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ABSTRACT
Strategies in manipulating language in political issues is very complicated and critical which can be investigated to find nuance differences to determine its impressive influence in politic realms. Tactful chosen of every aspect of language can have significant power in inauguration speech of presidents. Personal pronouns in the light of the comparative analysis of speech discourse in inaugurations of Bush and Obama illustrated consideration of an audience and their specific attitudes and feelings as certainly an important factor in making a speech; therefore, choice of particular pronouns can play a key role. Findings of this study suggested that politicians use personal pronouns in their speeches in order to gain the support of the people. The number of first personal pronoun of ‘I’ in Bush speech and Obama speech clarified Bush’s arrogance and self-confidence by conveying his own point of view. In contrast, less use of pronoun of ‘I’ of Obama is the strategy to decrease his responsibility. The number of ‘we’ unlike ‘I’ was much more in Obama speech than Bush speech. This was president’s strategy to share responsibility with his audience, and to reach the same target. Finally, I have concentrated on the examination of two types of ‘we’ in terms of exclusive ‘we’ and inclusive ‘we’. Both presidents used inclusive ‘we’ much more than exclusive ‘we’ to refer to themselves and the people of America to build unanimity.

1. Introduction
Human life is social and humans are the membership of this society to show that they are related together plays different roles in the social groups. These social groups differ in terms of their economic, cultural, or political power status. It is difficult to think of any political action which does not involve using language. Adetunji (2006) claims that language and politics are closely related in terms of social values which the first one used for communication in society and the other one is used to circulate power in society. Therefore, politics is closely related to the key term of power which is created and expressed in discourses, the power to make decision, to control resources, to control other people’s behavior and often to control value (Johnstone, 2008). Similarly, Sadeghi et al., (2014) have proved that discourse of media and politics are interwoven and each political party struggles to make their audience consistent with own attitude and change their standpoints in favor of their interests with an exploitation of discourse strategies ingeniously. According to Van Dijk (1993) one of the crucial factors in formulating discourse is the relationship between power and discourse among different social groups which is the major concern in critical discourse analysis. Fairclough (2003) and Van Dijk (1993) relate the politics of language to actual political discourse and concentrate on political strategy to achieve success.

In political speeches, politicians try to win power in order to make certain political, economic and social ideas practical. In this process, every political action is prepared, accompanied, influenced and played by
language, therefore, language is used in their political speech plays a crucial role in order to convince the audience to support their plans. Studies in political discourse have tried to explain this relationship between the use of language and the importance of the influence of it on people’s perception.

The perception that a listener can adopt towards the political speech has been a significant issue in political studies. Language used in political speech not only has influence on people’s attitude, thoughts and beliefs but also can control them. The main purpose of politicians is to influence their audiences’ perception in order to persuade them of the validity of their political claims. Their main significance in their speeches is to ultimately gain the support of the people. Consideration of an audience and their specific attitudes and the feelings is certainly an important factor in making a communication. Therefore each speech will be dependent upon the audience and the desired response. Communication is the process of transmitting information from one agent to another. In human speech, this involves identifying entities—people, places, things, ideas—and then making propositions about those entities. Communication is successful to the degree that interlocutors agree that they are talking about the same entities. Given this, if interlocutors wish to communicate unambiguously, then it should follow that they would always use unambiguous forms of reference: That is, they would always use names or clear modifiers in order to pick out a unique entity. Yet, people often use potentially ambiguous forms of reference—pronouns, in particular—in all forms of communication. In fact, pronouns are among the most frequent lexical items in the English language with most forms of the first, second, and third-person pronouns among the top 100 items in many corpus word-frequency lists (Leech, Rayson, and Wilson 2001). In spite of this, interlocutors seem to have little difficulty understanding who or what each other are talking about. One of the influential elements and strategies of persuasion in political speech can be used is the choice of personal pronouns. Work by Adetunji (2006) has similarly posited that speakers pair their intentions and attitudes expressed in speech with their choice of pronouns. In spite of the pervasiveness of pronouns in everyday speech and writing, they get relatively little explicit treatment in the language studies. In this paper, I argue that more attention is warranted by showing some of the subtle but important ways that pronouns are used in political speech and some basic principles guiding how and when pronouns are used in discourse, how prosody and the use of pronouns interact, and some sociolinguistic aspects of pronouns that relate to how people view self and others. Practical ideas for how these facts can be applied in discourse analysis are discussed and should be of interest to both researchers and political speech developers. Personal pronouns in political speech have a strong effect on audiences’ attitude and perception to become actively involved in political affair. Pronouns play a key role in the construction of political speeches. Pronoun are more than just a word class whose main function is to work as a substitute for nouns and noun phrases. They have pragmatic function. The pragmatics of personal pronouns is not always easy to understand in a particular context. Greene, McKoon and Roger Ratcliff (1992) argue that research on pronoun resolution must consider the discourse contexts in which pronouns are likely to occur. It is considered there is a direct relationship between choice of pronouns and political speeches. The intention behind the choice of particular pronoun needs investigation. There is much evidence to show that pronouns have many more subtle and important features in the political speech than their dictionary meanings. Pennycook (1994) made this argument in terms of the politics of Pronouns. Alastair Pennycook in his article (The Politics of Pronoun) argued some of the ways in which pronouns can be considered to be always political and the inherently political nature of all pronouns. Pennycook (1994) suggested that the language is not as a simple reflection of reality, we need to go beyond it and see meaning as located in discourses and language use reflects social relationship. So we need analysis to unravel the politics in choice of pronouns in political speeches. Personal pronouns are very much related to the relationship of power, identity, community and authority therefore the choice of pronoun that each politician uses reflect this. Politicians are considered as great speakers. Politician constantly have to be aware that they cannot speak casually as their own person but their utterances have to be acceptable to their political party and their words must win the favor of nation. The analysis of the pronouns in their speeches reveals the many aspects of speaker intentions in the use of them and whom they addressee and show the distance between them and their audience. Consideration of an audience and their specific attitudes and feeling is certainly an important factor in making a speech. They can use pronouns to create intimacy between them and audience, show sympathy and solidarity and make the audience remember important and significant information.

