HEGEMONY IN PNOY'S AND DUTERTE'S 1ST STATE OF THE NATION ADDRESS: A CRITICAL DISCOURSE ANALYSIS OF PERSON DEIXIS

Nimfa G. Dimaculangan & Ma. Cezanne D. Dimaculangan
Laguna State Polytechnic University, Philippines
(nimfadimaculangan@lspu.edu.ph; cezannedimaculangan@yahoo.com)

Abstract

This paper compares Benigno S. Aquino's and Rodrigo R. Duterte's person deixis and argues that their use of such a linguistic device in their first State of the Nation Address (SONA) is deliberate to communicate hegemony of inclusion. Triangulation of quantitative and qualitative methods is observed to analyze the person deictic markers in the two speeches. The quantitative part involves counting the number of occurrences of the lexical names and person deixis used; whereas, the qualitative method involves analysis of the nominals and pronominals used within the Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) frameworks of Fairclough (1989, 1992, 1995 [with Wodak], 2003) with Halliday's (1978) Systemic Functional Linguistics, and the general framework of pragmatics for person deixis as explained by Huang (2007) with Bramley's (2001) elucidation of politics of pronouns. Data show that Duterte's deictic names for the Filipino people convey the solidarity of his government and his alignment with both his constituents and the marginalized Filipinos. Duterte's first State of the Nation Address may be described by the marked use of *I*, inclusive *we*, and *you*; whereas, Pnoy's may be described by the marked use of inclusive *we*. Duterte uses the third person the least times; while, Pnoy uses the second person the least. Analysis reveals that the two presidents' person deictic markers position themselves with the Filipinos and convey their good intents as well as the goodness of their administrations, their sharing of responsibilities even with the commoners, and their building of hegemony of inclusion while communicating power, despite the difference in the frequency and choices of pronouns. Duterte appears to be more consistent with his lexical choices and pronominal use.

Keywords: critical discourse analysis, person deixis, hegemony, critical thinking

Introduction

The Philippines has been under the care of presidents from 1899 to the present, the latest of whom are two opposing political figures who were brought to the highest seat of power by an overwhelming number of Filipino people. They are 1) Benigno S. Aquino III, the 15th President of the Republic of the Philippines who reigned from 2010-2016, henceforth, Pnoy in this paper, and 2) the incumbent President Rodrigo Roa Duterte, the 16th President who assumed the presidency on June 30, 2016, henceforth, Duterte in this paper.

Like the past presidents, they delivered a nationally telecast and broadcast State of the Nation Address (SONA) after their 100 days of office, and then one annually within their presidency term. The SONA is an avenue for Philippine Presidents not only to speak about national policies and issues but also to establish the hegemony of inclusion to gain public support. The SONA is a power resource (van Dijk, 1998); the president has control over the speech and has great opportunities to influence and convince his listeners of his good intentions through his language.

Aristotle, as cited by Joseph (2007), states that man by nature is a political animal; however, Joseph (2007) adds that as a political animal, he is endowed with the gift of language which is political from top to bottom, whether considered at the level of his choice of language or style of discourse with others or the level of political rhetoric. He posits that language is political inasmuch as every speech act is potentially political and that politics and language interact with one another. Joseph links the origin of language to man's political need, i.e. he has to be able to discern between friends and fiends, and to create alliances.

Indeed, language is an instrument of persuasion or manipulation in political speeches like SONAs. It expresses a politician's view of his social environment and people through its lexicon, structures, semantics, and pragmatics. As suggested by analysts, a political figure relies on his ability to manipulate language to achieve his goals. For instance, he can use pronouns for varied purposes like convincing his audience to share the same ideologies, sharing government responsibilities, and strengthening the sense of unity and solidarity among them.

One good approach to the study of language in context is Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA). Socially and politically oriented linguists like Fairclough, van Dijk and Wodak founded such an approach to understanding language from a critical perspective. Relatively, Fairclough (1992), Wodak (2001), and van Dijk (2001) posit that critical discourse analysis requires the

application of linguistic expertise. Indeed, syntax, semantics, and pragmatics complement each other in meaning making. The literature on semantics, lexicon, and pragmatics suggest the interface between those levels of language, that is, the meaning of words and discourse are created by conversation interlocutors, and these meanings are carried out by syntax. In processing information heard or read, language users use their syntactic knowledge while operating at several semantic and pragmatic levels in order to make sense of the text.

Deixis is a part of English grammar; it comes from the Greek word *deiktikos* which means *to show* or *to point out*. Huang (2007, pp. 132-133) relates that deictic expression or deixis is a universal linguistic phenomenon whereby features of the context of utterance or speech event are encoded by lexical and/or syntactical means; thus, the interpretation of an utterance depends on the analysis of that utterance context. In other words, deixis and deictic expressions cannot be fully understood without contextual information that conveys the meaning. Among the five basic categories of deixis, is the *person deixis* which is concerned with the identification of the interlocutors' roles in speech event (Levinson, 1983). Deictic pronominals are a pervasive feature of speech; one can hardly speak without pronominalizing.

In the context of political discourse, roles, and responsibilities are negotiated in part through the deictic system (Fairclough, 2000, cited in Mulderrig, 2012). Likewise, Remorosa (2018) mentioned that many critical discourse analysts (e.g. Fowler & Kress, 1979; Fairclough, 1989; Wilson, 1990; Chilton & Schäffner, 2002; Van Dijk, 2002) have shown that the use of pronouns in political discourse is significant and manipulative, since it generates political stands. The persuasive function of political speeches is aided by the presentation of multiple individual and group identities which listeners will want to identify with and support. It is the politicians' interest to present themselves as multi-faceted in order to appeal to a diverse audience, and careful pronoun choice is one way of achieving this aim (Allen 2007, p. 13). This linguistic device has persuasive power; hence, political figures strategically play with them to persuade their audience of the validity of their intentions.

Literature Review

To understand the present study and establish its significance, this brief review of studies that examined various political speeches within the tradition of linguistic and critical discourse analysis is presented. Studies on political

discourse have tried to shed light on the politicians' strategic use of deictic expressions for varied purposes such as persuasive aims (Adetunji, 2006, p. 181, cited in Hamdaoui, 2015). They manipulate the pronominal system to assume or reject responsibility and to establish solidarity with the audience so as to persuade them regarding certain decisions.

Quinto (2014) analyzed Pnoy's address retrieved from the Official Gazette. He illustrated how Pnoy deployed person, time, location, and social relationships in the English translation of his October 30th televised national address. Quinto (2014) tried to show how meanings and effect are shaped and conveyed by his use of deictic expressions in the speech which in turn affected the readers' understanding of the political speech. Using the frameworks of Hanks (2005) and Buhler (1934), he examined how Pnoy strategically set up the deictic field by placing personal, temporal, spatial and social deictic expressions in the ground zero.

His analysis revealed that Pnoy's deployment of deictic expressions created a deictic field in which the Filipino people were situated at deictic center, and that Pnoy and his critics were in binary oppositions. He found that Pnoy's deployment of deictic expressions was very effectively done; hence, the deictic center was persuaded to judge him and his government favorably; while, the binary opposite in the deictic field, unfavorably. Quinto (2014) proved that the four types of deixis: personal deixis, temporal, spatial and social deixis help a political actor to persuade the audience in their favor and boost leverage in his political discourse.

