

People's Democratic Republic of Algeria
Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research
M'hamed Bougara University of Boumerdes
Faculty of Languages and Letters
Department of English



**Discursive Strategies in Jacinda Ardern's 2022 Harvard Commencement
Speech: A Critical Discourse Analysis.**

**Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Master Degree in
Language Sciences**

Submitted by:

Miss. DELLALI Hannane

Supervised by:

Dr. BENMANSOUR Rim

Panel of Examiners:

Supervisor: Dr. BENMANSOUR Rim.

President: Dr. DERRADJI Mohamed El Amine.

Examiner: Mrs. KAFI Amina.

2023

Declaration

I hereby declare that the substance of this dissertation is entirely the result of my own investigation and is my original work, and that due reference or acknowledgement is made, whenever necessary, to the work of other researchers.

Signed

DELLALI Hannane

July 11th, 2023

Acknowledgements

First and foremost, I am truly grateful and thankful to Allah, the Almighty, and the Most Glorified, for gifting me the ability to conduct this research.

I would like to express my sincerest appreciation and gratitude for my supervisor Mrs. BENMANSOUR Rim for all her time, help and guidance throughout the process of achieving this humble work.

I would also like to acknowledge the jury members Mrs. KAFI and Mr. DERRADJI for giving time to evaluate my research.

DEDICATION

This dissertation is wholeheartedly dedicated to my late father, may Allah rest his beautiful soul,

To my mother for her endless love and constant moral and emotional support and prayers.

To my sister who has been my source of inspiration and motivation throughout my journey.

To all my loved ones.

Abstract

On May 27th, 2022, Jacinda Ardern, the former Prime Minister of New Zealand, delivered an inspiring speech in which she warned her audience of freshly graduates from the ‘fragility’ of democracy as well as urging tech companies to act up against the danger of disinformation. The present investigation subjected the aforementioned discourse to a critical analysis applying Teun Van Dijk's (1991, 1995; 2006) analytical framework. The primary objective of this research is to identify all discursive strategies present in our speech sample, in order to elucidate how politicians employ specific language to serve specific intentions. The findings of the analysis indicate that the speaker has employed several discursive strategies as outlined by Van Dijk's model, mainly: Positive self-presentation/National Glorification, Repetition, and excessive use of pronouns. Thus the framework selected for our study was found perfectly appropriate for our research, given the prevalence of discursive strategies in our speech sample.

Key Words: Critical Discourse Analysis, Jacinda Ardern, Discursive Strategies, Van Dijk’s Model (1991, 1995, 2006).

Table of Contents

Declaration	i
Acknowledgments	ii
Dedication	iii
Abstract	iv
Table of Contents	v
List of Abbreviations	viii
List of Tables	ix
General Introduction	1
Statement of the Problem	2
Research Questions	2
Aims of the Study	3
Significance of the Study	3
Organization of the Dissertation	3
CHAPTER ONE: Theoretical Background of the Study and the Related Studies	5
Introduction.....	5
Section One: Theoretical Background of the Study.....	6
1. Definition of Discourse.....	6
2. Definition of Discourse Analysis	7
3. Definition of Critical Discourse Analysis.....	8
3.1. Aims of CDA.....	10

3.2. Tenets of CDA.....	11
4. Media Discourse.....	11
5. Political Discourse.....	13
6. Jacinda Ardern’s Biography	14
Section Two: Related Studies and Literature Review.....	16
Conclusion.....	23
CHAPTER TWO: Research Methodology and Design.....	24
Introduction.....	24
1. Research Methodology Choice.....	24
2. Research Questions.....	29
3. Data Collection Procedures.....	29
4. Data Analysis Procedures.....	29
Conclusion.....	30
CHAPTER THREE: Results Analysis and Discussion.....	31
Introduction.....	31
1. An Overview of the Speech	31
2. Discursive Strategies Employed in the Speech.....	32
3. Discussion of the Findings.....	40
3.1. Positive Self-representation.....	40
3.2. National/Self Glorification.....	41
3.3. Repetitions.....	42
3.4. Authority.....	43
3.5. Pronouns.....	44
3.5.1. Ardern’s Use of the Pronoun ‘I’	45

3.5.2. Ardern’s Use of the Pronoun ‘we’	46
3.5.3. Ardern’s Use of the Pronouns ‘us’ & ‘our’	47
3.5.4. Ardern’s Use of the Pronoun ‘you’	47
3.6. Counterfactuals.....	49
3.7. Evidentiality.....	49
3.8. Irony	50
Conclusion.....	51
General Conclusion.....	52
References.....	54
Appendix A	58

List of Abbreviations

DA: Discourse Analysis.

CDA: Critical Discourse Analysis.

CL: Critical Linguistics.

CDS: Critical Discourse Studies.

PDA: Political Discourse Analysis.

PM: Prime Minister.

List of Tables

Table 01: Elements of Van Dijk’s model.....	25
Table 02: Discursive Strategies illustration.....	32
Table 03: Frequency of Repetitions	42
Table 04: Frequency of Pronouns.....	48

General Introduction

Politics has been an integral part of human societies since their inception, with human beings actively engaging in political activities. Politicians employ precise language when communicating with their audience to uphold their powerful status and persuade them to adopt their perspectives and embrace ideologies and principles that align with their interests. Politicians rely heavily on words to influence their audiences' cognition and emotions.

Speech in general and political speech in particular is a one powerful tool of communication, Language used in delivering a speech is precise, important and intended to have an effect on the listeners. The power of language is evident as it is used a tool to help shaping and affecting individuals' thoughts and ideas. People in power, such as politicians meticulously choose the words they produce to have a certain influence on their audience. Political speeches garner significant media attention and have a great impact on people. People with these powerful positions can influence others with any statement they produce, hence they take that into advantage for their and their own nation's good. Therefore it is important to examine this type of discourses in order to reveal the linguistic strategies employed by politicians which shape the public perception of them.

Jacinda Ardern, the former Prime Minister of New Zealand and one of the most powerful women leaders in the world delivered a speech on May 26th at the Harvard University 371th commencement to the class of 2022 graduates. In her speech, Ardern called on the graduates to protect democracy, treat differences with kindness and respect and warmed against disinformation. This study is intended to examine this speech using a multidisciplinary approach that mainly studies discourses called Critical Discourse Analysis.

Critical discourse analysis (CDA) is a type of discourse analytical research that primarily studies the way social power abuse, dominance, and inequality are enacted, reproduced, and resisted by text and talk in the social and political context. With such dissident research, critical discourse analysts take explicit position, and thus want to understand, expose, and ultimately resist social inequality (Van Dijk, 1985). Through this study, The New Zealand prime minister Jacinda Ardern's speech at the Harvard University 371st commencement ceremony will be critically analyzed using Van Dijk's (1991, 1995; 2006) frameworks of analysis with the aim of uncovering a number of discourse strategies used.

Statement of the Problem

Lately, researchers' interest in the critical discourse analysis field has grown. This study takes a part by analyzing a speech delivered by the former Prime Minister of New Zealand Jacinda Ardern, by investigating how she uses language to influence her audience of freshly graduates and to encourage them to unite and protect and strengthen their democracy. This study aims at finding and investigating the discursive and ideological strategies used by Ardern to influence her audience.

Research Questions

This study attempts to answer the following questions:

- RQ1: What are the main discursive strategies used by Jacinda Ardern in her speeches?
- RQ2: How are these language strategies intended to shape the public's perception of her?
- RQ3: How does Ardern use language to influence her audience?

Aims of the study

This study is concerned with the language employed by the former Prime Minister of New Zealand Jacinda Ardern in her speech at the 2022 commencement at Harvard University. This research aims at uncovering the discursive strategies embedded in the discourse delivered by Ardern. It also analyses Ardern's language use in order to encourage unity to her nation and warn against disinformation.

Significance of the Study

After consulting and reviewing the literature in this area of research, it appears that there are no studies yet done on the former New Zealand prime minister's 2022 speech at Harvard University. Therefore this study is a humble contribution to the field of CDA. Additionally, this study offers an up to date addition to the political language as well as contributing to the vast knowledge in relation to the CDA research field by expanding the readers' horizon who are inspired to work on similar political speeches.

Organization of the Dissertation

This study consists of three chapters in addition to a general introduction and a general conclusion which are organized as follows:

First, this paper begins with a general introduction which explains the subject of the research, the problematic that will be addressed, the aims of the study and the significance of the study. Next, chapter number one entitled "Theoretical Background of the Study and Related Studies" is the theoretical part of this paper, it is divided into two sections, the first one is concerned with a detailed explanation of theories and concepts and the second section includes a review of similar studies.

Chapter number two entitled “Research Methodology and Design” presents the research methodology chosen to conduct the research in addition to data collection and analysis procedures. The final chapter is called “Results Analysis and Discussion” in which the results of the research are discussed. The paper is concluded with a general conclusion which sums up everything that has been stated in this paper.

CHAPTER ONE

Theoretical Background and Related Studies

INTRODUCTION:

Discourse analysis is seen as a way of approaching a problem or situations through deconstructing the text (Van Dijk, 2006; Bayran, 2010; Gadalla, 2012 and Ngozi, 2016). Discourse analysis is particularly used to analyze political texts, trying to understand the power relations: why did a politician use this particular word in this context rather than that? In other words, discourses are more than linguistic, they are social ideological practices which can govern the ways in which people think, speak, interact, write, and behave (Van Dijk, 2006)). In the last years, politics become globally the main activity in life of human beings in order to discuss and negotiate different crises such as the relations between countries, health crisis, the crisis of the water sources, the diplomatic relations, and war announcements and so on by manipulating language which has different types and aims. There are many studies which are focused on the political speeches of different presidents and politicians, these studies adopt different theories and models in order to show their ideologies, power, plans and different discursive strategies used. (Kadim, 2023)

Our first step in our research is to introduce basic background and theoretical knowledge and developments of CDA in addition to a literature review in order to help readers comprehend this rich and interdisciplinary field of research. This chapter is divided into two sections; the first section is concerned with defining and introducing the related concepts to our study in the field of CDA, and the following section sums up a variety of related research that were carried out in the last decade.

Section One: Theoretical Background of the Study.

1. Definition of Discourse:

In the study of language, some of the most interesting observations are made, not in terms of the components of language, but in terms of the way language is used. The word “discourse” is usually defined as “language beyond the sentence” and so the analysis of discourse is typically concerned with the study of language in texts and conversation. (Yule, 1985)

The definitions of discourse are so abundant that many linguistics books on the subject now open with a survey of definitions. In their collection of classic papers in discourse analysis, for example, Jaworski and Coupland (1999) include ten definitions from a wide range of sources. They all, however, fall into the three main categories noted above: (1) anything beyond the sentence, (2) language use, and (3) a broader range of social practice that includes nonlinguistic and nonspecific instances of language.