2. Review of the Literature

The main purpose of this part is to gain an insight into what had previously been studied in this area and to outline the theories which I will use as a basis for my study. By studying language in circumstances where all its functions and variations are taken into consideration, it is possible to learn more how perceptions, convictions and identities are influenced by language. People who deal with language, discourse and knowledge of context are considered important proportions of their jobs (Sadeghi and Soutuodeh Zanjani, 2014 a,b).
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As Johnstone (2008) mentions the study of the language is the analysis of discourse, therefore, the aim of discourse is to having specific effect on the audience opinions or behaviors and political speech is one of the influential discourse types which can be explored in terms of their linguistic elements to reveal how it can be appealed to change the audience perception (Navratilova, 2009).

The term ‘political speech’ covers a large quantity of forms ranging from negotiations and formal meetings, to briefings, interviews, press conferences and speeches. Political speeches are a part of politics and are therefore historically and culturally determined. Each speech has a certain function to fulfil dependent upon the political activity at that time. Politicians constantly have to be aware that that they cannot speak casually as their own person but their utterances have to be acceptable to their political party and their words must win the favour of the nation. There are a number of persuasive techniques that can be employed by political speakers in order to win the support of their people. Personal pronoun is the technique is under investigation in this study. In his discussion of the politics of pronouns, Pennycook (1994) argues that all pronoun use is ultimately political because one's choice of pronouns reveals a lot about two perspectives: One's self-concept and one's concept of others. Politicians exploit pronouns to construct different identities of themselves and other. Therefore pronouns are crucial in the construction of discourse. Pronouns are considered as a tool to create a picture of a politician’s ‘version of reality’ in the discourse and are used in different ways to create positions with and establish boundaries between different identities. Pronouns are used to express fixed social relationship and they are used to project positive images of the politicians (Bramley, 2001). In his study he found that pronouns are a key factor in “the construction of reality - a reality that is created and understood in the discourse of the moment”.

