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Abstract

In Australia, Closing the Gap is a highly profiled federal government policy aimed at closing the gap of disadvantage between Australia’s First Peoples and non-Indigenous Australians. This policy comprises of a yearly report providing statistical data addressing the progress of the initiative. As a significant parliamentary contribution towards the ideology of reconciliation in Australia, political leaders present a national address that responds to the statistical data of the report. This thesis presents a combined discourse analysis of the speeches presented in 2017, by Prime Minister Malcolm Turnbull and Leader of the Opposition Bill Shorten. Being a political discourse analysis, it focuses on the language features used by Australian political leaders to support their political ideology. Michèle Koven (2002) presented a model that explained how political leaders align (or misalign) themselves with other social actors. This research will adapt that model to identify how these leaders position themselves ideologically through their Closing the Gap speeches. Then by using critical discourse analysis, it will also present a typology of discursive strategies used in such political discourses, when negotiating an ideological alignment with Australia’s First Peoples. These two approaches will be further justified with two more supporting analyses. This comparative analysis contributes to a clearer understanding of how political language is used in Australia. Additionally, it contributes to the surprisingly minimal literature related to Australian political discourse analysis surrounding Indigenous issues, reconciliation and the Closing the Gap policy itself. By analysing such political speeches, reflection, engagement and empowerment then have the capacity to influence institutionalised notions of racism, poverty and class-consciousness with the view to rectifying them.
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Explanatory Notes

Several significant formatting features have been implemented in this thesis. For the purposes of readability and consistency, the following features will be justified:

Quotation Marks: Quotation marks have been reserved for direct quotes and some speech titles. They also surround ‘new and different’ words, in order to introduce their continuing use. In these cases, the ‘new and different’ word will be parenthesised in the first instance only. e.g. “The next strategy to be discussed, will be the ‘numbers game’.” In this so-called numbers game several questions are presented.”

Australian English: A large number of speech extracts are located throughout this thesis. In every case, they are quoted directly from the official transcript. At times, however, this presents inconsistencies when the text is analysed in the thesis. For example, the abbreviation for Mister, in American English is Mr. with a period. This punctuation will be encountered in direct quotes from the speeches discussed. However, as this thesis utilises British/ Australian English, the period after Mr will be omitted in the context of the study itself. This is to ensure consistency in the thesis’s writing style. In all cases of spelling and formatting, British/ Australian English has been honoured, even if this differs to the spelling used within the direct quotes.

Labor Party: The Australian Labor party or ALP, was known as the Labour party prior to 1912. Therefore this thesis continues to honour that spelling change.
**Chapters and Sections:** Chapters will be treated as titles and formatted with capitals for every significant word. Sections will be treated as headings therefore retaining standard sentence formatting.
Introduction

1.1 Introduction

This chapter will define the scope of the research and its relevance within linguistics by displaying a comparative discourse analysis of two major Australian political speeches. In order to analyse these speeches, specific research questions will be explored, motivating the selected methodological approaches for critiquing the data. These approaches are fully explained below. This chapter explains the context of the analysis, particularly the socio-cultural setting and the relevant Australian political agenda. Contextualising the socio-historical framework serves to illustrate the necessity for analysing these speeches.

The Closing the Gap speeches are annual parliamentary presentations that promote an Australian government policy as an act towards reconciliation. This study aims to identify the strategic use of language in these speeches, or more specifically, to highlight the strategies chosen and depended upon by each speaker. Such a speech can be defined as a coherent stream of spoken language that is usually prepared for delivery by a speaker to an audience for a purpose on a political occasion (Charteris-Black, 2014, p.xiii). The sole concern of the political speaker is then to simply deliver the speech appropriately and ‘achieve maximum required effect on the audience’ (Wilson, 1990, p.60). Although these speeches are usually prepared by party speech writers, the public always identifies speeches with those who deliver them. It is here that the purpose of these political speeches is identified. They are designed to ‘satisfy emotional, moral and social needs’ (Charteris-Black, 2014, p.xiii), and one of the greatest social necessities is hope. This point has been effectively illustrated by some inspiring political/ prime ministerial speeches for reconciliation with Australia’s First Peoples, in
recent history. Paul Keating’s 1992 inspiring *Redfern Park* address (Keating, 1992) arguably began the act of recognition for Australia’s First Peoples. When Prime Minister (hereafter PM), Kevin Rudd announced that an apology to the *Stolen Generations* (Commonwealth of Australia, 2008) would be made in parliament on 13 February 2008, a long-anticipated and subsequently famous speech was delivered. The above historical facts strongly indicate that speeches of Australian political leaders have a profound impact on the public, which is one reason why political speeches addressing Indigenous issues are chosen for analysis in this study.

Ultimately, this research aims to illustrate how these speeches shape public understanding of *Closing the Gap* and its contribution towards reconciliation in Australia. Unveiling the political discourse strategies that underlie the way these policies and issues are understood leads to a higher level of critical engagement towards such issues. In this way, the present thesis can hopefully have some degree of social impact. This is particularly the case since surprisingly few discourse analysts in Australia have turned their attention to the *Closing the Gap* speeches. This constitutes a remarkable gap in the literature, as reconciliation and its associated policy of Closing the Gap are significant components of contemporary Australian social life. It is hoped, that the present study can contribute to a better discursive understanding of *Closing the Gap*, thus shaping in some small way, the direction of reconciliation and the future of Australia’s First Peoples.

### 1.2 Overview of thesis

This thesis presents an analysis of Australian political speech discourse, focusing on the range of linguistic forms that are employed by political leaders, regarding how
they position themselves ideologically and in how they negotiate their construction in socio-cultural alignment. In this context, alignment refers to bringing a person or group into agreement with the policy of another. Using Michèle Koven’s three role-perspective model (2002) and critical discourse analysis (hereafter CDA) linguistic forms and functions are revealed in the two *Closing the Gap* speeches. Contextualising Closing the Gap will be explored in section 1.5.

From PMs Kevin Rudd and Julia Gillard to Tony Abbott and Malcolm Turnbull, this annual parliamentary performance piece has evolved over the years since its inception in 2009. While the textual content of the piece has adapted, so has the style and delivery of the orators. This is, in part, due to the evolution of the policy itself from including health and life expectancy markers, to education markers and recommendations for including an Act of Recognition in Australia’s Constitution. Furthermore, the government’s ongoing accountability to this policy report impacts the content and character of these annual speeches. Commencing in 2016, the Leader of the Opposition has also delivered a parliamentary speech on behalf of the Labor party, speaking to the policy of *Closing the Gap*. The present research critically and comparatively analyses the two 2017 parliamentary speeches, by Australia’s Coalition PM Malcolm Turnbull (Appendix A), and the Labor Leader of the Opposition Bill Shorten (Appendix B).

1.2.1 Chapters and contents

Chapter 1 presents the scope of the study, the research questions and contributions to the literature on Australian political speech analysis. It situates the analysis of the political leaders’ speeches and details their socio-cultural setting. Explained are the
rationales for choosing the time period and the targeted social actors. Chapter 2 covers a literature review. Reviewed are works that draw on theoretical notions supporting the two approaches accounting for alignment strategies. Also reviewed are previous works on Australian political speeches and works surrounding Australian Indigenous issues. In chapter 3, the methodological approaches are presented. Chapter 4 focuses on Turnbull’s analysis. Observed is his utilisation of different ‘voices’ (explained in section 2.3), positioning himself according to his political goals. Also illustrated is how he specifically uses the proposed discursive strategies to indicate alignment. Hence, his linguistic choices are examined to ratify alignments. Chapter 5 focuses on Shorten’s analysis, his use of varying roles and how their associated linguistic choices are strategically placed throughout his speech. Demonstrated is the typology of discursive strategies offered as theoretical insight into his linguistic displays of alignment in relation to the other political actors involved in Closing the Gap. Chapter 6 presents the comparative analysis of the two political leaders, illuminating their peculiarities and commonalities by way of changing voices as strategies. This chapter shows the applicability of the two methods, validating the results of the two different approaches. Also introduced here are the two other supporting methods of analysis. Additionally, this chapter discusses the analytical results with comments, insights, and recommendations for further research. Lastly, chapter 7 concludes with an overall reflection on the thesis.

1.2.2 Research questions

The political aspiration of reconciliation and assimilation with Australia’s First Peoples is a desirable Australian ideology. While the measures, issues, and policies continue to evolve, this ideology remains steady. Considering how Australia’s
political leaders’ primary roles are to represent all Australians and their values, clear questions begin to emerge.

Firstly; ‘How do Australia's primary political leaders position themselves ideologically through their use of speech in their Closing the Gap addresses?’ Within these speeches, Australia’s political leaders have the task of constructing their political ideology towards reconciliation and defining it by linguistic means. In the case of the Closing the Gap policy, this definition continues to be redefined. As the wording surrounding this political ideology of reconciliation is evaluated for the first research question, the negotiation for any construction of alignment with Australia’s First Peoples and non-Indigenous Australians then significantly emerges. This circumstance leads to the second research question; ‘How do the Australian leaders negotiate alignment with Australia’s First Peoples in the Closing the Gap addresses?’

1.2.3 Purpose of this research

The present study situates itself within ‘socially responsible linguistics’ (Hymes, 1996; Labov, 1984). That is, it develops its theoretical understanding and empirical scope in the tradition of recent works on language, power and politics such as Billig and MacMillan, (2005); Bhatia, (2006); Blackledge, (2005); Chilton, (2004); Butt, Lukin and Matthiessen, (2004); Dunmire, (2005); Wodak, (2002); and Lazar and Lazar, (2004).

Such studies explore the way political discourse is shaped for social meaning and highlight how power, sociocultural, and ideological processes are embedded in political discourse. Here, the present study constructs a link between lexical items and ideology. It also uses a qualitative approach which analyses various speech features commonly found in political speeches.
1.3 Language and politics: an overview

Previous studies have tried to affirm the interconnection of discourse and politics. Thus, political agents have relied on the effects of language use confirming that ‘politics is very largely the use of language’ (Chilton, 2004. p.14). The aim of analysing political speeches from a linguistic perspective is often associated with the approach of critical linguistics (Fairclough, 2003), whereby scholars focus on the critical analysis of language. These boundaries within critical language studies can also be effectively applied to social research. Such political discourse analysis (hereafter PDA) has attempted to decipher the relationship between power and discourse, racism, inequality, cognitive structures such as metaphors and language of deception. This tendency has observed how social or elite groups misrepresent, control, or exploit language in order to preserve their societal status, and how political speakers validate their actions or proposals through the use of language (Chilton, 2004).

Blommaert (2005) noted that language must be understood as a vehicle for its users. It is within this conventional tradition that the present study proposes an analysis of language use in politics to illustrate the way politicians convey their beliefs, desires, political goals and to align themselves with the audience. Political speakers understand the power of words, thus attempting to persuade people to support them. Silverstein (2004) explains how political speech analysis requires comprehension of any indexical reading embedded within political messages to indicate how politicians deliver those messages. By way of CDA, we can unveil linguistic notions of political rhetoric which allow politicians to conceal their intentions. When observing how politicians achieve alignment with other social actors, this study also observes discursive strategies used to create that alignment. Here, the distinction between PDA, CDA and even the overarch-
ing framework of Discourse Analysis (hereafter DA) appears minimal, however their exclusivity and interrelation is further explored in Section 2.2.

1.4 Rationale for timeframe and choice of social actors

As this Masters-level thesis is relatively short, being 30,000 words, it will only examine two Closing the Gap speeches, i.e. this is intended to be an exploratory study, with the possibility for expansion should further research be undertaken. Therefore, the two parliamentary speeches presented in 2017 were chosen. At the time, they presented a current contrast of party perspective on this social issue. As this dual delivery has presented as a new phenomenon within the house, a comparison of their respective political discourse would provide a cross-discipline benefit to the fields of political science and sociology, all which benefit from the linguistic perspective of DA, regarding any speech surrounding institutional power, minority representation and social justice issues. By execution of this foundational research, wider research inclusive of all previous of Closing the Gap speeches (nearing a decade of data to date) can be proposed. The following section explains the magnitude of the Closing the Gap policy and its place within the Australian Indigenous social agenda. It also frames the analysis within current Australian political affairs.

1.5 Contextualising Closing the Gap

The Closing the Gap policy began as the Close the Gap campaign in 2006, when Australia’s First Peoples demanded equality in health and life expectancy. So significant was the campaign that it was taken to the Indigenous Health Summit in 2008. It was here that Labor PM Kevin Rudd responded with his history-making speech, National Apology to the Stolen Generations (Commonwealth of Australia, 2008). A state
ment of intent was signed to achieve specific objectives by 2030. After a name change to *Closing the Gap*, it has remained a standing item in all Commonwealth of Australia Government (COAG) meetings. Since 2009, the PMs of Australia have delivered annual parliamentary speeches responding to the reports of *Closing the Gap* policy.

This ideology is a formidable task for any Australian government of the day to design, develop, present, and implement, given the inherent scope of issues to address, from historical institutional injustices and cultural sensitivities to the logistical and financial considerations of any proposed plan. However, it was the moral and ethical responsibility of the Australian government to implement this proposed ideology towards reconciliation. This policy included six key performance criteria to be addressed and measured for yearly progress. In 2009, the policy was introduced by the PM under a Labor government and as such has been retained under this government until 2015. Therefore, the Labor PM has consistently presented this annual report. A party change in office then occurred in 2016. Here, with a newly appointed Coalition government, PM Turnbull presented his first *Closing the Gap* speech to the House of Representatives. Interestingly, since the change of office in 2016, the Leader of the Opposition (Labor) has upheld the tradition of the Labor leader speaking to the *Closing the Gap* policy. This practice continues, thus resulting in two annual parliamentary addresses to *Closing the Gap*: one from the PM and one from the Leader of the Opposition.

### 1.6 Summary of chapter 1

This chapter has described the scope of this thesis, presenting research that links linguistic choices with ideological alignments. It has explained the structural presentation of the thesis, identifying the research questions and the purpose of the study. Also explained is the rationale for the data selection and a foundational explana-
tion of the Australian socio-political climate, motivating the leaders’ speeches. Proposed is a multifaceted analysis sufficient for a comprehensive evaluation of the data, revealing how political leaders present themselves linguistically on the national political stage.
2.1 Introduction

Some of the most significant contributions to the linguistic analysis of political discourse have taken place in the last 30 years. Section 2.2 will explore the distinction between PDA, CDA and DA and analyses of political speeches. Much of this previous work has primarily been driven by CDA, including scholars already introduced, such as Chilton, Wodak, Billig and MacMillan; in addition to Kress and Hodge, Fairclough, van Dijk, van Leeuwen and Seliger. Section 2.3 will focus on the founding scholar of the first methodological approach used in this study; that is Koven's (2002) role-perspective model for analysing narratives of subjective experience. Also discussed in section 2.3 will be notions such as ‘footing’ (Goffman, 1981) and voicing (Bakhtin, 1981) connected with this approach. Following the literature reviews associated with the methodological approaches, there will be a discussion of relevant analytical discourse work conducted within the Australian context. Therefore, sections 2.5, 2.6 and 2.7 will focus on literary contributions towards speech discourse of Australian political leaders, Indigenous issues and Closing the Gap.

2.2 Linguistic analysis of political language

Literary contributions to the field of PDA have been significant. Van Dijk (1995), (as cited in Blommaert & Bulcaen, 1997) clarified some ambiguity surrounding PDA, explaining that PDA is not a normative process of what it should include, but rather its intention is to identify an adequate way of doing such an analysis. In order to explore this approach, PDA is better understood within the framework of contemporary CDA (explained in section 2.4), which in turn sits within the larger framework of DA. Therefore, the inten-
tion here is to retain the integrity of PDA within the broader contexts of both CDA and DA. For this reason, the terms PDA, CDA and DA, which are used frequently throughout this thesis, are not interchangeable. In other words, as PDA deals with power issues or potential abuse of power through political discourse, it is doing so positioned within a wider critically analytical approach. Here, Van Dijk (1995) (as cited in Blommaert & Bulcaen, 1997) argued that PDA is not merely a contribution to studies on discourse, but more inclusively to the interdisciplinary fields of social and political sciences. Therefore, many analysts attempting to link politics with discourse are linguists, including Chilton (1985 & 1988), Geis, (1987) and Wilson (1990), but this is not to say that PDA is – or should be – the exclusive domain of linguists.

Other previous scholars that have also attempted to relate language with politics, expressing the importance of this ideology (e.g. Hodge & Kress 1993; Billig & MacMillan 2005; Wodak, 1989; Seliger, 1976) and power (i.e. Blackledge, 2005; van Dijk, 1993; Fairclough, 1989, 2002). Others define propositions or general characteristics of political discourse as operating indexically, or showing binary conceptualisations (Chilton, 2004). Van Dijk (2005) explores political implications such as peace and security, positive self-presentation and negative other-presentation. Duranti (2006) has explored discursive strategies in an alternative socio-cultural context of the USA. These examples of research are implications, generalisations and propositions for generating insights into the comprehension of the nature of political discourse and showing ways in which language is shaped to achieve political goals.

However, there are some areas of previous research in political ideology and alignment that has neglected to analyse the linguistic form as it correlates to language and ideology; and to explore ways in which power, ideology, and sociocultural considerations are linguistically constructed. In such instances, the focus on the lexical choices
enabling an explicit and unambiguous link between linguistic form and sociolinguistic function is missing. The present research fills this literary gap by proposing an analysis that relates to lexical forms, structures and items, with specific positioning and ideological alignments. Furthermore, the present research introduces a typology of discursive strategies, which interplay in the text creating a persuasive presentational package aimed at creating unity between the social actors.

2.3 Position, voicing, and speaker roles

The present research shows the varying alignments political leaders enact by using language, cultural knowledge, and any available semiotic resources. Goffman (1981) proposed that the notion of footing accounts for any changes in alignment. On the other hand, Bakhtin (1981) claims that language is manipulated by the social experience of the speakers. For him, utterances and words are culturally and socially loaded. In this sense, words are socially pre-loaded before a speaker uses them. Each utterance is ‘filled with echoes and reverberations of other utterances’ (Bakhtin, 1986, p.91), in other words, discourse is dialogic being related, shaped and influenced by other discourse (Blackledge, 2005). For Bakhtin, meaning is not a final product as it is always being exposed to re-definitions through varying voices. He defines voicing as an identifiable social position or role enacted by a speaker (Wortham & Locher, 1996). Blackledge (2005) claims that in political speech there are multiple dialogic situations in which speakers’ quote or evoke other characters or voices. Such examples of this Bakhtinian voicing reveals these voices as discursive strategies used in political discourse. His theory offers a reliable tool for PDA: ‘Although Bakhtin’s theories were principally developed in the context of literary critical theory, they have been found to be of immense value in understanding the role and power of public discourse’ (Blackledge,
Therefore, the first methodological approach will build on this theory by analysing how political leaders use a range of voices to enact their changing roles and position strategically within the discourse.

Goffman (1981) maintains that any linguistic forms used in an utterance have been shaped through the way others have used those linguistic forms. Bakhtin’s notions of a double voiced co-existence in an intrinsic dialogical discourse through heteroglossia (Bakhtin, 1981) illustrates the range of positioning by social actors through interactive and overlapping narratives. These narratives index former and future narratives by interconnecting them. Both Bakhtin and Goffman’s frames account for social positioning by indicating a range of meaning embedded in an utterance. They are complementary as Bakhtin’s analysis understands the larger social structures that allow for interactional positioning, whereas Goffman’s footing connects individuals, leaving the interactional setting disconnected from the social structures (Woolard, 2004). Bakhtin’s theory provides a clearer understanding of the link between social contexts and linguistic forms. By use of voicing, the process of manipulating, creating, or changing social meanings are captured. Bakhtin’s theory offers important advantages to PDA, by bringing fresh insights in tracing the different social voices or roles used by politicians.