Critical discourse analysts also view discourse as an instance of social practice (Fairclough, 1992). Fairclough argues that discourse is a social practice and thus integral to society. To be more precise, Fairclough indicates that discourse is one of the components that construct society by the production of actions through which people around the world in general and within society in particular can act upon and represent reality. (Fairclough, 1992). In addition Fairclough stated that:

Discourse is in an active relation to reality, that language signifies reality in the sense of constructing meanings for it, rather than that discourse is in a passive relation to reality, with language merely referring to objects which are taken to be given in reality. (Fairclough, 1995).

Accordingly, critical discourse analysts hold that social actors use discourse as a tool to generate thoughts, beliefs and ideologies.

2. Definition of Discourse Analysis.

The 1970s saw the emergence of a form of discourse and text analysis that recognized the role of language in structuring power relations in society. At that time, much linguistic research elsewhere was focused on formal aspects of language which constituted the linguistic competence of speakers and which could theoretically be isolated from specific instances of language use (Chomsky, 1957). Where the relation between language and context was considered, as in pragmatics (Levinson, 1983), with a focus on speakers' pragmatic/sociolinguistic competence, sentences and components of sentences were still regarded as the basic units. Much sociolinguistic research at the time was aimed at describing and explaining language variation, language change and the structures of communicative interaction, with limited attention to issues of social hierarchy and power (Labov, 1972; Hymes, 1972). In such a context, attention to texts, their production and interpretation and their relation to societal impulses and structures, signaled a very different kind of interest. The work of Kress and Hodge (1979), Fowler et al. (1979), Van Dijk (1985), Fairclough (1989) and Wodak (ed.) (1989) serve to explain and illustrate the main assumptions, principles and procedures of what had then become known as CL or DA.

Discourse analysis is a rapidly growing and evolving field. Current research in this field now flows from numerous academic disciplines that are very different from one another. Given this disciplinary diversity, it is no surprise that the terms “discourse” and “discourse analysis” have different meanings to scholars in different fields. For many, particularly linguists, “discourse” has generally been defined as anything “beyond the sentence.” For others, for example, Fasold(1990), the study of discourse is the study of language use. These definitions have in common a focus on

specific instances or spates of language. But critical theorists and those influenced by them can speak, for example, of “discourse of power” and “discourses of racism,” where the term “discourses” not only becomes a count noun, but further refers to a broad conglomeration of linguistic and nonlinguistic social practices and ideological assumptions that together construct power or racism.

The analysis of discourse is, necessarily, the analysis of language in use. As such, it cannot be restricted to the description linguistic forms independent of the purposes or functions which those forms are designed to serve in human affairs. While some linguists may concentrate on determining the formal properties of a language, the discourse analyst is committed to an investigation of what that language is used for. (Brown & Yule, 1983)

3. Definition of Critical Discourse Analysis.

Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA), or Critical Discourse Studies (CDS) is an interdisciplinary field of study that regards “language as a social practice” (Fairclough and Wodak, 1997) and it “takes consideration of the context of language use to be crucial” (Wodak & Meyer, 2001). Both Critical Linguistics (CL) and Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) are often used interchangeably. This movement was developed by “Critical Linguists” at the University of East Anglia during 1970s including Fowler, Kress, and Hodge. In addition to Van Dijk (1985), Fairclough (1989) and Wodak (1989) whose works serve to explain and 24 illustrate the main assumptions, principals, and procedures of what had then become known as CL (Wodak& Meyer, 2001).

Van Dijk (1985) defined Critical discourse analysis (CDA) as a type of discourse analytical research that primarily studies the way social power abuse, dominance, and inequality are enacted,

reproduced, and resisted by text and talk in the social and political context. With such dissident research, critical discourse analysts take explicit position, and thus want to understand, expose, and ultimately resist social inequality.

CDA is not so much a direction, school, or specialization next to the many other “approaches” in discourse studies. Rather, it aims to offer a different “mode” or “perspective” of theorizing, analysis, and application throughout the whole field. We may find a more or less critical perspective in such diverse areas as pragmatics, conversation analysis, narrative analysis, rhetoric, stylistics, sociolinguistics, ethnography, or media analysis, among others.

It is a fact that CDA follows a different and a critical approach to problems, since it endeavors to make explicit power relationships which are frequently hidden, and thereby to derive results which are of practical relevance. One important characteristic arises from the assumption of CDA that all discourses are historical and can therefore only be understood with reference to their context. In accordance with this, CDA refers to such extra linguistic factors such as culture, society, and ideology. In any case, the notion of context is crucial for CDA, since this explicitly includes social, psychological, political and ideological components and thereby postulates an interdisciplinary procedure.

From the notion of context a further difference emerges concerning the assumption about the relationship between language and society. CDA does not take this relationship to be simply deterministic but invokes an idea of mediation. There is a difference between the various approaches to discourse. Norman Fairclough defines the relationship in accordance with Halliday's multifunctional linguistic theory and the concept of orders of discourse according to Foucault, while Ruth Wodak, like Teun Van Dijk, introduces a socio-cognitive level. This kind of mediation

between language and society is absent from many other linguistic approaches, such as, for example, conversation analysis. (Meyer, 2001)

a. Aims of CDA:

According to Van Dijk (1995), critical research on discourse needs to satisfy a number of requirements in order to effectively realize its aims:

- As is often the case for more marginal research traditions, CDA research has to be “better” than other research in order to be accepted.
- It focuses primarily on social problems and political issues, rather than on current paradigms and fashions.
- Empirically adequate critical analysis of social problems is usually multidisciplinary.
- Rather than merely describe discourse structures, it tries to explain them in terms of properties of social interaction and especially social structure.
- More specifically, CDA focuses on the ways discourse structures enact, confirm, legitimate, reproduce, or challenge relations of power and dominance in society.

To Fairclough (1993), CDA aims to: systematically explore often opaque relationships of causality and determination between (a) discursive practices, events and texts, and (b) wider social and cultural structures, relations and 2 processes; to investigate how such practices, events and texts arise out of and are ideologically shaped by relations of power and struggles over power; and to explore how the opacity of these relationships between discourse and society is itself a factor securing power and hegemony.

b. Tenets of CDA:

Fairclough and Wodak (1997) summarize the main tenets of CDA as follows:

- CDA addresses social problems.
- Power relations are discursive.
- Discourse constitutes society and culture.
- Discourse does ideological work.
- Discourse is historical.
- The link between text and society is mediated.
- Discourse analysis is interpretative and explanatory.
- Discourse is a form of social action.

4. Media Discourse:

The undeniable power of the media has inspired many critical studies in many disciplines: linguistics, semiotics, pragmatics, and discourse studies. Traditionally, often content analytical approaches in critical media studies have revealed biased, stereotypical, sexist or racist images in texts, illustrations, and photos. Early studies of media language similarly focused on easily observable surface structures, such as the biased or partisan use of words in the description of Us and Them (and Our/Their actions and characteristics). (Van Dijk, 1998).

The critical tone was set by a series of “Bad News” studies by the Glasgow University Media Group (1976, 1980, 1982, 1985, 1993) on features of TV reporting, such as in the coverage of various issues (e.g. industrial disputes (strikes), the Falklands (Malvinas) war, the media coverage of AIDS). Perhaps best-known outside of discourse studies is the media research carried

out by Stuart Hall and his associates (Hall et al. 1980) within the framework of the cultural studies paradigm. An early collection of work of Roger Fowler and his associates (Fowler et al. 1979) also focused on the media. As with many other English and Australian studies in this paradigm, the theoretical framework of Halliday's functional-systemic grammar is used in a study of the "transitivity" of syntactic patterns of sentences.

The point of such research is that events and actions may be described with syntactic variations that are a function of the underlying involvement of actors (e.g. their agency, responsibility, and perspective). Thus, in an analysis of the media accounts of the "riots" during a minority festival, the responsibility of the authorities and especially of the police in such violence may be systematically de-emphasized by defocusing, e.g. by passive constructions and nominalizations; that is, by leaving agency and responsibility implicit. Fowler's later critical studies of the media continue this tradition, but also pay tribute to the British cultural studies paradigm that defines news not as a reflection of reality, but as a product shaped by political, economic, and cultural forces (Fowler, 1991). More than in much other critical work on the media, he also focuses on the linguistic "tools" for such a critical study, such as the analysis of transitivity in syntax, lexical structure, modality, and speech acts. Similarly Van Dijk (1988) applies a theory of news discourse (Van Dijk, 1988) in critical studies of international news, racism in the press, etc.

The primary objective of most media discourse analysis (from the linguistic to the sociological) is often the registering of the presence of bias or ideology in language, or the problematizing of power relations in society.

5. Political Discourse:

Given the role of political discourse in the enactment, reproduction, and legitimization of power and domination (Van Dijk, 1985), many critical discourse studies of political language are expected. These studies have been carried out by linguists and discourse analysts, because political science is among the few social disciplines in which discourse analysis has remained virtually unknown, although there is some influence of “postmodern” approaches to discourse and many studies of political communication and rhetoric overlap with a discourse analytical approach.

The study of political discourse, similarly to other areas of discourse analysis, covers a broad range of subject matter, and relies on a wide range of analytic methods. Perhaps more than with other areas of discourse, however, one needs at the outset to consider the reflexive and potentially ambiguous nature of the term political discourse. The term is suggestive of at least two possibilities: first, a discourse which is itself political; and second, an analysis of political discourse as simply an example discourse type, without explicit reference to political content or political context. But things may be even more confusing. Given that on some definitions almost all discourse may be considered political (Shapiro 1981), then all analyses of discourse are potentially political, and, therefore, on one level, all discourse analysis is political discourse.

According to Chilton and Schaffner, (1997), politics is an idea which comes into practice only through the use of language. This use of language further depends upon the situation and political demands like what vocabulary and structure is used for what purpose. The primary aim of the political discourse is the use of speech for influencing others’ thoughts, beliefs and ideologies. Moreover, Chimbarange, A., Takavarasha, P., & Kombe, F. (2013) suggest that politicians use speech as a medium of discourse to imply their implicit agendas. Their postures, gestures, body movement and delivery style also contribute to step them toward their intended targets. Using

language, politicians want to exercise their power and achieve their goals such as achieving economic as well as social positions. However, sometimes, they inform the public about follies and foibles of the ruling party using language.