Pronouns’ capacity is one of the function of pronouns is to express different social relations. The most well-known of these is the account of the pronouns of power and solidarity by Brown and Gilman (1960) which shows how social hierarchy is reflected in the use of the pronouns. Van Dijk (1993) refers to pronoun as indicators of dominance which refers to social power and politeness. The meanings of pronouns must be interpreted within a particular context. In traditional grammars of English, pronouns are often explained in terms of their referential and anaphoric properties. The more simplified of these traditional explanations define pronouns in the literal sense of replacing a noun. Language is used to express role relationships between individuals through the usage of personal pronouns. Brown and Yule (1983) refer to one of the characteristics of a pronoun as it can be used to refer back to something, therefore avoiding repetition so they are considered as text coherence devices, therefore, pronouns have long been described as cohesive elements of discourse. Discourse coherence guides pronoun reference, and pronoun reference guides discourse coherence (Wolf, Gibson, & Desmet, 2004, & Kehler 1997). Pronouns are accounted for in terms of addressing and referring to speech participants. In such a view, the first person represents the speaker and the second person represents the addressee. Brown and Gilman (1960), studying the semantics of pronoun address, found that there is “covariation between the pronoun used and the objective relationship existing between speaker and addressee.” Address the speaker uses is not the only means to determine the participants' interpersonal relation; in addition personal pronouns which are sensitive to the social context are used to reflect interpersonal relations in terms of power and solidarity (Navratilova, 2009). There is a broader relationship between language and power. Power is the degree to which one speaker can control the behavior of the other. In contrast to power, solidarity which is an important relationship in sociolinguistic interaction is used to express intimacy and familiarity. Solidarity is made between two speakers when they share some common attributes (Sterling, 2000). Pennycook (1994) refers to language use as a result of social relations and the meanings are located in discourse. In order to get the meaning we should go beyond the language and investigate it in the discourses. He argued that in discourses all pronouns have political value. He refers to ‘we’ as the pronoun of solidarity and distinguishes between exclusive ‘we’ which can be exploited to share responsibility and inclusive ‘we’ which refers to the speaker and the listener simultaneously. ‘They’ can be used to refer unknown authority.  ‘I’ can be substitute for ‘you’ or ‘they’ as well as ‘we’ can. In addition ‘I’ reflects the shared communality. According to Duran’s research (2008) inclusive ‘we’ is frequently used by both candidates Bush and Kerry. Gocheco (2012) examined the reflection of relationship between language, persuasion, and culture in the personal pronoun usage in political speech. He found that the pronoun ‘we’ is the strategy in politician’s speech to get commitment, on the other hand, pronoun ‘I’ is used for exclusion. ‘we’ is used for persuasion and ‘I’ is more dominant pronoun in political discourses. Pennebaker and Chung (2007) examined pronouns in their investigation of the psychological function of function words. Function words such as pronouns are words that demand a shared understanding of their referent between the speaker and listener. A first person singular pronoun is a particularly robust marker of the status of two people in an interaction. Pronoun ‘we’ would be more common in collectivist cultures, and the pronoun ‘I’ more frequent in individualistic cultures. There is a direct relation between culture and the number of personal pronouns which can be revealed people’s different perception (Kashima, 1998).
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Even there is evidence in the relation of writing and the physical health proved that people who alternated in their use of personal pronouns when writing about emotional disorders have health improvements in the months after writing (Campbell & Pennebaker, 2003 & Pennebaker, 2011). Pronoun ‘I’ is the most commonly word used in English and it is believed that ‘I’ reflects self-confident and arrogant. The pronoun of ‘I’ is missing in Barak Obama’s speeches. Pronouns are rarely used in his speeches. He is the one who has the lowest use of ‘I’ has compared to other US presidents. This is revealed that Obama’s strategic use of pronouns to have the emotional distance with his audience and be one of them not someone who does not belong to them (Pennebaker, 2011). In the critical discourse analysis of Obama’s speeches in terms of personal pronouns Wang (2010) found that first personal pronoun ‘we’ is the most used one which applied to shorten the distance between him and his audience, to create a sense of closeness and intimacy with his listeners, to reflect they are in the same boat and they follow the same goals. Green (2007) investigated the discursive strategies in the political speech of Dr. Bing Wa Mutharika and he found that he used pronouns in order to shift the responsibility away from him. Ursini and Akagi (2011) examined the interpretation of plural pronoun of ‘they’ in the discourse and found that all the referents represented by their antecedent.

The aim of this study is to give deep insight to intention of Barak Obama and George W. Bush in the use of pronouns and compare them. What this investigation is setting out to do is to examine how these two presidents use pronouns effectively to attract audience’s attention, support and how influence people’s political views and convince them.

3. Methodology
This is an empirical analysis based on two inaugural speeches by George W. Bush on January 20, 2001 and Barak Obama on January 20, 2009. The speeches first downloaded from the internet. The second thing that I did was to automatically mark every occurrence of the pronouns in the two speeches. Later I double-checked it by manually going through the two texts. The result of the occurrence I then counted so a comparison would be possible and finally I compiled the numbers into table 1. Then, the number of inclusive ad exclusive ‘we’ have been counted and listed in table 2. Subsequent figures have been included for the analysis of personal pronoun and of ‘we’ as inclusive or exclusive.