2.3.1 Michéle Koven

Koven has made a unique contribution to the understanding of narrative discourse by exploring style shifting and code switching. She synthesises Bakhtinian voicing (Bakhtin, 1981) and Goffman’s footing (1981) to account for a diverse understanding of storyteller narration. In doing so she builds a triadic set of role distinctions, namely: narrator (or author), character and interlocutor. She explains that a political speaker
usually opens their speech in the role of narrator. According to her theory, the narrator recounts events, often taking the form of a commentary. The narrator’s ‘character’ can then be introduced in the form of a ‘ventriloquation’ – that is, in the form of other voices (Bakhtin, 1981). This can be clearly identified when the narrator quotes others. Koven asserts that narrators do not simply quote characters to replay what someone may have said, but rather to ‘position themselves and others as particular kinds of social actors’ (2002, p.100). These multiple positionings are summed up Wortham’s observation that ‘Whenever people interact...they take up some sort of position with respect to others’ (1996, p. 332). Lastly, as the interlocutor, a speaker will display features that enact the peculiarities of the actual interaction in which the speaker is engaged. That is to say, this role communicates a here-and-now context, containing evaluative references and remarks to the current participants (self and audience), thereby facilitating relationship-building communication.

Koven’s triadic model is particularly effective in political discourse to present links between linguistic features, voices and discursive goals (Reyes-Rodriguez, 2008). As voices are characterised by lexical choices and linguistic features, they can be considered as stylistic shifts. Koven’s roles - narrator, character, and interlocutor- present a functional understanding of storyteller narration, allowing the analyst to identify and explain alignments in the political speech data.

2.3.2 Combining Koven’s Tripartite Model with Critical discourse analysis.

The present thesis relies on the contributions of Koven as a framework for analysing speaker roles in the 2017 Closing the Gap speeches. Koven (2002) proposes an analytic approach that examines how oral narrative is multifunctional and multi-voiced in systematically specifiable ways. Koven claims that her tripartite distinction is not just
analytically useful but is pragmatically salient to listeners (Errington, 1988, as cited in Koven, 2002). She argues that speeches with a greater density of interlocutory discourse forms reveal more about the speaker as they are today, whereas speeches with a greater density of character performance yields a better sense of the speaker at the time of time of the event, lending support to the tripartite speaker-role distinction. She attempts to integrate discussions of what has variously been called evaluation, footing and voicing, to show clearly how speakers combine, juxtapose or collapse these different role performances. Role distinctions are not only useful for the analyst, they also aim to tap into something meaningful for listeners. The distinctions show how the interaction among three dominant voices constantly redefines the discourse.

Therefore, this study aims to build on Koven’s (2002) model by illustrating the relation between the different voices evoked by the politicians under study and the discursive goals they pursue. Here, CDA is applied to account for the explicit construction of the alignment through a typology of discourse strategies. It is argued that these two approaches propose different analyses of political discourse to explain data from a wider perspective (utilisation of three voices to achieve political goals) and from a narrower view (linguistic choices and discursive strategies used specifically in the construction of alignment). Scholars who have contributed to the literature surrounding CDA will be presented in section 2.4.

2.4 Critical discourse analysis

The present study also intends to identify and evaluate the negotiation of ideological alignment within the political speech data. While DA is confined to explaining discourse practices, CDA describes the social relationship of ideologies and power through discourse. Fairclough (1992) distinguishes CDA from DA by indicating new goals and
understandings of the former. CDA situates discourse utterances as social practices that manipulate, build, shape and mis/represent social identities, reality and the systemic knowledge of belief. A text analysis, in its simplicity, is insufficient to decipher social nuances and meanings embedded in speech events. Thus, CDA is critical in two senses, (i) Habermas (1972) asserted that it must be self-reflective, taking into account the historical context of the interaction; and (ii) asserted by Kress and Hodge (1979), each discourse utterance has social meaning thus maintaining a close relation between social and linguistic structure.

CDA is still an emerging science, aimed at decoding the ideologies embedded in the discourse, to inspect the link between discourses, and to evaluate the updating process of ideology through the discourse used. CDA forms a concept of language as an expression of social action, attempting to reveal how social actors are represented in discourse (van Leeuwen, 2002) and the reciprocal influences of social structure and language, which usually goes unnoticed (Fairclough, 1989, 1995). According to Wodak, de Cilla, Reisigl, and Liebhart (1999), the aim of CDA is to ‘unmask ideologically permeated and often obscure structures of power, political control and dominance...’ (p.8). The following sections explain the primary insights of the approaches offered by three of the most influential CDA theorists.

2.4.1 Norman Fairclough

Drawing on Foucault, Bakhtin, and Marx, Fairclough introduced the idea of textually oriented discourse analysis (1992). Here, the author considers the focus on text analysis against the philosophical treatment of discourse. He explored how utterances unveil social practices and how these social practices are shaped through discourse (Fairclough, 2003). He provided explanations about the relationship between speech
genres, textual properties, and sociological practices. Fairclough understood genre as a way of acting, discourse as a way of representing, and style as a way of being. Therefore, by selecting a specific linguistic presentation we also present/perform specific social practices. Fairclough combined text analysis with Foucauldian DA ‘which focuses less on text but rather on how it is constituted and constitutes social relations within particular orders of discourse’ (Wong Scollon, 2003, p.72). Foucault examines how the notion of truth and meaning have been created in various epochs; he analysed discourse formations in order to understand how knowledge is constructed (Foucault, 1972).

In describing these two levels of analyses - text analysis and social practices - Fairclough offers a relational approach to text analysis distinguishing external relations (social practices, social events, and social structures) with internal relations (grammatical, lexical, semantic, and phonological relations). Conversely, ‘interdiscursivity’ and ‘intertextuality’ (Fairclough, 1992) explains (within the external relations) how elements from other discourses are incorporated into present texts or discourses. Fairclough used intertextuality to explain the presence of varying elements of different texts within a given text - thus the potential for the presence of different voices. Quotes and reported speech are two examples of intertextuality (Fairclough, 2003).

Interdiscursivity on the other hand, explains how a certain mix of discourses, genres, and style are expressed within a text. Therefore, there is a level of mediation between social analysis and linguistic analysis (i.e. practices and events) (Fairclough, 2003). The notions of intertextuality and interdiscursivity present an influence of Bakhtin's ‘dialogicality’, explaining the link between different voices within texts, being derived from the ‘dialogical’ theory of language: ‘Any utterance is a link in a very complexly organized chain of other utterances’ and among them they reflect ‘one kind of relation or another’ (Bakhtin 1986, p.69). Fairclough’s description of intertextuality runs parallel to
the Bakhtinian polyphony of voices that will be used track the different voices within the data of this study. This is significant, as Australian political leaders often to refer to previously respected leaders as a strategy to further their own agenda.

2.4.2 Tuen van Dijk

Van Dijk focused on a more of cognitive approach (1993), namely that of cognitive language processing. Where Fairclough observed the relationship between different discourses and related social structures with text analysis, van Dijk explored the cognitive process and attempted to analyse how meaning is constructed in people's minds, explaining their development of beliefs and knowledge. Van Dijk (1998) argued for a sociocognitive common-ground between socially discursive structures. From cognitive psychology, he analysed the link between cognitive dimensions such as people’s knowledge, beliefs, attitudes, norms, values, ideologies, and discourse. He explained the power which elite groups possess, shaping these cognitive dimensions in other’s minds. Additionally, van Dijk analysed the re/production of prejudice within discourse, with the intention of developing theoretical models supporting the cognitive discourse devices that reflect reproductions of those prejudices, for example, racism. ‘Symbolic elites’ (van Dijk, 1993) include journalists, politicians, writers, academics and are frequently the re/producer of those dominant discourses which support inequality. The present study will explore discursive strategies used by the speakers’ that maintain their elite positions, while attempting to construct their negotiation of alignment.

2.4.3 Ruth Wodak

Wodak developed the discourse historical approach. This approach investigated the historical and political topics/ texts by tracking discursive reflections of the past to
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comprehend the discourse formations for the present and future. In writing Language, Power, and Ideology, Wodak defines her field as ‘critical linguistics’, and as ‘an interdisciplinary approach’ to language study with a critical point of view intended for studying ‘language behaviour in natural speech situations of social relevance’ (Wodak, 1989, p.xv). She also emphasised the significance of diverse theoretical and methodological approaches, suggesting that these can also be applied in ‘analysing issues of social relevance’ (Wodak, 1989). She encouraged the use of a range of methods for language research while underscoring the necessity to identify the historical and social components. As a point of difference to Fairclough and van Dijk, Wodak worked on political discourse by searching for discursive strategies (that is the argumentation scheme) and their means of realisation. For example, in the ‘Discursive construction of national identity’ (Wodak, de Cillia, Reisigl and Liebhart 1999), the authors analyse political speeches from Austria. Their analysis is primarily thematic as they contrast and compare statements from different political leaders on the same topic. This analysis provides the authors with the principal forms and strategies of linguistic realisation that deal with specific topics.

The present study adopts a typology of discursive strategies adapted from Wodak’s (2001) model (as cited in Wodak and Meyer, 2001), and is designed to support the linguistic construction of alignment. Her analysis is an important guide to this study and is further discussed in chapter 3. Referential strategies or nomination strategies are used for the construction and representation of social actors. Identified here are the strategies used in the construction of us-and-them groups. Predicative strategies appear when these social actors are identified or explained through, for example, evaluative attributions (predications). Here the attribution of positive or negative qualities to the other are explored. Argumentation strategies are resources to justify those attributions.
For example, if Australia’s First Peoples are attributed positive qualities of being the traditional land owners of Australia, then the argument would be that it is the governments’ moral and ethical duty to ensure equality. Intensifying and mitigation strategies portray a skewed representation of those social actors and their actions in the narrative. For example, the intensification strategy of repetition can effectively reinforce a position of any proposed action. These last types of strategies emphasise the differences or similarities among participants and their actions.

2.5 Research on Australian political leaders’ speech

Political speech is a point of interest for many researchers. Many articles in political speech analysis are available for speeches originating from United Kingdom, USA, and Europe. Speeches from Winston Churchill, Margaret Thatcher, and Tony Blair to Martin Luther King, Barack Obama, and Donald Trump have diligently been analysed by linguistic scholars (Crespo-Fernández, 2013; Reicher and Hopkins, 1996; van Dijk, 2008; Foss, 2018; Wang, 2010). In contrast, when researching similar cases within the Australian context the results are infrequent. However, there have been some illuminating studies on, for example, Gillard’s famous 2012 Misogyny speech (Wright & Holland, 2014). There are also illuminating studies on communication styles of Australian PMs John Howard and Keating (Bennister, 2008; Dryenfurth, 2007; Johnson, 2007; Morris, 1992). For example, Bennister (2008) focuses on the direct contrast between the communication styles of two PMs John Howard and Tony Blair (Australia and UK). Dryenfurth (2007) focused on hegemony features within political discourse. The author explored how Howard's rhetorical appropriation of egalitarian ideals, such as 'mateship', 'battler' and the 'fair go', are examples of the intersection of cultural and elec-
toral politics. Morris (1992) focused on aspects of persona and orator styles as applied to former Australian PM, Keating.

This communication analysis is significant to the field of discourse analysis, as orator styles and speech content intertwine in parliamentary discourse. Furthermore, previous parliamentary speech analysis of PMs Howard and Sir Robert Menzies has also identified the interdisciplinary relationship of discourse analysis and political science (Younane, 2007; Young, 2007). Younane (2007) explores political rhetoric from the perspective of political science, demonstrating the interdisciplinary relationship between political science and the linguistic discipline of PDA. Young (2007) compares two former Australian Prime Ministerial orators, Menzies and Howard. Their political speech styles and content are analysed by the author in a multimodal capacity. The multimodal analysis is comprehensive, covering orator styles of delivery and engagement with the intended audience. In summary, these studies highlight the significance of Australian political speech analysis due to Australia’s unique historical, cultural, social and geographical considerations, when compared to international political speech analyses.

2.6 Research on the discourse of Indigenous affairs in Australia

Discourse surrounding Indigenous affairs in Australia is a growing area of research that has until recently been minimal. Most studies, such as those mentioned previously, stem from the white, patriarchal perspective of political leaders. It is worth noting, however, that previous scholars have written at least some face-to-face analyses of public pronouncements on Australian Indigenous affairs (e.g. Augoustinos, Hastie and Wright, 2011; Hastie & Augoustinos, 2012; Worth, Augoustinos & Hastie, 2015; Johnston & Forde, 2017). Martha Augoustinos, in particular, has contributed significant research on the discourse of racial issues within Australia and Australian Indigenous af-
fairs (Augoustinos, Tuffin and Every, 2005). Together with her contemporaries, her sociolinguistic contribution to Australian issues of racism (including asylum seekers) has highlighted Australian political discourse as a significant contribution to other interdisciplinary fields of analysis - race studies, gender studies, psychology, education and humanitarian issues. For example, Hastie and Augoustinos (2012) analysed the pragmatic and linguistic features of the 2008 Rudd apology speech to the Stolen Generations. The Stolen Generations refers to the abolished policy of assimilation in Australia, which saw Indigenous children removed from their families and placed into non-Indigenous families or Christian missionaries. Hastie and Augoustinos (2012) contributions are significant for the present study surrounding race/ethnic discourse. These authors proposed a need for building an anti-racist rhetoric in the context of Australia’s First Peoples and non-Indigenous relations in Australia.

In contrast, Johnstone and Forde (2017) reinforce the interdisciplinary nature of PDA in the Indigenous Australian context. Such input from other disciplines strengthens the present study of DA from Australian political leaders. The strength of this reference is its theoretical approach that hypothesizes that ‘mediatisation’ influences political speech acts. Still, most of this focus has surrounded the Stolen Generations, with the associated political rhetoric of reconciliation and apology. Prominent linguistic studies on Howard’s 1997 Values and Australian Identity speech (Johnson, 2007) and Keating’s 1992 Redfern Park speech (Augoustinos, Hastie and Wright, 2011; LeCouteur, 2001) also situate themselves within Australian Indigenous context. Augoustinos et al (2011) explore discourse designed to invoke empathy and identification with the other. This aspect is significant to the current study, in highlighting the linguistic strategies that humanise those less powerful, and elicit support for redressing social injustice.
2.7 Literature surrounding *Closing the Gap*

While there is developing scope for research of discourse surrounding Indigenous affairs, there is a particular opportunity for discourse analyses of the political policy of *Closing the Gap* as an independent focus. Scholars such as LeCouteur (2001) have explored how discourse analysis used in institutionalised settings. This contributes to an understanding of the perspective of the political speeches used in the present study. While the LeCouteur doesn’t focus directly on *Closing the Gap*, the focus on Rudd’s apology to the *Stolen Generations*, is still significant. Such a political response addressing historical injustices is significant to indigenous issues in Australia. Rudolph (2016) explored the Closing the Gap policy as having a purpose to address historical injustices. However, this reference is focused on policy reform, examining the related gap-oriented research from an educational perspective, rather than that of a discourse analyst focused on the political speeches.

2.8 Summary of chapter 2

To date, there has been no significant literature regarding discourse analysis of the *Closing the Gap* speeches, although there have been scholars from similarly interested disciplines that have analysed speeches of other Australian political leaders and areas of Indigenous issues. This gap in the literature would, therefore, benefit from an analysis such as the present one, ensuring a comprehensive contribution towards parliamentary discourse representation of Indigenous policy within Australia. This chapter has reviewed previous literature in contributing fields, identifying the varied areas of literary contributions that facilitate this study. Outlined have been works on linguistic analysis of political speeches, works contributing to the three role-perspective model,
scholars from CDA and contributions to the discourse within the Australian context of political speech analysis, Indigenous issues and Closing the Gap. In the following chapter (chapter 3), the methodology used for this study will be presented. It will be argued that a combined methodological approach can offer a comprehensive analysis of the data.
Methodology

3.1 Introduction

The present study will present a connection between sociolinguistic functions and linguistic form, by utilising two primary methodological frameworks together with two supporting methodological frameworks. A three role-perspective model, CDA, a statistical analysis and a comprehension level comparison will be used to provide evidence of the choice of linguistic forms used by the two political leaders in servicing their political ideology and negotiation of alignment. This section will discuss each in turn. As indicated earlier, alignment (in this context) refers to bringing a person or group into agreement with the policy of another. Additionally, Seliger's definition on ideology is followed: ‘Sets of ideas by which men posit, explain and justify ends and means of organized social action, and specifically political action irrespective of whether such action aims to preserve, amend, uproot or rebuild a given social order’ (1976, p.14). The present study will collect linguistic ways in which political leaders construct alignment with Australia’s First Peoples after its history of misalignment, attempting to observe similarities and differences between the political leaders regarding their ideological positioning.

Firstly, a three role-perspective model will be used, as it acknowledges the discursive shifts in perspectives, and exemplifies the linguistic shifts in presenting the ideology of reconciliation. Koven (2002) proposed a model of three role-perspectives to evaluate the narrative of personal experience within a speech event, detecting discursive shifts used by politicians to achieve their political goals. Her model will be adapted for the present study. This model integrates Labov’s notion of ‘evaluation’ (1972, 1997), Bakhtin’s notion of voicing (1981) and Goffman’s notion of footing (1981). Labov's
focus on narratives identifies the level of evaluation speakers present in a narration, observing their use of evaluative comments on a given event. Koven's (2002) model, provides accountability for the various roles enacted within the speech, to create alignments or set distance with the involved social actors. It also engages with the empirical linguistic data such as pronoun choice, displaying generalisations required for a clearer understanding of the circumstance. Additionally, it shows incidences of role perspectives used to achieve desired goals within the speeches. Narrator, character and interlocutor all facilitate the speakers to align themselves with other social actors and their political message. Koven’s (2002) model then attempts to shows the relation between the various roles (Narrator, character and interlocutor) used by the political speakers and their pursued discursive goals. For example, through using the voice of a character from the past, a speaker can evoke personal quotes. Similarly, they can align themselves with respected symbolic figures of Indigenous issues e.g. Keating, Rudd and Patrick Dodson. These character enactments validate and reinforce the speaker's position as they are recontextualised into the present speech. Goffman (1981), alternatively, regards a strategy called footing as a multifunctional analysis of different positions proposed by the speaker; for example, various enunciations of I reveal changes of direction, in different contexts, by drawing on different personal alignments. Bakhtin (1981), understands such changing roles or voices as an identifiable social role or position enacted by a speaker. As such, they are historically and culturally loaded, manipulating any given discourse.

Secondly, CDA supports Fairclough’s (2003) attempts to link the text with social practices. This aspect furthers the cognitive focus of van Dijk (1993), attempting to detect how politicians aim to manipulate people’s values and beliefs. Explored will be the discursive strategies involved in the negotiation of alignment as defined in section 1.2.
That is, the exploration will show how a political goal is linguistically created. Wodak’s (1989, 2002, 2011) explorations of nationalism and/or racism is referenced to display how racial alignment is linguistically constructed. In order to demonstrate how alignment is constructed and rectified linguistically among the social actors in this study, a typology of discursive strategies will used. These strategies explored by Wodak (as cited in Reisigl & Wodak, 2001) explain the construct of alignment or otherness by combining strategies with semantic implications e.g. of the actions denoted by these discourse strategies. Such strategies account for attempts in creating a notion of alignment. They evaluate semiotic resources or linguistic features, along with their explicit/implicit meanings, available to the speaker to create alignment. Such strategies are salient in Indigenous issues. Therefore, government institutional positioning requires historical acknowledgement to support any attempts in creating a notion of alignment.

Both methodologies will be presented in chapters 4 and 5.

After the first two primary modes of analysis are explored, the supporting methodologies will be introduced. The first of the supporting methodologies is a statistical analysis presented in chapter 6, to compare the recurrence and frequency of speech features presented in the speeches. It is relevant to provide a quantified model of the use of voices and discursive strategies discussed in this thesis for each speech, not for the purpose of drawing any determined conclusion but rather to shed some light on the frequency in which the proposed semiotic resources appear. The analysis of this section shows when the phenomenon previously discussed appears, how often it is used to determine if there is any significant similarities or differences among them. This analysis provides evidence that the phenomena discussed are not isolated; they occur with certain frequencies within the speech of each politician. The results and implications of this section must be cautiously interpreted taking into consideration the small data set, how-
ever, the inclusion of this methodology shows that the roles and discursive strategies employed by the different politicians are a common denominator in the speeches and not context-bound phenomena.