As Van Dijk observes, critical discourse analysis practitioners see the analysis of political discourse as an essentially critical enterprise. PDA is therefore understood as the analysis of political discourse from a critical perspective, a perspective which focuses on the reproduction and contestation of political power through political discourse. Van Dijk characterizes political discourse as attached to political actors – individuals (politicians, citizens), political institutions and organizations, engaged in political processes and events – and emphasized that a notion of context is essential to the understanding of political discourse. He also argues that PDA can have a lot to offer political science and can contribute to answering genuine political questions, but only if – as he observes – it focuses on features of discourse which are relevant to the purpose or function of the political process or event whose discursive dimension is being analyzed (Van Dijk, 1997).

Many genres of political discourse (parliamentary debates, laws, propaganda, slogans, international treaties, peace negotiations, etc.) are largely defined in contextual, rather than in textual terms. Political discourse is not primarily defined by topic or style, but rather by who speaks to whom, as what, on what occasion and with what goals. In other words, political discourse is especially 'political' because of its functions in the political process (Van Dijk, 1997).

6. Jacinda Ardern's Biography:

Jacinda Kate Laurell Ardern was born in July 26, 1980 in Hamilton, New Zealand. The former Prime Minister of New Zealand completed a Bachelor of Communication studies in Public Relations and Political Science at Waikato Management School from 1999 to 2001. After

graduating from the University of Waikato. In the past, Jacinda has worked as a researcher for Phil Goff, the minister of foreign affairs, and former prime minister Helen Clark. She afterwards relocated to London, where she served as a senior policy advisor in the UK Cabinet Office for British Prime Minister Tony Blair. Her assistance with the Home Office's examination of police in England and Wales was also seconded.

In 2007, Jacinda became the second woman ever elected president of the International Union of Socialist Youth, the world's largest international political youth organization, which saw her spend time in countries such as Jordan, occupied Palestine, Algeria and China.

Jacinda first stood as a candidate for the Labour Party in Waikato in 2008 and entered Parliament for the first time as a list MP. In 2017 she became MP for Mt Albert in a by-election, and just a month later she was unanimously elected as deputy leader of the Labour Party

Jacinda became the youngest female head of government in the world in 2017 after being elected prime minister at the age of 37. After Pakistan's Benazir Bhutto, Jacinda became just the second head of state in the modern era to give birth while in office in 2018 when she gave birth to her second daughter. On August 1st, 2017, Jacinda was chosen without opposition to lead the Labour Party after Andrew Little resigned. She became the third female prime minister of New Zealand in less than two months after being elected.

She resigned from the role in January 2023 after five-and-a-half unforgettable years. This includes guiding the nation through the terrorist attacks on the March 15 mosques in Christchurch, the volcanic eruption on White Island, and the Covid-19 epidemic. (Waikato, n.d.)

Section Two: Related Studies and Literature Review

As stated before, this field of research has become prominent and an area of interest for many researchers, numerous studies related to our topic have been conducted. Political and presidential speech in particular are what is mainly put under study in this field, similar to what is going to be conducted in this study.

Shousha (2010) for her PhD thesis conducted a study entitled: A Critical Discourse Analysis of the Image of the Arabs in the American Press, at the Faculty of Arts, University of Alexandria, Egypt. Through her study, Shousha aimed at revealing the portrayed image of Arabs in the American press after the 11 September 2001 incident. As well as unveiling the misconceptions of the image of the Arabs and suggested modification to the discourses used to portray them. The researcher analyzed selected articles from prestigious American press such as Newsweek and The Washington Post. The analysis of these articles illustrates that the linguistic features: lexical choices, thematic patterns, The investigation demonstrates how the language aspects, including as lexical selections, thematic patterns, rhetorical devices, and syntactic patterns, convey the dominant ideologies in society, the uneven power relations, and therefore a negative perception of Arabs. As a result, the number of publications about Arabs suddenly increased following the events, which may be considered one of the events' beneficial effects. However, there was a subsequent fluctuation in the number of articles, which was linked to the impact of the events linking America to the Arab world on the number of publications about the Arab world. Depending on how they relate to America, the Arab nations are depicted either negatively or moderately. They were divided between friends and foes. Shousha also highlighted the importance of CDA techniques in understanding the full meanings of press articles and also claimed that her study has

implications for teaching CDA awareness for adult students and help devise strategies and methods of achieving this educational goal. (Shousha, 2010)

Sherwani conducted a study entitled *A Critical Discourse Analysis of English Broadcast political speech*, in 2011, for the fulfillment of his PhD degree in English language and linguistics at Salahddin University, Iraq. The study deals with aspects of political speeches broadcasted on TV and radio channels. The main aims of this study is to uncover the implicit ideology in the language of politicians through studying selected political speeches of American and British politicians. Through his research, Sherwani provided a historical background of the CDA field and its relationship to other disciplines. The researcher used the practical framework of CDA adopted by Van Dijk, qualitative method, quantitative method and textual analysis are used as procedures to prove the hypotheses, data under examination consists of t political speeches, one by George W. Bush, which was addressed to the nation on May 15, 2006, and the other by Tony Blair, which was delivered on December 8, 2006, which were both analyzed linguistically and rhetorically. The conclusion offered by this study is that there is a large number of related linguistic and rhetorical characteristics in political discourse, namely, in broadcast political speeches. For instance, politicians use similar ways of interaction, communication, persuasion and public opinion. He also provided recommendations and suggestions for further studies in the field. (Sherwani, 2011)

Sipra and Rachid (2013) published an article in the journal of *Advances in Language and Literary studies*, under the title: “Critical Discourse Analysis of Martin Luther King’s Speech in Socio-Political Perspective”. The article presents the Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) of the first part of King Martin Luther’s speech “When I Have a Dream” in socio-political context. The study investigates how it lies on the basis of application of Fairclough version of CDA in the first part of the text. Moreover, it explicates the terms like social, cultural and political inequalities in the light

of text and framework. The main findings of the study concludes that Martin Luther King repeatedly uses certain textual and stylistic devices, therefore, the speech is syntactically organized with the use of repetitions. They also concluded that Martin Luther King's use of rhetorical devices highlights the institutionalized social oppressions.

In 2016, at Aalborg University in Denmark, Jensen, Jakobsen and Pichler conducted a study entitled: A Critical Discourse Study of Hillary Clinton's 2015/2016 Presidential Campaign Discourses. The thesis uncovers underlying discursive structures in Hillary Clinton's presidential campaign discourse. The study was done through the use of the theory and methodology of Critical Discourse Analysis. The specific aim is to identify elements of gender references, persuasive techniques and social inclusion and exclusion. The data used is transcriptions of Clinton's speeches during her 2016 campaign. Through the analysis of the latter, there were evidence of rhetorical devices for persuasion. Clinton's usage of pronouns indicated her perspective on both her fans and opponents in terms of social inclusion and exclusion. The study's conclusion notes that Clinton pushes the boundaries of historical perceptions of the American presidency in terms of gender, and it may appear that the primary goal of her campaign discourses is to create a narrative of herself as President of the United States of America.. (Jensen et al., 2016)

In 2017, Salahshour conducted a study entitled: Representation of Immigrants in New Zealand Print Media: A Critical Discourse Analysis, for the fulfillment of her PhD degree at the Victoria University of Wellington. Salahshour's research intends to better understand how immigrants are produced discursively in the New Zealand Herald newspaper between 2007 and 2008. The research also attempted to analyze anticipated inequalities in the representation of immigrants during economically tough periods given that the Global Financial Crisis first became apparent in 2008. The researcher used methodic triangulation, which is the analysis of data using

two complementary analytical frameworks, namely corpus-assisted discourse analysis (Baker, KhosraviNik, Krzyzanowski, McEnery, & Wodak, 2008) and the Discourse-Historical Approach (Reisigl & Wodak, 2009). This strategy was based on a critical approach. Following this study, a thorough examination of carefully sampled news stories is conducted with the goal of identifying the various discursive and argumentative techniques that are frequently used in print media. The results of both investigations indicate to an inconsistent portrayal of immigration. On the one hand, immigrants are portrayed as competent and essential to addressing New Zealand's skill gap. In this constructive construction, immigrants are portrayed as a valuable economic resource that should be utilized. Additionally, the data unexpectedly uses liquid metaphors, which have been argued to dehumanize immigrants and create them as unmanageable (KhosraviNik, 2009), to construct the immigration of huge numbers of immigrants to New Zealand as necessary. Additionally, immigrants are portrayed as passive or threatening victims. Immigrants are therefore seen as both harmful and advantageous to New Zealand society. This study reveals a distinctive portrayal of immigrants in the New Zealand Herald, which may be explained by the nation's distinctive socio-political and geographic backdrop. This research's triangulation and methodological rigor also guarantee that the results may be generalized to the entire dataset and add to our understanding of immigrant representation and methodologies for the study of speech and representation. (Salahshour, 2017)

In 2019, Dr. Jaradat published an article entitled: Persuasion Strategies Employed by Bill Clinton and Barack Obama in their Presidential Nomination Speeches in 1992 and 2008: A Comparative Study, in The Jordanian Association for Educational Sciences, Jordanian Education Journal. The goal of the study was to compare the persuasive techniques used by Bill Clinton and Barack Obama in their speeches accepting their nominations as the Democratic Party's nominee for president in 1992 and 2008, respectively. The nature of the persuasive methods used in each

speech were identified and compared through a deconstruction analysis of the speeches. In order to analyze these talks, the study used the critical discourse analysis (CDA) method. The main persuasion techniques that politicians frequently deploy are examined to discover which techniques are used in each of these speeches. The comparative critical deconstruction of the speeches revealed that both Clinton and Obama used a range of persuasion techniques, including the inclusive strategy, the strategy of making promises and commitments, the contrasting strategy, the strategy of exaggerating the negative side of the “other” and the repetition strategy. In addition, employed three more persuasive strategies (the fear strategy, the strategy of historical citation and the strategy of religious citation) that were not used by Obama. However, Obama used only one strategy that was not used by Clinton which is the emotional strategy. The analysis also revealed that neither Clinton nor Obama used any of the other persuasive techniques that some politicians occasionally employ, such as the strategy of rousing the national identity of their audience, the strategy of questioning, the strategy of using metaphors, the strategy of swearing, the strategy of using proverbs, and the strategy of summarizing. The study came to the further conclusion that Clinton's and Obama's speeches' persuasive techniques helped them win the 1992 and 2008 presidential elections using the repetition strategy. (Jaradat, 2019)