Remorosa (2018) conducted a critical discourse analysis of President Rodrigo Duterte's thirty political speeches which were retrieved from an online archive and hard copies which were furnished by the office of the President. She examined the political speeches in terms of linguistic features and rhetorical strategies that uncovered issues behind the discourse. Specifically, she looked at the linguistic features in the political speeches of President Rodrigo Duterte and the underlying social issues and ideologies presented in the political speeches. Her analysis revealed the linguistic features such as personal pronouns that show inclusivity and exclusivity, passivity, transitivity, and dominating verb tenses and aspects present in the speeches.

Remorosa's data reflected socio-economic, legal and political related problems and highlighted war on drugs, criminality, graft and corruption as the underlying social issues and ideologies in his political speeches. She concluded the paper by advancing that the President who is the highest official of the land is expected to lead the country in a crusade to alleviate the

condition of the constituents and to provide a fast solution to the prevailing issues and problems.

In addition to the studies conducted in the Philippines, Hamdaoui (2015) investigated the use of person deixis in political discourse. She adopted the general framework of pragmatics to scrutinize President Obama's manipulation of the deictic entity *we* in the 14 speeches he delivered in 2009 which were about the 2007-2009 financial crisis. She adopted the mixed quantitative and qualitative methods to analyze Obama's use of the pronoun *we*. The statistical part was confined to counting the number of occurrences of the deictic category *we* in Obama's political speeches about financial crisis; whereas, the qualitative method was limited to showing how the pronoun *we* in the corpus was used for persuasive ends.

The statistical results obtained from the quantitative analysis of the person deixis in the corpus were analyzed qualitatively within the general framework of pragmatics, particularly within the notion of inclusive person deixis, to discuss Obama's use of person deixis for persuasive ends and to shed light on the way politicians rely on person deixis as a persuasive power. The inclusive person deixis in her data indicated the deictic acts of including the speaker and the audience in the political actions and ideas being discussed. She found that the pronoun *we* was the most used deictic category for persuasive ends. It was used to create a stereotypical image of the American character, to remind the audience of their glorious past, and to spread the load of responsibility, to persuade the audience and gain their support.

Mulderrig (2012) conducted a corpus-based critical discourse analysis of deixis in education policy to show how the New Labour government used the pronoun *we* as an important rhetorical tool in legitimizing its policy decision thru the neoliberal consensus on the context of education while articulating a politics of inclusion. She found 83 % of instances of *exclusive we*, as the most numerous in each document in fairly distribution ratio, 13% of the *ambivalent we*, and 3% of *inclusive we*.

Within the Systemic Functional Grammar, her data revealed that the *Exclusive we's* were used as representation of the government's past, present, or future action, as hedging of governance, and as a boast for past actions and present descriptions. The *inclusive we* was used to make evaluative descriptions of the nation, usually in terms of competitive relation with others. The *inclusive we* helped internationalize the context of education and was used in modalized statements with implicit hortatory meaning. Seventy-five percent of the *ambivalent we* was frequently textured with modal forms to construct exhortation for future policy action.

The foregoing literature presents just a few political speeches whose meanings are understood through Stylistics and Critical Discourse Analysis lenses. The studies reviewed showed either broad scope (i.e. all types of deixis or at least person deixis with other rhetorical devices or syntactic features were investigated in relation to the speakers' persuasive power) or very limited one; hence, the pragmatic meanings of person deixis used might not have been explored with depth. In addition, the political speeches under study were of individual presidents. None of the studies reviewed, at least that this researcher is aware of, is a comparison of speeches of two well-loved leaders who are from opposing parties with different ideologies. Therefore, this paper intends to fill this identified gap and contribute to the literature showing that politicians' use of deictic markers is a verbal strategy aimed at accomplishing certain intentions.

Methodology

Data Collection and Analysis

This paper is a descriptive study of the accounts of Duterte's and Pnoy's playing with person deixis. The data analyzed were gathered from the two presidents' first SONAs which were downloaded from the internet. Convenient sampling was applied in creating the small corpus for the present analysis. This sampling technique is relevant inasmuch as the purpose is not to make generalizations from a large corpus but to find a representative of SONAs. In addition, the corpora for CDA are not too broad, and the texts analyzed are among the prototypical ones of the selected discourse. Indeed, Wodak and Meyer (2001) suggest that many CDA studies deal with small corpora which are regarded as typical of certain discourses. Moreover, according to Fermin (Edison A. Fermin, personal communication, December 1, 2017), one SONA is sufficient to determine the speaker's communication of hegemony which operationally refers to love, unity, and solidarity in this paper. Critical Discourse Analysis is both a theory and a method (Fairclough, 2001); scholars who use critical discourse analysis methods apply different criteria particularly with regard to the size and scope of their studies (Wodak, 2001) and the selection of texts (Wodak & Meyer, 2001).

The downloaded SONAs were printed out for easier identification of the data needed to answer the posted research questions. These are the first SONA of 1) President Benigno S. C. Aquino III (Pnoy) which was delivered on July 26, 2010 during the opening of the first Regular Session of the 15th Congress at the Batasang Pambansa Complex, Quezon City, and 2) the

first SONA of President Rodrigo Duterte (Duterte) which was delivered in the same platform on July 25, 2016 (Aquino III, 2010; Duterte, 2017)**.**

Duterte's first SONA presents the major issues that hound the Philippines as well as his platform of government vis-a-vis his administration's solutions to these issues. The speaker starts with his promise not to waste time blaming the alleged responsible for the sad plight and sufferings of the Filipinos nor talk about the mistakes committed by the previous administration. The issues that he presented include prohibited drugs, peace problem, high taxes issue, heavy traffic, poor Philippine economy, graft and corruption, and even internet access. He mentions his administration's all-out campaign against drugs and criminality and declares a unilateral ceasefire with rebels. He promises a clean government, lower income and corporate tax rates, improvement of the train systems, extension of Light Railway Transit (LRT) operating hours along with better travel options, better job creation and poverty reduction, red tape cut down, shorter transaction or document processing time, and free Wi-Fi access in public places.

Pnoy's first SONA is started off blaming the past administration for many of the country's ills and mentioning anomalies made like: number of tax evaders and smugglers, a budget deficit of P196.7 billion in the first half of the year, depleted calamity fund with a large chunk spent for the home province of the former president, alleged abuses and corruption of some officials in an office, funds misused by another office, and mismanagement of a corporation, among others. Similarly, he enumerates his government's new legislative measures to benefit Filipinos, e.g. better implementation of Anti-Trafficking law, more employment for the Filipinos, good health programs for the poor, synchronization of ARMM for national elections, solutions to flooding problems, and DOST and UP team up to develop a prototype monorail system. He declares that he will lead the country to the straight path and offers other solutions to the identified problems. These include prudent spending of the national budget, spending only for the identified source of funding, giving the small and medium scale enterprises the opportunity to participate in the growth of Philippine economy, being more responsive to the needs of national security, and improving the witness protection program to eradicate the culture of fear and silence.

Machin and Mayr (2012) convey that although CDA has received harsh criticism, especially for using a small number of texts, conducting it with thorough procedures helps increase the ability to describe texts and to bring out the ideologies concealed in texts so that they can be more easily

challenged. Hence, this study was conducted in two stages. The first part involved a careful manual search of data to see the lexical items that deictically refer to the Filipino people and to find the number of occurrences of such items and each pronoun in the first SONAs of the two Presidents. However, since there is a significant difference between the number of words in the two SONAs, Pnoy's SONA consisting of 3,835 words only which is half of Duterte's SONA consisting of 9,491 words, the data was balanced by truncating Duterte's SONA into 3,835 word-SONA too.