The software AntConc\(^1\) is used to obtain these results. In addition to measuring these recurring speech features, AntConc also establishes ‘concordances’ as a list of target words extracted from a given text, or set of texts, often presented in such a way as to indicate the context in which the word is used. Additionally, this format can present information called ‘Key Words in Context’ (hereafter, KWIC). The inclusion of this statistical analysis is useful as it can detect subliminal differences in the language that intuition cannot, such as the number of times a speaker can utter inclusive pronouns when referring to Australia or Australians. It also bolsters the empirical foundations of the primary methodologies, thus reducing researcher bias (i.e.: subjectivity) and increasing the credibility, validity and readability of the analysis. Furthermore, the procedures of such an approach are replicable, which consequently increases the scientific value of the approach.

The last supporting method of analysis to be presented in this combined approach is a comprehension level comparison of the speeches. The Flesch-Kincaid (1975) readability assessments will be used here. These assessments were designed to indicate how difficult a passage is to understand. It is acknowledged that the speeches are in fact heard and not read. However, the premise remains that they still must be understood by the target audience. An example of the effectiveness of this method of

---

\(^1\) AntConc is a freeware concordance program developed by Prof. Laurence Anthony, Director of the Centre for English Language Education, Waseda University (Japan).
analysis, was a study conducted by Carnegie Mellon University (2016), which concluded that most United States presidential candidates speak at grade 6-8 level. Therefore, this methodology will be similarly applied to the present study, as any attempt to construct alignment with other social actors, must consider the range sociocultural and socioeconomic inclusions. In other words, by articulating a political speech at an academic level that is disproportionate with the desired audience, a negotiation of potential alignment is at risk. ‘Relate-ability’ is desirable in this case.

Thus, this study presents two assessments to analyse the data in this field; the Flesch reading ease assessment (1948), and the Flesch–Kincaid grade level assessment (1975). Any criticism towards this method of analysis usually involves whether the speech data are texts, or if they are transcripts of presentations where ‘ad lib’ are spoken on the spot. In this sense, spoken language is often less formal than written text. This criticism is countered in the present study due to the speeches being pre-prepared text that is presented and subsequently transcribed.

In summary, this combined methodology facilitates the required tools to spearhead the data and decipher the social meaning in political linguistic choices. It develops role perspectives and a critical approach, supported with statistical and comparative analyses to explain how alignment is linguistically demonstrated in the speeches.

3.2 First methodological approach: Three role-perspective model

---

2 The Flesch Reading Ease and the Flesch–Kincaid Grade Level use the same core measures (word length and sentence length), but have different weighting factors. Rudolf Flesch devised the Reading Ease evaluation. Later, he and Peter Kincaid developed the Grade Level evaluation for the United States Navy.
Koven’s three role-perspective model (2002) presents three roles used by political speakers in presenting their ideological position within their speeches. These roles are narrator, character and interlocutor. Narrator and character are voices usually used by politicians to project two sides (us and them) in their discourse. Table 1 below provides examples to illustrate each of Koven’s concepts.

Table 1: Examples of Koven’s three role-perspectives.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Narrator</td>
<td>Telling a story or reporting facts</td>
<td>“This is something that happened a long time ago....” or “This was said on the news last night...”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Character</td>
<td>Draws on someone else’s words</td>
<td>“Let’s remember what Luther King said: ‘I have a dream.’”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interlocutor</td>
<td>Interaction resembling a face to face conversation</td>
<td>“I went to the communities and spoke with the elders. We shared stories. Why can’t we do that more often?”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These roles can shift discursively throughout the speeches, as they contribute to the positioning and perspective of the political goal. They employ a range of items, including reporting, narration or quotation of events and utterances. Intertextual references can also speak to previous parliamentary speeches, reports or documents. These tools are useful in establishing footing with the desired audience. The role of interlocutor utilises personal involvement and stories can establish emotional notions. An example here is
provided in Table 1 above. Mention of Indigenous stories and achievements are also able to establish emotional responses. It is here that the subtle undertones and overtones of emotion and compassion will be evaluated, in inspiring the listeners’ trust and presenting solidarity with Australia’s First Peoples.

- **Narrator**

  The role of narrator provides objectivity to the utterances, distancing the speaker from the situation. There are two narration styles that will be evaluated in the present study. These are the reporter style and the storytelling style. Within both styles of narration, several devices are useful in the achievement of a political objective. The present research focuses on role of narrative that can be displayed by the use of certain linguistic features, interlocutor (interactional features = linguistic choices), narrator (narration of the events = distancing or aligning with the facts) and character (quotations = outsider’s voice). Koven's triadic model allows relations between the roles, linguistic and paralinguistic features and discursive goals (Reyes-Rodriguez, 2008).

- **Character**

  Koven (2002) understands character as speakers voicing themselves or others as quoted characters. According to the author: ‘Through quotations, speakers can evoke and invoke, inhabit, or comment upon specific, recognisable sociocultural identities from contexts beyond the here-and-now of the immediate interaction’ (Koven, 2002, p.100). The present study shows how politicians evoke different social actors under the role of character. Different realisations of the role character would bring different sociocultural indexes into the here-and-now discourse. Displayed is how quoting respected characters such as national historical figures pursue different discursive goals in the po-
itical speech. Character allows ventriloquation of other voices (Bakhtin, 1981). It occurs when the speaker cites or quotes someone else. An outside voice is often used by the speaker to legitimate his arguments and position. The character's role draws someone else's words into the discourse. Quotations allow speakers to display alternative versions of self (Wortham, 2001) or project distance between themselves and cultural others (Koven, 2002). Character is, therefore, an important tool in positioning social actors and creating differences or similarities among them.

- **Interlocutor**

The notion of interlocutor is also adopted from Koven (2002). As an interlocutor, the speaker displays interaction features typical of a face-to-face casual conversation. This role displays ‘overtly and explicitly social interactional elements of discourse’ (Bauman, 1986, p.99). Although Koven (2002) and Bauman (1986) apply this role to the setting of oral narratives, the interactional features presented in political speeches make the interlocutor role an important speaker role. This role contains evaluation remarks and references to current self and hearers, and it works as relationship-building communication.

### 3.3 Second methodological approach: Critical discourse analysis

Within the context of the present study, CDA aims to use a systemic attempt to identify patterns within the text and link them to the selected socio/political context of Indigenous issues. Therefore, it is well suited to the socio/political context of this study. The perspective from here is that social practice and linguistic practice focus on investigating how societal power relations are addressed and reinforced through language use. CDA is also useful in providing insights into the relationship between lan-
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guage and ideology. It is multifaceted, in that it does not limit its analysis simply to specific structures of text and/or talk. It also systematically relates these text-and-talk structures to structures within the sociopolitical context. For example, in this study, CDA is used to examine the selected political speech acts, to highlight the rhetoric behind these. Therefore, CDA can be viewed as an overarching approach. Also considered are the limitations with CDA. Its broad methodological approach may limit the ability to identify all intricate features within the speeches. However, its strength is in situating the text-and-talk speeches within their sociological and political construct, thus providing a robust and appropriate rationale for its usage.

3.3.1 Critique of critical discourse analysis

CDA explores the significance of language in human relations. It has shown how realities are constructed linguistically and can be consistently analysed (see section 3.4.2). Considering the objectives of the present study, CDA is an appropriate tool to develop the analysis. However, there has been some relevant criticism of CDA in the literature. Henry Widdowson (1995) criticises CDA and one of its most important representatives, Norman Fairclough. Widdowson asserts that there is some confusion in the notions related to CDA, namely the undefined notion of text and the lack of a clear, specific, and shared definition of discourse. He also challenges some of the extreme views of some who practice DA. For example, those who make statements about ideologies and beliefs with minimal text analysis, and conversely, those who analyse text without considering social factors. One of Fairclough’s primary arguments is that CDA is interpretive, and therefore (according to Widdowson) invalid as an approach for analysis (Widdowson, 1995). Widdowson highlights the risk of not considering reader's interpretations which may differ from the writer's intentions. According to him, CDA
provides only a partial interpretation. It is partial in that it ‘only chooses features in the
text which supports its desired interpretation’ (Widdowson, 1995). Schegloff (1997) has
also criticised CDA. He asserts that text analysis must first generate a description of the
texts. By categorising texts into such descriptions, the content can be more accurately
evaluated. Only then can they continue with a critical analysis. Widdowson (2000) and
Schegloff (1997) are understandably concerned with any biases inherent within CDA,
as researchers may analyse the text from a personal ideological position or from pre-
conceived ideas. They are also concerned that data analysed can be arbitrarily collected
with the intention of supporting the author’s ideological arguments. Fairclough (1996)
replies to Widdowson’s claims, stating that the latter misunderstood the goal of CDA.

The present research will follow CDA as part of its theoretical framework. It is
the view of this thesis that CDA has the capacity to reveal how political positioning can
be accomplished within discourse. However, it is accepted that some CDA analysts base
their conclusions predominately in a preconceived ideology rather than on an exhaus-
tive textual analysis. Therefore, this study aims to propose a method that avoids
ideological bias. This method is achieved by combining CDA with Koven’s (2002)
three role-perspective model, a statistical analysis and a comparative comprehension
level of analysis thus reducing any risk of potential researcher bias.

3.3.2 Discursive strategies in the construction of alignment

The three roles outlined within Koven’s (2002) methodology can provide insight
to the different alignments political leaders assume in relation to certain social actors.
These misalignments are linguistically constructed. This can be complemented via the
second methodology of CDA, through which a typology of discursive strategies used by
the speakers to create alignment is proposed. For this purpose, Wodak’s (2001) model
of ‘Political objectives, discursive strategies and devices’ (as cited in Wodak & Meyer, 2001) will be adapted for the present study, with the focus on answering the research questions surrounding ideology and alignment. Table 2 below displays these strategies, which will be applied in a clear and explicit way to the respective speeches of each political leader in chapters 4 and 5.

**Table 2: Political objectives, discursive strategies and devices, from Wodak & Meyer (2001)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Discursive Strategy</th>
<th>Devices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction of in and out groups</td>
<td>Referential/</td>
<td>Membership organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nomination</td>
<td>Naturalising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>e.g.: Pronoun Choice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labelling social actors</td>
<td>Predication</td>
<td>Stereotypical, evaluative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>positively or negatively,</td>
<td></td>
<td>attributions of positive or negative traits.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>deprecatorily or appreciatory.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justification of positive or</td>
<td>Argumentation</td>
<td>Topoi used to justify political inclusions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>negative attributions.</td>
<td></td>
<td>or exclusion, discrimination or preferential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>treatment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>e.g.: Persuasive devices such as</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>lexical repetition, repetition of structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modifying the epistemic status of</td>
<td>Intensification,</td>
<td>Humour, Emotion, Emphatic devices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a proposition</td>
<td>Mitigation</td>
<td>Imagery, Call to action, Visions for the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>future.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

• **Referential strategies:**

Referential nomination requires membership organisation; therefore, pronoun choice is highlighted in the analysis of both speeches (chapters 4 and 5). Here, pronoun ambiguity is an issue, as pronouns change semantically throughout the speeches. Fur-
thermore, use of first-person pronouns contributes to the extent to which a speaker owns an issue. The issue of shifting identity can also be identified as fluid in the creation of us-and-them groups.

• **Predicational strategies:**

Predication signifies stereotypical or evaluative attributions of positive or negative traits of the social actors. It is expected that evaluative attributions of positive traits will be applied to Indigenous people within the data, in attempts to construct alignment with them. Metaphor usage will be the focus, as well as how they are referred to linguistically.

• **Argumentation strategies:**

By focusing on argumentation analysis, a clearer account of political effectiveness is revealed. By means of arguments and argumentation schemes, the way specific persons or social groups try to justify and legitimise the exclusion, discrimination, suppression, and exploitation of others will be evaluated. In other words, arguments or argumentation schemes, linguistic structures, and rhetorical devices these leaders use to try and justify, legitimise and naturalise the inclusion of others, will be explored.

• **Intensification and mitigation strategies:**

Intensifying or mitigating the illocutionary force of utterances are effective discursive strategies that can use emotion, emphatic devices or repetition. Emphatic devices often use markers of modalisation. Here, modality shows a subjective comment, a commitment with an utterance, mostly expressed through modal verbs. Lexical and grammatical choices are also explored in each of the speeches, particularly the extent of repetition involved in each case. By investigating the degrees of lexical repetition (three
or more), an indication of the relative importance of specific themes by each speaker is highlighted. This reflects their assumptions about the audiences’ concerns. For example, ‘What Queenslanders want are jobs, jobs, jobs’.

Also included here, alongside repetition, is the use of three-part lists, as they represent devices also used in intensification or mitigation strategies. Three-part lists are often short, punchy declarations that are delivered in a set of three mutually dependant statements. They are commonly used in political rhetoric. For example, ‘one people, one empire, one leader’, is intended to have an attention-grabbing effect on the audience. Wotiff (1996, as cited in Fairclough and Fairclough, 2013) assessed three-part lists, for their form and function. Hillier (2004) recognised the strategy of Wotiff’s three-part lists that could evoke applause from the audience at desired points within a speech. These desired points remain, regardless of whether the applause is permissible (due to the formality of a speech presentation). For example, in the words of Julius Caesar, ‘I came, I saw, I conquered’.

3.4 Summary of chapter 3

This chapter has presented the combined methodologies used in the present study. The first methodological approach is adapted from Koven's three role-perspective model (2002). The second methodological approach employs CDA, based on Wodak’s (2001) model of political objectives, discursive strategies, and devices. As these are the two primary methods of analysis they have been explored in depth in sections 3.2 and 3.3. Both of these methods will be applied in each leaders’ analyses in chapters 4 and 5 respectively. The third methodological approach includes a statistical analysis and the fourth includes a comprehension level of comparison, both of which are explained in section 3.1. These last two modes of analysis are used as supporting methodologies,
providing measurable scientific approaches that reduce researcher bias inherent within the first two approaches. They will be applied in chapter 6. Thus, this chapter has arrived at a synthesised theoretical approach used to account for how political speakers position themselves ideologically including the identification of the specific discursive strategies used.
4.1 Introduction

This chapter will present a combined analysis of Turnbull’s speech. The first methodological approach will use Koven’s three-role perspective model as it displays the relation among different voices enacted by Turnbull. Salient devices will be identified and supported with line marked extracts from his speech. The second theoretical approach used is drawn from CDA focusing on the discursive strategies he uses to achieve his objectives. Here, predominate devices used in achieving these strategies will be identified and supported with line marked examples from the data provided in Appendix A.

4.2 Analysis of Turnbull’s address using Koven’s three role-perspectives:

Narrator, character, and interlocutor

• Narrator

As was explained in section 3.2, Koven’s notion of narrator can be defined as a voice that recounts an event. In his Closing the Gap speech, Turnbull enacts this role by narrating events, providing information, and responding to the statistical results of the report. While his speech is a parliamentary and national address, his narrator’s voice is primarily oriented towards the Indigenous community. This can be seen in the following extract.

T5 - The lives, the occupations, the dreams of Aboriginal and Torres Islander Australians are as diverse as those of all other Australians –
and stretched across this vast land, from the most remote communities to the heart of our capitals, to our national Parliament, our First Australians are showing that they can do anything, as they inspire us with their resilience, their courage and their enterprise.

Turnbull switches his narrator style throughout the speech, beginning and ending with an empathetic storytelling style. Throughout the middle sections of his speech, he emulates a journalistic style of narration, sticking to facts, numbers, and statistics presented in the report. By emulating an empathetic, storytelling style (narrator) and quoting from community members (which is what Koven would describe as the character role), Turnbull attempts to establish veracity and validate his arguments (as will be discussed in more detail below). When addressing an issue, Turnbull builds up an argument by elaborating on the causes and consequences of that issue. This involves reviewing, on numerous occasions, the socio-historic context of the issue which allows him to frame his current argument for a united effort towards reconciliation. He provides his audience with specific information about people, places, times, and more importantly, who was involved or responsible for the events, and where and when the events took place. This can be seen in the extract below.

T14 - On that hot dry day on the shores of the Cox Peninsula in Darwin, we acknowledged that the Larrakia people had cared for their country for tens of thousands of years, that their songs have been sung since time out of mind, and that those songs held and passed on the knowledge of Larrakia customs and traditions.
In this extract, under the role of narrator, Turnbull recounts the Kenbi Native land claim ceremony in a respectful way. In this capacity, he presents humility towards the Larra-kia people, by invoking an emotional account of their cultural values. This narration emulates an empathetic storytelling style in keeping with the Indigenous traditions of relaying information. It invokes both the imagery and emotion required for representing his authenticity, in supporting his ideology of reconciled equality.

- **Character**

As explained previously, Koven’s notion of character refers to the speaker using someone else’s words. As an example of character, we can observe how Turnbull quotes a source to present and support his argument. Here, Turnbull quotes Indigenous community leader Chris Sarra, with whom he has spoken in the year prior:

T6 - Last year Chris Sarra proposed three principles that would help make a difference in Indigenous policy. He said: “Do things with us, not to us. Bring us policy approaches that nurture hope and optimism; and acknowledge, embrace and celebrate the humanity of Indigenous Australia”.

Through the device of character, Turnbull enacts a different disembodied voice (Bakhtin, 1981). The quote above represents an outside voice (character) that Turnbull brings into the present moment to display his desired purpose. Such a quote is therefore a semiotic resource used to project authenticity by speaking the words of a respected Indigenous community leader. In this case, Chris Sara represents the voice of the Indigenous community. Therefore, by responding to this voice, Turnbull is responding to the entire
Indigenous community. The character voice backs up Turnbull’s arguments and provides authenticity.

• **Interlocutor**

Lastly, Turnbull displays another voice: the voice of the interlocutor. This role helps him to display features of informal or conversational style, and expresses the here-and-now. It contains evaluative remarks and references to current self and listeners, and it works by building solidarity with the Indigenous community. For example:-

T30 - As Prime Minister, Mr. Speaker, I will continue to tell those stories –

to talk about the strengths of our First Australians.

While the genre of political speeches does not provide a forum for two-way conversation, stylistic remarks such as the example above, represents the idea of relaxed communication, thus inviting trust. Indigenous trust in the governmental establishment is, needless to say, a key purpose of the speech. In sum, these voices of narrator, character and interlocutor, present a dynamic interaction in the discourse through the phenomenon of ‘heteroglossia’ (Bakhtin, 1981), allowing different positioning and overlapping narratives. The next sections show instances of the distinct roles/voices discussed above.

**4.2.1 The role of narrator: Storytelling and journalistic styles**

Under the narrator role, Turnbull presents two distinctive presentation styles. The delivery of both these styles can be formal and serious and can interchange throughout the speech. The first is a storytelling style, which can be seen as emulating
the Indigenous tradition of storytelling. At other times he switches to a journalistic style speaking about Closing the Gap results and specific historical events. This journalistic style, while at variance with that of storytelling, is suitable for the presentation of detailed information, facts, and numbers. Both are discussed in detail in the following sections.

4.2.1.1 Storytelling style

One way in which Turnbull enacts the role of narrator is by telling a story. This voice sometimes interrupts the other two voices: interlocutor or character. The narrator voice lacks first person singular conjugations so that it can place a distance between itself and the story. There are several famous figures that Turnbull mentions in his narrations: Charles Perkins, Vincent Lingiari and Eddie Mabo. Turnbull tells stories of these famous referents. In line 22, the mention of Charles Perkins as a freedom fighter is crucial given the socio-historical context of his address. Therefore, Perkins's past actions legitimise Turnbull's present actions. Similarly, the mentioning of Lingiari and Mabo (lines 23 and 24) further supports his actions, since these ‘personalities’ provided the national foundations for the ideology that he is now promoting. From his position of authority and power, Turnbull is attempting to align with Perkins, Lingiari and Mabo’s behaviours and actions. He also brings many more unnamed Indigenous social justice fighters into the current discourse within his speech. Turnbull searches for validity, support and strength for his own agenda since he wants to build on the foundations laid by those successful Indigenous leaders.

