 2 and 4, but also in instances when “good Brexit” (sentence 6), “a success of Brexit” (sentence 7) or “a successful Brexit deal” (sentence 31) are referenced.

When the social actor of the United Kingdom was represented in previous speeches, we could see that Cameron usually used the term “Britain” or a common noun like “country” to do so. He used the official name, “the United Kingdom”, only when he talked about the Scottish independence referendum. In May's previous speech, it was speculated that her motivations for using the official name might have been similar. However, this speech shows that May names the country as “the United Kingdom” even when the integrity of the union is not significantly threatened. Such examples can be found in sentences 1, 20 and 24. Moreover, May again appeals to the fact that the United Kingdom is a union of four countries in sentence 32 when she uses the expression “one proud union of nations”. This expression also shows that the country is generally depicted in a favourable way. Such portrayal is also exemplified by the abstracted rep-

resentation of the United Kingdom as “a champion of peace and order around the world” (sentence 20). Still, May unintentionally breaks away from such characterisation in sentence 23 when she talks about a vote for women and indirectly represents the country through “prejudice and discrimination”.

It is not only the European Union and Brexit that represent the United Kingdom in an international context. She makes references to “the world” several times in her speech, such as when she mentions a “world-class service” in sentence 16 or “global problems in sentence 22. She also introduces new social actors that are relevant to the international scene. These mainly include “our allies” in sentence 21, which is a selection of countries which remain more closely undefined, but which would aid the United Kingdom in case of a military conflict, and the “Commonwealth Heads of Government”, which is a personalised and somatised representation of the countries making up the Commonwealth of Nations. Like with Brexit and the European Union, the latter also helps the portrayal of May’s government as being intensely involved in negotiations, as suggested by the verb “host” and the noun “Meeting” in sentence 22.

When we look at the inclusion of actors relevant to the national level, it is the National Health Service that gains a new position as it has not been featured in any of the previous speeches. At first glance, the NHS is praised significantly. This is intensified by the fact that May chooses to personalise the actor by specifically mentioning the NHS staff, who are portrayed as being “wonderful” as well as by their “care and compassion” (sentence 18). However, she also represents the NHS through “its founding ideal”. This founding ideal stands for a contrast, which differentiates the NHS of the past (and of a potential future) from its flawed existence in the present day. Therefore, despite the praise, which is transparent, the NHS is at the same time opaquely criticised. By starting the representation by referring to its 70th birthday, she is able to hide her true intention and the reason for including the social actor – she wants to introduce important changes to the institutions, or rather she wants for the nation to “rededicate” (sentence 17) itself to the contrasting founding ideal.

Lastly, the use of pronouns needs to be briefly commented on. As opposed to her last speech, we can see a rise in the use of the governmental ‘we’ as a result of the fact that she tries to present the government as active in negotiating a good Brexit deal. Nevertheless, the frequency of its use still does not compete with that of Cameron’s. Regardless, it is the national ‘we’ that dominates the speech out of all the pronouns. May individualises the citizen on several

occasions. In sentence 33, a ‘me-to-you’ interaction can be identified in May wishing the public a happy New Year. In sentences 28 and 29, the pronoun ‘you’ in the singular sense is generalised in order to express a fact that is universally applicable to every individual.

In summary, May tends to focus on the international scene when representing social actors in this speech. That is exemplified when she talks about Brexit, which is a joint representation of both the EU and the UK and which is often associated with terms that relate to negotiations or coming to a deal. Moreover, she includes the vaguely defined “our allies” when she talks about the anniversary of the end of the First World War, and “the Commonwealth Heads of Government”. The latter supports her portrayal of negotiations. When she refers to the country of the United Kingdom itself, she chooses positive characterisation nearly all the time, but unintentionally represents it by “prejudice and discrimination” as well. Similar thing happens with the NHS, albeit this time, the negative depiction is intentional, but hidden behind praise. The use of pronouns might hint at a greater reluctance to talk about the government and its achievements as compared to Cameron and his speeches.

social actors		representations of the social actors
“Britain”	United Kingdom * (i.e. an impersonalised social actor, representing the United Kingdom as the country)	the United Kingdom (1), <i>Brexit negotiations</i> (2), <i>them</i> (2), <i>Article 50</i> (3), <i>the decision of the British people</i> (3), <i>agreement on the first phase of negotiations</i> (4), <i>the vital issues of trade and security</i> (5), <i>a good Brexit</i> (6), <i>(a success of) Brexit</i> (7), <i>an economy</i> (9), <i>government spending</i> (9), <i>(our) debt</i> (9), <i>good jobs</i> (10), every part of the country (10), <i>good healthcare</i> (17), the UK (20), a champion of peace and order around the world (20), <i>we</i> (21), <i>prejudice and discrimination</i> (23), (our) society (23), the United Kingdom (24), (our) country (27), (our) country (30), <i>a successful Brexit deal</i> (31), <i>an economy that’s fit for the future</i> (31), a stronger and fairer society for everyone (31), <i>united as one proud union of nations</i> (32)

	<p>citizens of the UK ** (i.e. the country personalised by its citizens)</p>	<p>our (objectives) (2), our (European partners) (4), most people (6), people's daily lives (8), we (9), our (debt) (9), our (fantastic teachers) (13), more families (14), our (natural environment) (15), our (most cherished institutions) (16), we (16), our (National Health Service) (16), <u>ourselves</u> (17), everyone, regardless of income (17), we (20), our (security services) (21), us (21), <u>we</u> (22/1), we (23), our (society) (23), everyone (24/1), everyone (24/2), a public (sphere) (26), we (26), each other (26), (each of) us (27), our (country) (27), <i>renewed confidence and pride (in our country)</i> (30), we (31), we (32/1), we (32/2), <u>united as one proud union of</u> people (32), everyone (33)</p>
	<p>a citizen of the UK *** (i.e. the country personalised by a singular citizen)</p>	<p>you (6), (what) every parent..., and ... every child (12), <u>each of us personally</u> (26), you (28), you (29/1), you (29/2), you (33), your (family) (33)</p>
	<p>May's government</p>	<p>we (2), we (3), we (4), the government (6), we (6), our (ambitions) (7), we (8), <u>government spending</u> (9), our (goal) (10), we (13), we (14), we (15), <u>ourselves</u> (17), we (19), our (NHS), <u>we</u> (22/1), we (22/2)</p>
	<p>Theresa May (i.e. the speaker)</p>	<p>I (set out our objectives) (2), I (believe) (30), I (know) (32), I (hope) (33), I (wish everyone a very happy new year) (33)</p>
	<p>European Union</p>	<p><i>Brexit negotiations</i> (2), <i>them</i> (2), <i>Article 50</i> (3), <i>the decision of the British people</i> (3), <i>agreement on the first phase of negotiations</i> (4), (our) European partners (4), <i>the vital issues of trade and security</i> (5), <i>a good</i></p>