The manual identification and counting of the expressions used to qualify the Filipinos and create a hegemony of love was done for frequency and analysis purposes. The terms that vividly reflect inclusion, the terms in the 3rd person that generalize the Filipino people, the items that pertain to the marginalized, and the expressions that refer to the liabilities and enemies of the society were marked and later grouped semantically for clearer presentation.

The marking of every occurrence of the person deixies *I*, *you*, *they*, and *we* followed. The markings of all the deictic expressions were double-checked by going through the texts repeatedly. The pronoun counting was done per sentence; when a pronoun has the same referent, for instance, the pronoun *we* with a single reference, which is used 3-4 times was counted as one. It was at times difficult to decide which of the personal pronouns *you*, *we* and *they* are generic (indefinite), so they were viewed closely in their contexts. In addition, the pronoun *they* which refers to objects or ideas were not counted for the analysis. The results of the occurrences based on manual counting are compiled in Table 2.

All the "*we sentence*s" in both Tagalog (we/kami, tayo) and English sentences were marked and analyzed. The pronouns *we* and *you* were given special attention because they are interesting from a political perspective. They have the power to include and exclude the audience, as well as separate self from others — the second person personal pronoun *you* is interesting because it may have a singular or plural, near or far referents, and as Allen (2007) posits, the generic *you* can be used by politicians to criticize the opposition by including or excluding them from generalizations.

The second part was qualitative textual analysis to see the contexts and the reasons for the pronominal choices in the SONAs; hence, after the encoding of frequency of deictic expressions' occurrences, the texts were reread repeatedly for the researcher to arrive at clear analysis of the pragmatic functions of Duterte's and Pnoy's deictic expressions, i.e. the discourse parts where the identified lexical items appear were highlighted and then manually

analyzed in relation to their syntactical and contextual environments using the frameworks discussed in the subsequent section.

Her coauthor counterchecked her interpretations to confirm her readings of the pronouns' deictic meanings.

Frameworks for Analysis

In order to analyze Duterte's and Pnoy's deployment of person deixis in their first SONA, the present study subscribes to the Critical Discourse Analysis framework of Fairclough (1989, 1992, 1995, 2003) with Halliday's (1978) Systemic Functional Linguistics framework, and the general framework of pragmatics for person deixis considering the technical qualifications made by Huang (2007) and Bramley (2001). Halliday (1970) advances that language is a systematic resource for expressing meaning in context; therefore, it must be studied in contexts. Relatively, Fairclough (1989, p. 19) states that language is a social process; it is socially shaped and is also socially shaping (Fairclough, 1993).

For van Dijk (1998), CDA makes a connection between the textual analysis of language and the social practice analysis. It stresses the cause of discourse from the aspect of social structure and analyzes the hidden power behind language to disclose its role in social change. Van Dijk (1998) states that any explicit method in discourse studies maybe used in CDA research as long as it is able to produce insights into the way discourse reproduces social and political inequality, power abuse, or domination. CDA does not limit its analysis to specific structures of text or talk but systematically relates these to structures of the sociopolitical context. According to him, all levels and structures of context, text, and talk can in principle be controlled by powerful speakers, and such power may be abused at the expense of other participants.

Fairclough (1989) provides a three-dimensional framework for discourse. According to him (Fairclough, 1989, 1992), discourse can be simultaneously seen as a spoken or written text, discourse practice or text production and text interpretation, and sociocultural practice. Fairclough (1992) recommends that as a part of a practical methodology of CDA, the analysis should be organized under four headings which are: vocabulary, grammar, cohesion, and text structure. Duterte's and Pnoy's choice of deictic names for the Filipinos and deictic personal pronominals fall under vocabulary. Likewise, his (1989, 1992, 1995 [with Wodak]) model of three-tier analysis covers description, interpretation, and explanation. According to him, a text can be analyzed at the *descriptive level* in which the analyst deals with its lexical, syntactical and textual structures; at the *interpretative level* when the

analyst deals with the relationship between the discursive process of production and interpretation of the text; and at the *explanation level* when one deals with the relationship between the processes of production and interpretation.

Further, Fairclough (1989) proposes three types of values that may be featured in a text. The first is the experiential value in which the writer or speaker experiences in the natural and social world reflected in the content through expressions of personal knowledge and beliefs. The second is the relational value in which the social relationships are enacted in the discourse, and the third is the expressive value in which the source of the discourse evaluates an aspect of reality or social identities. Fairclough emphasizes that the choice of vocabulary, grammar, and textual structures to make up the formal features of a text is determined by these values.

Fairclough's CDA model of three level analysis has a close relation to Systemic Functional Grammar (SFL/SFG). Halliday who had been influenced by the work of the Prague School and British Linguist, Firth developed SFL in the UK and then in Australia. SFL is considered as an influential tradition to linguistic study because it reflects the trend in linguistics development. Nordquist (2018) explains that Systemic Functional Linguistics treats grammar as a meaning-making resource and insists on the interrelation of form and meaning. According to him, SFL is deeply concerned with the purposes of language use, i.e. what a writer or speaker is doing, what linguistic devices are available to help him do it, and on what basis do they make their choices. The Hallidayan model explains that language use is functional, semantic, contextual and semiotic. In other words, language use is functional, and its function is to make meanings; these meanings are dictated and influenced by the social and cultural contexts, and the process of using language is a semiotic, a process of making meaning by choosing (Halliday, 1978).

With regard to person deixis, critical discourse analysts claim that the use of pronouns in political discourse is significant and manipulative since they generate political stands (e.g. Fairclough, 1989; Van Dijk, 2002). Bramley (2001) states that the primary concern of a politician is to create an image of the reality, and pronouns are a linguistic tool in doing so. Bramley (2001) has illustrated that pronouns do not merely rename people, number, and gender as suggested by traditional grammar nor merely do referential work, but they operate in terms of the contexts in which they are used.

Duterte's and Pnoy's person, deictic markers in their first SONA, were analyzed at three levels: description, interpretation, and explanation within

Fairclough's (1989, 1992, 1995 [with Wodak]) three-dimensional CDA framework and Halliday's (1978) Systemic Functional Linguistics, and the pragmatic general framework of person deixis with Bramley's (2001) explanation of pronouns.

Results and Discussion

Duterte's speech is a typical Philippine President's speech, i.e. linguistically and substantially tailored in formal English for grand gathering of VIP's and highly educated officials and guests; however, it is simplified and adjusted to the masses on the spot through his impromptu adlib in the mixture of English and Tagalog which is understood by the laymen. On the other hand, Pnoy's is formal straight Tagalog which is mixed with English social and political jargons whenever better understood in English. His straight Tagalog, which is colored by a few code-switching and his use of lip popular tabloid register seem to help him reach the commoners, the poor, and the less educated.

CDA lets people see their words' meaning in a particular historical, social, and political context. Words, written or oral are used to convey a broad sense of meanings; in this paper, to communicate hegemony of inclusion. It was observed that apart from the evident flow of pronouns in the SONAs, notable deictic expressions would inevitably catch the attention of critical listeners. The two Presidents used nearly the same jargons and specific lexical items to refer to the Filipino people, particularly the commoners who comprise the big number of the population as can be seen in Table 1.