The storytelling narrator voice is on display when Turnbull tells a story with no first-person singular deictics (spacial distancing) nor conjugations, in order to distance
himself from the story. However, the role of narrator is sometimes interrupted by his use of interlocutor, which he employs to clarify and explain the rationale of the past story into the current discourse. For example:

\[ T25 \] - Mr. Speaker, theirs are the shoulders among many upon which a new generation of Indigenous leaders stand today.

Eventhough Turnbull is telling a story under the role of narrator, he opens with the interlocutor role by speaking directly to ‘Mr Speaker’. This is an example of what Bakhtin (1981) considers ‘double-voicing’.

This section has explained how Turnbull linguistically relates the three historical figures and introduces them, under the role of narrator, to the audience. As a storyteller, he displays sociocultural conceptualisations (Silverstein, 2004), which reproduce meanings shaped socio-culturally within the Indigenous community. By identifying with famous freedom fighters of the past, Turnbull aims to position himself positively, thus creating a foundation on which to present his ideology of reconciliation.

### 4.2.1.2 Journalistic style: Framing events in time and space

This section focuses on the adverbial phrases used by Turnbull to provide specific circumstantial information about the events, which are representative of the so-called journalistic style. These adverbials indicate with precision when and where the events took place. Such adverbials are common under the role of narrator throughout Turnbull's speech. The example below constitutes the narration of an event.

\[ T16 \] - It is that acknowledgement that fifty years ago, saw the Australian
people vote overwhelmingly to change our Constitution so that
the Commonwealth could assume powers in relation to our First
Australians.

To explain a present situation, Turnbull describes a fact that occurred 50 years before.
He provided a time frame when they occurred. He continues…

T19 - The success of the 1967 referendum also meant that First
Australians were counted equally in our official population –
alongside all other Australians in the Census.

These types of adverbial phrases, emphasised in bold, describe exact times and places,
often appear under the role of narrator. He frames his events within a precise time and
place to provide accuracy. In addition to providing the precise time coordinates, these
adverbials contain numbers, and numbers, as shown below, convey implicatures in the

4.2.1.3 Journalistic style: Numbers

The mentioning of numbers in the speech produces a different effect on the audi-
ence, since they cast the speaker as highly knowledgeable and in full control over his
subject matter. This phenomenon can be referred to as the ‘numbers game’ and has been
studied by van Dijk (2005) as a political strategy. The following examples show how
Turnbull reiterates optimism in the face of undesirable statistics.

T57 - The employment target is not on track either, but 57.5 per cent
of those living in major cities are employed.

T58 - 5,000 Indigenous job seekers have been placed into real jobs through our Vocational Training and Employment Centre network.

The number of Indigenous businesses mentioned in the statement, regardless of whether the figures are accurate or exaggerated, manifest impressive knowledge. The following is another example in which those numbers are emphasised.

T59 - Almost 500 Indigenous businesses were awarded more than $284 million in Commonwealth contracts thanks to our Indigenous Procurement Policy.

This precise and concrete data can create the impression, according to van Dijk (2005), of a well-informed politician. This knowledge allows Turnbull to legitimatise any potential future decision. The precise numbers do not matter here; he could have said that ‘plenty’ of Indigenous job seekers have been placed into jobs. Instead, he breaks down the exact numbers in specific detail. The point of the numbers game is its rhetorical projection of objectivity and credibility. Turnbull shows that he knows what he is talking about, that he has done his homework, and at the same time, uses these ‘facts’ as proof for his arguments. In other words, the numbers game satisfies the general strategy of positive self-presentation showing that he is well-informed and hence is doing his job as leader of Australia. He takes the numbers game to the next level, by surrounding the undesirable report statistics with large indefinite numbers.
4.2.2 The role of character: Speaking in Ngunawal

Arguably, Turnbull is not a fluent speaker of Ngunawal, although he opens his speech with a greeting in the language of the Ngunawal people. One may even wonder whether he understands what he is saying. Furthermore, it is understood that the Ngunawal language is that of the traditional owners of the Canberra region.

T1 - Yanggu gulanyin ngalawiri, dhunayi, Ngunawal dhawra
Wanggarralijinyin mariny bulan bugarabang.

T2 - Today, Mr. Speaker we are meeting together on Ngunawal land country and we acknowledge and pay our respects to their Elders.

This presentation is intended to perform a corroborative function with Turnbull’s desired audience, prior to detailing the report results of Closing the Gap, indicating low levels of Indigenous welfare despite 20 years of reconciliation and the spending of twice as much on Australia’s First Peoples than on non-Indigenous Australians. However, this is risky strategy as Ngunawal may be considered a dead language, spoken by virtually no one other than some researchers and activists, using a vocabulary (so far) of just 300 recovered words (Jackson-Nakano, 2017). Regardless, invoking the voice of a romanticised Indigenous past is displayed in this character role. This inclusion, however, is risky. By choosing this language, he is endorsing the Ngunawal tribe as the traditional owners of the land around parliament house. This claim, however, has been strongly refuted by the Ngambri tribe, who speak a different language (Jackson-Nakano, 2017). Therefore, this characterisation lacks authenticity due to the discrepancy, risking offence with any audience member who identifies with the Ngambri people. This destabilises any previous strategy aimed at presenting as a well-informed, knowl-
edgeable and authoritative Australian leader. In turn, this could negatively affect his positioning in presenting his ideology of reconciliation.

4.2.3 The role of interlocutor

So far, we have applied Koven’s notions of narrator and character to the Turnbull text. In this section we observe how both of these two roles operate in dynamic combination with that of the third perspective: interlocutor. As mentioned previously, Koven describes the interlocutor role as an interaction resembling a face-to-face conversation. The example below demonstrates the importance that quotations or paraphrases have in a political address.

T45 - In the Anangu Pitjantjatjara Yankunytjatjara Lands, the APY
Lands, Principal Matt Green spoke to me of the fierce rivalry in community football. But he said he was more interested and focused on the fierce rivalry than to attain school attendance targets. And with the help of our Remote School Attendance Strategy, championed by Minister Nigel Scullion, Matt is driving cultural change in Fregon. The Strategy is working. RSAS schools show a higher attendance rate in 2016 compared to 2013.

While, in part, he is reporting the words of Green, the rest of the text is presented in Turnbull's voice, which narrates the event. The interlocutor role is used for clarification and further explanation. Such double-voicing (Bahktin, 1981) as seen in this extract allows Turnbull to both present his story (in the role of narrator) and create links with his audience (as interlocutor). He is able to explain or clarify issues to the listeners using
the referential indexical we (see section 4.2.3.3), which has the effect of grouping together both speaker and audience.

The interlocutor role also displays features typical of a here-and-now interaction, appearing as another voice in the speech. When Turnbull shifts from narrator to interlocutor; he is effecting a shift; from one voice, position or social role (Bakhtin, 1981) to another. The interlocutor often presents ‘interpersonal rapport...conveying their attitudes toward the narrated events’ (Koven, 2002, p.94). Discussed in the following section is the language specific device normally displayed by the speaker under the interlocutor role, namely questions and verb conjunctions.

4.2.3.1 Questions

Since the nature of political speeches is less interactional than other forms of communications, questions can rarely be answered and therefore may seem impractical. However, a certain degree of interaction can be assumed, i.e. the impression that the audience is literally being asked to answer a question. Since questions are interactive, they are used under the interlocutor role, and can operate as devices for conveying solidarity as the PM at least pretends to establish interaction with the audience. In the case of Australian parliamentary speeches, these questions are often directed to Mr Speaker as an intermediary representative of the audience. Interestingly, one device that Turnbull employs to avoid direct questioning is to convert questions or requests into a statement, which he does consistently throughout his speech. For example:-

T114 - Mr. Speaker, I ask that we give credit to the quiet achievers - the Indigenous people who the Indigenous people who are working on the front line of family violence, who are enabling people with
disabilities to gain the services they need, who are starting businesses, employing others, innovating. All people who have expressed their deep desire to work together as committed Australians.

T116 - And I ask that you seek out people like those I had the honour of addressing last night, every day, Indigenous Australians achieving extraordinary things.

T120 - I ask that we share these stories and those of the entrepreneurs, lawyers, scientists, teachers, nurses, servicemen and women, social service workers, writers, accountants, public servants, Ministers, Members and Senators. Again, their callings and achievements as diverse, as magnificent, as inspiring as those of other Australians.

A direct address to Mr Speaker presents an indirect interaction with the audience. While they are not framed as direct questions (rather requests), such instances approximate a casual conversation where an interlocutor is looking for confirmation via a confirmatory question (Green, 1996). In these cases, they are used as solidarity devices (Green, 1996).

4.2.3.2 Singular first-person verb conjugations

Another characteristic of the interlocutor role is the use of conjugated verbs, often in first person singular. Pennycook (1994) suggests that although political speakers prefer less subjectivity in their addresses they may use the first person singular pronoun
to reinforce the relevance of a moment, providing the audience with a sense of the here-and-now. The second methodology to be applied in this thesis will identify other pronominal subjects in different conjugations, but the pronoun I requires special attention in the present analysis. The narrator achieves distance from the event through impersonal verbal constructions, while the interlocutor uses first-person and conjugated verbs to be involved in the event and therefore to participate in the action. This narrative feature places him closer to the audience as he narrates personal events, experiences, etc.

The speaker becomes part of the discourse and creates a new identity now, not as a narrator, but as a social actor who is himself involved in the discourse (i.e. an interlocutor).

T93 - **I welcome** Professor Ian Anderson into my Department, who will play an important role in leading this new way of working, along with people like Anne-Marie Roberts, who leads a team of passionate and committed staff working in communities across the nation.

T99 - **I have met** mothers like Norma and Lena from Western Australia, who have lost children to suicide.

T104 - And **I could tell you**, Mr. Speaker, many more stories of self-reliance from Fregon, Redfern, La Perouse, Scotdesco, Brisbane, Darwin, Perth. It’s a very long list as we know.

These are examples of the interlocutor role in which Turnbull speaks in the first-person, getting involved in the narration and explaining personally what he is doing and how he
is going to proceed with the narration. One of the most effective reasons for a political speaker to use the pronoun I is to convince an audience of their honesty and responsibility, to present himself in a positive light, and to emphasise personal qualities (Håkansson, 2012).

**4.2.3.3 Referential indexicals**

Personal pronouns are indicators of subjectivity showing commitment to an affirmation (Benveniste, 1971). Referential indexicals, on the other hand, involve and relate social actors inter-personally in the discourse.

T29 - That being Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Australian means to succeed, to achieve, to have big dreams and high hopes, and to draw strength from your identity as an Indigenous person in this country.

The occurrence of personal pronouns in political speech brings dynamism into the narrative since numerous social actors are now involved and there is a conversation among them. The effect of these pronoun-references in the speech resembles a casual conversation where pronouns are used more frequently.

T30 - As Prime Minister, Mr. Speaker, I will continue to tell those stories – to talk about the strengths of our First Australians.

In the above extract, ‘I will continue to tell these stories’, displays a relationship among personal pronouns. These pronouns ‘index interactional alignments for the narrating event’ (Wortham, 1996, p.346) positioning the speaker in specific roles in relation to
others (Wortham, 1996, p.346). The identity of ‘our’ is not explicit and the speaker must assume a common ground with the listener to connect each indexical form with a specific identity. Referential nomination strategies will be further evaluated in chapter 4.3.1.4.

### 4.2.3.4 Markers of modalisation.

Fairclough (2003) argues that markers of modalisation can be modal verbs, adverbs, adjectives and hedges. They allow speakers to express subjectivity in their ideas, for example:

- T127 - We will not waver in our quest to achieve these outcomes.
- T128 - But we will have the humility to admit that we must travel this road together with open hearts and a determination to ensure that our First Australians, and all Australians, will be able here, more than anywhere, to be their best, and realise their dreams.

In the above extracts Turnbull expresses an attitude toward the pure content of the utterance (Verschueren, 1999), implying certainty.

### 4.2.3.5 Vocatives

Another feature performed under the interlocutor role is the use of vocatives, which Turnbull uses to address people directly. This has a dramatic effect since it directs attention away from Turnbull himself onto someone else. Turnbull noticeably adopts this strategy when addressing Mr Speaker, which he does 13 times. This is significant, as it repeatedly deflects the audiences focus way from Turnbull’s authoritative
position, to a position representative of the audience. As can be seen, vocatives interject drama as they alter the very nature of the communication, from a uni-directional speech to a bi-directional dialogue.

4.3 Critical discourse analysis of Turnbull’s speech.

The speech roles discussed above are useful in revealing how Turnbull attempts to position himself ideologically within his speech. His political goal of reconciliation and the idea of a united Australia becomes apparent as his three distinct roles interplay. Additionally, he suggests an intercultural model of united leadership. As the narrator, Turnbull provides information about Australia’s First Peoples. As the interlocutor, he aligns himself with that audience offering solidarity with them. As the character, he invokes voices that support the arguments for equality. However, the second methodological approach is also needed to further explore how this ideology of reconciliation is presented. It is also needed to explore whether alternative interpretations or subtexts might exist. CDA will therefore be used to investigate the explicit linguistic strategies needed in the construction of such an alignment, as foreshadowed in the second research question. In order to achieve this, these discursive strategies adapted from the Wodak and Meyer model (2001) are addressed in the following sections.

4.3.1 Discursive strategies: Negotiating alignment

The discursive strategies to be focused on here are primarily conveyed under the role of narrator and interlocutor. These strategies are: referential strategies, predicational strategies, argumentation strategies, and intensification/mitigation strategies. It will be argued that these strategies assist Turnbull in reducing distance between himself and the Indigenous community, or at least positioning himself in this manner. They are evi-
dent in his discourse regardless of his personal idiosyncrasies (i.e. non-verbal features such as silences, gaze direction, etc.). Therefore, this set of discursive strategies constitute a framework accounting for discourse attempts towards political and social alignment.

This section presents data from the speeches to show the occurrence and interaction of all the discursive strategies. To show a coherent analysis of these strategies in context, excerpts from Turnbull’s speech will be presented. The linguistic choices that display the roles or discursive strategies are marked in bold.

4.3.1.1 Referential nomination strategies in constructing alignment

To achieve the objective of constructing a unified group, the discursive strategy of referential nomination (Wodak and Meyer, 2001) is used to organise members into predetermined groups. In political speeches, referential nomination often displays the prominent pronouns. In considering how pronouns are used in political speeches, their placement in the grammatical context is revealing. Constantly and repeatedly referring to the name of an object or person is impractical, therefore requiring an alternative term of reference. In such cases, pronouns may be used. Pronouns suggest that those items ‘replace’ nouns (Pennycook, 1994, p. 173).

Personal pronouns can be subjective or objective. In other words, they can situate the speakers’ position with varying perspectives compared to the other participants within the speech. The determination of deictic distance and referents is relevant in political discourse, as it displays a spatial distance between the speaker and the audience (i.e. their ideological distance). Figure 1 shows a scale adapted from Rees (1983, p.16) which displays variable deictic distances implied by the pronouns analysed in the present study.
The scale shows that the pronoun *I* and *we*, and their possessive and objective forms, connote the greatest proximity to the speaker, while the pronoun *they* with its possessive and objective forms connote the greatest distance; the pronoun *you* is in the middle of the scale, acting perhaps as a mediator between *I* and *we* on one side, and *they* on the other. As for the use of pronouns in politics, Allen (2006, p. 1) states that they have a special effect in political speeches. By using them, politicians can present themselves as sharing the interests of the audience but can also promote themselves as good diplomats and most suitable leaders for their nations. By referring to themselves and the audience, politicians may persuade the public more effectively, especially by evoking a feeling of an inclusive community.

Therefore, to address the function of inclusion for Turnbull’s political ideology, the subjective pronouns *we*, *us* and *our* are useful. The pronoun *we* groups Turnbull with his audience, to show solidarity. The use of *we* also allows him to present his claims as plural claims on behalf of the different groups (i.e. non-Indigenous Australians, all Australians, the parliament, those in this room etc.). Therefore, any claims become stronger because the audience hears an inclusive *we* that seems the product of an agreement or decision of which the audience has been a part. The reality is that the audience has not been consulted but is implicitly included in the claim as a participant. This positioning of groups makes Turnbull’s claims more general and inclusive, and therefore, more powerful. This can be seen in the following extracts.
T87 - Greater empowerment of local communities will deliver the shared outcomes that we all seek.

T97 - Where communities are ready, we will work with them to build capacity ensure more responsibility for decision making rests as close to the community as possible.

Here, it is evident that Turnbull aims at constructing a wider categorisation of we. He seeks to make we more than policy makers or government, to include all non-Indigenous Australians, as responsible participants in Closing the Gap. This use of we is already ambiguous in terms of potential meaning, since it can be inclusive or exclusive of addressees. The fluidity of the meaning of we, not to mention its persuasive potential, has also been identified by Fairclough (2000, 2001, as cited in Fairclough and Fairclough, 2013), and Hillier (2004) and it is, therefore, ripe for exploitation. Those authors identify three potential referents for we:- ‘We the people’ (inclusive of addressee), ‘We the government’ (exclusive of addressee), ‘We as Australians’ (inclusive of all the population). In the above example, the meaning of we notably changes. For example:-

T87 - Greater empowerment of local communities will deliver the shared outcomes that we all seek. (Referent: ‘We as Australians’. Inclusive of all the population).

Immediately following this utterance, Turnbull switches the we referencing to ‘We the government’ (exclusive of addressee).
T97 - Where communities are ready, we will work with them to build capacity and ensure more responsibility for decision making rests as close to the community as possible.

This phenomenon can be seen again in the following extracts:

T127 - **We will not waver** in our quest to achieve these outcomes.

(Referent: we inclusive of all the population or we ‘the government’. Exclusive of the addressee).

T128 - But **we will have the humility** to admit that we must travel this road together with open hearts and a determination to ensure that our First Australians, and all Australians and, will be able here, more than anywhere, to be their best, and realise their dreams.

(Referent: we inclusive of the addressee)

Regardless, *we* grows in opposition to *they*, and vice versa. In other words, if there is a *we*, then there must be a *they*, even if left unsaid. Turnbull gets around this by referring to *they*, as stories and not another identity, as seen in the following extract.

T122 - **Let us** tell the stories of Indigenous achievement and hard work.

Because **those stories** are true markers of progress.

T124 - **They** inspire and encourage and they make a difference.
Similarly, the above example of the phrase ‘let us’ creates an atmosphere of inclusive activity as it politely includes the addressee into the discussion, without notable assertiveness. A sharedness among the members of the group can be understood through grammatical relations. The speaker shapes and redefines those in-group connections through his utterances.

T17 - And while many issues divide us in this place, we are united in our determination to ensure that our Constitution is amended once again to recognise our First Australians.

This extract starts with the role of interlocutor building connections with the audience with the referential we: ‘we are united’. It intends to negotiate an alignment with the audience. He builds that relationship with the audience by using interactional features creating the illusion of a dialogue or a common agreement on things. The use of we involves the audience in the discourse, making them participants of the political agenda. This can be seen again in the extracts below:

T28 - While we must accelerate progress and close the gap, we must also tell the broader story of Indigenous Australia - not of despondency and deficit but a relentless and determined optimism.

T35 - We have come a long way since the Referendum, but we have not come far enough.
There are verb conjugations in first person singular and plural and examples such as ‘we must accelerate progress’ that indicate the attempt to make those speeches group meetings in which everyone contributes to the discussion and the solution. Turnbull is trying to integrate his audience using the role of interlocutor. This is seen again in his closing statement:

T128 - But we will have the humility to admit that we must travel this road together, with open hearts and a determination to ensure that our First Australians, and all Australians, will be able here, more than anywhere, to be their best, and realise their dreams.