		<i>Brexit</i> (6), <i>(a success of) Brexit</i> (7), <i>a successful Brexit deal</i> (31)
* the United Kingdom	British schools	<u>the things that matter</u> (9), (our) school (9), good school (11), more good schools (13), <i>standards and discipline</i> (13)
	British police	<u>the things that matter</u> (9), (our) police (9)
	National Health Service	<u>the things that matter</u> (9), (our) precious NHS (9), one of our most cherished institutions (16), <i>the 70th birthday</i> (16), (our) National Health Service (16), its founding ideal (17), (our) NHS (19), it (19), <i>world-class service</i> (19)
	British security services	(our) security services (21), they (21)
** the citizens of the United Kingdom	the younger generation	young people (10), <i>a better future</i> (11), <i>getting a place at a good school</i> (11), the next generation (15), generations to come (19)
	teachers	(our) fantastic teachers (13)
	the workers in the NHS	<i>the care and compassion</i> (18), (our) wonderful NHS staff (18)
	soldiers that died in the First World War	the tremendous sacrifices of that conflict (20)
	women	the first votes for women (23)
“the world”		a world-class (service) (19), the world (20), global (problems like climate change and plastic waste) (22), the world (27)
people of “the world”		our (oceans) (22)
any single person in “the world”		<u>each of us personally</u> (27)
British international allies		our allies (21), <u>we</u> (21),

leaders of governments of the Commonwealth nations	the Commonwealth Heads of Government (Meeting) (22), (our) partners)
extremists	<i>all forms of extremism</i> (21)

Table 15: representations of social actors in Theresa May's speech from the New Year of 2018

3.9 Theresa May's Speech from the New Year of 2019

The video recording of May's last New Year speech proves to be the most varied of all. It is 2 minutes and 45 seconds long and when May is delivering the speech, she is seen standing in a room with an unidentifiable painting behind her, which is quite neutral. However, the image keeps shifting throughout the speech to present May in various thematically connected situations. Thus, she is seen coming to the negotiating table when she talks about Brexit. May is seen in the presence of Macron and Merkel when she mentions "our European partners". A principal of a South African high school and the Kenyan President Uhuru Kenyatta are seen together with May when she talks about "the world" and about Britain as "a globally trading nation". And she also represents various people belonging to the group of "citizens of the United Kingdom" and to various sectors of the society. Thus, she can be seen talking with hospital staff, collecting rubbish with schoolchildren, debating in a factory hall and so on. These very quick shots are centring on the person of the Prime Minister, depicting her as active and directly involved in everything that she is talking about. As a result, the tone of the speech is not neutral. However, it cannot be determined whether these scenes were included because of any contribution from May herself and whether they tell us something about how she wanted to represent social actors visually.

What permeates most of the speech is the topic of Brexit. As has been mentioned in the previous analysis, phrases related to Brexit often jointly relate to both the United Kingdom and the European Union as the process renegotiates their mutual relations. However, in this speech, it can be observed that the representations of Brexit begin to favour the United Kingdom a bit more as May lists the benefits it will bring to "our borders, our money and our laws" (sentence 3) as well as to employment or security. Still, the European Union is referred to as "our European neighbours" (sentence 9), which suggests a friendly and cooperative attitude that May may be trying to establish. Brexit is also important because it makes May include a social actor that has not been included before - the Parliament. It is represented both in a personalised and an impersonalised way with the first being identifiable in sentence 5 ("MPs") and the latter in sentence 6 ("Parliament"). The social actor is important to the momentary decision making on Brexit, which is out of May's hands. For this reason, May tries to appeal to the Parliament. However, such momentary concerns are unusual for a New Year speech.

Continuing with the depictions of the United Kingdom as an impersonalised actor, we can see a clear preference toward representing it as “the UK” (sentences 1 and 17) or the “United Kingdom” (sentence 4), though May uses the term “Britain” in sentence 22. The abbreviated name might have a neutral impact on the recipient’s perception of the country. However, the full name might be used to strengthen the notion of the country as unified. This could be why the full expression she uses in sentence 4 is “our whole United Kingdom”. May also tries to present a future ideal state of the country when she uses the expressions “globally trading nation” (sentence 9), “a healthier place” in relation to the natural environment (sentence 22), and “a country that truly works for every one of us” (sentence 31). The last of these expressions is reminiscent of the divisions that May listed in her first speech from the New Year of 2017. Other impersonalised actors are featured only rarely. A notable one might be the National Health Service. Though May is reforming the institution, she uses a very similar praise as in the previous speech, namely “our most precious public service” (sentence 20).

May possibly shows preference for representing personalised actors as opposed to impersonalised ones. When it comes to the use of pronouns, it is the national ‘we’ that once again dominates the speech and refers to the citizens of the United Kingdom collectively. Moreover, she also individualises a citizen of the country. Where in the previous speeches, individualisation was achieved mainly by the use of the pronoun ‘you’ in the singular sense, May does so by different means. Sentences 12-14 are sentences with no finite verb. In them, the citizen is individualised by gerund expressions, each of them pointing to different kinds of people. The expression “personal milestones” in sentence 11 suggests the scope of one individual life as well. Also, individualisation is attained by picking one person from the collective, such as in expressions “each of us” (sentence 11) and “every one of us” (sentence 31).

When we look at the use of pronouns, we can see a continued tendency to refrain to represent the government and its achievements through the governmental ‘we’. As such, her speeches may seem to be less boastful. Though the use of ‘I’ is similarly limited in May’s speeches as it is in Cameron’s speeches, May represents her person visually in the video recording, as was mentioned above. Thus, there is an incongruence between the visual and textual portrayal of the self. Though the use of ‘I’ does not suggest an overly egocentric textual message, the video does. This incongruence further adds to the speculation that May might not have chosen to include the scenes depicting her person in various situations herself.

To conclude, we can observe two simultaneous tendencies in this speech – to represent personalised agents rather than the impersonalised ones and to focus on the recipient rather than on the self, the government and its achievements. There is an exception to the first tendency when talking about Brexit, a process which represents both the United Kingdom and the European Union at the same time as they renegotiate their mutual relations. Though May probably seeks a peaceful Brexit and might think of the EU as possible future partners, she also presents a future ideal version of Britain, one that may come to pass after the deal is settled. The latter tendency is exemplified predominantly by a series of individualisations of the citizen of the United Kingdom. However, it is incongruent with the visual representation of herself by the video recording, which might suggest a person other than May herself selecting and including these specific scenes.