Deictic names for the Filipinos

Table 1. *Duterte's and Pnoy's Deictic names for the Filipino People*

Duterte's	Pnoy's

A. fellow workers in the government
   my countrymen
   kaibigan (ko)
	A. mga minamahal kong kababayan (my
	   fellowmen)

B. our people, people
   our soldiers
   our Muslim Brothers
   our Filipinos
   our religious bishops
   leaders, priests, pastors, preaches
   and imams
   our Filipinos
   our small and medium
	B. kapwa, ating mamamayan (our people)

entrepreneurs
our Lumad Brothers
our citizens
our brothers

C. the Filipinos-discipline, informed, involved
passengers
stakeholders, public transport operators
Filipino People, all Filipinos,
Ang Pilipino
the Philippines, country
every man, woman and child
the widows, the orphans
every man, woman, and child
the military and the police
passport applicants
Filipinos overseas
Couples

C. mahusay na Pilipino (good, skilled Filipinos)
taumbayan, mamamayan
sambayanan, mga tao (Filipino people)
bayan, gobyerno, estado (Philippine government)
retiradong empleyado/retirees
karaniwang manggagawa (labourers)
pambansang gobyerno (national government)
operator, negosyante
bawat Pilipino, karaniwang Pilipino
militar at kapulisan (the military and the police)
sandatahang lakas (National Defense)
sangay ng gobyerno (government agencies)
hudikatura
sundalo (military)
mga pamilya (Filipino families)
gobyernong local (local government)
moro, lumad, kristiyano
pinuno (leaders)

D. the poor and less skilled members
productive members of the labour
force beneficiaries of 4Ps the poor
fishermen

D.   milyong pilipino hindi kumakain ng tatlong beses sa   isang araw (Milion Filipinos who do not eat 3X a day)
pinakamaralitang pamilyang pilipino (the poorest Filipinos)

E. those who betray the people's trust
those who make the mockery
those who make our life miserable
human traffickers
illegal recruiters

E. midnight appointees (appointees of the previous government
nakaraan (previous administration)
smuggler, hindi nagbabayad ng buwis (tax evaders)
salarin (one responsible for a crime)
mga corrupt (corrupts)
kotong cops (policemen who get bribed)
kumokotong na rebelde, rebelled
mamamatay tao (killer)

The lexical items in Table 1 communicate Duterte's leadership of inclusion as suggested by the lexical names (enumerated as A and B Items) he used to address them. It can be noted from the table that Duterte would use the genitive forms of the first person singular *I* 'my' (*my countrymen*) and the inclusive *we* "our" to express his love for the common Filipinos and the solidarity of his government members as shown by the 10 deictic terms marked as Items B, e.g. *our people, our soldier, our Muslim brothers, our Filipinos, our religious bishops*. As can be seen, the offensive referents for the Filipinos in items D, are mitigated by the addition of heartening modifiers e.g. *fellow* workers in the government, *productive* members of the labour force, *religious* bishops, or the softened, *less skilled* members, instead of *unskilled* to qualify the marginalized Filipinos seem to effectively bring him closer to the addressees.

Apparently, he would detach himself from the enemies and liabilities of the Philippine society through the use of the demonstrative distal pronoun "those" as in *those who betrayed the people's trust, those who make the mockery*, or *those who make our life miserable* which are marked E, and through the use of derogatory third person names.

On the other hand, Pnoy used only two lexical items that obviously and directly establish a close relationship with the Filipinos and construct alignment with them. However, his *mga minamahal kong kababayan* does not harmonize with his later naming of the Filipino people in the third person which are identified as Items C and D. He used a dishonorific and downgrading expression that might have silently offended some, if not the majority of the addressees. Only very few would probably accept the pointing name, *pinakamaralitang pamilyang Pilipino*/the poorest of the poor Filipinos or *Filipinong hindi kumakain ng tatlong beses maghapon*/Filipinos who do not eat three times a day. In addition, his use of plain terms and vocatives for the Filipino, those named as C lexical items, e.g. *mga tao*/the people, *karaniwang mangggawa*/ ordinary workers, *bawat Pilipino*/each Filipino, *taumbayan*/citizen *and ordinary Pilipino*) do not reflect hegemony of inclusion but rather exclusion.

The Presidents' person deixis

Table 2 shows the frequency of the person deixis used in the first SONA of the two Presidents. As can be noted, they differ in the number of most used personal pronouns, that is, Duterte has the most number of the first person *I*; while, Pnoy has the inclusive *we*. Within the framework of deixis, Duterte's first SONA may be described by the marked use of *I* (44 instances), inclusive *we* (33), and *you* (35); whereas, Pnoy's may be described by the marked use of inclusive *we* (70 instances) only. Duterte used the third person the least times

(3x); while, Pnoy used the second person the least (4x). The indexicalities of the pronouns are presented in the subsequent sections.

Table 2. *Distribution frequency of Duterte's and Pnoy's Deictic Pronouns*

Person Deixis	Duterte's	Pinoy's
1ˢᵗ *person* I/Ako	44	13
Inclusive We (Tayo, natin)	33	70
Exclusive We (Amin, Namin)	12	12
Ambivalent we	9	11
2ⁿᵈ *Person*	35	4
3ʳᵈ *Person* Sya/S/he, Sila/They	3	9

Duterte's Singular first person deixis

It is evident that Duterte used the first person singular *I* almost thrice against Pnoy's 13 times. Duterte's *I's* to refer to himself seem versatile. The most motivating reasons for a politician to use the pronoun *I* in his speech is to come across as good and responsible, to describe himself positively and highlight personal qualities (Bramley, 2001). Duterte used it interchangeably with the inclusive and exclusive *we* to reveal his various "selves" (Bramley, 2001) and his footing with the Filipino people in general, with the government, and with his officials. Nevertheless, most of these *I's* point to himself as the man of authority. His first *I* is his *leader self*, the president. The instances of the pronoun *I* and its forms in the extracts are mostly presidential, and they inevitably convey his egocentricity and trust in his government officials.

He started his first SONA with a series of the singular and the non-singular *we*. The instances of *I* in the beginning part of the speech reflect his confidence as the new leader of the land as shown in this extract:

> *As a former prosecutor, I know there always --- ways of knowing how fast or how slow cases go. What I did was to look into the number of postponements and the time difference between each postponement and the next setting. It was as simple as that. I will appreciate deeply if we all in government attend to this urgent need.*

He would use the 1ˢᵗ person singular *I, Ako* and its forms when talking about his experiences or activities which only he, the president could accomplish, thus implicitly communicates authority or power resource, i.e. he is the symbol of power, the one above anybody else, a brave and resilient chief keeping democracy and constitution alive in the country as reflected in the sample part:

> **I** *order the National Police Commission (NAPOLCOM) to hasten the conduct of investigation and adjudication of administrative cases against police officers involved in criminal activities and illegal activities and prescribe policies on lifestyle checks for PNP members.*

By saying *my administration* in,

> *On the macroeconomic management,* **my administration** *will continue and maintain current macroeconomic policies, and even do better.*

And not *our administration* in the early part of his speech, he underscored his authority as the man in the highest seat of power and prided about the capacity of his administration. Here, he would implicitly exclude the listeners from his deictic origo; nonetheless, simultaneous with his exclusion of the listeners and announcement of the goodness of his administration was his use of expressions of commitment to the listening public. He was able to emphasize his authority while convincing the listeners of his concern for them.