Here, the involvement of Turnbull creates a cohesive end to his speech, by sharing a future vision with the audience, stepping out of the narrator voice to explain, clarify and connect precisely what the narrator voice has already talked about and what it plans for tomorrow.

4.3.1.2 Predicational strategies in constructing alignment

The objective of labeling social actors positively or negatively, appreciatively or deprecatorily, is achieved with the discursive strategy of predication. Predication can be described as an assertion or affirmation to the subject of a proposition. It is situated in devices such as stereotypical or evaluative attributions. This strategy is significant when negotiating a construction of alignment, as Turnbull displays in the following extracts.

T5 - The lives, the occupations, the dreams of Aboriginal and Torres Islander Australians are as diverse as those of all other Australians –
and stretched across this vast land, from the most remote communities
to the heart of our capitals, to our national Parliament, our First
Australians are showing that they can do anything, as they inspire
us with their resilience, their courage, and their enterprise.

T114 - Mr. Speaker, I ask that we give credit to the quiet achievers - the
Indigenous people who are working on the front line of family
violence, who are enabling people with disabilities to gain the
services they need, who are starting businesses employing
others, innovating. All people who have expressed their deep
desire to work together as committed Australians.

T116 - And I ask that you seek out people like those I had the honour of
addressing last night, every day, Indigenous Australians achieving
extraordinary things.

T122 - Let us tell the stories of Indigenous achievement and hard work.
Because those stories are true markers of progress.

T125 - This Parliament, Mr. Speaker, has the opportunity, using
the knowledge and wisdom of Indigenous people to embark on
a new approach to Closing the Gap on Indigenous disadvantage.
Predicational strategies are favoured by Turnbull, as he regularly interjects awe and admiration to both individuals and to the Indigenous community as a whole. However, it could be argued that while he projects it, he may not believe it, and this is a significant distinction to make in CDA. Regardless, the recurring use of this strategy could arguably have a cumulative effect in persuading listeners of his sincerity to the reconciliation cause. Attributing appreciative evaluations to Australia’s First Peoples is a strong attempt at replacing negative stereotypes or racial stigma with positive associations.

4.3.1.3 Argumentation strategies in constructing alignment

Argumentation is one way through which the presentation and justification of a political ideology is achieved. There are two main arguments that Turnbull attempts to justify in his speech. The first is that reconciliation is a necessary political ideology. The second is that the Closing the Gap policy is necessary for reconciliation and the racial equality initiative.

• **First argument: Reconciliation is necessary.**

  Turnbull has the task of attempting to justify the government’s strong support of Australia’s First Peoples. This support includes continued re-investment in the cause of racial equality and reconciliation. The first device, he adopts is the expression of obligation and moral responsibility, as seen the extract below.

  T83 - The **national interest** requires a re-commitment to the relationship with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples.
By invoking the idea of national interest, he implies a moral responsibility on behalf of all Australian citizens, to re-commit to reconciliation. This is designed to inspire trust in his leadership and rally the solidarity of all Australians to the cause. He also draws on an ethical responsibility as demonstrated in the extract below.

T6 - Last year Chris Sarra proposed three principles that would help make a difference in Indigenous policy. He said: Do things with us, not to us. Bring us policy approaches that nurture hope and optimism; and acknowledge, embrace and celebrate the humanity of Indigenous Australia.

By invoking the idea of the humanity of Australia’s First Peoples, he is encouraging a ‘levelling’ of race cultures within Australia. In these examples, reconciliation is both a moral and ethical responsibility. By implying that Australia’s First Peoples have been previously treated inhumanely, he is recognising that a moral injustice has been committed and must therefore be rectified through reconciliation.

- Second argument: Closing the Gap policy is necessary for reconciliation and the racial equality initiative.

Turnbull argues the need for the Closing the Gap policy as a vehicle for reconciliation. Argument reconstruction is useful to identify the main claims that are made in these speeches and the premises that support them. Like any similar external reason (obligation, duty, promise), a commitment to fairness or other values is at the same time an institutional fact: the government is obligated to act fairly, regardless of whether they want to act fairly or not, as they can be held responsible if they do not. The following
extract indicates Turnbull’s commitment to the *Closing the Gap* policy, while inviting all Australians to share the responsibility of its success.

T4 - I also welcome the First Ministers and their representatives from the states and territories who have gathered with us today to demonstrate that the responsibility - indeed, the opportunity - for closing the gap in partnership with our communities’ rests with all levels of government, and with all Australians.

T126 - *My Government will not shy away from our responsibility* and we will uphold the priorities of education, employment, health and the right of all people to be safe from family violence.

Strategically, by reinforcing his argument for the support of the *Closing the Gap* policy, he interjects the necessity for every party’s participation in the process. By doing this he upholds his institutional responsibility of moral and ethical fairness, while distancing himself from the outcome. He does this by strategically sharing accountability with the Indigenous community, for the success of the Closing the Gap policy. Turnbull is presenting and justifying a strategy of action that his government has already decided to embark on, as seen in the examples below.

T79 - Indigenous Affairs is an intricate public policy area.

T80 - It requires *uncompromised collaboration with Indigenous* people and national leadership.

T81 - It needs buy-in from states, communities, and most importantly families.
T86 - Mr. Speaker, I firmly believe that people must be involved in the process in order to be engaged in the outcomes. It has to be a shared endeavour.

T87 - Greater empowerment of local communities will deliver the shared outcomes that we all seek.

T125 - This Parliament, Mr. Speaker, has the opportunity, using the knowledge and wisdom of Indigenous people to embark on a new approach to Closing the Gap on Indigenous disadvantage.

By repeatedly reiterating shared responsibility for the outcome Indigenous concerns, Turnbull has the opportunity to reaffirm his share of commitment towards an ethical appeal: the government is both making public its concern for the impact of racial division and its desire and intention to be fair, by showing that it is aware of its responsibilities and intention to rectify them. Fairness is presented both as an active concern on behalf of the government but also as a public commitment, as it is the government’s duty to be fair.

4.3.1.4 Intensification/ mitigation strategies in constructing alignment

This section will explore the use of intensification and mitigation as discursive strategies used by Turnbull in his speech. Several devices are used in achieving these strategies. The most significant of these are repetition, emphatic and emotional devices. While repetition of key words or phrases are often used in political speeches, when attempting to intensify a proposition, it is not a device favoured by Turnbull.
Emphatic devices are strongly expressive, by placing emphasis on the proposition. This device is favoured by Turnbull when needing an intensification strategy, as seen below.

T51 - **We must** redouble our efforts to reduce smoking rates during pregnancy, continue to improve immunization rates, lift rates of antenatal care, reduce fetal trauma, and keep our children safe.

T127 - **We will not waver** in our quest to achieve these outcomes.

Emphatic directions such as these present as authoritative and decisive, marking the strength of a political leader. Emotional devices involve statements or imagery that invoke the desired emotions from the audience. Turnbull uses this device effectively in mitigating the undesirable results of the report. This strategy is amplified when Turnbull takes a subjective stance in expressing emotion. With this subjectivity, he distances himself from the undesirable report outcomes, as seen in the following extract.

T50 - **I am very saddened and disappointed** that the target to halve the gap in Indigenous child mortality is not on track, with the 2015 data being just outside the target.

Conversely, objectivity is more commonly used in creating distance from undesirable facts. Here emotion can still mitigate the undesirable news. The extract below shows how Turnbull mitigates the highly emotive issue of the treatment of Indigenous children in custody, with a soft yet powerful response of strong emotion - love. Here, he is not
referring to his own love; rather it is an ideological abstract. Regardless, it is an effective strategy.

T72 - Mr. Speaker, children should always be treated humanely, with love, and especially when they are in custody.

Here, uttering the unexpected emotion of love within such a political speech, could be viewed as risky when attempting to establish authenticity and trust with the Indigenous community. Such an expression could be perceived as disingenuous. This will be further discussed in chapter 6.

4.4.1 Summary of Turnbull's data

This chapter has shown how strategic shifts in Turnbull’s discourse, and the display of different role-perspectives position him ideologically. Style is a tool available to speakers to do things with language (Coupland, 2007). This chapter has applied Koven’s role model (2002) to show the strategic positioning of Turnbull throughout the discourse, aligning himself with other social actors through the use of a variety of semiotic resources. The three voices - narrator, character and interlocutor - invoked by Turnbull constitute strategic shifts in the presentation of his arguments and the positioning of himself in relation to his audience. This analysis shows how these voices interact and are marked linguistically. These roles or voices perform distinct functions. Firstly, Turnbull enacts the narrator voice to position himself outside the story to avoid subjectivity. For example, by recounting historical truths through narration, Turnbull can distance himself from ancestral treatment of Australia’s First People.
Secondly, under the role of character, he evokes the voice of Indigenous community members, quoting from them to imply authenticity and therefore veracity. The choices of specific quotations under the role of character empower the speaker with the possibility of shaping and redefining the discourse, his message and reality itself. Lastly, as interlocutor, he displays the interactional here-and-now features that are necessary to connect with the audience. He portrays solidarity, building a closer relationship with the audience through specific linguistic choices (specifically, questions, first person verb conjugations, referential indexicals, modal markers and vocatives).

In the second part of the chapter, analytical tools and theoretical notions from CDA were used to focus on the discursive strategies that address or refer to specific social actors and the construction of alignment with them. Applied is the typology of discursive strategies discussed in chapter 3. The occurrences and interactions of the strategies to create alignment are shown in Turnbull's discourse. Presented is the distribution of the discursive strategies, and their linguistic means of realisation (Wodak, de Cillia, Reisigl and Liebhart 1999). The nature of such political speeches and the hierarchical relationships understood in this context provide the speaker with the power (Bourdieu, 2001) to re-present reality or rearrange it according to the goals of his political agenda, which in this case is reconciliation.
Shorten Analysis

5.1 Introduction

This chapter presents the different strategies employed by Shorten to align himself ideologically with Australia’s First Peoples. As with Turnbull’s analysis, two methodological approaches will be used. Applied in the first methodology are the distinct roles provided by Koven (2002) - narrator, character and interlocutor - in the setting of a political speech. It can be observed that on numerous occasions Shorten delivers his message with the guise of these three roles in order to strategically achieve his goals. In brief, the role of narrator allows Shorten to present the story to his audience: to project his ideology, present political achievements, discuss local indigenous issues, etc. Under the role of character, he quotes people from relevant socio-cultural backgrounds, then strategically re-contextualises their words to support his own ideological position. Shorten brings various outside voices to corroborate his argument, thus authenticating and validating his position. Finally, it will be shown that as an interlocutor Shorten sets bounds of solidarity with the audience through a variety of interactional features.

As in the previous chapter, CDA will be used to shed light on the specific discursive strategies employed by Shorten in the negotiation of alignments. Applied is a typology of discursive strategies proposed in chapter 3 to account for the linguistic construction of alignment, also shown is the order of appearance and combination of those strategies and their means of realisation in language.
5.2 Analysis of Shorten’s address using Koven’s three role-perspectives:

Narrator, character, and interlocutor

Shorten opens his speech in the role of interlocutor, thanking people and paying respects (i.e. engaging with his intended audience). Subsequently, in the role of the narrator, Shorten attempts to describe Indigenous relations with Australia’s previous governments from an Indigenous perspective. This role suggests authenticity and truthfulness. The role of character allows Shorten to bring different community voices into the here-and-now to accomplish desired goals.

5.2.1 The role of narrator: Storytelling style

Like Turnbull, Shorten enacts the role of narrator by telling a story. The story relates to a past event. He employs first and second person singular deictics and conjugations to align himself with other social actors in the story. This voice is sometimes interrupted by the other two voices proposed by Koven (2002), character and interlocutor. The following extract demonstrates how Shorten presents his opinions in the form of a story. It shows interactional features, where the speaker expresses subjective evaluations about the current political situation.

S4 - This parliament and the nation we call home is, was and always will be, Aboriginal land.

S5 - Where we are, so too are Aboriginal peoples.

S6 - From the Noonga near Perth.

S7 - To the Eora of Sydney

S8 - The Nunga of Adelaide
Here, Shorten participates in the story in an attempt to present authenticity. The narrator intends to present an ideology to the audience, aligning the audience and speaker and the issue discussed. The extract below opens with a passive structure:

S4 - This parliament and the nation we call home is, was and always will be, Aboriginal land.

This statement sets the tone for the speech, indicating the direction of the story. By affirming that the nation is Aboriginal land, Shorten begins the narrative in a way that potentially positions the audience into a receptive mindset.

5.2.2 The role of character: Quotes

The role of character can also be identified in Shorten’s discourse. This role is enacted through quotations that allow new voices to interact in the here-and-now discourse. These quotations stand mostly as supportive arguments and provide a certain rationale for his agenda and the goals he presents. An interesting peculiarity in one of these quotes, if we compare them with Turnbull, is that he makes reference to a 50-year-old utterance. This quote comes from an influential Indigenous person and pre-
sents a philosophical ideal. However, a personal testimony is a powerful resource used by Shorten to deliver his message, to build alignments with the Indigenous community. This quote provides an explanation for an ideology proposed by the government. It is recontextualised into the here-and-now speech event to serve a purpose: to justify government actions as responses to the ethical needs or demands of all Australians. The political agenda responds to citizen's demands and therefore the government has an obligation to hear, listen and serve its citizens. The purpose of this quote is similar to Turnbull’s. The speaker uses it to support his arguments. The extract below is the referenced quote, indicating an instance of the enactment of character by Shorten.

S235 - As Senator Dodson has explained to me in the language of his people, he says:

S236 - “Let's go. The best advice is - let's get on with it.”

S237 - As he would say:

S238 - “Umba imbalan!”

Here, he uses the role of character to bring an individual, political, indigenous voice to later propose a solution to the situation of reconciliation in Australia. He could just as easily have summarised the quote or paraphrased. Instead, he provides a translation then reproduces verbatim the words of this influential indigenous political representative. This is a dynamic tool for shifting from one voice to another. This quote provokes a dramatic effect, maintaining the integrity and authenticity of the direct speech by demarcating its boundaries with author intonations and even with individual linguistic characteristics (Voloshinov, 1973). Speakers quote other people's words 'to position
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themselves and others as particular kinds of social actors’ (Koven, 2002, p.100). Shorten’s extract above represents an excerpt from commonplace daily conversations. The quote is brief and structured within simple sentences with coordination links. The quote is presented in a larger discourse where a problem is stated. Discussing reconciliation, the opposition leader brings in the voice of a fellow indigenous politician, to propose the solution or remedy to the problem. In this way, Shorten presents himself as attentive and aware of its citizens' needs and problems. He uses the role of character as a discursive strategy to set alignments with social actors. In this case, he aligns himself with Dodson to justify his proposal of creating a ‘new story’. The model of the three-role perspective allows the speaker to set alignments with social actors, in this case, a working fellow member of parliament. The use of this role relates to specific discursive goals in politicians' political agendas. For example, through the voice of character, Shorten reinforces and validates his arguments. He presents himself as active, concerned and caring. Table 3 shows the associations between Indigenous concerns and government actions through the role of character.
Table 3: Associations between people's complaints and government actions through the role of character.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem</th>
<th>Testimony</th>
<th>Government actions/ perspective taking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White attitude, Exclusion, Racism</td>
<td>Oodgeroo: ‘The victory of the 1967 Referendum was not a change of white attitudes. The real victory was the spirit of hope and optimism. We had won something. We were visible, hopeful and vocal’</td>
<td>Shorten: ‘It’s time to write a new story. A story of belonging’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exclusion from opportunity, from the pages of our history. And exclusion from the decisions which effect their lives’.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White attitude - Exclusion - Racism</td>
<td>Shorten: ‘Let’s go. The best advice is - let’s get on with it.” As he (sic). (Dodson) would say: “Umba imbalan!’</td>
<td>Shorten, ‘You belong here, equal citizens in this great country, equal partners in our common endeavour. This is your place. This is our place. Our future is your future’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 shows how quotations from respected Indigenous community members (role of character) are used strategically to support government actions in constructing a new ideology. In the discourse, Shorten presents another type of quoted character. He recontextualises Dodson's discourse and strategically incorporates it into the present situation bringing in Dodson's voice (Bakhtin) to serve his political agenda. ‘Recontextualisation’ (Bauman and Briggs, 1990; Blackledge, 2005; Fairclough, 2003) allows Shorten to present his ideology towards reconciliation. Additionally, as shown in Table 3, although Oodgeroo uttered those words in a different setting, decades ago, Shorten
makes those words relevant to the present time by bringing Oodgeroo’s voice back into the here-and-now. Historical events, figures, and quotes from the past are resources available to politicians to intentionally shape the present. Shorten uses the role of character to bring both of those voices into the current discourse and establish alignments with them to define and validate his own ideological positioning. The role of character allows the speaker to bring a voice in the present, to back up his arguments and ultimately obtain public support. Linguistically, the appropriation is done at two levels (i) by translating Dodson’s specific words and (ii) by quoting Dodson’s words verbatim.

In the quotes displayed in Table 3, Shorten portrays an ‘authoritative speech’ (Duranti, 1994; Gal and Woolard, 1995; Philips, 2004) by quoting a highly valued authority figure (Oodgeroo and Dodson). In that way, speakers look ‘more persuasive, more convincing, and more attended to’ (Philips, 2004, p.475). Therefore, under the role of character, the speaker evokes someone else's words and/or voice on the stage. In the case of Shorten, he quotes respected community figures and historical figures. He brings them into the present moment to legitimate and justify his political agenda.

5.2.3 The role of interlocutor

Shorten uses the role of interlocutor to connect with his audience in an informal way. He often uses clear features associated with the role of interlocutor. Such features include repetition of the proposition and first person verb conjunctions to express personal feelings, as illustrated in the extract below:

S48 - Instead, I believe in a new approach.

S49 - We must forget the insulting fiction that the first Australians are a problem to be solved.
S50 - And instead, take a new approach, to listen to the people who stand on the other side of the gap.

In this example, repetition of his proposition of a ‘new approach’ is an attempt to directly engage with the ‘people who stand on the other side of the gap’. His use of the first-person verb conjunction ‘I believe’ expresses personal feelings and intention essentially, to ‘start again’ when attempting to negotiate alignment. The extract above also contains other characteristics of the interlocutor role, such as simple sentence structures and simple language (Thompson, 2004). He uses the role of interlocutor to tell his personal story, displaying features of a face-to-face conversation, thus converting the audience into participants. He does this by using an informal, conversational presentational strategy. Discussed in the following sections is a combination of language-specific devices normally displayed by the speaker under the interlocutor role.

5.2.3.1 Questions

Although questions cannot normally be answered in a monologic political speech, the use of intonation calls on the attention of the audience and insinuates an attempt to make them participate. The presence of such questions may be intended to reflect an open dialogue, an interaction in which the speaker seems to seek a response through what are known as ‘confirmatory questions’ (Green, 1996). In this respect, questions are strategically used by speakers as solidarity devices. To understand how this works, let us examine the following extract.

S90 - At Redfern, Paul Keating threw down a gauntlet to us, the non-Aboriginal Australians.
S91 - He posed the question we had never asked.

S92 - “How would I feel, if this were done to me?”

S93 - 25 years later that question stands before Australia still.

S94 - **How would we feel** if our children were more likely to go to jail than university?

S95 - **How would we feel** if our life expectancy was twenty years shorter than our neighbour?

S96 - **How would we feel** if because of our skin colour, we experienced racism and discrimination.

S97 - **And how would we feel** if every time we offered a solution, an idea, an alternative approach we were patronisingly told that government knew best?