4. Results and Discussions
In this section I presented my analyses of two speeches. The analysis of the speeches begins with the number of particular pronouns chosen by each president. Then the number of total usage of pronouns are calculated and presented.

In Bush speech the pronoun ‘I’, ‘me’ and ‘my’ are used much more than in Obama speech. These pronouns represent the speaker, shows that he is committing himself and expressing his personal views and opinions. Comparing the use of these pronouns proved other studies results that Obama has the lowest use of ‘I’ among the other US presidents and as the ‘I’ reflects arrogant and self-confident so Bush is more arrogant and self-confident than Obama. But the reverse side of the coin is that the less use of pronoun of ‘I’ of Obama is the strategy to decrease pressure and responsibility on him and the government. In the first table the number of occurrence of the pronouns of two speeches are presented and the total number of use of pronouns are given.

Figure 1: A List of personal Pronouns used in Inauguration Addressee

![Personal Pronouns in Bush's Speech](image)
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As previously mentioned, the personal pronouns in each speech are used to represent people. The pronoun that it would be analyzed and discussed at the length is the use of the subjective first person plural ‘we’ as it is the most frequently occurring in two speeches.

The large number of use of pronoun ‘we’, ‘our’, ‘us’ and ‘ourselves’ in Obama’s speech in compare to Bush’s reveals Obama’s tendency to solidarity as Pennycook refers.

From the two speeches, I have analyzed ‘we’ in terms of inclusive ‘we’ and exclusive ‘we’. As discussed earlier in this study, there is a standard distinction between inclusive and exclusive uses of ‘we’. Exclusive ‘we’ does not refer to the addressee. It is generally used to refer to the speaker and third parties who may or may not be presented in the immediate situation. The use of the exclusive ‘we’ can be exploited to share responsibility. Inclusive ‘we’ refers to the speaker and the listener.

Table 1: The use of Inclusive and Exclusive ‘we’ in Inauguration Addressee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use of ‘we’</th>
<th>Bush</th>
<th>Obama</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusive ‘we’</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exclusive ‘we’</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regarding the large number of use of inclusive ‘we’, it is possible to see that both presidents’ presume to speak on the addressee’s behalf. In their addresses they use inclusive ‘we’ much more than exclusive ‘we’ to refer to themselves and the people of America and thus encourage solidarity. It is used most frequently to persuade the audience to work as a team and support their plans. This analysis has been discovered that the actual discourse referents of ‘we’ are infinite. There is a vague impression of the inclusive/exclusive distinction of ‘we’ because the speaker implies that the audiences are of the same view or same country.

Both presidents are not only speaking on behalf of the government or party (exclusive) but also on behalf of the audience (inclusive). The mutual knowledge of the speaker and the interpreter of the particular context can help to distinguish between inclusive and exclusive ‘we’.

5. Conclusion

Although it is not possible to make strong generalization from the analysis of data in this small-scale exploratory study, the findings of the analysis of two political speeches seem to be supported. These findings have helped to explore the aims of the study, which are examined how pronouns are used in political speeches. This study explores the usage of personal pronouns in two speeches of two different presidents. The findings of the analysis show that first personal pronoun of ‘I’ in Bush speech used more in compare to Obama speech which reflects that Bush is committing himself and expressing his personal views and shows his self-confidence and his more arrogance. Fewer use of pronoun of ‘I’ of Obama is the strategy to decrease pressure and responsibility on him and his government. Second dominant pronoun in two speeches is ‘we’ which occupies a large portion of pronoun numbers. ‘we’ unlike ‘I’ used more in Obama speech than Bush speech. This is president’s strategy to get commitment, share responsibility, and applied to shorten the distance between him and his audience, to create a sense of closeness and intimacy with his listeners, to reflect they are in the same boat and they follow the same goals.
Finally, I have concentrated on the examination of two types of ‘we’ in terms of exclusive and inclusive. Both presidents used inclusive ‘we’ much more than exclusive ‘we’ to refer to themselves and the people of America to encourage solidarity. It is used most frequently to persuade the audience to work as a team and support their future plans. Both presidents use ‘We’ to decrease their own personalities in situation where they want to express the importance of the people’s participation to reach a particular goal.
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