social actors		representations of the social actors
“Britain”	United Kingdom * (i.e. an impersonalised social actor, representing the United Kingdom as the country)	the UK (1), <i>the Brexit deal</i> (2), <i>the vote (of the British people)</i> (2), British (people) (2), <i>it</i> (3), <i>(our) borders</i> (3), <i>(our) money</i> (3), <i>(our) laws</i> (3), <i>jobs</i> (4), <i>(our) security</i> (4), (our) whole United Kingdom (4), <i>the deal</i> (6), Britain (6), <i>the referendum in 2016</i> (7), (our) country (8), <i>a strong new relationship (with our European neighbours)</i> (9), a globally trading nation (9), <i>Brexit</i> (10), <i>the only issue</i> (10), <i>agreeing a good Brexit deal</i> (16), <i>(our) economy</i> (17), <i>new markets</i> (17), <i>new jobs</i> (17), the UK (17), (our) country (18), <i>(our) natural environment</i> (22), Britain (22), a healthier place (22), the UK (23), <i>the employment rate</i> (24), <i>(our) debt</i> (24), a country that truly works for every one of us (31)
	citizens of the UK ** (i.e. the country personalised by its citizens)	the British people (2), us (3), our (borders) (3), our (money) (3), our (laws) (3), our (security), our (whole United Kingdom), we all (8), our (country) (8), we (9), our (differences) (9), our (European neighbours) (9), (each of

		us (10), we (15), our (energies) (16), our (economy) (17), our (country) (18), everyone (18), (a home of) their own (18), everyone (19), they (19), our (most precious public service) (20), us (20), we (20), our (natural environment) (22), our (debt) (24), everyone in every community (28), we (29), we (30/1), we (30/2), we (31), we (31), (every one of) us (31)
	a citizen of the UK *** (i.e. the country personalised and individualised by a singular citizen)	each of us (11), the personal milestones (11), <i>these</i> (15) <i>the things that matter most</i> (15), <i>those things</i> (16), every one of us (31)
	May's government	our <i>long-term plan (for the NHS)</i> (20), we (21)
	Theresa May (i.e. the speaker)	I (have negotiated) (2), I (believe) (29), I (know) (31)
	members of parliament	MPs (5), Parliament (6), agreeing a good Brexit deal (16),
	European Union	<i>the Brexit deal</i> (2), <i>the vote (of the British people)</i> (2), <i>the deal</i> (6), <i>the referendum in 2016</i> (7), <i>a strong new relationship (with our European neighbours)</i> (9), (our) European neighbours (9), <i>Brexit</i> (10), <i>the only issue</i> (10), <i>agreeing a good Brexit deal</i> (16)
* the United Kingdom	British businesses	(our) businesses (17)
	British schools	school (12), college (12), apprenticeship (12), technical education (19)
	National Health Service	the NHS (20), our most precious public service (20), it (20/1), it (20/2)
** the citizens of the United Kingdom	the poor	the number of people in absolute poverty (26)
	a young person	<i>sentence 12</i>

*** a citizen of the United Kingdom	a working person (i.e. in the productive age)	<i>sentence 13</i>
	a person starting a family	<i>sentence 14</i>
“the world”		the world (9), a globally (trading nation) (9)
immigrants		<i>a new skills-based immigration system (21), Freedom of Movement (21)</i>

Table 16: representations of social actors in Theresa May’s speech from the New Year of 2019

3.10 Boris Johnson's Speech from the New Year of 2020

Johnson's first and only speech that is analysed returns to the neutral tone of its video recording. Once again, the image is static and the background blurred. The video is 2 minutes and 52 seconds long. However, what is peculiar about Johnson's speech is that it is the first time that the message delivered in a spoken form via the recording differs significantly from that which was released in a written form on the official governmental website. This can suggest that though Johnson had prepared the speech in a written form, he might prefer improvisation and spontaneity when he actually delivers it. As there are differences in social actor representations, both versions of the speech will be analysed and compared.

Firstly, elements featured only in the spoken message will be considered. What is immediately noticeable is that Johnson directly addresses the citizens of the United Kingdom by the less formal term 'folks' (sentences 1 and 21). Not only has such a direct address never been used in the previous speeches, the public has also not been represented by such a frank and informal term. Nevertheless, Johnson does this to close the social distance between himself and the recipient, which has been attempted by the previous Prime Ministers at various points in their speeches as well. As a consequence, Johnson sets up a tone of friendship rather than of formality of the Prime Minister speaking to the public. This can make the recipients more accepting of the content that Johnson presents.

Several other characteristics can be observed in the spoken text. When it comes to the representations of himself and the government, he uses the singular pronoun 'I' more than any references to the government. This suggests that Johnson is unafraid to represent himself as an active agent in various situations, which is especially exemplified in sentence 17 as he mentions him travelling and meeting people. The figurative reference to his own person and his personal activity in "working my socks off" (sentence 5) further develops the informal tone set up in the first sentence. However, Johnson might prefer to portray himself as a part of "the people", as evidenced by his use of the national 'we' in many instances throughout the text. It builds up a sense of commonality between himself and the public. When he talks about the United Kingdom, he uses the expression "a sovereign nation" in sentence 7 in relation to Brexit. This furthers his notion of the country as not being sovereign when it remains in the European Union.

Secondly, elements that the spoken and written versions have in common will be discussed. One of such features is Johnson's tendency to activate the citizens of the United Kingdom through the use of first person imperative 'let's'. Activation is not very common in New Year speeches, especially when related to the public. Nonetheless, in Johnson's case, the imperative is not so much a call to specific action on the part of the public as imploring them to support Johnson and his actions. In the spoken version, 'let's' is repeated more times than in the written one. However, Johnson also achieves an activation of the citizens in the written text through characterising them by their qualities of "decisiveness" and "determination" as well as by the metaphor of "an electoral bulldozer" in sentence 26 or by representing them as "the will of the electorate" in sentence 5. Similarly, he talks about unleashing potential in both versions. In the spoken text, he does so in relation to the impersonalised Britain in sentence 5, but in the written one, he uses it to characterise "British people" again (sentence 4). Some of these qualities can be also seen as a praise in the written text. In the spoken text, he blatantly flatters the people when he characterises them as "fantastic people" or as "the many talented, compassionate, funny, hardworking, ingenious people that make this the greatest place on earth" in sentence 17.

Johnson also represents the political scene similarly in both versions of his speech. The phrase that has an almost one-to-one correspondence is "the division, the rancour, the uncertainty" (sentence 2 of the written text) and "the division, rancour and uncertainty" (sentence 3 of the spoken text). As this characterisation relates to the past, it can be viewed as an indirect critique of the previous government and its work. Contrarily, the image of Johnson's government that the speaker creates is that of the "people's government" (sentence 26 of the written text and sentence 10 of the spoken one). Thus, he associates the citizens with the government, which is similar to what the inclusive national 'we' usually achieves. Though Johnson selects this portrayal as another way to cater to 'the people', it also legitimises his and the government's actions as they are "delivering the people's priorities" (sentence 9 of the written text).

The United Kingdom is also represented similarly. He uses the term "Britain" (sentence 14) in the spoken text and "United Kingdom" (sentences 2 and 23) in the written one. But in both, it is referenced as "our union" (sentences 13 in both versions), which suggests that the aspect of the countries being united is important to Johnson. Moreover, Johnson brings focus away from the centres to the margins of the country. In sentence 36 of the written text, this is

exemplified in “not just in London, but in the Midlands, the North and across the country”. This is echoed in the spoken version when mentions of “every corner of our country” (sentence 14) or “every corner of the country” (sentence 17) are included.