These questions help Shorten to develop his ideology of Australian identity and unity. He proposes the questions that the audience should be asking. Even if the audience have not necessarily formulated a certain question, Shorten is able to channel the course of his message to cover his political agenda through the use of this questioning device. These questions in turn become the norm to allow a follow-up answer which is, of course, his own. These questions allow Shorten to present very important information, e.g. the proposition that Indigenous children are more likely to go to gaol than university, that Indigenous people have a short lifespan, that Indigenous people experience racism and that Indigenous people are silenced by those in power. Shorten could have stated these facts directly, but instead, he presents the statements as answers to questions, questions supposedly posed by the audience in response to a Keating rhetorical challenge: ‘How would I feel if this were done to me?’ Shorten chooses to present this
information in the structure of a face-to-face conversation, a style more familiar to the audience since most of our daily communication is based on casual/informal conversations. These linguistic choices allow him to appear as a leader concerned about his audience and knowledgeable of the questions they may have for him when, in fact, he is following his own political agenda.

5.2.3.2 Singular first-person verb conjugations

By using first-person pronouns, the speaker gets involved in the discourse and makes the audience participants of his personal, subjective experiences (Benveniste, 1971). Shorten displays these features to create interpersonal rapport and affect. He expresses personal emotions and wishes with constructions. The following extract presents an instance of first-person singular conjugated verbs in Shorten’s interlocutor role.

S27 - I will never forget walking into Cairns West Primary on Djabugay country on the first day of last year’s campaign and seeing the wide-eyed smiles of so many young Aboriginal students, as I introduced them to Senator Patrick Dodson.

By using conjugated verbs in the first-person (singular), as shown above, the speaker becomes deeply involved in the event, as a direct participant in the action, placing him closer to the audience as he narrates personal events and experiences to his audience. In the above extract Shorten is telling a personal anecdote. In the formal setting of a political speech, this device serves to present himself as more human, more ‘common’, and essentially more similar to the audience: he is telling them what happened when he was in Cairns. His feelings and emotions are displayed under the interlocutor role together
with interactional features to build a here-and-now rapport with the audience. The speaker leaves the main story (narrator) aside to talk to the audience on a face-to-face basis presenting evaluative remarks, and references to his current self and the listeners.

5.2.3.3 Referential indexicals

Shorten frequently uses referential indexicals within his narrations. In the extract below, he uses the first-person singular pronoun I to reinforce the relevance of a moment, by providing an audience with the sense of here-and-now.

S14 – Mr. Speaker

S15 - After the last election, I took on the Shadow Ministry for
Indigenous Affairs.

S16 - My family and I went back to Garma, to listen and learn.

S17 - I met with Northern Territory leaders, defending the young men
being abused in juvenile detention.

S18 - I travelled to Wave Hill, to commemorate the courage of
Vincent Lingiari and the Gurindji.

S19 - And I looked to my Indigenous colleagues for their wisdom.

S20 - They are as inspirational as they are modest.

S21 - A Wiradjuri woman in the House, a Shadow Minister
S22 - A Yanuwa woman in the Senate, heading our Aboriginal and
Torres Strait Islander Caucus Committee
S23 - And a Yawuru man, the father of Reconciliation, my mentor and
my Assistant Shadow Minister.
S24 - I also recognize the Member for Hasluck, Ken Wyatt - and
congratulate him on his historic appointment.

S25 - **I recognize** too Senator Lambie.

In the above extract, the frequency of referential indexicals creates the resemblance of a casual conversation and therefore, while political speeches are mainly uni-directional, the involvement of these indexicals provides the features (or at least the illusion) of an interaction. He is attempting to reinforce his level of engagement with the Indigenous community by generating a story of his presence and commitment with both the Indigenous community and also his Indigenous colleagues. By using the referential indexical of *I* with a host of verbs frequently, Shorten gives the impression that he is engaged of many different levels with the listeners.

**5.2.3.4 Markers of modalisation.**

Evaluative markers often allow the interlocutor voice to express subjectivity. Consider the following example.

S92 - *“How would I feel, if this were done to me?”*

S93 - 25 years later that question stands before Australia still.

S94 - **How would we feel** if our children were more likely to go to jail than university.

S95 - **How would we feel** if our life expectancy was twenty years shorter than our neighbour?

S96 - **How would we feel** if because of our skin colour, we experienced racism and discrimination.

S97 - **And how would we feel** if every time we offered a solution, an idea,
an alternative approach we were patronisingly told that
government knew best?

This example displays how Shorten uses such a marker to express subjective opinions that are typical of casual conversation: in particular the how would we feel refrain. Koven (2002) explains how modality markers allow the speaker to express subjective judgments about events, people and/or people's actions (cf. Labov, 1984). Here, Shorten steps out of the objectivity of the narration to make a here-and-now remark about his feelings, emotions, and evaluations on the effects of racial discrimination.

5.2.3.5 Vocatives

Similarly to Turnbull, Shorten uses vocatives addressing Mr Speaker to indirectly address the audience. Mr Speaker is uttered nine times the Shorten speech. Additionally, he directs an address to Labor’s former PM Rudd.

S133 - I say this, Kevin: you can take well-deserved pride in your leadership on the 2008 apology.

However, Shorten directly elevates this feature to another level when he directly addresses ‘nations’ as seen in the extract below. Although presented as a euphemism, it remains a direct address.

S215 - To nations who fought the invaders.

The above examples show how vocatives create a dramatic effect as the speaker diverts attention to selected listeners. However, the most effective use of vocatives is in his
closing remarks where he is speaking directly to both individual Indigenous listeners and also to the Indigenous community as a whole, as presented in the below extract.

S218 - **You belong** to a tradition of sporting brilliance, in the face of racism from opponents, teammates, administrators and spectators.

S219 - **You belong** to humanity’s oldest continuous culture – more famous around the world now than ever before.

S220 - **You do not belong** in a jail cell, for an offence that carries an $80 fine.

S221 - **You do not belong** strapped to a chair, with a hood on your head.

S222 - **You do not belong** in the back of a windowless van, away from your family and loved ones.

S223 - **You do not belong** in a bureaucrat’s office, begging for money.

S224 - **You do not belong** on the streets, with nowhere to go.

S225 - **You belong** here, as members of this parliament, as leaders of this nation.

S226 - **You belong** in the Constitution, recognized at last.

S227 - **You belong** in schools, teaching and learning.

S228 - **You belong** on construction sites, building homes and gaining skills.

S229 - **You belong** on country, caring for the land.

S230 - **You belong** here, growing up healthy, raising your children in safety, growing old with security.

S231 - **You belong** here, strong in your culture, kinship, language and country.

S232 - **You belong** here, equal citizens in this great country, equal partners in our common endeavour.
Vocatives involve dynamic changes in the presentation since specific people in the audience are focused upon. There is a change from uni-directional communication from the speaker to bi-directional participation.

5.3 Critical discourse analysis of Shorten’s speech

Shorten’s previously discussed role perspectives provide clarity as to how he positions himself ideologically. He proposes a united Australia, arguing strongly for social equality. As the narrator, Shorten provides an explanation and commentary on the current situation of the Indigenous people of Australia. As the interlocutor, he aligns himself with them by decreasing the sense of social distance between them and himself. As the character, he invokes voices that support the argument for equality and immediate action. This second methodological approach to be adopted here - that of CDA - addresses the second research question by investigating effective discursive strategies for constructing and negotiating alignment. Here, it is worth remembering that Shorten is the Leader of the Opposition, and that this colours what he says and how he says it.

5.3.1 Discursive strategies: Negotiating alignment

The three role-perspectives allow Shorten to align or distance himself from different social actors. While Shorten makes a noticeable attempt throughout the speech to align himself with his Indigenous audience (as interlocutor), he also establishes mis/alignment with another group: the Coalition government. For example, under the role of narrator, he produces the following utterances.

S65 - … Labor hears you.

S149 - Labor continues to demand a justice target.
S155 - *Labor* will listen to, work with SNAICC - and most importantly work with communities themselves – to look at new models and approaches.

By repeatedly referring to his own party, he is reinforcing the division between himself and the Coalition government. The explicit linguistic choices employed by Shorten to distance himself and his message from the Coalition government can be elucidated through a CDA approach. This involves the identification and application of a typology of discursive strategies as will be shown in this study.

The following sections show how the discursive strategies are combined to linguistically represent misalignment. As with the Turnbull analysis, the strategies that apply to the negotiation of alignment in this study are referential strategies, predicational strategies, argumentation strategies, intensification strategies, and mitigation strategies. Similarly, the linguistic choices that realise the roles or discursive strategies are marked in bold, as are the specific strategies themselves.

**5.3.1.1 Referential strategies in constructing alignment**

Political speakers often use personal pronouns to establish the roles that they are playing with respect to each other (Wortham, 1996, p.332). These pronouns involve the speaker as a member of one or more groups of people or social categories. The speaker becomes someone who shares features with the rest of social actors in the group (Silverstein, 2004). Additionally, the use of certain pronouns can help them to present positive aspects of themselves and their allies. This can be achieved by providing deictic closeness or distance. Pennycook (1994, p.174) explains that in politics there is ‘never an unproblematic’ we, you, they or I. Rather than being neutral referents of an unproblem-
atic world, the use of pronouns ‘opens up a whole series of questions about language, power, and representation’. Often, the way politicians refer to themselves, to their opposition and to their audience ‘can effectively be used as a persuasive means’ (Allen, 2006, p. 2).

The pronoun *we* will be the focus of this section, as it is used in the construction of alignment. *We* as a first-person plural is an ambiguous pronoun as it may contain overlapping referents and is often used with many different potential scopes of reference even within a single discourse. In context, the speaker can use *we* to imply community, closeness, and sharing, however, it can also indicate separation and division. That is, it can signify either inclusion or exclusion, explained with an inclusive *we* or an exclusive *we*. Like Turnbull, Shorten aims at constructing a wider categorisation of *we*, in his construction of an inclusive group. Similarly, the interpretation of *we* is intentionally ambiguous, thus making attempts at scrutiny more difficult. This can be seen in the following extracts.

S4 - This parliament and the nation *we* call home is, was and always will be, Aboriginal land (Referent: *we* inclusive of all Australians)

S5 - Where *we* are, so too are Aboriginal peoples. (Referent: *we* exclusive of Indigenous Australians)

S13 - *We* are one country, enriched by hundreds of nations, languages and traditions. (Referent: *we* inclusive of all Australians)

S49 - *We* must forget the insulting fiction that the first Australians are a problem to be solved. (Referent: *we* inclusive of all Australians, or
we inclusive only of government).

S63 - The change required is deeper and more profound than where we visit and who we talk to. (Referent: we inclusive of all Australians, or we inclusive only of government).

Regardless of any ambiguity, however, the inclusive form of we can focus on invoking a feeling of intimacy, community, and immediacy. This can be seen in the following extract.

S108 - There's a spirit of courage which lurks in the hearts of all Australians.
S109 - There's that sense that we, at a certain point, we'll be pushed no further, that we will not stand for it any more.

This example illustrates Shorten’s attempt at re-establishing a single united Australian community, by implying that we (as a group), are one. It proposes immediacy, in that change is imminent, driven by the ‘courage’ of we Australians. In sum, this section has explored how referential strategies are favoured by Shorten in creating alignment.

5.2.1.2 Predicational strategies in constructing alignment

As with Turnbull, the objective of labelling social actors positively or negatively, appreciatively or deprecatorily, is achieved with the discursive strategy of predication. As explained in section 4.3.1.2, predication (or assertion) is situated in devices such as stereotypical or evaluative attributions. By referring to positive attributes of the
desired ally, a persuasive sense of alignment can be achieved. This strategy is demonstrated in the following extracts.

S19 - And I looked to my Indigenous colleagues for their wisdom.

S20 - They are as inspirational as they are modest.

S33 - So many first Australians are in the galleries today.

S34 - You, your friends and your peers would elevate and enrich our parliament with your talent, whichever party you chose.

This strategy can also involve an element of negative self-representation. This achieves the goal of reducing distance between the elite and the social group with whom the speaker is trying to connect, as presented in the below extract.

S172 - It is time for truth-telling.

S173 - Our ancestors drove the first peoples of this nation from their bora ring, we scattered the ashes of their campfires.

S174 - We fenced hunting grounds, we poisoned waterholes, we distributed blankets infected with diseases we knew would kill.

By Shorten’s self-proclaimed admission of ‘truth’, he is effectively shaming ‘our ancestors’, thus elevating the Indigenous community to a higher moral level. This levelling continues as below.

S176 - So today, I come not to tell but to ask.
S177 - Because where **we have failed** the first Australians have succeeded.

S178 - On the road to Reconciliation, **our first Australians who have led the way**.

S179 - **Giving forgiveness, as we seek forgiveness.**

By demonstrating humility at his self-proclaimed truth, Shorten emphasises the impact of this predicational strategy by asking forgiveness and implying that the Indigenous community are leaders in bestowing forgiveness. In this sense, Australia’s First Peoples are placed above all other Australians in a moral and humanitarian capacity implying that, by their grace and integrity, we will all become more closely aligned.

**5.3.1.3 Argumentation strategies in constructing alignment**

As we saw with Turnbull, the objective of presenting and justifying a political ideology is largely achieved through argumentation. Again, argumentation strategies employ several devices to justify Shorten’s primary position, which is better treatment of Australia’s First Peoples in the name of reconciliation. Repeatedly invoking such reasons for a recommitment to the ideology of equality functions as an ethical appeal. He is making public, his concern about the impact of racial division, his desire to be fair, and showing that he is aware of his responsibilities to rectify these issues. Fairness is presented both as an active concern on his own behalf, but also as a public commitment. This concern of fairness is exemplified below.

S56 - Understanding and recognising there are many Aboriginal nations across this country:

S57 - Waanyi and Warlpiri

S58 - Badi and Gumatj,
S59 - Tharawal and Kuarna

S60 - Yorta-Yorta and Narrunga

S61 - And all of these nations have the right to the control of their future.

In addition to this suggestion of fairness, Shorten also recognises institutional responsibility to the moral and ethical considerations of reconciliation. In the extract below, Shorten refers to decency as the humanitarian ideal that justifies the cause.

S137 - Decency demands that we now have a conversation at the Commonwealth level about the need to follow their lead on reparations.

S138 - This is the right thing to do. It is at the heart of Reconciliation: telling the truth, saying sorry, making good.

As with Turnbull, another argument that Shorten presents is justification of the Closing the Gap policy itself. This is particularly significant for Shorten, as his party predecessor initiated the policy in 2008.

S145 - The Closing the Gap framework is an intergenerational commitment to eroding centuries of inequality.

S146 - It outlives governments, parliaments, prime ministers and opposition leaders - but it also requires renewal.

S147 - This year, many of the current targets are due to be renegotiated.
These utterances present a predetermined unity for the policy itself (however imperfect), as the uncontested answer to reconciliation and in the negotiation of alignment with Australia’s First Peoples. Argument reconstruction is again useful to identify the main claims that are made in these speeches and the premises that support them. As with Turnbull, the argument presented here are emphatic statements, demonstrating solidarity and strong leadership. However, the progress and outcomes of the government initiated policy, in turn, shift to a shared responsibility with the Indigenous community, as seen in the below extracts.

S198 - The people on the frontline, elders, leaders, teachers and health-care workers know what to do.

S199 - We need to take the time to listen. We need to respect the right of Aboriginal voices to make decisions, control their own lives, give them their own place and space. They just need us to back them up.

5.5.1.4 Intensification strategies in constructing alignment

As with Turnbull, the discursive strategies of intensification/mitigation are achieved by using some reliable devices. It is worth noting, that there is an absence of mitigation in Shorten’s speech. However, he displays a number of intensification strategies with their associated devices. The most significant of these are repetition, motion and emphatic devices. Shorten favours all three of these devices, however it is particularly important to note the effect of repetition. Shorten prefers this device above all others. Repetition is, arguably, the most effective linguistic device used by politicians to get their messages through. Repetition captures the attention of the audience. Speakers
are able to reproduce an idea that echoes in the audience's mind and therefore has a
greater chance of being retained. By investigating the degrees of lexical repetition (three
or more), an indication of the relative importance of negotiating alignment by Shorten
can be highlighted. This reflects his assumption about the audiences’ concerns and rein-
forces his position ideologically regarding reconciliation, as seen in the below extract.

S48 - Instead, I believe in a new approach.
S49 - We must forget the insulting fiction that the first Australians are a
problem to be solved.
S50 - And instead, take a new approach, to listen to the people who stand
on the other side of the gap.
S51 - A new approach that from now on, the first Australians must have
the first say in the decisions that shape their lives.
S52 - A new approach that means a stronger voice for the National
Congress of Australia’s First People and the resources to make it happen.
S53 - A new approach to extend ourselves beyond hand-picked sources
of advice.
S54 - A new approach to be in the places where our first Australians
live, work and play: in Mount Druitt and Logan, in the APY Lands
and East Arnhem.

With six repetitions of A new approach, the message is adamantly recounted to the au-
dience, thereby intensifying the message, and reinforcing an intention to align with the
Indigenous community. Shorten also uses this device of repetition to intensify his clos-
ing remarks. In this capacity, multiple repetitions of his illocutionary intention are in-
tended to resonate with the Indigenous audience. The same can be considered with the extract below.

S218 - You belong to a tradition of sporting brilliance, in the face of racism from opponents, teammates, administrators and spectators.

S219 - You belong to humanity’s oldest continuous culture more famous around the world now than ever before.

S220 - You do not belong in a jail cell, for an offence that carries an $80 fine.

S221 - You do not belong strapped to a chair, with a hood on your head.

S222 - You do not belong in the back of a windowless van, away from your family and loved ones.

S223 - You do not belong in a bureaucrat’s office, begging for money.

S224 - You do not belong on the streets, with nowhere to go.

S225 - You belong here, as members of this parliament, as leaders of this nation.

S226 - You belong in the Constitution, recognized at last.

S227 - You belong in schools, teaching and learning.

S228 - You belong on construction sites, building homes and gaining skills.

S229 - You belong on country, caring for the land.

S230 - You belong here, growing up healthy, raising your children in safety, growing old with security.

S231 - You belong here, strong in your culture, kinship, language and country.

S232 - You belong here, equal citizens in this great country, equal partners in our common endeavour.
Here, *You belong* is repeated ten times and *you do not belong* is repeated five times. This example shows how the intensification strategy can unite multiple devices for maximum impact, to reinforce the political objective. It is a presentational strategy designed to invoke rousing emotion, and otherwise cue enthusiastic applause.

Like Turnbull, Shorten also uses emotional devices as an intensification strategy. Emotional devices such as these are rarely seen in political speeches surrounding social issues, such as Indigenous affairs. As with Turnbull, Shorten also uses the word - love - in addition to the words - emotion and compassion -, to propel his ideology, as seen in the extract below.

S99 - And so our test as a people and a parliament is not just to craft a new response but to **rediscover an old emotion**.

S100 - To recapture the best of Australian **compassion**.

S101 - To wake up brotherhood and sisterhood.

S102 - **Love** for our fellow human being, dedication to our neighbours.

By the simple mentioning of unexpected words in such a political speech - emotion, compassion and love - the reinforcement of Shorten’s ideological position is intensified. By integrating such a thorough range of intensification strategies, Shorten presents a speech that is charismatically loaded with its ideology of reconciliation and equality.

### 5.4 Summary of Shorten’s data

This chapter has shown how Shorten aligns himself in the discourse under different roles - narrator, character, and interlocutor - (Koven, 2002) to achieve the specific
goals of his political agenda. Explained is how creative indexical moments in the speech event allow the speaker to display different alignments to shift direction in the discourse and position himself strategically. The role of narrator tells the story or presents the facts. This voice does not display personal evaluations from the speaker. Under the role of character, Shorten evokes different voices that present different quotes with specific discursive goals, particularly the quotes of prominent figures in the Australian socio-cultural scene. The first role of character intends to validate his ideology and justify his actions. Another type of quote brings interactional features to the here-and-now situation from a casual conversation in an attempt to connect with the audience. These types of utterances are examples of double voicing (Bakhtin, 1981) in which the role of character and interlocutor blends. Next, the role of interlocutor correlates with specific features that constitute an interactional setting. He uses this role to build relationships with the audience, bringing all the social actors together. Lastly, the second theoretical approach (CDA) traces the specific linguistic means of constructing alignment with the use of the typology of strategies proposed in this thesis.
Comparative Analysis

6.1 Introduction

Having considered the two speakers in turn, this chapter presents a comparative analysis of the two 2017 Closing the Gap speeches. It will be argued that the two leaders evoke quite distinct voices (Bakhtin, 1981), and that these voices interact within the discourse under several role-perspectives in order to achieve their respective goals. The interaction between these voices will also be evaluated. This chapter will also compare the recurrence of specific speech features, using statistical analyses. Additionally, a comparison of comprehension levels (introduced in chapter 3) will be discussed.