He would also use the pronoun *I* to reveal his constant empathy to the Filipino people as in,

> *I heard the people on the streets complain that justice had become illusory; that equity and fairness and speedy disposition of cases had deteriorated into hollow concepts fit only for master dissertations. It was and still is, very sad indeed.*

He sounded like he wanted to be felt not as the newly elected president who is on top of the rest of the people, but as an ordinary Filipino. This *I* suggests his personal compassion for the Filipino, and it could be a verbal strategy to get closer and commune with them. According to Bramley (2001), *I* create the notion of 'relationship' with the audience because it sounds like the speaker speaks on a more personal level. *I* might also be used to show commitment to the audience and personal involvement in issues.

Moreover, he used *I* more when persuading the Filipinos that the beliefs, experience, and involvement he was narrating were his personal ones. His pronoun *I* helped him express commitment to the audience and emphasize the importance of his authority. His *I*'s and *me,* and *my* which indexed self-show alignments with personal integrity and positive vision of his government achievements. Indeed, Bramley (2001, p. 27) advances that *I* can be used by a speaker to convey his opinion, to make his speech more subjective, to show his authority and his compassion with the audience, and to narrate a story.

Pinoy's singular first person deixis

Pinoy's instances of *I* (ako) and its genitive forms *my, mine (akin)* are scarce; there are 13 instances only. The issue of subjectivity might have made some politicians avoid using *I* (Pennycook, 1994). His limited *I*'s would point to himself as the country's president; however, he claimed sole ownership of the presidency, and the act of shouldering issues; hence, he would sound excluding the Filipino big community and even his officials from the deictic sphere as shown in this extract,

> **Akin** ang lawak ng problemang ating namana; damang-dama **ko** ang bigat ng *aking responsibilidad*. (The problems that we inherited are mine...)

Beard (2000) suggests that claiming of power separates the Presidents from the rest of the members of their administrations, and reminds the audience that the President is the one with the highest power. It distinguishes self from others and puts self in a mostly positive light; thus, it conveys that the speaker thinks of others as inferior to himself. Nonetheless, Pnoy mitigated his egocentricity in the sample extract by establishing an equal footing with the common Filipinos. He would not give command but would pronounce request in a polite language with Tagalog particle of respect "po" which has no English equivalent [*nakikiusap po*/Please…] and [*Inaasahan ko po*/*I expect*….] as in,

> *Nakikiusap **po akong** isulong ang Whistleblower's Bill upang patuloy nang iwaksi ang kultura ng takot at pananahimik.* (I request that Whistleblower's bill be pushed through, so that the culture of fear and silence be overcome.)

The extract,

> *Napakarami po ng ating pangangailangan: mula sa edukasyon, imprastruktura, pangkalusugan, pangangailangan ng militar at kapulisan, at marami pang iba. Hindi kakasya ang pondo para mapunan ang lahat ng ito. Kahit gaano po kalaki ang kakulangan para mapunan ang mga listahan ng ating pangangailangan, ganado pa rin **ako** dahil marami nang nagpakita ng panibagong interes at kumpyansa sa Pilipinas,* (The government funds is not sufficient for our needs: from education, health, military, etc. I am still inspired despite the problem because many Filipinos convey trust in the Philippine Government.)

suggests that Pnoy would resort to the first person singular *I, Ako* and its forms when talking about his activities as the president, thus implicitly would communicate power resource too, i.e. he is the symbol of power, the one above anybody else, a resilient chief keeping constitution alive in the country.

Some instances reflect Pnoy's inconsistency of intention. In the early part of the speech, he communicated his presidential power through his *ako/I*; while, in the following excerpt, he would shift to the non-singular form *natin* for *ako, akin, ko* (I, my, mine) to dramatize his sharing of roles and power with the common Filipinos,

> *Mahirap magsimula ang usapan habang mayroon pang amoy ng pulbura sa hangin. Nananawagan **ako**: huwag po natin hayaang masayang ang napakagandang pagkakataong ito upang magtipon sa ilalim ng iisang adhikain.* (I'm calling your attention: let us not waste this beautiful chance to be united with one aspiration.)

Duterte's first person non-singular deixis

The pronoun *we* can be used to put demarcation line between inclusion, i.e. speaker and hearer and exclusion, i.e. hearer. In other words, Van Dijk's (2002) and Pennycook's (1994) semantic duality include or exclude participant from the deictic center/origo or ground zero (Bühler, 1934 cited in Huang, 2007 p. 135), a reference point from which the entities, places, and times denoted in an

utterance can be identified and interpreted. This means that the deictic center is the present time, location, and participant role of the speaker or I, here, now. Mulderrig (2012) asserts that the referent of *we* depends on the context and speakers' purpose, and its inherent duality allows deictic flexibility. Because of its deictic flexibility, it can be used to indicate, accept, deny, or distance themselves from responsibility.

Duterte's inclusive *we* refers to himself and the entire Filipino people as can be noted in,

> **We** *cannot move forward if* **we** *allow the past to pull us back. Finger-pointing is not the way. That is why* **I** *will not waste precious time dwelling on the sins of the past or blaming those who are perceived to be responsible for the mess that we are in and suffering from.*

Here, he switched to the singular first person *I* to remind the listeners that he is one with them; however, he is the President who was the speaker at that moment. Nevertheless, the *I* does not seem to change the meaning of *we.* Bramley (2001) explains that another function of the first person singular pronoun *I* in political speeches includes giving a sense of here and now, suggesting that *I* captures the moment. *I* can also be used to create a relationship with the audience because using *I* put the speech on a more personal level.

The other instances of *we* seem to refer to the Philippine government and are collocated with the deontic modals *must*, *shall* and *will* to communicate shared beliefs and responsibilities of the president and the Filipinos. The collocations of *we* with the deontic modals may result in building unity and solidarity between the speakers and listeners. Duterte effectively shared his authority with his listeners who may opt to include or exclude themselves from the sphere as in,

> *Except maybe extract a lesson or two from its errors we will not tarry because it is the present that we are concerned with and the future that we should be prepared for.*

The use of *inclusive we* are a useful rhetorical tool, Levinson (1983) explains that the speaker and addressee are bound together, anchored to the deictic centre; hence, it establishes solidarity and social bonding. Likewise, Pennycook (1994) calls it the pronoun of solidarity and rejection and communality and authority.