The NHS is one of the actors that retains its prominence, which is demonstrated by it being featured in both versions. In the written one, it is given more space. The reason for it could be the fact that the written text is longer. There, the NHS is, as it was in May’s speeches, praised and personalised. The praise can be found in sentence 15 as he refers to the NHS as to “a wonderful British invention”. Where similar praise continued with personalised actors in May’s speeches, Johnson’s personalisation is much more detached, referring to the workers only in terms of their number. As a result, they are only talked about as “50,000 more nurses” and “6,000 more GPs” (sentence 19). Still, the representation of the NHS’s staff hints at the importance of this included social actor.

Lastly, the peculiarities of the written text will be dealt with. The first of these could be the distribution of pronouns. Johnson represents the government more than in the spoken text, but it is still the person of the Prime Minister that is more prominent. Johnson’s use of the first-person pronoun ‘I’ can be said to be egocentric, which is a significant difference from the speeches of the previous Prime Ministers. The evidence of the primacy of himself and the lesser importance of the government that Johnson tries to put forward can be found in sentence 14. He first says that “people expect us” as he uses the governmental ‘we’ before correcting himself by “expect me”. Thus, Johnson claims not only personal responsibility for all the governmental work, but also personal agency in the actions of the government.

We could see that Johnson criticises the previous government and legitimises his government as the “people’s government” (sentence 26). He does something similar for the Parliament as well. The newly elected government is associated with Johnson’s government when he uses both terms almost synonymously in sentence 26. The new parliament is also legitimised and associated with the citizens of the United Kingdom in sentence 7, where it is characterised as “elected by the people to deliver the people’s priorities”. Contrarily, the previous government is depicted in negative and almost mischievous way, using “every trick in the book” (sentence 6). Moreover, it thwarts not only Johnson, but also the people, because both are represented by the ‘us’ of the new parliament. Therefore, Johnson cannily exploits us vs. them attitudes. The

previous parliament is labelled as ‘them’, the enemy, which hinders Johnson’s, and in extension the people’s, endeavours.

As was mentioned above, the citizens are once again a priority. But in the written text, Johnson also acknowledges those opposing him or those not fully supporting him. In both instances, he uses a ‘me-to-you’ interaction and talks to them directly. However, the pronoun ‘you’ is used in its plural sense, representing the citizens as a collective. He devotes more space to those in opposition. He first tries to associate them with the general group of all the citizens. For this reason, he says that he will be a Prime Minister “for everyone, not just those who voted for me” (sentence 31). Then, he wants to associate them with his own person, which is why he refers to them as “friends and equals” (sentence 32). Both representations attempt to portray the opposing people not as separate, but as parts of the supportive groups.

To summarise, we can see that Johnson can differ in how he depicts social actors when he delivers his message rather spontaneously in speech and when he has a chance to premeditate the representations he uses and convey the speech in a written form. In both speeches, we can see some common tendencies, which could hint at them being characteristic of the speaker. For instance, Johnson tends to present himself in a much more egocentric way as compared to the previous Prime Ministers and legitimise his and his government’s actions by associating both with ‘the people’. ‘People’ are also often activated in his speeches, notably by the first-person plural ‘let’s’. What also speaks of Johnson’s apt use of various representations is that he is able to exploit ‘us vs. them’ attitudes to clearly define the previous Parliament as an enemy of both himself and the citizens of the country. The written and spoken versions can differ in the frankness and directness that they use. In the spoken, Johnson addresses the public by a rather informal expression “folks”, whereas in the written, he uses a ‘me-to-you’ interaction and addresses his opponents by the pronoun ‘you’ in its plural sense. It is the former that establishes a more intimate contact with the recipient. The written text is longer and thus allows for the inclusion of more social actors, for their better characterisations or for the use of metaphors, such as when the citizens are referred to as an “electoral bulldozer”.

representations of the social actors in the spoken version of the speech	
social actors	representations of the social actors

“Britain”	United Kingdom * (i.e. an impersonalised social actor, representing the United Kingdom as the country)	this country (2), a country (4), Britain’s potential (5), <i>Brexit</i> (6), a sovereign nation (7), <i>(our) money</i> (7), <i>(our) laws</i> (7), <i>(our) borders</i> (7), <i>(our) trade</i> (7), <i>infrastructure</i> (12), (our) streets (13), <i>(our) environment</i> (13), (our) union (13), a Britain (where we are uniting) (14), every corner of our country (14), <i>the summer Olympics in Tokyo</i> (15), <i>Euro 2020</i> (15), <i>the games in London and Glasgow</i> (15), <i>the UN climate change summit also in Glasgow</i> (15) we (15/2), every corner of the country (17), the greatest place on earth (17), this country (18), <i>growth</i> (20), <i>prosperity</i> (20), <i>opportunity</i> (20)
	citizens of the UK ** (i.e. the country personalised by its citizens)	folks (1), you... all (1), we (2), let’s (2), us (3), we (4), unite as a country (4), you (5), your (priorities), we (5), we (6), we (7), free (to chart our own courses) (7), our own (courses) (8), control (7), our (money) (7), our (laws) (7), our (borders) (7), our (trade) (7), <i>certainty</i> (7), we (7), <i>confidence (for people)</i> (7), people (7), the people’s (government) (10), the people’s (priorities) (10), our (schools) (10), our (scientists) (11), people (12), our (streets) (13), our (environment) (13), our (union) (13), we (14), our (country), we (15/1), fantastic people (17), the many talented, compassionate, funny, hardworking, ingenious people that make this the greatest place on earth (17), let’s (19), we (19), us (19), let’s (20), <i>confidence</i> (20), folks (21), let’s (21)
Johnson’s government		we (9), <i>a packed, ambitious agenda</i> (9), the people’s government (10)

Boris Johnson (i.e. the speaker)		I (want you to know) (5), I'm (gonna be working my socks off), (5), my socks (5), I (promise) (16), I (travelled) (17), I (met) (17), I (know) (18)
European Union		the EU (7)
the previous government		<i>the division</i> (2), <i>the rancour</i> (2), <i>the uncertainty</i> (2)
* the United Kingdom	British businesses	(confidence for...) businesses (7), fantastic businesses (17)
	National Health Service	the NHS (10)
	British schools	(our) schools (10), the classroom (10)
** the citizens of the United Kingdom	British scientists	(our) scientists (11)
“the world”		<i>the summer Olympics in Tokyo</i> (15), <i>Euro 2020</i> (15), <i>the games in London and Glasgow</i> (15), <i>the UN climate change summit also in Glasgow</i> (15), our planet (15)
Tokyo		Tokyo (15)
London		London (15)
Glasgow		Glasgow (15/1), Glasgow (15/2)
United Nations		the UN (15)