6.2 Discourse shifts and the speaker role-perspectives

- Narrator: Journalistic style

While Turnbull uses a narrator voice in the manner of a storyteller, he also orients his narrator's voice towards journalistic or 'news reporter' style when reporting policy outcomes. In doing so, he is attempting to validate his story by portraying it as a 'truthful' source, in the sense that truth is often associated with news reporting (Craig, 2006; Pippert, 1989). He presents the statistics followed by measures and actions that his government is taking. These report results are then buffered, often shifting from this journalistic style to that of a storyteller, telling of Indigenous triumphs, thus mitigating the impact of undesirable news. This can be seen in the following extract.
The national school attendance target is also not on track, around 20 per cent of the gap in school performance between Indigenous and non-Indigenous students can be explained by poor attendance.

But there are examples of real progress with families and communities.

In the Anangu Pitjantjatjara Yankunytjatjara Lands, the APY Lands, Principal Matt Green spoke to me of the fierce rivalry in community football. But he said he was more interested and focused on the fierce rivalry to attain school attendance targets.

Here, Turnbull switches from the undesirable school attendance records in the report (journalistic style), to a story telling style, recounting his own previous casual conversation (explained below), explaining that Indigenous community members are ‘not concerned’ with those statistics, thus buffering the undesirable statistics within the report. In contrast to Turnbull, Shorten does not employ the journalistic style, preferring to avoid revealing entire details of the report. He uses his interlocutor style (explained below) to avoid subjective connection to the outcomes, as seen in the extract below.

Mr. Speaker

Today, I do not seek to present a balance sheet of the good and the bad.
S46 - Not a list of top-down programs, imperfectly managed.

S47 - Not the same old story, of reports written but not read.

S48 - Instead, I believe in a new approach.

Under this role, however, he offers an unusual subjective perspective. On one hand, he acknowledges the continued pattern of undesirable outcomes presented in the reports. On the other hand, he avoids delving into the details of the report. So, although he speaks subjectively, as in the quote above, he is still seeking to maintain distance from the undesirable report outcomes.

- **Narrator: Storytelling style**

Under the storytelling style, Turnbull’s narrator voice is sometimes realised with quotes. These quotes may come from one of two sources.

(i) Influential Indigenous figures whose voices are recontextualised (Blackledge, 2005; Fairclough, 2003) into the present moment (directly or indirectly), as evidenced in the following extract.

T6 - Last year Chris Sarra proposed three principles that would help make a difference in Indigenous policy. He said: Do things with us, not to us.
(ii) Recounts of his own previous casual conversations or interactions. This type of narration explains cases of double-voiced utterances (Bakhtin, 1981) in which the role of character and interlocutor intertwine, creating complicity with the audience while recounting personal events and private conversations, as illustrated in the following extract.

T99 - I **have met mothers** like Norma and Lena from Western Australia, who have lost children to suicide.

T100 - **These women have bravely shared their stories**, working tirelessly with leaders like Pat Dudgeon, Gerry Georgatos and Adele Cox to find locally-driven solutions.

T101 - I **met** Corey McLennan, and the leaders of Ceduna and the Far West Coast as well as Ian Trust from the Kimberley, who have co-designed the trial of the new Cashless Debit Card with the government.

T102 - **We hosted** Charlie King and the ‘No More’ Campaign **to end violence against women**.

T103 - In an historic display of support, **Parliamentarians, all of us**, **linked arms and walked with Charlie** to end this scourge of violence against women.
Shorten evokes a similar narratorial voice of the storyteller to present information about the Indigenous situation.

S26 – Mr. Speaker

S27 - I will never forget walking into Cairns West Primary on Djabugay country on the first day of last year’s campaign and seeing the wide-eyed smiles of so many young Aboriginal students, as I introduced them to Senator Patrick Dodson.

S28 - The value of role models, of the next generation seeing faces like theirs in places of power, cannot be underestimated.

As with Turnbull, this voice is also linguistically realised by quotes from influential figures whose voices are recontextualised into the here-and-now, as in the examples below.

S90 - At Redfern, Paul Keating threw down a gauntlet to us, the non-Aboriginal Australians.

S91 - He posed the question we had never asked.

S92 - ‘How would I feel, if this were done to me?’

S93 - 25 years later that question stands before Australia still.
In this example, Shorten brings Keating’s words into the here-and-now, as Keating represents the ideal of Shorten’s objectives. He uses Keating’s respected status in the Indigenous community to leverage his own agenda.

- **Character**

Under the role of character, Turnbull’s opening statement in the Ngunuwal language positions his as alignment to the Ngunuwal Indigenous community. This character voice complements the role of narrator. Shorten’s enactment of the character role also strengthens his arguments and is similar to the cases of Turnbull’s invocation of character. This role for Shorten is primarily enhanced by Senator Dodson. Dodson is the main voice Shorten brings to the current discourse to validate and support his ideological position and the actions proposed by his party, as seen in the extract below.

S235 - As Senator Dodson has explained to me in the language of his people, he says:

S236 - "Let's go. The best advice is - let's get on with it."

S237 - As he would say:

S238 - Umba imbalan!

It must be clarified here that within the two sets of data, quotes are used under the role of narration and also the role of character. Sometimes they are intertwined as
explained by Bakhtin (1981) in the case of double-voicing, but sometimes the roles are switched entirely. The difference here is that under the role of narrator, quotes are telling (or retelling) a there-and-then story or event, in order to recontextualise them into the here-and-now. In contrast, under the role of character, Indigenous quotes are spoken as a direct voice and representation of an Indigenous influential figure.

- **Interlocutor**

Lastly, in the third role of interlocutor, the two political leaders utilise specific semiotic resources which constitute footing as understood by Goffman (1981) as previously explained in section 2.3. Some of the linguistic features connected to the role of interlocutor are: the use of questions (full or tag questions), first-person singular verb conjugations, referential indexicals, and markers of modalisation (Fairclough, 2003). From an elite position, the interlocutor role can allow the leaders to attempt to connect with the Indigenous community creating a more relaxed conversational setting that is distinct from the often uni-directional nature of political speeches. Ochs (1979) explains how political speeches are planned discourses. This genre does not usually allow for spontaneous interaction. However, the role of interlocutor allows the leaders to simulate a conversation, levelling the political leaders and the Indigenous community. Shorten, for example, uses the interlocutor role, to level himself with other social actors as though he were speaking to them in a casual conversation, as in the following extract.

\[ S176 \quad \text{We seek your help, your partnership, your inspiration and your leadership.} \]
This simulated conversation style allows Shorten to reduce his elite identity as opposition leader, and to accept a humbler role. He perhaps wants to be regarded an ordinary man attempting to build solidarity with his audience, thus rejecting his presentation as an authority figure. He continues:

S177 - So today, I come not to tell – but to ask.

S179 - Giving forgiveness, as we seek forgiveness.

This direct conversation is a favoured strategy for Shorten throughout his speech as evidenced below.

S114 - So my message today is not just for the people in this chamber - but for the first peoples of this nation.

S115 - We seek your help, your partnership, your inspiration and your leadership.

S116 - Because things cannot continue as they are.

This role is also used in his closing statements, when repeating, directly to the Indigenous audience ‘You belong’ (Lines 218 - 232). Shorten favours this strategy under the role of interlocutor, whereas Turnbull does not attempt to simulate a casual conversation in his presentation. Both leaders do, however, use questions as an effective strategy under the role of interlocutor.
6.2.1 The interaction of narrator, character and interlocutor

The following extracts show the interactions between the different roles enacted by Turnbull and Shorten. The narrator corresponds to the unmarked text. The interlocutor is indicated by the underlined text, and the character role appears in bold font.

- **Turnbull**

Turnbull narrates a story (narrator) that gets interrupted by the role of character - the words of Chris Sarra. After the quote, the role of narrator shifts to the interlocutor role by using a subjective emotion that appeals to the attention of the audience, to demonstrate what he and his government has done in response to the quote presented under the role of character.

T5 - The lives, the occupations, the dreams of Aboriginal and Torres Islander Australians are as diverse as those of all other Australians - and stretched across this vast land, from the most remote communities to the heart of our capitals, to our national Parliament, our First Australians are showing that they can do anything, as they inspire us with their resilience, their courage and their enterprise.

T6 - Last year Chris Sarra proposed three principles that would help make a difference in Indigenous policy. He said: Do things with us, not to us.
T7 - Bring us policy approaches that nurture hope and optimism; and acknowledge, embrace and celebrate the humanity of Indigenous Australia.

T8 - And I am pleased that Chris has agreed to join the new Indigenous Advisory Council along with Andrea Mason, Susan Murphy, Ngiare Brown, Roy Ah See, and Djambawa Marawilli.

Here, Turnbull utilises the three voices to project and present political goals. Through the character role, he aligns himself with a social actor (Chris Sarra) and through the role of interlocutor, he aligns Chris Sarra, himself with another social actor (his government), directly addressing a response to Sarra’s quote and therefore building rapport with it.

- Shorten

  Shorten brings Oodgeroo’s words to the present through the voice of character, and the character's role is interrupted by that of the narrator, which conveys the context in which those words were uttered. After the quote, the speaker shifts to the interlocutor to express to the audience the need to write a new story.

S203 - Fifty years ago, Oodgeroo wrote:

S204 - The victory of the 1967 Referendum was not a change of white attitudes.

S205 - The real victory was the spirit of hope and optimism.
S206 - **We had won something.**

S207 - **We were visible, hopeful and vocal.**

S208 - All too rarely before and since has that been the story for Aboriginal people.

S209 - Instead, it has been a tale of exclusion.

S210 - Exclusion from opportunity, from the pages of our history.

S211 - And exclusion from the decisions which effect their lives.

S212 - **It is time to write a new story.**

S213 - **A story of belonging.**

This extract shows how the character role is a discursive strategy to support, validate and justify the ideology of reconciliation. The interaction of these voices allows Shorten to achieve his political goal. He brings the voice of Oodgeroo (character) into the present political situation. Then, operating under the role of interlocutor, he embraces his audience by proposing that it is time to write a new story. This proposal is presented objectively as a response to Oodgeroo’s ideology.

6.3 **Commonalities and peculiarities in the use of the three role-perspectives**

This section shows the commonalities and/or peculiarities of the application of these voices by the two leaders. It can be seen that the narrator voice evokes a common discursive goal in the two case studies, which is to align the respective speaker with respected Indigenous authoritative figures, and thereby achieve a sense of ‘authoritative
speech. The political objective of these alignments with the Indigenous community is arguably the same: to validate, support and justify the measures and actions executed by recent governments. Under the interlocutor role the leaders strategically position themselves with the audience, often by reference to Mr Speaker. The main goal here is to address the audience, levelling the status of both listeners and speakers, by calling for the attention of the audience and sometimes effectively asking for participation.

Questions in political speech are of course interactional features. But another purpose they serve is to reflect dynamism just by the mere alternation of different tones in the discourse (e.g. between declarative and interrogative forms). Taking into account that questions usually attempt to seek confirmation from the audience (Green, 1996) and are also used as solidarity devices (Green, 1996), these questions can be indicators of the salience of the interlocutor role in both Turnbull’s and Shorten's discourse. Additionally, in both speeches, the role of interlocutor seems to be located especially at the end of the speeches fulfilling a specific function of reaffirming a lasting connection with the audience.

6.4 Discursive strategies in the construction of alignment

The political leaders analysed in this study use the voices presented above to set alignments with different social actors and topics within the discourse. These three voices allow the speakers to re-establish and reinforce a bond with the Indigenous community. Their use of footing when presenting their ideological position is established under the role of narrator. Their ideological proposals towards reconciliation are strengthened with clear, identifiable voices under the role of character. Their strategy of levelling is used under the role of interlocutor. To complement this analysis, we

---

3 Speech associated with authoritative people presents the speaker as more persuasive and convincing (Philips, 2004, p.475)
now turn to the second methodological approach, CDA, by which a typology of discourse strategies is presented. This typology accounts for instances of alignment, highlighting the linguistic choices used by the leaders to negotiate its construction.

6.5 Recontextualisation and interdiscursivity: Manipulating and recycling semiotic resources

A common strategy presented throughout the two cases is the recontextualisation of socio-cultural concepts into the discourses of the political leaders. From the traditional perspective of rhetoric studies, this relationship has been explained by observing the construction of meaning throughout time (Hart & Sparrow 2001; Hart, Jarvis, Jennings, & Smith-Howell, 2005). Hart describes the ‘collective memory’ as an important instrument to carry meaning throughout generations, looking at the rhetoric of the present and the past (Hart et. al., 2005). Through connections with meanings of words at different times, some words become, for example, part of a disapproved lexicon (Hart et. al., 2005). In a similar trend, Beasley (2004) explains these connections of meanings through the use of shared beliefs.

Each discourse shapes the meanings of concepts incorporating new nuances to its meanings. Here, in both cases, each speaker incorporates the voices and stories of other people - historical or respected Indigenous figures, to support their own political agenda. They both recontextualise those voices into their here-and-now discourse. Words, figures, or expressions (famous or political) have distinctive and impressionable semantic features, as they apply to predetermined beliefs. This explains why the speakers do not need to describe every word they use or every personality they refer to every single time.
This study has illustrated how these semiotic features (e.g. voices from social actors under the role of character) stand as resources available to a speaker, which may be conveniently reutilised. Political leaders manipulate the recontextualisation (Bauman and Briggs, 1990; Blackledge, 2005; Fairclough, 2003) of those resources to shape the audience's understanding of events and present a favourable view of their political agenda. These recontextualisations describe and redefine ideological positionings taken by the political leaders. For example, the role of character is a discursive strategy used by the speakers to seek approval of their political ideology by appropriation of other people's voices. The use of the role of character, therefore, represents a manipulation of resources available. In the same way, lexical choices get recontextualised and redefined through interdiscursivity (Blackledge, 2005) in a new context to serve each speaker's purpose.

6.6 Statistical analysis

As previously explained, this thesis addresses the data qualitatively using two methodological approaches to answer the research questions. These two approaches account for linguistic ways in which the political leaders position themselves within their ideology and how they negotiate the construction of alignment with the Indigenous community. Here, it is important to understand the possible contributions of a statistical analysis to grasp the different nuances of political discourse. The number of times a speaker uses a specific discursive strategy or utters an expression can indicate some characteristics of the political discourse of that speaker. However, it is not possible to measure with numbers the socio-political context of an utterance or its impact on the audience. For these reasons, frequencies are referred to cautiously, not only because the data constitutes only one speech from each of the two politicians, but also due to the
complexities that arise from interpreting numbers to reflect meaning in linguistic choices within the discourse. This study does not necessarily attempt to show how often discursive strategies appear, but rather when they do appear, what specific linguistic choices are employed in their realisations. This approach shows how political leaders use voices to build alignments with other social actors and the discursive strategies that are employed in those alignments.

### 6.6.1 The typology of devices used in discursive strategies: Frequency

This section analyses the number of occurrences of devices used in discursive strategies in the speeches of the two political leaders. Table 4 below shows the recurrence of speech features that can be quantified for direct comparison and analysis.

**Table 4: Comparison of the recurrence of speech features**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Turnbull</th>
<th>Shorten</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Words</td>
<td>2890</td>
<td>3050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Switching</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paragraphs</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of the Speech dedicated to presenting the details &amp; recommendations of the report.</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self/ Party Referencing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Questioning</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repetition Lists of x 3 or more</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
When considering frequencies of speech features within the data, the comparative length of the speeches are measured. In this case, both speeches are of a similar, comparative length. It can be seen that role switching between the three role-perspectives is favoured by Shorten, who uses this strategy twice as much as Turnbull, indicating that the interaction between the distinctive voices is desirable in positioning himself within his ideology of reconciliation. It also indicates that the interaction of such perspectives allows for a greater scope in his construction of alignment, from each perspective.

Shorten presents over double the amount of paragraphs, indicating a delivery that consists of shorter, punchier statements that have the potential to be easily remembered by the audience. Also, Shorten has the opportunity to use the full length of the speech to concentrate of presenting his proposed ideology under his government. Turnbull, by comparison, presents about half the amount of paragraphs, indicating a more elaborate or explanatory style of delivery, which is expected when speaking to the details of the report. Here, Turnbull has dedicated just over half of his speech to detailing the report, allowing only half the length of time dedicated to

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Turnbull</th>
<th>Shorten</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Part Lists x 3 or more</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pronouns</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Person Speech</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Person Speech</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third Person Speech</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
imagery in presenting his ideology or visions for the future. Both leaders reference their own party in equal amounts, although it is more apparent in Shorten’s speech, as he is specific in saying the Labor party; whereas Turnbull refers to his government. Shorten favours the strategy of direct questioning to members of the audience, as used under the interlocutor role. In contrast Turnbull does not use direct questioning, preferring to question indirectly through Mr Speaker.

Lexical and grammatical choices are also demonstrated in both speeches, particularly the extent of repetition involved in each case. By investigating the degrees of lexical repetition (three or more), an indication of the relative importance of specific themes by each speaker is highlighted. This reflects their assumptions about the audience’s concerns. Repetition is favoured by Shorten, who uses the strategy three times as much as Turnbull. This heavy reliance on repetition is exaggerated in every case, with each repetition far exceeding a triple repeat. In lines 50-54, A new approach is repeated five times; in lines 94-97, How would we feel, is repeated four times, and finally in lines 218 -232, You do not belong is respected five times, intertwined with

You belong being repeated a dramatic ten times, in closing his speech. This is effective in driving the message of unity and alignment into the audiences’ memory.

One typical and popular feature that uses repetitions is three-part lists. Wotiff (1996, as cited in Fairclough and Fairclough, 2013) assessed three-part lists, for their form and function. However, Fairclough and Fairclough (2013) concluded that
such a strategy devalues the use of three-part lists. He claimed that they do the ideological work of audiences, tasking them with concluding inferred connections, which are deliberately left implicit. On the other hand, Hillier (2004) recognised the strategy of Wotiff’s three-part lists that could evoke applause from the audience at desired points within a speech. Although the forum of the Shorten speech does not permit actual applause, the implication still remains. Shorten favours this strategy, using it ten times more than Turnbull. These examples are presented in Table 5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lines</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6-12</td>
<td>Regions of tribal communities</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-23</td>
<td>Indigenous politicians</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-47</td>
<td>Everything Shorten is not presenting</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57-60</td>
<td>Aboriginal nations</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69-74</td>
<td>Recognition of Aboriginal qualities</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103-104</td>
<td>Historically famous Indigenous Australians</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124-128</td>
<td>Areas of failure</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142-144</td>
<td>Understanding</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>158-161</td>
<td>Vicious cycles</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>166-169</td>
<td>The story</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>187-194</td>
<td>Indigenous successes</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Shorten often exceeds a triple count usually expected of part lists, providing short, punchy declarations, which are easily remembered. Both repetition and part lists are
exemplified in Shortens speech, as favoured strategies, with the speaker amplifying the effect (in both cases) by exceeding a standard triple count.