A few of Duterte's exclusive *we* as in:

> *We will create an Inter-Agency Committee on Illegal Drugs that will integrate efforts and strengthen the partnership of all stakeholders.*

may sound ambiguous; however, this ambiguity can also be a rhetorical tool. As Fairclaugh (2000) states, the forms of *we* can be used to draw lines of inclusion and exclusion. They can equally be used to blur those boundaries through continual ambivalence and slippage between these forms across the text. One might have read the *we* in the above statement as inclusive *we*; however, its immediate neighboring statements provide the clearer context of its exclusiveness,

> *The reservists will be mobilized for information campaign against drug use and the dissemination of information regarding drug rehabilitation programs being offered by the government. Let us also strengthen our ROTC Program to instill a love of country and good citizenship.*

The naming of the reservists gives the earlier *we* its exclusive sense. The sentence,

> *There can never be real, tangible and felt development without making **our** people feel secure, and it is **our** duty to uplift the people's welfare.*

may make the listeners think that they are within the inclusive sphere, yet the following statement,

> *With this, **my administration** shall be sensitive to the State's obligations to promote, and protect, fulfill the human rights of **our** citizens, especially the poor, the marginalized and the vulnerable and social justice will be pursued, even as the rule of law shall at all times prevail.*

exclude them. The noun phrase, *my administration* and the use of the items *citizens, the poor, the marginalized* and *vulnerable* suggest the exclusion; although, the shift in the third person is mitigated by the use of the inclusive form, *our.*

Pnoy's first person non-singular deixis

While it was kind of difficult to determine the pragmatic reference of Duterte's *we* in his first SONA, it was a bit easy to identify the inclusivity and exclusivity

dichotomy of *we* in Pnoy's SONA because it was delivered in Tagalog. The Tagalog equivalent of the English *we* has its distinct inclusive form, *tayo* with its genitive forms *atin, natin* (we and its genitive and objective forms: our, ours, us), and the exclusive form *kami* with its forms *namin, samin* (the exact repetition of the same forms of *we, our, us* in English).

Within the entirety of the SONA, Pnoy used the inclusive *tayo, natin,* and *atin/ating* to frame himself with all the Filipino people, leaders or otherwise. The extracts show how he used the hearer inclusive first person non-singular pronoun and its forms to dramatize his concern for the masses and make real his sharing not only of the country's resources with them but his roles as the highest government official in the land. The addressees, in effect, might have felt their importance as well as the greatness and the pride of having been entrusted equal roles and responsibilities in 1) investigating the conspicuous activities of the corrupt officials of the past administration, and 2) in improving old ways in their favor because of eventual poverty reduction and nation building which are vividly reflected in,

> *Sa isang banda po ay ang pagpili para sa ikabubuti ng taumbayan. Ang pagtanaw sa interes ng nakakarami, ang pagkapit sa prinsipyo; at ang pagiging tapat sa sinumpaan **nating** tungkulin bilang lingkod-bayan. Ito po ang tuwid na daan.* (It's the consideration of the majority's interest, adherence to principle, and sincerity with our sworn responsibilities as government servants.)

Further, Pnoy seems wise to overwhelmingly use the hearer *inclusive tayo* with its possessive forms *natin* and *atin* to trigger the masses curiosity and interest in the illegal doings of the past administration. The pronoun could make the hearers feel that they are indeed part of the investigating body discovering what sounded as anomalous activities of the corrupt past offices. The forms of the inclusive *tayo* designate the listeners as active legitimate members of his administration trailing the straight and right path for the progressive Philippines as conveyed by the sample extract,

> *Bawat linggo po ay may bago tayong kasong isinasampa kontra sa mga smuggler at sa mga hindi nagbabayad ng tamang buwis…* (Every week, we will file cases against smugglers and tax evaders.)

His exclusive *we* is evident in only one statement in the early part of the speech,

> *Sa una ng tatlong linggo ng **aming** panunungkulan, marami po **kaming** natuklasan. (In our three weeks of office, we discovered a lot…).*

The Tagalog exclusive forms *amin* and *namin* (our) clearly put the non-officials away from the deictic center. This might be a wise decision to communicate exclusivity of the non-government officials from certain activities which may be beneficial to them. Quinto (2014) advances that the speaker in a political speech has the power to deploy deictic expressions in the deictic field. This enables the speaker to strategically use deixis in order that he may situate himself, his addressee and other actors involved in a way that judgment by the addressee and others become favorable to him.

Duterte's and Pnoy's ambivalent we

Different forms of *we* can be used to draw lines of inclusion and exclusion, distinguishing between different forms of belonging and identification. They can equally be used to blur those boundaries through continual ambivalence and slippage between these forms across text (Fairclough, 2000, cited in Mulderrig, 2012). While Fairclough and Mulderrig have ambivalent *we* for instances where it is not possible to clearly determine its reference, Pennycook (1994) has the inclusive-exclusive *we*. He argues that *we* is always simultaneously inclusive and exclusive. Both Duterte's and Pnoy's speeches show instances of the same complexity of the pronoun *we* which leave the listeners the option to include or exclude themselves from the people addressed by the speakers.

Duterte did it by strategically shifting from the inclusive to exclusive *we* and vice-versa, and ending with ambivalent *we,* therefore blurring the inclusivity exclusivity distinction as illustrated in,

> *To **our** Muslim brothers, the Moro country, and the members of the CPP/NPA/NDF let me say this: **All of us** want peace, not the peace of the dead, but the peace of the living. [applause] **We** express our willingness and readiness to go to the negotiating table, **and yet we load our guns**, fix our sights, pull the trigger. It is both ironic and tragic – and it is endless. While **we** extol the bravery and heroism of **our** soldiers — **kayo (you), the rebels** – do the same for the members and fighters.*

As can be noted, Duterte began the sentence with the exclusive *our* (Muslim brothers) which refers to himself and the Muslim listeners; he continued with the inclusive *us* in *all of us* where the expression *all* covers the Muslim brothers as well as the Filipinos, then he went back to the exclusive form in *we*

express…referring to himself as the president and to his officials who are to negotiate with the rebels for peace in the land. The last two *we*'s in *we extoll*. . . and *we will strive* blur the reference as to whether inclusive or exclusive of all the Filipino people. This may be an employed strategy to ambiguate the inclusive// exclusive dichotomy.

> Pnoy's is a bit different as illustrated in,
>
> *Sa lalong madaling panahon po, uupo na **tayo** sa LEDAC [Legislative Executive Development Advisory Council] at pag-uusapan ang mga mahahalagang batas na kailangan **nating** ipasa. Makakaasa **kayo** na mananatiling bukas ang aking isipan, at ang **ating** ugnayan ay mananatiling tapat.*

What literally appears as inclusive *we* in *uupo tayo* (we will start an office at the LEDAC…), actually means the *exclusive we* (kami) as conveyed by the next pronoun *kayo* (the plural you) in *Makakaasa kayo/ you can be sure…* He then switched to the essence of inclusive *we* that refers to the Philippine government and the Filipino people, for him to stick to his expression of concern, especially to the commoners. According to Allen (2007), "shifting identity through pronoun choice and using pronouns with ambiguous referents enables politicians to appeal to diverse audiences which helps broaden their ability to persuade the audience to their point of view. It is a scattergun effect – shoot broadly enough, and you'll hit something". The same is true with,

> "*Ang inakala ng **taumbayan** na natipid nila sa kuryente ay binabayaran din **natin** mula sa kaban ng bayan. May gastos na **tayo** sa kuryente, binabayaran pa **natin** ang dagdag na pagkakautang ng gobyerno.*" (What the Filipino people think they have saved; we are paying through or taxes.)

The noun *taumbayan* (citizen) creates the sense of exclusivity of the inclusive *natin* (our) and *tayo* in the second sentence.