Table 17: representation of social actors in Boris Johnson's speech from the New Year of 2020, which was delivered as a spoken message in a video recording

representations of the social actors in the written version of the speech		
social actors		representations of the social actors
“Britain”	United Kingdom * (i.e. an impersonalised social actor, representing the	(our) United Kingdom (2), (our) country (4), <i>the referendum</i> (7), <i>Brexit</i> (7), <i>Brexit</i> (8), <i>that oven-ready deal</i> (9), <i>(our) laws, borders, money and trade</i> (12),

	<p>United Kingdom as the country)</p>	<p><i>infrastructure</i> (13), <i>immigration</i> (13), (our streets (13), <i>(our) environment</i> (13), (our Union (13), <u>British</u> (invention) (15), this country (20), the best place on earth when it comes to quality education and cutting edge science (20), this country's (approach) (22), the UK (22), an engine for the ideas of the future (22), the whole United Kingdom (23), <i>opportunity</i> (23), <i>better infrastructure</i> (23), <i>taxes</i> (24), <i>rates of income tax</i> (24), <i>VAT</i> (24), <i>National Insurance</i> (24), (our) cities and towns (36), not just in London, but in the Midlands, the North and across the country (36), <i>new trading relationships</i> (37), British (scientists and engineers) (38)</p>
	<p>citizens of the UK ** (i.e. the country personalised by its citizens)</p>	<p>our (United Kingdom) (2), we (3/1), we (3/2), public life (3), us (3), we (4/1), our (country) (4), we (4/2), <i>the enormous potential (of the British people)</i> (4), the British people (4), <i>the will (of the electorate)</i> (5), the electorate (5), us (5), we (6), us (6), we (7), the people (7), the people's (priorities) (7), <u>we</u> (12), our (laws, borders, money and trade) (12), <u>we</u> (13), the people's (priorities) (13), our (streets) (13), our (environment) (13), our (Union) (13), people (14), <u>British</u> (invention) (15), (for) us and our families (15), we... whatever our background (15), we... regardless of ability to pay (15), <u>we</u> (18), let's (21), your (taxes) (24), you, the people (25), we (25), your decisiveness (26), your determination (24), the electoral bulldozer (26), you (26), everyone, not just those who voted for me (30), let's</p>

		(33), every community (35), our (cities and towns) (36), we (38), let's (39)
	a citizen of the UK *** (i.e. the country personalised and individualised by a singular citizen)	you (1), your (neighbour's garden) (1)
Johnson's government		we (8), we (10), (deleted in the first clause of sentence 11), we (11), <u>we</u> (12), <u>we</u> (13), us (14), , (one of) our (first actions) (17), <u>we</u> (18), we (19), we (22/1), we (22/2), our (vision) (23), we (24), a people's government (26)
Boris Johnson (i.e. the speaker)		my (agenda) (5), I (talked about) (9), I (heard) (14), (expect) me (14), my (top priority) (16) I (also want) (20), I (know) (27), (lent) me (your vote) (27), I (am humbled) (28), I (am also acutely aware) (29), (vote for) me (29), I (want to reassure you) (30), I (will be) (30), a Prime Minister for everyone (30), (voted for) me (30), I (know) (31), I (want) (32)
European Union		the European Union (5), the EU (6), <i>the referendum</i> (7), <i>Brexit</i> (7), <i>Brexit</i> (8), <i>that oven-ready deal</i> (9),
the previous government		<i>the division, rancour and uncertainty</i> (3)
the previous Parliament		a Parliament (determined to use every trick in the book to stop us leaving the EU) (6), <i>every trick in the book</i> (6), Parliament (11), MPs (11), <i>the deadlock and paralysis</i> (26), parliament (26)
the current Parliament		a new Parliament (elected by the people to deliver the people's priorities) (7)
* the United Kingdom	National Health Service	the NHS (13), the NHS (14), the NHS (15), a wonderful British invention

		(15), the NHS (16), (my) top priority (16), the NHS (17), <i>hospital building programme</i> (18), <i>40 new hospitals</i> (18), <i>20 upgrades</i> (18), <i>50,000 more nurses</i> (19), <i>6,000 more GPs</i> (19), <i>50 million more GP surgery appointments</i> (19), <i>state of the art healthcare</i> (34)
	British schools	schools (13), quality education (20), per pupil funding in primary and secondary schools (22), superb education (23), great schools (35)
	British hospitals	hospital building programme (18), 40 new hospitals (18), 20 upgrades (18), 50 million more GP surgery appointments (19)
** the citizens of the United Kingdom	British scientists	scientists (13), <i>cutting edge science</i> (20), <i>science and research</i> (22), <i>high technology</i> (23), British scientists (38)
	British nurses	50,000 more nurses (19)
	British general practitioners	6,000 more GPs (19)
	British teachers	hardworking teachers (22)
	those who do not fully support Johnson	many of you (27), (not consider) yourself natural Tories (27), your (vote) (27), your (support) (28)
	those who did not vote for Johnson	millions of people who did not vote for me and were disappointed by the result (29), you (30), one of them (30), you (30), you (31/1), you (31/2), you (32), friends and equals (32), we (32)
	British engineers	(British scientists and) engineers (38)
immigrants	<i>immigration</i> (13)	
“the world”	the international school league tables (21), <i>new trading relationships</i> (37), nations around the world (37)	

political parties other than the Conservative Party	another party (31), Remain (31)
--	---------------------------------

Table 18: representation of social actors in Boris Johnson’s speech from the New Year of 2020, which was delivered as a written message published on the government’s website

3.11 Discussion

In this section, an attempt at summarising of the findings of the analyses will be made. The most important tendencies will be identified, which have the capacity to reveal how social actors are represented in New Year speeches in particular and possibly also in some political speeches in general. Also, a brief comparison between the three speakers will be included. Though this can shed some light on personal preferences pertaining to the portrayal of social actors in their speeches, the informative value of the comparison will be limited due to the disproportionate number of texts that each of the speakers contributes. Cameron's five speeches can better reveal personal tendencies as opposed to Johnson's sole speech (regardless of its two versions).

Representations of “Britain”

All of the New Year speeches predominantly portray the social actor of “Britain”. It embraces two distinct kinds of representation. On the one hand, it is depicted as an impersonalised actor, or as the United Kingdom, the country. On the other hand, it can exist in the text as a personalised actor, as the citizens of the United Kingdom, or the people. Therefore, New Year speeches are patriotically focused, outlining the speaker's vision of the present state of the country and its people, while often envisioning the future and sometimes building upon the past.

The portrayals of the impersonalised country can pertain to both the international and the national levels. When the former is involved, we can see the United Kingdom interacting with other countries. These countries can be nominated, such as Libya or Afghanistan in Cameron's speech from 2012, or only very vaguely identified when the terms such as “the world” or “global” are used. The latter is notable because “the world” can be sometimes given as an example to aspire to. But if the countries are not identified or specified, such an example can prove contentless as it provides no specific model to follow. Apart from these two kinds of portrayal, Brexit becomes a prominent joint depiction of both the European Union and of the United Kingdom in May's and Johnson's speeches. Brexit always implies the process of negotiation between the two actors.