Bukhtiar, Dr. Hafeez and Dr. Akhtar published an article in Orient Research Journal of Social Sciences in 2020 entitled: Nobody’s Free Until Everybody’s Free: A Critical Discourse Analysis of Obama’s COVID-19 Speech, in which they critically analyzed the speech of former US President Barack H. Obama focusing primarily on the implicit practices behind discourse. Using qualitative approach, they took Obama’s speech on COVID-19 as a sample. The latter was analyzed using of Fairclough’s three-dimensional model where first the text was linguistically analyzed before explanation of the discursive process and social process. Findings of this study

show that Obama masterfully employed language strategies, such as historical allusions, the use of inclusive pronouns, the repetition of sentences, etc., to connect with his audience. Additionally, he emphasized the need of harmony, love, and peace as a way to combat the COVID-19 epidemic and other pressing problems. We also emphasize how a person's social status might alter their perspective on the world. The study investigates the political leaders' veiled viewpoint in their speech. They employ language as a means of disseminating their ideas so that they might carry the populace into a different realm. The study of the speech demonstrates how well Obama exploited the linguistically rich discourse to further his hidden goals for change the perception of the young generation of USA. With the help of current speech, Obama gives a new direction to the people of the whole world, i.e. help others to live happy and prosperous. (Bukhitar et al., 2020)

A Critical Discourse Analysis of President Trump's Speeches during the Coronavirus Pandemic Crisis, is the title of study conducted by Awawdeh in 2021 at the Faculty of Arts and Sciences, University of Middle East, Amman. This study investigates the possible implications of Trump's choice of certain lexical items in his speeches during the coronavirus crisis. Awawdeh used transcription of televised speeches of Donald Trump as the data under study and Norman Fairclough's (1995) three-dimensional as the model of Critical Discourse Analysis. He also examined the ideological stands reflected in Trump's usage of certain grammatical constructions, including modal structures, comparative and superlative forms, and pronouns. The researcher concluded that Trump used linguistic tools to stress ideas like American dominance and supremacy, national unity, citizen participation, and self-glorification using similar language devices. The frequent use of the pronouns "I" and "we" in Trump's remarks, he said, was evidence of egoism and exaggeration. The researcher came to the conclusion that Trump's use of inflammatory rhetoric in his talks during the coronavirus outbreak made it difficult for Americans

to embrace his beliefs. Voting against him in the elections and in favor of his running partner Joe Biden was evidence of this. (Awawdeh, 2021).

In February 2023, Kadim published an article in the International Journal of Humanities and Educational Research, which she entitled: A Critical Discourse Analysis of Vladimir Putin's Speech Announcing 'Special Military Operation' in Ukraine. This study attempts to analyze the speech of President Vladimir Putin concerning the crises of Ukraine. It adopts Van Dijk (1999, 1995, 2004, 2006) discursive strategies. This study aims at finding how Putin manipulated and used these strategies in his speech. It investigates the structures and the discursive strategies that reveal some aspects of Putin's political attitudes and ideologies. This research reveals the methods that Russian President Vladimir Putin use in his address to persuade audiences of his views and beliefs and to get support for his aims and plans to be carried out in the near future.. (Kadim, 2023)

CONCLUSION:

This chapter provides a general overview of our research field and an introduction to basic concepts related to the research area such as definitions of CDA, political discourse and other relevant topics. In addition, a literature review of related studies that included various different studies and articles published over the past decade. While all the studies take slightly different approaches to critical discourse analysis, they do have one main goal, which is unveiling the true meaning behind language of a politician.

CHAPTER TWO

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY AND DESIGN

INTRODUCTION:

In this chapter, the steps followed to conduct this study as well as the methodology choice will be explained thoroughly. To begin with, a comprehensive explanation of the model used to analyze our data is presented, which is Teun Van Dijk's (1991, 1995; 2006) model. Followed by the research questions that will be answered later on, and finally, the data collection procedures and data analysis procedures are provided.

1. Research Methodology Choice:

In order to find out the linguistic and ideological strategies that are embedded in our speech sample, this study follows a qualitative research design and adopts Teun Van Dijk's (1991, 1995; 2006) model for the analysis, which is one of the most influential approaches of Critical Discourse Analysis studies. The latter is used to analyze the discursive strategies used in discourses such as: presupposition, repetition, compassion moves, implication, pronouns, etc. to determine the powerful and influential tendencies and ideologies inserted in texts. Van Dijk's (1991, 1995; 2006) frameworks of analysis focuses on the micro levels of political discourse, that is the meaning, style, and rhetoric of its lexical items and sentences. He put forward a large number of discourse strategies of the local meaning of political discourse, which are presented in the following table:

Elements	Explanation
PRESUPPOSITION	According to Yule (2010), a presupposition is an assumption by a speaker/writer about what is true or already known by the listener/reader.
REPETITION	In media and political discourse, repetition can serve as a powerful strategy to insist on an idea or an event.
COMPASSION MOVE	This strategy shows sympathy for (the weak) or innocent civilians by the wrong policies or actions of others to achieve political interests (Van Dijk, 1995).
IMPLICATION	Implication is a strategy used by media owners, journalists and politicians to communicate an idea or feeling without saying it directly. People imply something by what they say. But the listener or receiver infers something from what somebody else says (Van Dijk, 1991)
PRONOUNS	Pronouns such as ‘I’ and ‘we’ are repeatedly used in political speeches to show unity, belonging... and to present one’s qualities and capacities.

ACTOR DESCRIPTION

The way actors are described in discourses also depends on our ideologies. Typically we tend to describe in-group members in a neutral or positive way and outgroup members in a negative way. Similarly, we will mitigate negative descriptions of members of our own group, and emphasize the attributed negative characteristics of ‘Others’. (Van Dijk, 2006)

CONSENSUS

To claim or insist on cross-party or national consensus is a well-known political strategy in situations where the country is threatened, for instance by outside attack. Immigration is often seen as such a threat. (Van Dijk, 2006)

COUNTERFACTUALS

“What would happen, if ...”the typical expression of a counterfactual, it is a strategy used to create alternative possibilities to events that had already happened. (Van Dijk, 2006)

AUTHORITY

Many speakers in an argument, also in parliament mention authorities to support their case, usually organizations or people who are above the fray of party politics, or who are generally recognized experts or moral leaders. International organizations, scholars, the media,

the church or the courts often have that role. People of different ideologies typically cite different authorities. (Van Dijk, 2006)

DISCLAIMER

A well-known combination of the ideologically based strategy of positive self-presentation and negative other-presentation are the many types of disclaimers.(Van Dijk, 2006)

EVIDENTIALITY

Claims or points of view in argument are more plausible when speakers present some evidence or proof for their knowledge or opinions. This may happen by references to authority figures or institutions, or by various forms of evidentiality: How or where did they get the information. (Van Dijk, 2006)

EXAMPLE/ILLUSTRATION

A powerful move in argumentation is to give concrete examples, often in the form of a vignette or short story, illustrating or making more plausible a general point defended by the speaker. Concrete stories are usually better memorized than abstract arguments, and have more emotional impact, so they are argumentatively more persuasive. (Van Dijk, 2006)

GENERALIZATION	Instead of providing concrete stories, speakers may also make generalizations, in political discourse typically used to formulate prejudices about generalized negative characteristics of the out-group. (Van Dijk, 2006)
HYPERBOLE	Hyperbole is a semantic rhetorical device, which consists of exaggerating events for the enhancement of meaning. (Van Dijk, 2006)
IRONY	It is a well-known literary device, irony can be employed to convey a powerful feeling or make an important point. It is the use of humor to express a non-literal meaning.
METAPHOR	It is a semantic-rhetorical figure used by politicians in their speeches, which is of the best use for persuasion and emphasis.
NATIONAL GLORIFICATION	A form of positive self-representation, which may be implemented by various forms of national or self-glorification, which consists of positive references to or praise for one's own country, its principles, history, and traditions. (Van Dijk, 2006)

Table 01: Elements of Van Dijk's Framework.

2. Research Questions:

This study attempts to answer the following questions:

- RQ1: What are the main discursive strategies used by Ardern in her speeches?
- RQ2: How are these language strategies intended to shape the public's perception of her?
- RQ3: How does Ardern use language to influence her audience?

3. Data Collection Procedures:

The data used to conduct this study is a speech sample delivered by the former Prime Minister of New Zealand Jacinda Ardern at the 2022 Harvard graduation ceremony. The data is a video collected from Harvard university YouTube channel as well as a transcription of her speech collected from the official website of the New Zealand Government called Beehive.govt.nz published on May 27th 2022. The speech sample was chosen after an internet research about the latest speeches delivered by the former PM Ardern since the latter is one of most influential political figures in the world.

4. Data Analysis Procedures:

The corpus is analyzed to draw out the political strategies embedded in our speech sample. The first step into this procedure is to thoroughly understand and breaking down the speech by using both text and video part by part in order to assess whether the aforementioned elements can be found in the speech, and this would answer our first research question. The next step is to answer our second research question which consists of identifying the strategies employed as well as to highlight each and every extract from the speech where those strategies found are employed. The

following and final step is to show how these strategies helped to achieve the success of Arden's speech and how did it contribute in shaping the public perception of her and influence her audience of young minds.

CONCLUSION:

This chapter presents the research methodology design followed to conduct this study, which is a qualitative approach developed by Teun Van Dijk, in addition to the research questions that this study will attempt to answer, as well as the procedures followed to collect and analyze our data.

CHAPTER THREE:

RESULTS ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

INTRODUCTION:

The present chapter is the practical part of our research, which shall include first an overview of our speech followed by a thorough analysis of our speech sample in addition to a discussion of the findings. With the application of Van Dijk's model, the first step involves uncovering every possible strategy employed in the speech delivered by the former PM Jacinda Ardern at the Harvard 2022 graduation ceremony, as well as discussing those findings to determine how well the strategies are used to influence an audience.

1. An Overview of The Speech:

On May 27th, 2022 the former Prime Minister of New Zealand Jacinda Ardern delivered a rousing speech in Harvard University where she addressed democracy which she described as 'fragile'. The Prime Minister received a standing ovation for highlighting the nation's recent notable achievements. In addition, she urged on tech companies to reduce the risks associated with internet use in light of the dangers posed by disinformation and the use of mainstream media. Ardern begins her speech by speaking in a native New Zealand language, the PM also told stories and anecdotes of her experiences from her upbringing in a rural area to her rise to power. The PM finished her address to her audience of a thousand students with a call to treat their differences with kindness and empathy.