Duterte's second person pronominal

Duterte's 2nd person *you* is pliant. He used *you* to address his critics, the corrupt and/or ill government servant/s with whom he socially distances himself as shown by-

> *Alam **mo, kayong** mga media, naghahanap **kayo** ng, "Where's the big fish?" "**Kayo** namang hindi pa bungog diyan, hindi pa pumasok yang mga droga, eh kung ayaw **ninyong** mamatay, ayaw **ninyo**ng masaktan, huwag **kayon**g umasa diyan sa mga pari pati Human Rights, hindi nakakapigil yan ng kamatayan."* (You who are not yet into drugs, if you don't want to die, if you don't want to get hurt, don't rely on priests; even Human Rights [maybe Commission on Human Rights] cannot control death.)

He also used it when addressing the masses with whom he is very familiar and close, and with whom he shares equal roles to strategically emphasize his beliefs, observations, and evaluations of what is going on as can be observed in these two excerpts:

> *"Look at the work load. Napaka-bobo mo naman. Tingnan mo, 'Ilan ang workload ninyo?' Pagkatapos, 'O bumalik ka dito, August 3, 3 o'clock.' Iyan 3 o'clock, ibigay mo, ibigay mo."* (You're so stupid. Look, how much workload are you given? Then, "Come back on August 3, 3:00 o' clock." Give; give (the client's requested document).
> *"Mamaya yung **kayo** --- **kaibigan ko** --- tangad, tangad, tangad [laughter] Kaya huwag na **ninyong** gawin. Simple lang 'yan eh. Para walang away sa gobyerno, yung mga bagay na illegal at masama at hindi tama, huwag **mong** gawin, at hindi kami mag-aaway dito."* (And then you--- my friend--- do not get into it. It's simple. So that you will not have problem with the government, do not do wrong/illegal acts. We will not quarrel then.)

Therefore, he, the speaker is part of the pragmatic meaning of *you* in this context because Siewierska (2004) in Allen (2007) suggests that the potential referents of impersonal *you* can be anyone and/or everyone; thus, *you*, when used impersonally, may include the speaker and the addressee among the set of potential referents.

Pinoy's Second person pronominal

Sacks (1992 in Bramley, 2001) claims that an inherent property of *you* is its 'this and that ambiguity' where *you* can mean both singular, plural or generic *you*. When the listener tries to work out what the *you* refer to, s/he considers whether it is herself/himself that is being referred to. Sacks states that if the listener does not think that *you* refer to himself/herself alone, then s/he will try

to see if the *you* is the listener and some others. Even if the listener concludes that *you* refer to him/herself and others, the listener is still included. Pnoy used the generic *you* to recognize the good members of the society, and like Duterte excluded the not good elements of the society from him and from the Filipino people as illustrated in,

> *Inaasahan ko po ang ating mga kaibigan sa media, lalo na sa radyo at sa print, sa mga nagbablock-time, at sa community newspapers,* **kayo** *na po mismo ang magbantay sa inyong hanay. Mabigyang-buhay sana ang mga batayang prinsipyo ng* **inyong** *bokasyon.* (I expect that our friends from media, especially, those from radio and print, those who block time, and those connected with community newspapers, do the monitoring yourselves. May your guiding principles be practiced in your vocation.)

Allen (2007) suggests that when giving speeches, politicians present the positive aspects of themselves and the negative aspects of their opponents. Both Duterte and Pnoy achieved this is by intentionally using the pronoun *you* which seem to refer to themselves and others. Indefinite *you* can be used in two ways: to refer to the speaker, as a replacement for *I*, and for the speaker to include himself as a typical member of a category, in which instance may refer to *us*.

Duterte's and Pnoy's 3rd person pronominals

The two presidents' third person pronouns can be counted with fingers. These non-deictic pronouns are very few; however, they deictically point towards the government's menace. Duterte has one singular *he* and five third person non-singular *they/sila* and its objective form *nila;* while, Pinoy has nine *sila* with its objective case. Bramley (2001) explains that politicians use the third person plural *they* to separate themselves or their group from others. It is used to form an oppositional relationship between the speaker and others, often with negativity towards these others. In addition, *they* show ideological difference among people and positive presentation of the speaker self. This was observed in the two SONAs under study.

They can be used to lessen the speaker's responsibility for actions or events. While acting as a distancing strategy, *they* can be also used for positive self-presentation (Allen, 2007). This can be observed in the two presidents' statements with the pronoun *they*. Duterte's third person pronouns refer to the slow moving and even irresponsible government servants from the operation officer down to the ordinary employees. Relatively, Pinoy's refer to the past

administration and society's bad elements; his third person statements show his strategic use of the third person deixis to underscore his good governance and the past administration's folly as shown in the following extracts:

> Pnoy
>
> *Hindi lang iyon: may mid-year bonus, productivity bonus, anniversary bonus, year-end bonus, at Financial Assistance. May Christmas bonus na, may Additional Christmas Package pa... …… sa bawat miyembro ng Board maliban sa pakotse, technical assistance, at pautang. Uulitin ko po. Lahat ng ito ay ibinibigay* **nila** *sa* **kanila***ng mga sarili habang hindi pa nababayaran ang mga pensyon ng* **kanila***ng mga retirees.* (Not only that, they enjoyed mid-year bonus, productivity bonus, anniversary bonus, year-end bonus, and Financial Assistance. I will repeat. All these, they would give themselves even before paying their retirees.)

> Duterte
>
> *They direct the traffic of drugs sa kanila. Meron silang ganito, malaki. Real time. Nakikinig sila ngayon dito. I am very --- 101 percent, nakikinig yan. Nandoon. Doon lang. Izo-zoom in nila sa Tondo.* (They direct the traffic of drugs to them, themselves. They have this, huge. Real time. They're listening now. I am 101% sure they are listening. Over there, as in there only. In Tondo, they will zoom it in.)

Conclusion and Recommendations

In sum, both the speakers would use deictic person markers to communicate hegemony of inclusion and convince the Filipinos of their love and concern for them and their government. Duterte's deictic names for the various groups of Filipino listeners unite them into one solid community; whereas, Pinoy's silently do the opposite, inasmuch as the majority of his deictic names for the Filipinos do not harmonize with the only two expressions of inclusion that he has in the introductory part of his speech.

      Duterte's first person *I*'s convey his egocentricity and authority, his trust in his administration, his positive vision about his government, and his concern for the Filipinos. Pinoy relies on his *we*'s to explicitly pride about his programs and implicitly express authority while convincing, particularly the common Filipinos that they share similar ideologies, dreams, and aspirations for their fellow Filipinos and their country. They both use the plural 3ʳᵈ person *they* to exclude themselves and their officials from the government's menace

and underscore the goodness of their administrations while highlighting the folly of the past administrations.

The SONAs showed that, albeit both the Presidents use person deixis to reveal and position themselves with the Filipinos and to establish the hegemony of love, unity, and solidarity, Duterte sounds more consistent and sincerer with his intentions and claims as conveyed by his employment of consistent person deictic markers. Pinoy sounds loving, too, of the Filipinos as reflected by his intelligent choice of person and social deixes; however, he is not able to sustain his professed love and footing with the commoners because of his shifting of lexical choices to refer to them.

The comparison of lexical choices of the two Presidents in their first SONA may not be solid and very valid because of the limited speeches used; hence, it is recommended that the same or related studies be done for more comprehensive comparison of the two presidents' person deixis. Other rhetorical and linguistic devices used by the two presidents which are not considered in this study promised interesting scholarship, too. Discourse analysts may examine other categories of deixes, as well as other linguistic devices such as metaphor, repetition, jargon, and other pragmatic concepts like speech act, relevance, and politeness to support or debunk the present findings.