We can also have a look at the use of the name of the country. Cameron commonly uses the term Britain to refer to it. It can be perceived as a shorter and less formal name for the UK and it can be used for the sake of language economy despite it being rather imprecise. However,

Cameron employs the shortened version of the official designation, the United Kingdom, as well. This happens when the integrity of the union was threatened by the Scottish referendum (in Cameron's speech from 2014). The unity of the country is appealed to and therefore, the "United" part of the name is exploited. This is also done in May's first speech from the New Year of 2017, which is interspersed with other expressions pertaining to its message of unity as well. Sometimes, this aspect of being "United" is supported by all the countries making up the UK being nominated. This can be found in both in Cameron's speech from 2014 as well as in May's speech from 2017. Nevertheless, this is not always the case. Johnson does not try to overly appeal to unity and uses the designation of the United Kingdom as an interchangeable alternative to Britain.

Differentiation is a process that is also involved in the depiction of both the impersonalised and personalised actor of Britain. Through differentiation, the identity of the United Kingdom is sought to be strengthened by pointing out the differences from other countries. Thus, the EU is given as a negative economic example by Cameron in his speech from 2012. Furthermore, differentiation often occurs when a set of values is identified to suggest the country. This occurs in Cameron's speeches from 2012 and 2016. Not only do such items strengthen the identity of the impersonalised country, but also reproduce ideas about what values the citizens should ideally espouse.

At the national level, the impersonal Britain can be indirectly represented by various structures or aspects of the country. The inclusion of some of these and exclusion of others not only reveals the personal preference of the speaker, but at the same time communicates ideas about what aspects of the country are deemed important and which are favoured. Education is mentioned to some extent by all the speakers. Cameron prefers to focus on the economy whereas in May's and Johnson's speeches, it is the healthcare system that notably appears through the representations of the NHS. The importance of these rather abstract systems can be raised by including related actors which can act on their own as groups or institutions. Thus, as Cameron focuses on the economy, he talks about 'businesses' or 'small businesses' (in the speech from 2014). To highlight them even more, these actors can be even personalised either as collectives, which is why Cameron represents 'small business owners' (also in the speech from 2014) and May 'the NHS staff' (in her speech from 2018), or as individuals, such as when Cameron refers

to a worker, a parent, and a pensioner in the speech from 2015. These personalised representations allow the speakers to get on friendly terms with these people and even praise them in much more personal terms than impersonalised representations would allow. Referring to individualised actors can be the more successful option in achieving this effect.

Britain itself is commonly personalised through the citizens of the country. Among these representations, the national 'we' turns out to be dominant. This is an inclusive kind of the first-person pronoun and as such, it refers jointly to both the speaker and the recipient in a unified way. Thus, the ideological impact of using the national 'we' rests on its potential to deictically project the recipient of the message to the position of the speaker, which makes the former more likely to accept the propositions of the latter. Moreover, the national 'we' builds upon what the speaker and the recipient share. By using it, the speaker can express that their goals and interests are aligned, which can make the recipient even more willing to cognitively accept the message.

The citizens of the United Kingdom are more commonly represented as a collective, but sometimes, speakers can individualise them. By addressing a singular recipient, the speakers are able to get on personal terms with the recipient, which again makes the reproduction of ideas more successful. When individualisation is employed, we can clearly discern the singular pronoun 'you', which is commonly used in these instances, from the same pronoun in its plural sense, which appears when people are addressed collectively. We have also described a 'me-to-you' interaction. In Cameron's speech from the year 2013, it arises when the individualised singular 'you' is complemented with the singular first-person pronoun, 'I'. Thus, he talks as an individual to another individual, imitating a rather intimate exchange that can occur in the recipient's daily life, which also affects the recipient's cognition positively in terms of being prone to accept the speaker's propositions. However, we can discern a scale of intimacy with this interaction with what has just been described as the most intimate variant. Johnson uses a similar interaction in his written speech, but the pronoun 'you' is used in the plural sense and he is addressing the collective of British citizens. Cameron also uses the governmental 'we' and the plural 'you' in a similar fashion in the speech from 2016, which results in a more formal interaction than the previous variants.

Some noteworthy tendencies of the speakers relating to the manner of portrayal of the citizens can also be briefly commented on. Johnson's spoken speech is notable, for he attempts

to be much more personal with the recipients, which is most clearly evidenced by the speaker's calling them 'folks'. This deviates from the usually more formal tone of New Year speeches. Johnson also tries to activate the people by repetitions of the first-person imperative 'let's' and pays some attention to the ones living on the 'margins' of the country, that is not in the large metropolitan areas. In May's speeches, an increase in the use of personalisation could be seen, which suggests that she focuses on the people and on personal matters rather than on the workings of the state in terms of rather abstract systems, such as the economy. Contrarily, the economy is very notable in Cameron's speeches. Not only does this affect his representation of impersonal actors like 'small businesses', but he also represents personalised actors in economic terms and associates them with their income, whether they benefit from welfare programs or what kind of taxes they pay.

Representations of Political Actors

Apart from Britain and actors related to diverse structures of the country, it is the actors related to the political system of the country that are often featured. The chief among these is the government led by the speaker, which appears in all of the speeches. To represent it, speakers commonly use a pronoun that has been labelled as governmental 'we'. It excludes the public, but includes the speaker in the representations of the government. We can see that Cameron uses the pronoun heavily to speak about both the achievements and plans for the future. In doing so, he avoids the use of 'I', which can be perceived as egocentric and boastful. Moreover, the governmental 'we' can also serve to convey the idea of the Prime Minister being a successful leader as it is under his or her leadership that the government acts. Though Cameron relies on this form of the pronoun, its use is limited by the subsequent Prime Ministers.

The speaker can also select representations of himself or herself alone. As has been mentioned, if the personal pronoun 'I' is employed too often, the speech can appear to be excessively egocentric. However, not every occurrence of 'I' can be considered egocentric. Its role can be revealed by the verb that usually follows. Very often, the speakers use the combination of 'I know', which can be described as an empathetic use rather than an egocentric one and which is meant to reassure the listener. When it comes to personal preferences, we can see that Cameron tries to avoid the personal pronoun, whereas Johnson uses it much more frequently. For Johnson, the purpose can be similar to what happens when a 'me-to-you' interaction is employed – to increase intimacy and get on personal terms with the listener.

In some speeches, political opponents are also mentioned. In such cases, the governmental ‘we’ can get into opposition with such representation, which results in an ‘us vs. them’ dynamic although the third person pronoun does not need to be used explicitly. What matters is that the political opposition is depicted as somehow malevolent, almost sinister, as ‘not us’. We can see that this happens in Cameron’s speech from 2015 when the opponents are portrayed as “the chaos” whereas his government becomes an opposing force, the competence. Similarly, Johnson describes the parliament that was in power before the newly elected one as a sort of mischievous power that thwarts not only his own plans, but as suggested by the use of the national ‘we’, the plans of the people as well.