2. Discursive Strategies Employed in the Speech:

Upon conducting an extensive reading of the speech sample, it has been observed that a number of discursive strategies are employed by the speaker. The subsequent table will demonstrate and analyze these strategies.

Strategies	Examples
Positive self-description:	<p>“In the past ten years we have passed laws that include everything from the introduction of gay marriage and the banning of conversion therapy, right through to embedding a 1.5 degree climate change target into law, banning military style semi-automatics and assault rifles, and the decriminalization of abortion.”</p> <p>We have a Mixed Member Proportional system, which essentially means every vote counts, and it’s ensured our parliament better reflects our communities. Almost 50 percent of our parliament are women, 20 percent are Māori, the indigenous people of New Zealand, and our Deputy Prime Minister is a proud gay man and sits amongst several other rainbow parliamentarians.</p>
National Glorification:	<p>E oku manukura, nga pou haemata o te ngahere.</p> <p>E Piko o Te Mahuri, tera te tipu o te rakau.</p> <p>E tipu, e rea, ka puta, ka ora.</p>

	<p>Tena koutou katoa.</p> <p>President Bacow, Provost Garber, Governing Boards and deans, and most importantly, graduates. In Te Reo Māori, the language of the indigenous people of New Zealand, I paid tribute to all of the esteemed guests who stand here in this great forest of knowledge. It is a privilege to be here, and I thank you for the honour.</p> <p>I am used to walking into a room in New Zealand and knowing at least someone. It is one of the beautiful and comforting aspects of living in a small country. And while this moment feels incredibly daunting to me right now, I do take comfort knowing there are around 30 New Zealanders studying here, and statistically at least one of them will be my cousin.</p>
<p>Repetition:</p>	<p>“Democracy”, “Disinformation”, “Debate”, “Argue”, “Social Media”, etc.</p>

Authority:	<p>In June 1989 the Prime Minister of Pakistan stood on this spot and delivered the commencement address: titled “Democratic nations must unite.” She spoke about her journey, the importance of citizenry, representative government, human rights, and democracy. I met Benazir Bhutto in Geneva in June of 2007. We both attended a conference that drew together progressive parties from around the world. Just seven months later she was assassinated. There will be opinions and differing perspectives written about all of us as political leaders. Two things that history will not contest about Benazir Bhutto. She was the first Muslim female Prime Minister elected in an Islamic country, when a woman in power was a rare thing. She was also the first to give birth in office.</p>
	<p>The path she carved as a woman feels as relevant today as it was decades ago, and so too is the message she shared here. In this place. She said part way through her speech in 1989 the following: “We must realize that democracy... can be fragile.”</p>

	<p>Recently I had the privilege of joining ex German Chancellor, Angela Merkel on a panel. I have long been in awe of her leadership, not least for her endurance. She was in power for 16 years. I once asked her how she managed it, her response was “things have changed a lot.” In the panel discussion, she reflected on some of that change, by commenting that: “In the old days we had certain events that happened within our societies, and television reported it, and the next day everyone talked about it.” .Today, even that simple act has changed.</p>
	<p>Thomas Rid argues that the modern era of disinformation began in the early 1920s “during the Great Depression, in an era of journalism transformed by radio, newly cut throat and fast paced” and that what has followed since has come in waves, including in mid-2010, “with disinformation reborn and reshaped by new technologies and internet culture.”</p> <p>Others point to the acceleration of the information and disinformation flow that comes with each new technology that enables mass duplication and distribution – from photocopiers to cassette tapes. The only thing that has changed perhaps, is speed.”</p>
<p>Pronouns:</p>	<p>“...I paid tribute to all of the esteemed guests...”</p> <p>“...I do take comfort knowing there are around 30 New Zealanders studying here...”</p>

“I read those words as I sat in my office in Wellington, New Zealand...”

“Where I come from, we have a parliamentary representative democracy...”

“Now I am not an academic. I acknowledge... Rather, I am a politician from Morrinsville...”

“...small rural town of 5000 people where I spent most of my formative years...I lived in that important space that sits between difference and division.”

“I remember the first person in my school who had access to the internet...”

“I was raised a Mormon in a town where the dominant religions were Catholic... I was a woman interested in politics...”

“I met Benazir Bhutto in Geneva in June of 2007...”

“I had the privilege of joining ex German Chancellor... I have long been in awe of her leadership... I once asked her..”

“...we have a parliamentary representative democracy...”

“We have a Mixed Member Proportional system...”

“...we have passed laws that include...”

“...we have also seen the opposite...”

“...how **we** strengthen our democracies...”

“...if **we** don’t act to firm up their foundations.”

“...If **we** don’t find once again our ability to argue...”

“If **we** don’t find a way to ensure difference...”

“...**we** felt a sense of responsibility. **We** knew **we** needed significant gun reform”

“...**we** need to learn to analyze and critique information...”

“The impact that **we** each have as individuals.”

“...The very things **we** teach our children, but then view as weakness in our leaders.”

“The issues **we** navigate as a society will only intensify... But **we** have it within us to ensure that this doesn’t mean **we** fracture.”

“**We** are the richer for our difference, and poorer for our division.”

“...perspectives written about all of **us** as political leaders...”

“...a crevice between **us** becomes so deep that no one dares cross to the other side.”

“...to gather with people like **us** and avoid the dreaded sense of cognitive dissonance.”

“That algorithmic processes make choices and decisions for **us** ...”

“Our history shows **us** the importance of this...”

“...we have it within **us** to ensure that this doesn't mean we fracture.”

“...– let **us** reclaim the space in between.”

“...find once again **our** ability to argue **our** corners...”

“... We logged on in **our** billions... We published **our** thoughts...”

“...celebrate **our** difference...”

“...reinforce **our** own views...”

“... Our willingness to recognize **our** own preconceived ideas.”

“...we uphold **our** basic sense of humanity...”

“...events that happened within **our** societies...”

“...**our** ability to assess facts on their merits...”

“...**our** young people are universally learning about their past... what is important here is not just what **our** young people learn...”

“Teaching **our** kids to deal with disinformation...”

“...the comfort of **our** tribes will be magnified...”

“We are the richer for **our** difference, and poorer for **our** division.”

“...**you** stop debating ideas and **you** start debating conspiracy...”

“...but whether **you** can call it information at all...”

	<p>“...you have those who will argue that the current problems of disinformation are not the result of algorithms...”</p> <p>“You are, and will always be surrounded by bias. You will continue to be exposed to disinformation”</p> <p>“How you choose to engage with information...how you choose to address being baited, or hated – it all matters.”</p> <p>“...the impact of simple steps that are right in front of you.”</p>
Counterfactuals:	<p>“Now I will admit to some trepidation entering a discussion on how we strengthen our democracies when this issue is so easily and wrongly distorted into being opposed to free speech. But that fear is overshadowed by a greater fear of what will happen to our democracies, if we don’t act to firm up their foundations.”</p> <p>“If we don’t find once again our ability to argue our corners, yes with the passion and fire that conviction brings, but without the vitriol, hate and violence.”</p> <p>“If we don’t find a way to ensure difference, that space where perspectives, experiences and debate give rise to understanding and compromise, doesn’t instead become division – the place of entrenchment, where dialogue departs, solutions shatter, and a crevice between us becomes so deep that no one dares cross to the other side</p>

Evidentiality:	“But as Rid concludes, either way, “the stakes are enormous – for disinformation corrodes the foundation of liberal democracy, our ability to assess facts on their merits, and to self-correct accordingly.”
Irony:	<p>“There are some moments in life that make the world feel small and connected, this is not one of them.”</p> <p>“I do take comfort knowing there are around 30 New Zealanders studying here, and statistically at least one of them will be my cousin.”</p> <p>“I am a politician from Morrinsville. As a point of geographic reference, it’s right next to Hobbiton. I’m not actually joking.”</p> <p>“I was raised a Mormon in a town where the dominant religions were Catholic, Anglican and Rugby”.</p>

Table 02: Discursive strategies illustration.

3. Discussion of the Findings:

After displaying and illustrating the discursive strategies found in our speech sample, a thorough analysis and explanation of these strategies will be presented subsequently.

3.1. Positive self-representation:

Politicians tend to positively describe their in-group and emphasize their qualities. After a thorough reading of the previous Prime Minister Jacinda Ardern’s speech, a frequent use of the positive self representation can be noticed. She praised the nation’s progress and the achievements during her time in the office, which she received a standing ovation for. In addition, the ex PM

gave a favorable account of their Proportional system and highlighted the wide diversity of people in their parliament that she claimed it reflects their community, she stated that half of the parliament are women, 20% are native people and it also includes homosexuals.

3.2. National/Self Glorification:

This strategy is a form of positive self-representation, which consists of positive references to or praise for one's own country, its principles, history, and traditions. In this sense, the ex PM Ardern delivered her speech wearing a traditional New Zealand clothing and opened it by speaking in the New Zealand native language "Te Reo Māori" by which she paid a tribute to all the guests of the knowledge ceremony, the 'then' prime minister also described her presence there as a privilege. The passage in Māori translates to: My dears, The Haemata pillars of the forest. The way in which the young sapling is nurtured, determines how the tree will grow. It grows, reproduces, emerges, and lives. Hello everyone.

Furthermore, the former PM Ardern described being from a small country as beautiful and comforting, which makes the New Zealanders connected at some point. She described the moment of being on stage in front of a big audience as 'incredibly daunting', but she took comfort in knowing that there are at least 30 New Zealanders among the audience and assumed that statistically at least one of them is her cousin.

Jacinda Ardern listed the accomplishments that the nation has achieved during her term in office, which can alternatively be regarded as self- or national glorification (see excerpts number one and two). In addition, ex-PM Ardern glorified her personal accomplishment and highlighted the fact that she is only the second female leader to give birth in the office which she received a massive applause. She stated: "The second and only other leader to have given birth in office almost

30 years later, was me. My daughter, Neve Te Aroha Ardern Gayford, was born on the 21st of June 2018.

3.3. Repetition:

This strategy is also evident throughout our entire discourse. The former PM frequently utilized certain words such as ‘democracy’, ‘information’, ‘disinformation’ and ‘social media’, etc. this move is considered as powerful since it is used to emphasize on ideas and draw attention to a certain issue. The frequent repetitions employed by the former PM will be illustrated in the following table:

WORDS	REPETITIONS
Democracy/democratic	13
Differences/different	12
Information	10
Disinformation	10
Political leader	4
Debate/debating	8
Change/changed	13
Connect/Connected/Connection	7
Issues	5
Mainstream Media	3
Argue	6
History	7
Politics/political	5

Division	4
Social Media	8
Violence/Violent	3
Dialogue	4
Society/Societies	5

Table 03: Frequency of repetitions.