The objectives of language education should not be limited to memorization of language patterns but should be extended to the development of students' critical thinking through language processing, e.g. students should be deliberately taught high critical discourse analysis as one effective approach to the teaching of language forms. Language processing is a mental activity which learners gradually develop when implicitly taught how languages work; hence, the teaching of higher level thinking in language classes through CDA is advanced. Consequently, the teaching of CDA requires a change in paradigm; teachers themselves should be the first one to embrace a new perspective on language and language teaching. They should provide their students learning tasks that will make them aware of social and moral issues, and teach them to analyze and judge these issues so as not to be misled or fooled. This development of students' higher cognitive complexities will surely lead to the improvement of their writing competencies.

Language represents the world and constitutes in the construction of meaning; therefore, language teachers may deliberately teach meaning while teaching personal pronouns, honorifics, and other forms of address via critical approach. When students are trained to look at language beyond its surface level meaning, they will always find it easier to make sense even of complex

discourse; thus, they cannot be easily deceived or politicized. The teaching of grammar should not be separated from the teaching of the real world's meaning. The 21ˢᵗ century language teachers are critical thinkers who produce 21ˢᵗ century critical thinking language speakers as well as listeners.

Critical thinking such as problem-solving skills, argumentation, and text analysis are fundamental skills that universities teach to be at par with other universities and keep up with the international standards; thus, teachers of **all content areas**, therefore, should implicitly and explicitly include social issues in their lessons and teach critical thinking to produce flexible and quick critical thinkers.

References

Adetunji, A. (2006). Inclusion and exclusion in political discourse: Deixis in Olusegun Obasanjo's speeches. *Journal of Language and Linguistics*, *5*(2), 177-191.

Allen, W. (2007). Australian political discourse: Pronominal choice in campaign speeches. Retrieved from https://espace.library.uq.edu.au/data/UQ_12794/ALLEN_W_ALS2006.pdf Allen, W. (2007). Australian political discourse: Pronominal choice in campaign speeches. Retrieved from https://espace.library.uq.edu.au/data/UQ_12794/ALLEN_W_ALS2006.pdf

Almurashi, W. A. (2016). An introduction to Halliday's systemic functional linguistics. *Journal for the Study of English Linguistics*, *4*(1), 70-80. Retrieved from http://www.macrothink.org/journal/index.php/jsel/article/download/9423/7638

Aquino III, B. (2010). First State of the Nation Address. Retrieved from https://www.pep.ph/news/26298/full-transcript-of-president-noynoy-aquino39s-first-state-of-the-nation-address

Bramley, R. N. (2001). Pronouns of politics: The use of pronouns in the construction of 'self' and 'other' in political interviews. Retrieved from https://openresearchrepository.anu.edu.au/bitstream/1885/46225/6/02whole.pdf

Beard, A. (2000). *The language of politics*. London: Routledge.

Buhler, K. (1934). *Sprachtheorie: Die darstellungsfunktion der Sprache*. Jena: Fischer

Chilton, P., & Schaffner, C. (Eds.). (2002). *Politics as text and talk: Analytical approaches to political discourse*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Chilton, P. and Schäffner, C. (2002). *Classroom discourse analysis: A tool for critical reflection*. Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press.

Duterte, R. (2017). First State of the Nation Address. Retrieved from https://news.abs-cbn.com/focus/07/25/16/read-transcript-of-president-dutertes-1st-sona

Fairclough, N. (1989). *Language and power*. New York: Longman Inc.

Fairclough, N. (1992). *Discourse and Social Change.* Cambridge: Polity Press.

Fairclough, N. (2000) *New Labour, New Language?* London: Routledge.

Fairclough, N. (2001). Critical discourse analysis as a method in social scientific research. In R. Wodak & M. Meyer (Eds.), *Methods of critical discourse analysis* (pp. 121-138)*.* London: Sage.

Fairclough, N. (2003). *Analysing discourse: Textual analysis for social research*. London: Routledge.

Fairclough, N., & Wodak, R. (1995). Critical Discourse Analysis. Retrieved from https://www.scribd.com/doc/55170203/Fairclough-Critical-Discourse-Analysis-1995

Fowler, T. and Kress, S. (1979). *Language form and Language function*. USA: MIT Press.

Halliday, M. A. K. 1970 Functional diversity in language as seen from a consideration of modality and mood in English. *Foundations of Language*.

Halliday, M. A. K. (1978). *Language as Social Semiotic: The Social Interpretation of Language and Meaning*. London: Edward Arnold.

Hamdaoui, M. (2015). The Persuasive Power of Person Deixis in Political Discourse: The Pronoun 'We' in Obama's Speeches About the 2007-2009 Financial Crisis as an Example. Retrieved from http://papers.iafor.org/wp-content/uploads/papers/ecah2015/ECAH2015_15702.pdf

Hanks, W.F. (2005). Explorations in the deictic field. *Current Anthropology* Vol 46 (2).

Huang, Y. (2007). Pragmatics. New York: Oxford University Press.

Joseph, J. E. (2007). Language and Politics. Retrieved from https://www.scribd.com/doc/162130175/John-E-Joseph-Language-and-Politics-Edinburgh-Textbooks-in-Applied-Linguistics-2007

Levinson, S. (1983). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Machin, D., & Mayr, A. (2012). *How to do critical discourse analysis: A multimodal introduction.* Los Angeles: Sage.

Mulderrig, J. (2012). The hegemony of inclusion: A corpus-based critical discourse analysis. Retrieved from journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/095792651245537 in March 2015

Nordquist, R. (2018). Systemic Functional Linguistics. https://www.thoughtco.com/systemic-functional-linguistics-1692022

Pennycook, A. (1994). The politics of pronouns. *ELT Journal*, *48*(2), 173–178. Quinto, E. J. M. (2014). Stylistic Analysis of Deictic Expressions in President Benigno Aquino III's October 30th Speech. *3L: The Southeast Asian Journal of English Language Studies*, *20*(2), 1–18. Retrieved from http://ejournal.ukm.my/3l/article/download/5140/3397

Remorosa, R. R. (2018). President Rodrigo Roa Duterte's Political Speeches: A Critical Discourse Analysis. *IOSR Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, *23*(8), 72-87. Retrieved from http://www.iosrjournals.org/iosr-jhss/papers/Vol.%2023%20Issue8/Version-2/I2308027287.pdf

Sacks, H. (1992). *Lectures on Conversations* (Vol. 1 and 2). Oxford: Blackwell.

Siewierska, A. (2004). *Cambridge textbooks in linguistics* Cambridge, New York: Cambridge University Press.

Van Dijk, T. A. (Ed.). (1998). *The handbook of discourse analysis*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.

Van Dijk, T. A. (2001). Multidisciplinary CDA. In R. Wodak & M. Meyer (Eds.), *Methods of critical discourse analysis* (pp. 95-120). London: Sage Publications.

Van Dijk, T. (2002). Ideology: Political discourse and cognition. In P. Chilton & C. Schaffner (Eds.), *Politics as Text and Talk: Analytical Approaches to Political Discourse* (pp. 203-238). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Wilson, L. (1990). *Critical discourse analysis as a research tool*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wodak, R. (2001). The discourse-historical approach. In R. Wodak & M. Meyer (Eds.), *Methods of critical discourse analysis* (pp. 63-93). London: Sage Publication.

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