What we can also observe is that New Year speeches are quite short and tend to be very general. This results in the vagueness of identification of some social actors, as has already been mentioned, as well as the tendency not to nominate social actors very frequently, that is not to represent them by their personal names. The only occurrence of nomination can be traced in May’s speech from 2017 in which she uses semi-formal nomination of Jo Cox. It is a notable representation of a political actor because Cox was a member of the Labour Party and a political opponent of May. Nevertheless, this fact and also the context of Cox’s murder allows the Prime Minister to use the representation as a symbol of unity, a topic that she focuses on in her speech. Similarly, Cox’s own words are utilised in the process of utterance autonomisation for the same purpose.

Ideological Impact of Other Social Actor Representations

In the paragraphs above, the ideological impact of the dominant representations, such as that of the personal pronouns or of the processes of individualisation or nomination, has been described. Nevertheless, it should be pointed out that the depiction of social actors that are featured rather marginally is important as well. Jeffries maintains that the choice of head nouns and their modifications encodes information about social actors, hence such information is then transmitted. Unless there is a significant deviation from how the recipient perceives the world, he or she is likely to accept this information as true, according to the Principle of Minimal Departure. This is why the tables accompanying the analyses are important as they attempt to identify all such encodings and unravel what information may lie hidden.

Summary

In this section, an attempt has been made to outline the main tendencies in terms of representations of social actors in the New Year speeches of British Prime Ministers. We could see that Britain was featured the most and it was depicted both in a personalised and an impersonalised way. Various political actors, such as the government, political opponents, and the speakers themselves, were also notably present. In terms of the linguistic forms used, personal pronouns played a significant role in the portrayal of actors. This summary also tried to determine the ideological impact that various forms used could have and sought to compare the personal tendencies of individual speakers, despite the limited size of the corpus.

4 Conclusion

In this diploma thesis, an analysis of diverse representations of social actors in the New Year speeches of British Prime Ministers was conducted. This analysis is also intended to serve as an explanatory critique focusing on what ideas are encoded in these representations, how these ideas are communicated and what impact on the recipient's perception they can possibly have.

When it comes to ideological impact, it has been established that nominal phrases encode certain information or ideas that the speaker has about a social actor. These are then transmitted to the recipient and are likely to be accepted unchallenged unless this information deviates significantly from how the recipient perceives the world. For example, Cameron's ideology is encoded in his representations of the unemployed in the speech from the New Year of 2013. He admits that he expects them to get a job and work, showing that he dislikes their situation regardless of its context. Other instances of an ideology emerging in the speeches include depictions of Brexit, which is never talked about negatively, because both Johnson and May try to see the process through and not something to be stopped. These and other cases of ideas being communicated have been commented on in the analyses themselves. Ideologies also become apparent by the mere inclusion of certain actors and exclusion or backgrounding of others.

The selection of a representation is important because of the cognitive impact it can have on the recipient. If the ideas deviate significantly from the way the recipients already see the world, they are likely to be rejected. This can affect the representations themselves. For example, the unemployed in the above-mentioned example are not regarded as the unemployed, but rather as 'people', which mitigates the impact of the criticism. However, what proves to be more important in this respect is the process of the transmission of ideas, or the way in which the ideas are presented to the recipient. This is facilitated by two processes – by deictic projection, which draws the recipient to the speaker's point of view, and by expressing engagement, in which the speaker establishes some kind of relationship with the recipient.

The analysis has shown that both of the processes of transmission are achieved by the employment of personal pronouns. Recipients are often deictically projected to the position of

the speaker by what has been labelled a national ‘we’, an inclusive form of the pronoun expressing a ground that is shared between the two. At the same time, this sense of having something in common also expresses the other process, engagement.

New Year speeches never strive to be excessively formal. However, the speakers may attempt to increase the engagement with the public by moving from relatively the formal devices to the less formal or even informal ones, which may result in the public being more accepting of the ideas that are communicated. For instance, a ‘me-to-you’ interaction can appear in many manifestations which can range from very intimate to quite formal. When the pronouns, ‘I’ and ‘you’ are in their singular sense, the exchange can be considered very intimate, which eases the transmission of ideas. Engagement is also increased by the processes of personalisation and individualisation.

We have also established which actors are predominantly represented. Britain was found to be the most common. Its textual instantiations depict it either as an impersonalised actor, the country of the United Kingdom, or as a personalised one, to denote the citizens of the United Kingdom. Linguistic forms chosen when Britain is talked about can affect how the recipients perceive the country and themselves. For instance, in the process of differentiation, the country is often connected with certain values that it should espouse. The speaker can consider such values to be inherent to the country and embodied by the citizens themselves. Apart from Britain, the choice of the inclusion of other actors can be affected by the dominant concern of the speakers and/or the period of delivery (e.g., the then topical issues). Therefore, schools and education are featured in all the speeches, businesses and the economy dominate in Cameron’s speeches whereas the NHS is talked about by May and Johnson alike.

Among the social actors, representations of the political actors are significant as well. These include predominantly the speaker and the government they lead. The speaker is often represented by the pronoun ‘I’, but its use is often limited in order for the speech not to appear excessively egocentric. The government is chiefly represented by a governmental ‘we’, which excludes the public, but includes both the government and the speaker. Occasionally, political opponents are also mentioned. These occurrences are notable because they tend to transmit a very negative outlook on the opponents. When this happens, an ‘us vs. them’ dynamic is exploited, resulting in the actors being perceived as a malevolent force that stands against both the speakers and their governments as well as against the people.

The New Year speech is a genre that is primarily intended for the public of a certain country. Therefore, it is predominantly the actors at the national level that are featured in the Prime Ministers texts. Still, we can find occasional representations of international actors as well. Most commonly, these actors are considered third parties as they are not the intended recipients. But even then, the speakers encode ideas in their representations that can send signals about the speakers' thoughts on the actors or on the relationship of the country with other countries of the world. For example, Cameron distances the UK from the EU by portraying the latter negatively in terms of its economy in the speech from 2012. He excludes the UK from the representations of the EU, which can send a signal that the mutual relationship does not need to be as firm as could be otherwise expected. Cameron is the only speaker who deviates from the norm of and features an international actor not as a third party, but as a recipient. This happens in the New Year of 2016 and stands for a significant instance of a Prime Minister directly trying to influence the international political scene in a New Year speech by communicating ideas about Islamic terrorists.

The genre of the New Year speech can be seen as affecting the representations of social actors in other ways as well. Given the relatively small length of a text belonging to the genre, an in-depth representation of many included actors is not possible. Therefore, a lot of them can be depicted rather vaguely or only in a very limited scope. It is clearly the citizens of the UK as a whole that dominate the representations, which suggests the intended recipients. This is certainly not applicable to all political speeches. For instance, speeches made during election campaigns aim to address only a portion of the public. The national 'we' then caters to the wholeness of the public as well, which is most pronounced in May's speech from 2017, which works with the message of unity. Though the politicians have a chance to manipulate such large numbers of people, they do not tend to do so intentionally very often in New Year speeches. For instance, when the ambiguous uses of the pronoun 'we' are examined, the cases where the governmental and national variant of the pronoun can be exchanged for the other with the intention of misleading the public are close to non-existent.