In addition, the former PM Ardern utilized the same sentence opening the closing her statement. “There are some things in life that make the world feel small and connected.” Is what the previous New Zealand leader chose to start and conclude her inspiring speech.

3.4. Authority:

Politicians often appeal to authority in order to bolster their arguments and views. In most cases the authorities mentioned are other politicians and experts who are generally recognized as moral leaders and who are known for their good reputation. Accordingly, the previous Prime Minister began her address by praising a female leader she admires. Benazir Bhutto, the former prime minister of Pakistan and the first Muslim woman to hold a position of power in a Muslim country and the first to woman to give birth in office. Ardern was also inspired by the commencement speech that Bhutto delivered in 1989 in which she described democracy as ‘fragile’.

Additionally, Jacinda Ardern brought up another powerful female leader she looks up to and is inspired by. While speaking about mainstream media and its inconveniences, she recalled meeting former German Chancellor, Angela Merkel at a discussion panel and expressed her

admiration for her. Ardern also quoted Merkel's statement which was about how television used to report every social event and get people to talk about it, but now media evolved and things has changed.

Continuing to discuss the danger of disinformation in social media, Jacinda Ardern relied on arguments of the political scientist Thomas Rid. The latter is a German scholar who has gained prominence for his research on the historical evolution and potential risks associated with information technology. Rid argued that disinformation has existed since ancient times, predating the advent of modern technology and the emergence of mainstream media, Ardern cited the political scientist's assertion that disinformation weakens liberal democracy and hinders individuals' capacity to evaluate facts and truths.

According to Ardern, societal exposure to bias and disinformation is an enduring phenomenon that will probably worsen over time, and that's why constitution was adopted. She cited the founding father of the United States Benjamin Franklin reply to what had been created which was: "A republic, in you can keep it." Which is shown in the following passage: "And perhaps that is why, when your own constitution was adopted, Benjamin Franklin was asked what had been created and replied "A republic, if you can keep it."

3.5. Pronouns:

The choice of pronouns in a political speech is affected by the relationship between the speaker and the listener. Addressing someone in the same way as they would address you shows solidarity and equality. (Brown & Gilman, 1960). Pronouns such as: 'I' and 'we' frequently appear in political speeches as a way to demonstrate solidarity, group identity, and a sense of shared purpose... and to demonstrate one's qualities and abilities. One pronoun shift that is common in

political discourse is the alternation between 'I' and 'we'. This reflects the politician's moving between his/her identity as an individual and his/her identity as a member of a group. The analysis of our speech sample reveals a consistent use of the first-person pronouns 'I' and 'We' by Prime Minister Ardern. This pattern is evident throughout the entirety of the discourse, as exemplified in the aforementioned excerpts.

3.5.1. Ardern's Use of the Pronoun 'I':

The constant use of 'I' in a speech establishes a connection with the audience, as it creates a sense of personal involvement and connection. 'I' is also used to demonstrate a sense of dedication towards the audience and an individual's active engagement in important issues. Ardern's usage of the pronoun 'I' can be noticed throughout our whole speech sample. Jacinda Ardern employed personal pronouns, specifically the first-person singular pronoun 'I', in a repetitive manner to narrate personal anecdotes related to her upbringing and origins. The politician employs a rhetorical strategy of repeatedly referencing her origins from a small town in New Zealand. This tactic serves to establish a sense of affiliation with her audience and to foster an impression of her as being a credible and reliable figure. The primary purpose of utilizing the first person singular pronoun 'I' in political speeches is to convey a sense of immediacy, implying that the speaker is in the present moment. Furthermore, the prime minister also used the pronoun 'I' to recount personal anecdotes about encountering two strong female political leaders, which she admires and is inspired from. Ardern used this move to show similarities between her and the previous Pakistani Prime Minister Benazir Bhutto, both of whom are the sole female leaders to have given birth while a leader of a country. The PM also shows enormous respect and admiration for the previous German Chancellor Angela Merkel.

The PM used the pronoun 'I' also to confidently express her own arguments, opinions and perspectives. She strongly stated that she is optimistic that the nation and its people are capable of making a positive change in the times ahead. The most motivating reasons for a politician to use the pronoun I in the speech is to be seen as good and responsible, to describe himself/herself in a positive way and highlight personal qualities. Examples of personal qualities that politicians want to express include being someone with principles, moral, power and who is not afraid to take action when necessary. (Bramley, 2001)

3.5.2. Ardern's Use of the Pronoun 'We':

As for the usage of plural personal pronoun "we", the researches show that it can be used by the politician if he or she wishes to share the responsibility, to give a sense of collectivity, and also to create involvement with the audience (Bramley, 2001). Jacinda Ardern employed the pronoun 'we' several times during her address, which is demonstrated in the table above.

Ardern proudly stated a number of the country's accomplishments using the pronoun 'we', which demonstrate that those achievements are a result of a team work, thereby underscoring the collaborative nature of these achievements. This strategy fosters a sense of national pride among her people, and it also engenders admiration among her audience of international backgrounds. Additionally, Jacinda Ardern constantly employed the pronoun 'we' to denote herself and her people as a one community. In order to cultivate a sense of affiliation and intimacy among her listeners, she employed the phrases 'we as humans' and 'we as individuals' on multiple occasions. Below are the passages that illustrate Ardern's use of this strategy.

3.5.3. Ardern's Use of the Pronouns 'us' & 'our':

The first person plural pronouns 'our' and 'us' are used in a similar way to 'we', which is to shorten the distance between the speaker and the audience. Both the speaker and the listener are often found in the same arena, and thus make the audience feel close to the speaker. The frequent use of the pronoun 'us' is exemplified previously.

Ardern employed the object pronoun 'us' on multiple occasions to denote her inclusion as both one of the political leaders and a member of the public as a whole. This strategy depicts the politician as seeking to reduce the differences between themselves and their audience, thereby cultivating a sense of confidence and reliance among the listeners. The possessive pronoun 'our' also appears frequently in our speech sample. Ardern used the possessive pronoun 'our' with a similar intention as using the pronouns 'we' and 'us'. The politician repeatedly referred to the younger generation as 'our young people', 'our kids' and 'our children' in order to convey the notion that it is a collective responsibility to make a change and educate the younger generation on how to tackle the issue of disinformation.

3.5.4. Ardern's Use of the Pronoun 'you':

Regarding the utilization of the pronoun "you," it is employed by the speaker to direct their communication towards a particular group or the entirety of the audience. The plural form of the second-person pronoun 'you' is utilized in a generic context, wherein it encompasses all individuals. In political discourse, the use of "you" is often intended to address the entire electorate. Most importantly, "you" serves to enhance the persuasive impact of the argument presented.

Towards the concluding segment of her address, the previous Prime Minister repeatedly used the pronoun 'you' as a way to warn her audience in general and the New Zealanders amongst

the audience in particular from the danger of disinformation as well as urging them to make a change and to treat their differences and diversity with kindness. Ardern's utilization of the plural form of the pronoun 'you' is a deliberate strategy aimed at fostering a sense of responsibility within her audience regarding their social media use and how they engage with information online, which has a great impact in causing disinformation. Thus, she calls on her audience to undertake the small steps that can lead to a significant change.

The following table will illustrate the frequency of occurrences of the pronouns 'I' and 'we' along with 'us/our' and 'you':

The Pronoun	Frequency
“I”	37
‘WE’	62
‘US’	7
‘OUR’	27
‘YOU’	15

Table 04: Frequency of pronouns.

3.6. Counterfactuals:

This strategy is widely prevalent in political speech, wherein the speaker endeavors to caution the listeners regarding potential occurrences that may take place in the absence of specific actions. Ardern employed this strategy towards the beginning of her address while speaking about the issue the ‘fragile’ democracy, she warned her listeners about the potential negative outcomes that may arise if they fail to strengthen their democratic system, and if they are unable to engage in constructive discourse empty of hate and aggression.

Moreover, Ardern emphasized the significance of embracing diversity to prevent societal fragmentation. The speaker cautioned that failure to comprehend and value different perspectives and viewpoints among individuals may result in societal division discord, and lack of cohesion.

3.7. Evidentiality:

The credibility of arguments or perspectives is enhanced when speakers provide substantiating evidence or proof for their assertions or viewpoints. This strategy may occur through the utilization of references to authoritative individuals or institutions, or through the implementation of diverse forms of evidentiality, to show the source of the information and how was it obtained. Ardern employed this strategy when discussing the phenomena of disinformation, drawing upon the political scientist’s Thomas Rid arguments who asserted that the issue of disinformation is not recent, but emerged years and years ago. She said: “what we are in the middle of isn’t really new.” Likewise, Thomas Rid argued that the era of disinformation began in the early 1920s, she quoted him: “during the Great Depression, in an era of journalism transformed by radio, newly cut throat and fast paced modern internet culture has reconfigured this phenomenon, in Rid’s words: “with disinformation reborn and reshaped by new technologies and internet culture.”

Ardern also concludes this arguments in Thomas Rid words, she quoted him: “But as Rid concludes, either way, “the stakes are enormous – for disinformation corrodes the foundation of liberal democracy, our ability to assess facts on their merits, and to self-correct accordingly.”

3.8. Irony:

Irony and politics have much in common, they both pursue similar aims. Both politics and irony strive to convey the communicative intention of the author, i.e. to create the necessary effect. Ardern embedded humor in her speech on several occasion, in fact, she opened her speech by making the audience giggle. She also joked about the small popularity of her country, she said: “, I do take comfort knowing there are around 30 New Zealanders studying here, and statistically at least one of them will be my cousin.” Moreover, Ardern joked about not being an academic despite wearing a robe: “Now I am not an academic. I acknowledge, the robes on this occasion aren’t exactly truth in advertising.” The speaker ironically referenced her hometown’s location by mentioning the town next to it, referencing to how small her hometown is. She also joked about rugby being as important as their religion, she said: “I was raised a Mormon in a town where the dominant religions were Catholic, Anglican and Rugby”. Ardern used this strategy in order to make her people feel connected to their country leader, knowing that she comes from a small town and a middle class family as well.