Lastly, despite the limited size of the corpus, a comparison of individual tendencies of Cameron, May, and Johnson was attempted both in the individual analyses of texts as well as in the final discussion. These are chiefly seen in the amount and manner of the representation of the self, of the government, and of the people. Cameron focuses more on the impersonalised

actors and the economy, and associates himself with the government as a whole, whereas May puts emphasis on the personalised actors while reducing the representations of her government. Johnson opts for a more familiar tone while also trying to activate the public.

Works Cited

Primary Literature

- Allagbe, Ayodele, and Franck Amoussou. "Principles, Theories and Approaches to Critical Discourse Analysis." *International Journal on Studies in English Language and Literature*, vol. 6, no. 1, Jan. 2018, pp. 11–18., doi:10.20431/2347-3134.0601002.
- Castle, Gregory. *The Blackwell Guide to Literary Theory*. Oxford: Blackwell, 2007.
- Dijk, Teun Van. "Critical Discourse Analysis." *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis*, edited by Deborah Tannen et al., Chichester: John Wiley and Sons, 2015, pp. 466-485.
- Dijk, Teun A. Van. "Ideology and Discourse Analysis." *Journal of Political Ideologies*, vol. 11, no. 2, June 2006, pp. 115–140., doi:10.1080/13569310600687908.
- Dontcheva-Navratilova, Olga. "Authorial presence in academic discourse: Functions of author-reference pronouns." *Linguistica Pragensia*, vol. 23. no. 1, Jan. 2013, pp. 9-30.
- Dušková, Libuše. *Mluvnice současné angličtiny na pozadí češtiny*. Praha: Academia, 2006.
- Eagleton, Terry. *Ideology: an Introduction*. London: Verso, 1991.
- Eggs, Suzanne. *An Introduction to Systemic Functional Linguistics*. London: Continuum, 2013.
- Fairclough, Isabela, and Norman Fairclough. *Political Discourse Analysis: A Method for Advanced Students*. London: Routledge, 2012.
- Fairclough, Norman. *Critical Discourse Analysis: The Critical Study of Language*. London: Routledge, 2013.
- Fairclough, Norman. *Language and Power*. Abingdon: Routledge, 2013.
- Halliday, Michael A. K., and Ruqaiya Hasan. *Language, Context, and Text: Aspects of Language in a Social-Semiotic Perspective*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998.

- Jeffries, Lesley. *Critical Stylistics: The Power of English*. Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010.
- Johnson, Kyle. *Introduction to Transformational Grammar*. N.p.: University of Massachusetts at Amherst, 2004.
- Leeuwen, Theo van. "The Representation of Social Actors." *Discourse Studies*. Vol. 5, edited by Teun A. van Dijk, London: Sage Publications, 2008, 268-302.
- Mazid, Bahaa-eddin M. *CDA and PDA Made Simple: Language, Ideology and Power in Politics and Media*. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2014.
- Nilsen, Don L. F. "The Transformational Process: An Oversimplified Overview." *College English*, vol. 38, no. 7, 1977, pp. 696–702. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/376072. Accessed 6 May 2020.
- Quirk, Randolph, et al. *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. New York: Longman. 1985.
- Wales, Katie. *Personal Pronouns in Present-Day English*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.
- Whittington, Richard. "Giddens, Structuration Theory and Strategy as Practice." *Cambridge Handbook of Strategy as Practice*, Jan. 2015, pp. 109–126., doi:10.1017/cbo9780511777882.008.
- Wodak, Ruth. "What CDA Is about - a Summary of Its History, Important Concepts and Its Developments." *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*, London: Sage Publications, 2001, pp. 1-13.
- Yule, George. *Pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996.

New Year Speeches

- Cameron, David. "2016 New Year message from the Prime Minister". *Youtube*, uploaded by 10 Downing Street, 31 Dec. 2015, <https://youtu.be/eVx3eudrXsU>.

- Cameron, David. "David Cameron - New Year's Message 2014". *Youtube*, uploaded by Conservatives, 1 Jan. 2014, <https://youtu.be/q7ToQT48C7U>.
- Cameron, David. "David Cameron's New Year message 2013". *Youtube*, uploaded by 10 Downing Street, 30 Dec. 2012, https://youtu.be/Z4_RK2taLjc.
- Cameron, David. "Our New Year's resolution must be to stay on course to prosperity - and secure a better future.". *Facebook*, 1 Jan. 2015, 10:06 a.m., <https://www.facebook.com/DavidCameronOfficial/videos/908809879143331>. Accessed 12 Oct. 2020.
- Cameron, David. "Prime Minister's New Year Message 2012". *Youtube*, uploaded by 10 Downing Street, 20 Dec. 2011, <https://youtu.be/ULqMjXrwipI>.
- Johnson, Boris. "'A fantastic year ahead' - Boris Johnson's New Year's message". *Youtube*, uploaded by The Telegraph, 31 Dec. 2019, <https://youtu.be/M2AM2rxkNK4>.
- Johnson, Boris. "Prime Minister's New Year's message: 31 December 2019". *GOV.UK*, 31 Dec. 2019, <https://www.gov.uk/government/news/prime-ministers-new-years-message-31-december-2019>. Accessed 12 Oct. 2020
- May, Theresa. "New Year 2018: Theresa May's Message". *Youtube*, uploaded by 10 Downing Street, 31 Dec. 2017, <https://youtu.be/f205q1XQs78>.
- May, Theresa. "Theresa May: Happy New Year". *Youtube*, uploaded by Conservatives, 31 Dec. 2016, <https://youtu.be/nOj49CzODEU>.
- May, Theresa. "Theresa May's new year message: back Brexit deal". *Youtube*, uploaded by Guardian News, 1 Jan. 2019, <https://youtu.be/O0fOb-SGm4Y>.

List of Attachments

Attachment 1 – David Cameron’s Speech from the New Year of 2012

Attachment 2 – David Cameron’s Speech from the New Year of 2013

Attachment 3 – David Cameron’s Speech from the New Year of 2014

Attachment 4 – David Cameron’s Speech from the New Year of 2015

Attachment 5 – David Cameron’s Speech from the New Year of 2016

Attachment 6 – Theresa May’s Speech from the New Year of 2017

Attachment 7 – Theresa May’s Speech from the New Year of 2018

Attachment 8 – Theresa May’s Speech from the New Year of 2019

Attachment 9 – Boris Johnson’s Speech from the New Year of 2020 (the spoken version)

Attachment 10 – Boris Johnson’s Speech from the New Year of 2020 (the written version)