The identification of irony and its correct interpretation ensure comfortable atmosphere and optimizes interpersonal relations between interlocutors. Irony has an evaluative edge and manages to provoke emotional responses. Irony, used in political discourse, leads to active thinking while interpreting it. When used skillfully, irony is an efficient tool to persuade and manipulate, it disguises meanings, accentuates certain features and forms public opinion. (Gornostaeva, 2019)

CONCLUSION:

The final chapter of this work included a brief overview of our speech sample followed by a thorough analysis of it. The process of the analysis revealed every discursive strategy employed in the speech, which were well explained and illustrated with passages extracted from the speech.

GENERAL CONCLUSION

Political speeches are among political texts that are written to persuade, affect and change public opinions (Irvine et al., 2009). In order to achieve the success of influencing the public opinion, several language strategies are employed. Our research investigated the use of these strategies in a political speech delivered by a former female political leader. The main objective of this investigation is to identify the discursive strategies employed in our speech sample and to thoroughly explain each strategy.

The study relies on Teun Van Dijk (1991, 1995; 2006) frameworks of analysis to uncover the strategies used by the former Prime Minister of New Zealand Jacinda Ardern in her 2022 Harvard commencement speech and to fully analyze them. Given the absence of similar studies conducted on our speech sample, this study represents a modest addition to the broad field of Critical Discourse Analysis.

As far as the first research question is concerned, our investigation found an extensive use of discursive strategies. Ardern mainly used Positive Self-representation and national glorification to describe and refer to her nation in positive words, in addition to the strategy of Repetition, which is used to emphasize certain ideas, Ardern also repeatedly used Personal Pronouns, as well as the strategy of Authority, by which she mentioned authoritative figures whom she looks up to.

Furthermore, regarding the second research question, it can be observed that Ardern's utilization of authority and reference to two prominent female leaders, coupled with her expression of admiration towards them, is intended to shape her public image as an inspiring, feminist and a supportive female political figure, particularly influential for her young female audience. As for the repeated use of the plural personal pronoun 'we', this strategy contributes in portraying Ardern

as a humble collaborative country leader. Ardern's use of all the strategies mentioned previously is intended to shape her public image as an ethical, persuasive, outgoing, and a confident country leader, and most importantly a sharp communicator politician.

Moreover, concerning the third research question, in order to influence her audience using language, Ardern utilized specific political strategies. For instance, the speaker used repetition in order to highlight the issues she wants her audience to be interested in. another strategy that made her audience of young minds more interested and connected with her is the use of humor. Ardern addressed the issue of disinformation specifically to her young audience since people of their age range are the most active in mainstream and social media and are the most influenced by it.

Finally, our research is limited to the transcription of Jacinda Ardern's speech at the 371st Harvard University commencement as the corpus of the study, as well as Van Dijk's (1991, 19995; 2006) model as the methodology used in the study only. Therefore the results and conclusions of this study are limited to what is analyzed in the selected speech only and by relying on Van Dijk's model only. Further studies can be conducted by other researchers on the speech sample we studied, we suggest analyzing feminist speech in Jacinda Ardern's address.

References

Alavidze, M. (2016). The use of pronouns in political discourse. *International Journal of Arts & Sciences*, 9(4).

From: <https://search.proquest.com/openview/e4dbd6f038623ef85635399774a08f93/1?pq-origsite=gscholar&cbl=626342>

Arden, J. (2022). Harvard Commencement Speech - Democracy, disinformation and kindness.

From: <https://www.beehive.govt.nz/speech/harvard-commencement-speech-democracy-disinformation-and-kindness>

Awawdeh, N.A. (2021). *A Critical Discourse Analysis of President Trump's Speeches during the Coronavirus Pandemic Crisis*. (M.A dissertation, Middle East University, Jordan)

Bramley, N. R. (2001). *Pronouns of Politics: the use of pronouns in the construction of 'self' and 'other' in political interviews*. (Doctoral thesis, Australian National University). Retrieved

from: <https://openresearch-repository.anu.edu.au/handle/1885/46225>

Brown, R., & Gilman, A. (1960). The pronouns of power and solidarity. *Style in language*, (pp.252-281). From:

<https://www.degruyter.com/document/doi/10.1515/9783110805376/pdf#page=258>

Bukhtiar, H. et al. (2020). "Nobody's Free until Everybody's Free": A Critical Discourse Analysis of Obama's COVID-19 Speech. *Orient Research Journal of Social Sciences*.

5(2). (pp.88-100)

Chilton, P. & Schaffner, C. (1997). Discourse and Politics. In T. A Van Dijk (Ed), *Discourse as Social Interaction*. (pp. 206-230). London: SAGE

- Fairclough, I., & Fairclough, N. (2013). *Political discourse analysis: A method for advanced students*. Routledge.
- Fairclough, N. (1992). *Discourse and social change*. UK: Policy Press
- Gornostaeva, A. (2019). Irony and communicative values in political discourse: Intercultural and interpersonal communication. *International Journal for Cross-Disciplinary Subjects in Education*, 10(4). From: <https://infonomics-society.org/wp-content/uploads/Irony-and-Communicative-Values-in-Political-Discourse.pdf>
- Hamilton, H. E., Tannen, D., & Schiffrin, D. (2015). *The handbook of discourse analysis*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Jaradat, M. (2022). Persuasion Strategies Employed by Bill Clinton and Barack Obama in their Presidential Nomination Speeches in 1992 and 2008: A Comparative Study. *The Jordanian Association for Educational Sciences, Jordanian Education Journal*, 7(1).
- Jaradat, M. (2022). Rhetorical Strategies Employed in the 2007 Speech of King Abdullah II before the US Congress. *International Journal of Liberal Arts and Social Science*. 10(2)
- Jensen, I., Jakobsen, I. K., & Pichler, L. H. (2016). *A critical discourse study of Hillary Clinton's 2015/2016 presidential campaign discourses*. (M.A. Dissertation, Alborg University, Denmark).
- Kadim, E. N. (2022). A critical discourse analysis of Trump's election campaign speeches. *Heliyon*, 8(4).

- Kadim, E.N. (2023). A Critical Discourse Analysis of Vladimir Putin's Speech Announcing 'Special Military Operation' in Ukraine. *International Journal of Humanities and Educational Research*. 5(1).
- Kolmogorova, A. V., & Gornostaeva, Y. A. (2019). Media coverage of current political situation in Ukraine: Discourse analysis. *Journal of the Siberian Federal University. Humanitarian sciences*.12 (1), 89-96. doi: 10.17516/1997-1370-0031
- Meyer, M. (2001). Between theory, method, and politics: positioning of the approaches to CDA Michael Meyer. *Methods of critical discourse analysis*. (113) 14.
- Salahshour, N. (2017). *Representation of immigrants in New Zealand print media: A critical discourse analysis*. (Doctoral thesis, Victoria University, New Zealand).
- Sherwani, K.A. (2011). *A Critical Discourse Analysis of English Broadcast Political Speeches*. (Doctoral thesis, Salahaddin University, Iraq).
- Shousha, A. I. (2010). *A critical discourse analysis of the image of Arabs in the American press*. (Doctoral thesis, Alexandria University, Egypt). Retrieved from <https://awej.org/>
- Sipra, M., & Rashid, A. (2013). Critical discourse analysis of Martin Luther King's speech in socio-political perspective. *Advances in Language and Literary Studies*. 4 (1).
- Sud, K. (2014). *Discourse analysis* (Doctoral dissertation, Department of Sociology, University of Mumbai). Retrieved from: https://www.academia.edu/7862472/Discourse_Analysis
- University of Waikato. Jacinda Ardern. Prime Minister of New Zealand. From: <https://www.waikato.ac.nz/study/success-stories/jacinda-ardern>

Van Dijk, T.A. (2005). Politics, Ideology and Discourse. In R. Wodak (Ed.). *In Encyclopedia of Language & Linguistics*. Volume on Politics and Language Elsevier Ltd.

Van Dijk, T.A., (1995). Discourse analysis as ideology analysis. In: Schaffner, C., Wenden, A. (Eds.), *Language and Peace*. Dartmouth Publishing, Aldershot.

Wodak, R. & Michael, M. (2001). *Methods of critical discourse analysis*. London: Sage.

Yule, G. (1985). *The study of language*. Cambridge university press.

Yule, G., 2010. *The Study of Language*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Appendix A:

The former Prime Minister of New Zealand Jacinda Ardern's Harvard Commencement Speech.

May 27th, 2022

E oku manukura, nga pou haemata o te ngahere.

e Piko o Te Mahuri, tera te tipu o te rakau.

E tipu, e rea, ka puta, ka ora.

Tena koutou katoa.

President Bacow,

Provost Garber,

Governing Boards and deans,

And most importantly, graduates.

In Te Reo Māori, the language of the indigenous people of New Zealand, I paid tribute to all of the esteemed guests who stand here in this great forest of knowledge. It is a privilege to be here, and I thank you for the honour.

There are some moments in life that make the world feel small and connected.

This is not one of them.

I am used to walking into a room in New Zealand and knowing at least someone. It is one of the beautiful and comforting aspects of living in a small country.

And while this moment feels incredibly daunting to me right now, I do take comfort knowing there are around 30 New Zealanders studying here, and statistically at least one of them will be my cousin.

But then there are some moments that serve to remind you, that despite distance, despite vastly different histories and experiences, there are many things that connect us.

In June 1989 the Prime Minister of Pakistan stood on this spot and delivered the commencement address: titled “Democratic nations must unite.”

She spoke about her journey, the importance of citizenry, representative government, human rights, and democracy.

I met Benazir Bhutto in Geneva in June of 2007. We both attended a conference that drew together progressive parties from around the world. Just seven months later she was assassinated.

There will be opinions and differing perspectives written about all of us as political leaders. Two things that history will not contest about Benazir Bhutto. She was the first Muslim female Prime Minister elected in an Islamic country, when a woman in power was a rare thing. She was also the first to give birth in office.

The second and only other leader to have given birth in office almost 30 years later, was me.

My daughter, Neve Te Aroha Ardern Gayford, was born on the 21st of June 2018.

Benazir Bhutto’s birthday.

The path she carved as a woman feels as relevant today as it was decades ago, and so too is the message she shared here. In this place.

She said part way through her speech in 1989 the following:

“We must realise that democracy... can be fragile.”

I read those words as I sat in my office in Wellington, New Zealand. A world away from Pakistan.

And while the reasons that gave rise for her words then were vastly different, they still ring true.

Democracy can be fragile.

This imperfect but precious way that we organise ourselves, that has been created to give equal voice to the weak and to the strong, that is designed to help drive consensus – it is fragile.

For years it feels as though we have assumed that the fragility of democracy was determined by duration. That somehow the strength of your democracy was like a marriage – the longer you’d been in it, the more likely it was to stick.

But that takes so much for granted.

It ignores the fact that the foundation of a strong democracy includes trust in institutions, experts and government – and that this can be built up over decades but torn down in mere years.

It ignores that a strong democracy relies on debate and dialogue, and that even the oldest regimes can seek to control these forums, and the youngest can seek to liberate them.

It ignores what happens, when regardless of how long your democracy has been tried and tested – when facts are turned into fiction, and fiction turned into fact, you stop debating ideas and you start debating conspiracy.

It ignores the reality of what we are now being confronted by every single day.

Where I come from, we have a parliamentary representative democracy. Without giving you a litany of fun facts on New Zealand you’re unlikely to need again – here’s the brief version.

We have a Mixed Member Proportional system, which essentially means every vote counts, and it's ensured our parliament better reflects our communities. Almost 50 percent of our parliament are women, 20 percent are Māori, the indigenous people of New Zealand, and our Deputy Prime Minister is a proud gay man and sits amongst several other rainbow parliamentarians.

In the past ten years we have passed laws that include everything from the introduction of gay marriage and the banning of conversion therapy, right through to embedding a 1.5 degree climate change target into law, banning military style semi-automatics and assault rifles, and the decriminalisation of abortion.

These are significant issues, and they have not been without debate and difference. But they are all examples of where we have navigated times of deep change, without, for the most part, leaving deep rifts.

But we have also seen the opposite. Whether it's democratic elections that erupt into violence, or the COVID crisis exposing mistrust of experts, institutions and governments – western democracies are seeing it and experiencing examples and New Zealand is no different.

Now I will admit to some trepidation entering a discussion on how we strengthen our democracies when this issue is so easily and wrongly distorted into being opposed to free speech. But that fear is overshadowed by a greater fear of what will happen to our democracies, if we don't act to firm up their foundations.

If we don't find once again our ability to argue our corners, yes with the passion and fire that conviction brings, but without the vitriol, hate and violence.

If we don't find a way to ensure difference, that space where perspectives, experiences and debate give rise to understanding and compromise, doesn't instead become division – the place of

entrenchment, where dialogue departs, solutions shatter, and a crevice between us becomes so deep that no one dares cross to the other side.

We are at a precipice, and rather than ask what caused it, today I want to talk about how we address it.

Now I am not an academic. I acknowledge, the robes on this occasion aren't exactly truth in advertising. Rather, I am a politician from Morrinsville. As a point of geographic reference, it's right next to Hobbiton. I'm not actually joking.

But in that small rural town of 5000 people where I spent most of my formative years and will forever love for what it gave me, I lived in that important space that sits between difference and division.

I was raised a Mormon in a town where the dominant religions were Catholic, Anglican and Rugby. I was a woman interested in politics, left wing politics, in a region that had never in its entire democratic history, elected anyone other than a conservative candidate.

These differences were a part of my identity, but never a source of isolation.

But I am old. And unquestionably, things have changed.

In fact, mine is the generation that sat on the cusp of the internet age.

I remember the first person in my school who had access to the internet. Her name was Fiona Lindsay and her father was the local accountant. After he had shut the office for the day, we would get the key and log onto his massive desktop computers, with screens so wide that the desks were tiered to fit the whole thing in.

It was the 1990s. The interface and even what you used the internet for in those days was different. For a time it was almost as if the directory for this vast landscape didn't exist. It was a modern ham radio. You would dial in, and talk to someone. Anyone. It was the spontaneity of connection that in some ways mirrored real life.

But as the opportunities to connect expanded, humans did what we have always done. We organised ourselves.

Social media platforms were born offering the promise of connection and reconnection. We logged on in our billions, forming tribes and sub tribes. We published our thoughts, feelings and ideas freely. We found a place to share information, facts, fiction dressed up as facts, memes, and more cat videos than you ever thought possible.

We found a place to experience new ways of thinking and to celebrate our difference.

But increasingly, we use it to do neither of those things.

I doubt anyone has ever created a group titled "political views I disagree with, but choose to enter into respectful dialogue with to better understand alternative perspectives."

As humans, we are naturally predisposed to reinforce our own views, to gather with people like us and avoid the dreaded sense of cognitive dissonance. We seek validation, confirmation, reinforcement. And increasingly with the help of algorithms, what we seek, we are served, sometimes before we even know we're looking.

Now I am not here to argue that social media is good, nor bad. It's a tool. And as with anything, it's the rules of the game and the way we engage with it that matters.

But social media matters a lot. And perhaps, much more than we thought.

On the 15th of March 2019, 51 people were killed in a terrorist attack on two mosques in Christchurch, New Zealand. The entire brutal act was live-streamed on social media. The royal commission that followed found that the terrorist responsible was radicalised online.

In the aftermath of New Zealand's experience, we felt a sense of responsibility. We knew we needed significant gun reform, and so that is what we did. But we also knew that if we wanted genuine solutions to the issue of violent extremism online, it would take government, civil society and the tech companies themselves to change the landscape. The result was the Christchurch Call to Action.

And while much has changed as a result, important things haven't.

The time has come for social media companies and other online providers to recognise their power and to act on it.

That means upholding their own basic terms of service.

That means recognising the role they play in constantly curating and shaping the online environments that we're in. That algorithmic processes make choices and decisions for us – what we see and where we are directed – and that at best this means the user experience is personalised and at worst it means it can be radicalised.

It means, that there is a pressing and urgent need for responsible algorithm development and deployment.

We have the forums for online providers and social media companies to work on these issues alongside civil society and governments. And we have every reason to do it.

Let's start with transparency in how algorithmic processes work and the outcomes they deliver. But let's finish with a shared approach to responsible algorithms – because the time has come.

But tech companies, they are only part of the answer.

What we do as individuals in these spaces matters too. Our willingness to recognise our own preconceived ideas. The level of critique we apply to what we engage with. And how we uphold our basic sense of humanity when interacting with others.

There's a term that gets thrown around a lot – keyboard warrior. It's used to refer to someone who makes aggressive or abusive posts online, often anonymously. I like the name. In my mind, when I read something especially horrific on my feed, I imagine it's written by a lone person unacquainted with personal hygiene practices, dressed in a poorly fitted super hero costume – one that is baggy in all the wrong places.

Keyboard warrior or not though, it's still something that has been written by a human, and it's something that has been read by one too.

I 'do' my own social media. I always have. After all, it has been described as the new 'town square'. But we all know that it's more than just news and information being shared these days.

Recently I had the privilege of joining ex German Chancellor, Angela Merkel on a panel. I have long been in awe of her leadership, not least for her endurance. She was in power for 16 years. I once asked her how she managed it, her response was "things have changed a lot." In the panel discussion, she reflected on some of that change, by commenting that: "In the old days we had certain events that happened within our societies, and television reported it, and the next day everyone talked about it."

Today, even that simple act has changed.

What we consider to be mainstream media outlets have proliferated but ownership structures have not.

Mainstream media have layers of accountabilities and journalistic expectations that others, who also present information to us, don't.

There is competition for advertising revenue with subscription services and paywalls, all to aid in the survival of the fittest – with fittest now defined by how easy it is to monetise your content.

And in amongst all of that, lies the fact that we're not just talking about how we access information to inform debate, but whether you can call it information at all.

There are those far more learned than I who will argue where the source of the scourge of disinformation lies.

Within your own campus, you have those who will argue that the current problems of disinformation are not the result of algorithms or trolls, but of “asymmetric media structures decades in the making.”

I am not here to argue either way. Because at its heart, what we are in the middle of isn't really new.

Thomas Rid argues that the modern era of disinformation began in the early 1920s “during the Great Depression, in an era of journalism transformed by radio, newly cut throat and fast paced” and that what has followed since has come in waves, including in mid-2010, “with disinformation reborn and reshaped by new technologies and internet culture.”

Others point to the acceleration of the information and disinformation flow that comes with each new technology that enables mass duplication and distribution – from photocopiers to cassette tapes. The only thing that has changed perhaps, is speed.

But as Rid concludes, either way, “the stakes are enormous – for disinformation corrodes the foundation of liberal democracy, our ability to assess facts on their merits, and to self-correct accordingly.”

I accept the picture I am painting may seem overwhelming and insurmountable. But I am an optimist at heart. And while we cannot change everything about the environment we are in – we can change ourselves.

To build greater strength and resilience, in spite of the headwinds around us.

And I see examples of that every day.

Leah Bell and Waimarama Anderson were two young students from a public school in New Zealand called Otorohanga College. They couldn’t understand why every young New Zealander didn’t learn at school about New Zealand history including the New Zealand Wars, the conflict between British and colonial troops and Māori in the 19th century.

These two students pushed for change, presenting a petition to parliament. And they succeeded. Next year, for the first time, our young people are universally learning about their past, their culture, and their history.

But what is important here is not just what our young people learn, but how.

In a disinformation age, we need to learn to analyse and critique information. That doesn’t mean teaching ‘mistrust’, but rather as my old history teacher, Mr Fountain extolled: “to understand the

limitations of a single piece of information, and that there is always a range of perspectives on events and decisions.”

Our history shows us the importance of this. But so too does our present.

You are, and will always be surrounded by bias. You will continue to be exposed to disinformation.

And overtime, the ‘noise’ you are surrounded by will probably only get worse.

And perhaps that is why, when your own constitution was adopted, Benjamin Franklin was asked what had been created and replied “A republic, if you can keep it.”

If YOU can keep it.

Yes, diversity of voice in mainstream media matters. The responsibility of social media matters.

Teaching our kids to deal with disinformation and the role we play as leaders all matters.

But so do you.

How you choose to engage with information, deal with conflict, or confront debate, how you choose to address being baited, or hated – it all matters.

In the overwhelming challenges that lay in front of us, in our constant efforts to reach into the systems, the structures, the power, don’t overlook the impact of simple steps that are right in front of you.

The impact that we each have as individuals.

To make a choice to treat difference with empathy and kindness.

Those values that exist in the space between difference and division. The very things we teach our children, but then view as weakness in our leaders.

The issues we navigate as a society will only intensify. The disinformation will only increase. The pull into the comfort of our tribes will be magnified. But we have it within us to ensure that this doesn't mean we fracture.

We are the richer for our difference, and poorer for our division.

Through genuine debate and dialogue, through rebuilding trust in information and one another, through empathy – let us reclaim the space in between.

After all, there are some things in life that make the world feel small and connected, let kindness be one of them.