Pronouns are necessarily included when measuring the frequency of discursive strategies, indicating their significance when negotiating a construction of alignment. Table 6 shows the comparative frequency of first, second and third pronouns in each of the speakers’ speeches.
# Table 6: Pronoun and cluster count of speeches

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pronouns</th>
<th>Clusters</th>
<th>Turnbull</th>
<th>Shorten</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I will</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I want to</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>my government</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>my department</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>my respects</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Me</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Let me</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thank you</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You Belong</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your leadership</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We Will</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We Can</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We Must</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our Constitution</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our First Australians</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our Nation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Us</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Let Us</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They Can</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They Need</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They Are</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They Inspire</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Their</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Their Lives</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Their Country</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Their Dreams</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Them</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bringing them home</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL PRONOUNS</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>197</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
First-person pronouns, *I, my* and *me* are used more frequently in Shorten’s speech indicating a stronger subjective engagement with his ideology. Second person pronoun *you* used significantly more by Shorten with a ratio of 23 to two, when compared to Turnbull’s speech. Similarly, Shorten’s use of *your* outweighs Turnbull’s usage with a ratio of 18 to one. Both *you* and *your* highlights Shorten’s preference for both a narrative role which recognises Indigenous qualities, values and attributes as exclusive to them and their history; and also for an interlocutor role which speaks directly to the Indigenous community. *We, us* and *our* are the most significant in the construction of alignment and in presenting the ideology of reconciliation. Third person pronouns, *they, their* and *them* are comparatively similar between the two speeches, indicating that neither speaker prefers to refer to the Indigenous audience in an exclusionary manner.

### 6.7 Comprehension comparison assessments

As discussed in section 3.1, the tools used to measure the comprehension of the speeches are the Flesch reading ease assessment (1948), and the Flesch–Kincaid grade level assessment (1975). These assessments and scores indicate the ease with which text can be understood. As explained the scores correlate approximately inversely. Both leaders’ scores are presented in table 7 below.

| Table 7: Results of the Flesch-Kincaid readability scores |
The Flesch-Kincaid reading ease scores returned a results of 39.81 for Turnbull and 56.25 for Shorten. This indicates that Turnbull’s text at 39.81 is difficult to read when compared to conversational English which carries a score of 90-80; with Shorten’s text at 56.25 being fairly difficult to read as compared to conversational English. The Flesch–Kincaid grade level scores can be interpreted as shown in table 8 below.

Table 8: Flesch-Kincaid Grade Level Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>US Grade Level</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100.00-90.00</td>
<td>5th grade</td>
<td>Very easy to read. Easily understood by an average 11-year-old student.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90.0-80.0</td>
<td>6th grade</td>
<td>Conversational English for consumers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80.0-70.0</td>
<td>7th grade</td>
<td>Fairly easy to read.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70.0-60.0</td>
<td>8th &amp; 9th grade</td>
<td>Plain English. Easily understood by 13 to 15 year-old students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60.0-50.0</td>
<td>10th to 12th grade</td>
<td>Fairly difficult to read.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score</td>
<td>US Grade Level</td>
<td>Explanation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.0–30.0</td>
<td>University/ College</td>
<td>Difficult to read.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.0–0.0</td>
<td>University/ College Graduate</td>
<td>Very difficult to read. Best understood by university graduates.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Flesch-Kincaid Grade Level presents a score of readability at a United States grade level. It can also mean the number of years of education usually required to understand the text, relevant when the formula results in a number greater than ten. The grade level formula emphasises sentence length over word length. This is significant in Turnbull’s case, where he presents fewer paragraphs with long explanatory sentences. For the Flesch-Kincaid grade level, Turnbull’s speech scored 13.02 indicative of tertiary level text; whereas Shorten scored a grade level of 9.47 which is indicative of a text that could be more closely considered as plain English, thus easier to read and understand.

The limited scope of this study being 30 000 words is insufficient to evaluate the other components that contribute to these scores, such as word length, number of syllables and sentence length. However, as a pilot for more comprehensive research in the future, these considerations would necessarily be explained.
**Conclusion**

This chapter concludes what this research thesis has demonstrated and accomplished. It defines how political speeches display socio-cultural features that create and shape social meaning through language use, presenting a combined approach to the analysis of political discourse. This research suggests the feasibility of applying methodologies developed for analysing narratives of subjective experience (Koven, 2002) in the field of political speech to reconsider the multi-voiced nature of political discourse, the relations between discursive shifts and the different positionings or discursive strategies of the speaker. Applied has been a combined theoretical model to account for the way in which the political leaders position themselves and other social actors within their speeches.

Koven’s (2002) model has been adapted to show how the speakers use the semiotic resources available in the discourse to set alignments with the Indigenous community. The second approach, built upon the theoretical notions of CDA, illuminates the precise linguistic forms used by the leaders to refer, define and construct their political ally. While the first approach presents the discursive strategies displayed by the enactment of different roles in the discourse, the second approach focuses more specifically on lexical choices to account for the creation of alignment. With notions from CDA, a typology of discursive strategies is proposed, to code political discourse in the search for linguistic realisations to construct alignment. These two approaches propose different analyses of political discourse to explain data from
a wider perspective. This work also displays the lexical choices used to realize the different discursive strategies, that is, their linguistic means of realization (Wodak, de Cillia, Reisigl and Liebhart, 1999).

Changes of roles are marked in the discourse with linguistic features and each role - narrator, character, and interlocutor - conveys specific features. These roles display different discursive goals for the speaker. The narrator tells the story and presents the information to the audience, the speaker shows distance from the history to present it with objectivity. Under the character role, the speaker quotes different sources or identities, bringing specific voices to the here-and-now discourse. These voices allow the speaker to validate and corroborate the information the narrator has provided. In this sense narrator and character roles harmonise, complementing each other in a dialectical relationship. Finally, the role of interlocutor allows the speaker to approach the audience and create connections with it attempting to reproduce a casual conversation with the use of interactional features.

The analysis shows how the two Australian political leaders respond to a similar trend of creating, defining and re-defining their sense of alliance with the Indigenous community. The research presented also shows how the use of language is manipulated by politicians to achieve their objectives. Under the role of narrator, the recasting of events in the guise of objective information serves to cue the audience’s perception of reality, using the power politicians have as a result of their privileged access to discourse (van Dijk, 1993). Under the interlocutor role, the speakers
are able to present a relaxed, casual atmosphere where the communication almost seems like a conversation between two friends, producing confirmatory questions to create solidarity (Green, 1996). Politicians bring voices into the discourse to emotionally appeal to the audience (Elster, 1994) to recall important national figures and place them out of context. Arguably, to validate the political argument of a politician in a specific time is to employ deceiving tactics under the role of character to support and back up the arguments of the political agenda.

In addition to the two primary methods of analysis this study has combined two supporting methodologies to analyse the data. The statistical analysis was used to indicate frequencies in the data, that can be undetectable with intuition alone. Then the Flesch reading ease assessment (1948), and the Flesch–Kincaid grade level assessment (1975), underscores the significance of linguistic choices when proposing political ideologies and alignments. Here, however well-intentioned the speakers are at using role-perspectives and reliable discursive strategies, designed to create trust and alliance, these text book strategies are still seemingly insufficient to inspire trust, as evidenced in public responses presented by the media. Their employment of such speech strategies become apparent as both the speakers attempt to speak to and with their desired audience, as opposed to speaking around them or above them. Utilisation of these strategies marks a departure from previous Closing the Gap speeches, which spoke to a problem to be solved (Commonwealth of Australia, 2011), rather than an opportunity to reconcile. It is here, that a widened scope of
what constitutes PDA may be beneficial, when attempting to understand why established strategical linguistic devices, aimed at achieving political objectives fall short. However, the proposal of any inclusion into the framework of PDA necessarily requires a combined critical analysis of methods and content currently utilised, in order to measure their effectiveness; and whether a wider inclusion of speech features and analysis could provide a control for which future political linguistic effectiveness can be measured. As a foundation for such a proposal, this research has identified and analysed the data using two contrasting methodologies, currently useful in dissecting such political data.

Overall, the linguistic choices used by both leaders naturally contribute to the reception of their speeches. It can be both disappointing and perplexing for major public figures when apparently proven linguistic strategies of effectiveness fall short of the desired outcome. While it is not the intention of this research to speak to the details of the policy itself, consideration of its reception, is clearly within the remit of the discourse analyst. Both leaders present limited solutions when espousing their political ideology, with Turnbull engaging in lengthy explanations as to why we are where we are, and Shorten presenting short, punchy declarations of what must happen (with no pragmatic solutions offered). In Shorten’s case, final words are crucial, and as such; they are pointed. They sketch the theme of his entire speech. In some sense, it is these words that audiences may remember. However, it may be too optimistic to expect these leaders to present a ground-breaking speech, such as a Keating-Redfern speech or a Rudd-apology. Instead, what is presented by
both leaders is essentially a history lesson in colonisation and a nod towards constitutional recognition. Controversial topics such as treaties are avoided entirely, marking a focus on what is not being said, as much as what is being said. Such inconsistencies form a Closing the Gap narrative that has already been predetermined - the government will assist Australia’s First Peoples in a politically sterile fashion, as risky ideas have previously proved unwelcome. Having said that, neither leader necessarily fails in their Closing the Gap addresses. Neither were particularly impressive nor offensive, preferring to take the middle road. But their positions are difficult ones, given the near decade of commitment to Closing the Gap, and the billions of dollars aimed at reducing the disadvantage. The lack of progress could render one speechless.

In closing, the Closing the Gap policy marks an important chapter in Australian political history. It is a policy that addresses a significant step towards reconciliation in Australia. It is a policy that promises hope for the future of all Australians. Consequently, the political discourse that surrounds Australia’s indigenous issues is central to how these issues are perceived and understood. By identifying role perspectives and discursive strategies as key to this political discourse, these roles and strategies can be analysed and compared for their effectiveness. The outcome is a clearer understanding of the discourse surrounding Closing the Gap and its place within national reconciliation and the equality of Australia’s First Peoples, thus an essential aid for Australian democracy. With this comprehensive clarity, all Australians, individually and collec-
tively, can engage more meaningfully in the democratic processes that shape the direction of Australia’s Indigenous future.
Appendices

Appendix A

Turnbull’s Closing the Gap Speech 2017


2. Today, Mr. Speaker, we are meeting together on Ngunuwal land and we acknowledge and pay our respects to their elders past and present.

3. And pay our deep respects to all Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people gathered today - including our Aboriginal Members of Parliament - and all across Australia, who have been the custodians of these lands and whose elders hold the knowledge of their rich and diverse cultures.

4. I also welcome the First Ministers and their representatives from the states and territories who have gathered with us today to demonstrate that the responsibility - indeed, the opportunity - for closing the gap in partnership with our communities rests with all levels of government, and with all Australians.

5. The lives, the occupations, the dreams of Aboriginal and Torres Islander Australians are as diverse as those of all other Australians - and stretched across this vast land, from the most remote communities to the heart of our capitals, to our national Parliament, our First Australians are showing that they can do anything, as they inspire us with their resilience, their courage and their enterprise.

6. Last year Chris Sarra proposed three principles that would help make a difference in Indigenous policy. He said: Do things with us, not to us.
7. Bring us policy approaches that nurture hope and optimism; and acknowledge, embrace and celebrate the humanity of Indigenous Australia.

8. And I am pleased that Chris has agreed to join the new Indigenous Advisory Council along with Andrea Mason, Susan Murphy, Ngiare Brown, Roy Ah See, and Djambawa Marawilli.

9. I thank Warren Mundine and the retiring members for their work.

10. Mr. Speaker, nothing brought a quiet moment of humanity to the 2016 election campaign more than the handing of the title deeds to Belyuen Elder, Raylene Singh, 37 years after the Larrakia people submitted a claim to what had always been theirs.

11. For families like Rayleneís, despite their old people passing on before the Kenbi land claim was settled, the past continues to live in the present.

12. And acknowledging past wrongs enables healing to begin. We saw that with the National Apology to the stolen generations, delivered by Prime Minister Rudd who also joins us today on the ninth anniversary of that moment in history was recognized yesterday here in the House.

13. Acknowledgement requires the humility of acceptance of the truth.

14. On that hot dry day on the shores of the Cox Peninsula in Darwin, we acknowledged that the Larrakia people had cared for their country for tens of thousands of years, that their songs have been sung since time out of mind, and that those songs held and passed on the knowledge of Larrakia customs and traditions.

15. Acknowledgement is the seed from which hope and healing grow.

16. It is that acknowledgement that fifty years ago, saw the Australian people vote overwhelmingly to change our Constitution so that the Commonwealth could assume powers in relation to our First Australians.
17. And while many issues divide us in this place, we are united in our determination to ensure that our Constitution is amended once again to recognize our First Australians.

18. Changing the Constitution is neither easy nor a task for the faint hearted. The Referendum Council will conclude its consultations this year so that then Parliament can complete the work of formulating and presenting the recognition amendments.

19. The success of the 1967 referendum also meant that First Australians were counted equally in our official population alongside all other Australians in the Census.

20. This provided our first understanding of the survival and the resilience of our Indigenous peoples, but also the depth of that gap between their situation and other Australians.

21. The leaders of these times challenged us to think well past statistics.


23. Vincent Lingiari and his fellow workers at the Wave Hill walk-off.

24. Eddie Mabo and his fight for native title.

25. Mr. Speaker, theirs are the shoulders among many upon which a new generation of Indigenous leaders stand today.

26. And last night the Prime Minister’s courtyard was abuzz with enthusiasm, with positivity, and the hope of leaders challenging us to again think again past the statistics.

27. Bright, determined women and men stood tall, as successful people in their fields of work, proud of their heritage, anchored in their culture.
28. While we must accelerate progress and close the gap, we must also tell the broader story of Indigenous Australia - not of despondency and deficit but of a relentless and determined optimism.

29. That being Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Australian means to succeed, to achieve, to have big dreams and high hopes, and to draw strength from your identity as an Indigenous person in this country.

30. As Prime Minister, Mr. Speaker, I will continue to tell those stories - to talk about the strengths of our First Australians.

31. We have among us five Indigenous Members of Parliament, who bring this same pride, this same strength here to the heart of our democracy.

32. Ken Wyatt, the first Indigenous Member of the House of Representatives, and now the first Indigenous Minister to be appointed in a Commonwealth Government.

33. As well as Linda Burney, Senator Pat Dodson, Senator Malarndirri McCarthy and Senator Jacqui Lambie.

34. Yet even with the determination of our First Australians to create a better future, even with successive Commonwealth and state governments investing more resources and even with tens of thousands of dedicated Australians seeking to contribute and engage, we still are not making enough progress.

35. We have come a long way since the Referendum, but we have not come far enough.

36. Mr. Speaker, I present today to the Parliament and the people of Australia, the ninth Closing the Gap report.

37. This report demonstrates that all Australian Governments have much more work to do.
38. The proportion of Indigenous 20 to 24 year olds who have achieved Year 12 or equivalent is 61.5 per cent - up from 45.4 per cent in 2008. This target is on track to halve the gap.

39. A new target for Indigenous 4 year olds enrolled in early childhood education is 95 per cent by 2025. The data shows that in 2015, 87 per cent of all Indigenous children were enrolled in early childhood education the year before full-time school.

40. We have seen improvements in reading and numeracy for Indigenous students but this target is not on track.

41. Last year, 640 more children needed to read at the Year 3 benchmark to halve the gap. This year, that figure is around 440.

42. The literacy gap is narrowing and achievable, and through the individualized learning plans agreed at COAG, First Ministers have committed to improve these results.

43. The national school attendance target is also not on track, around 20 per cent of the gap in school performance between Indigenous and non-Indigenous students can be explained by poor attendance.

44. But there are examples of real progress with families and communities.

45. In the Anangu Pitjantjatjara Yankunytjatjara Lands, the APY Lands, Principal Matt Green spoke to me of the fierce rivalry in community football. But he said he was more interested and focused on the fierce rivalry to attain school attendance targets.

46. And with the help of our Remote School Attendance Strategy, championed by Minister Nigel Scullion, Matt is driving cultural change in Fregon. The Strategy is working.
47. RSAS schools show a higher attendance rate in 2016 compared to 2013.
48. We have made great gains in improving the key factors that influence the health of Indigenous children.
49. But we are also reminded of the fragility of life, and the heavy burden of responsibility of families, communities and governments.
50. I am very saddened and disappointed that the target to halve the gap in Indigenous child mortality is not on track, with the 2015 data being just outside the target.
51. We must redouble our efforts to reduce smoking rates during pregnancy, continue to improve immunization rates, lift rates of antenatal care, reduce fetal trauma, and keep our children safe.
52. Rates of attending antenatal care in the important first trimester are highest in outer regional, and lowest in major cities.
53. Ken Wyatt as the Minister for Indigenous Health - a field in which he has had many decades of experience - will work wisely and collaboratively with our state and territory counterparts, and the community health sector, to get this target back on track.
54. We have seen improvements in reducing mortality from chronic diseases, however the mortality rates from cancer are rising.
55. The overall mortality rate has declined by 15 per cent since 1998, and life expectancy is increasing.
56. However, it is not accelerating at the pace it should and therefore, as in previous years this target is not on track.
57. The employment target is not on track either, but 57.5 per cent of those living in major cities are employed.
58. 5,000 Indigenous job seekers have been placed into real jobs through our Vocational Training and Employment Centre network.

59. Almost 500 Indigenous businesses were awarded more than $284 million in Commonwealth contracts thanks to our Indigenous Procurement Policy.

60. I want to thank state and territory governments for agreeing to explore similar procurement policies to help the Indigenous business sector thrive.

61. Mr Speaker, the telling point, the data tells us that there is no employment gap, no employment gap between Indigenous Australians and non-Indigenous Australians with a university degree.

62. A reminder of the essential importance of education.

63. If we look at the long-term intergenerational trends, we see that Indigenous life expectancy is increasing, babies are being born healthier, more people are studying and gaining post-school qualifications and those adults are participating in work.

64. These are achievements that families, elders and communities can be proud of.

65. But incarceration rates, and rates of child protection are too high.

66. 63 per cent of Indigenous people incarcerated last year were in prison for violent offences and offences that cause harm.

67. Central to reducing incarceration is reducing the violence and of course, protecting the victims of violence.

68. Our Third Action Plan to Reduce Violence Against Women and Children includes measures to support Indigenous victims, and stop the cycle of reoffending.

69. Our Prison to Work report commissioned in last year’s Closing the Gap speech has since been delivered, and adopted by COAG.
70. Working in partnership with Kuku Yalanji man, Jeremy Donovan, we have gained important insights into the cycle of incarceration.

71. In response, COAG agreed to better coordination of government services especially in-prison training and rehabilitation, employment, health and social services.

72. Mr Speaker, children should always be treated humanely, with love, and especially when they are in custody.

73. The confronting and appalling images of children shackled and in spit hoods shocked our nation, and as Prime Minister, I acted swiftly.

74. While the work of the Royal Commission into juvenile justice and child protection continues, governments across Australia are taking steps to ensure children are always treated appropriately.

75. To provide the independent oversight, my Government will ratify the Optional Protocol to the Convention against Torture and I am pleased to inform the House that Bunuba woman, June Oscar AO, has been appointed Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Social Justice Commissioner.

76. The first woman to take on this role.

77. June brings tremendous knowledge, and has been a formidable campaigner against alcohol abuse, shining a light on the devastating consequences of Fetal Alcohol Spectrum Disorder.

78. Mr Speaker, the issues are complex and as we know, the solutions are not simple.

79. Indigenous Affairs is an intricate public policy area.

80. It requires uncompromised collaboration with Indigenous people and national leadership.
81. It needs buy-in from states, communities and most importantly families.

82. I am pleased that COAG has agreed to progress renewed targets in the year ahead, and I invite the Opposition and the cross-bench to participate, particularly all of our Indigenous Members of Parliament.

83. The national interest requires a re-commitment to the relationship with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples.

84. But there can be no relationship without partnership.

85. And there can be no partnership without participation and we heard that very eloquently this morning at the Redfern Statement breakfast.

86. Mr. Speaker, I firmly believe that people must be involved in the process in order to be engaged in the outcomes. It has to be a shared endeavor.

87. Greater empowerment of local communities will deliver the shared outcomes that we all seek.

88. So my Government is reforming the way the Indigenous Affairs portfolio operates, moving from transactional government, to enablement.

89. From paying for services, to linking funding to outcomes.

90. From a one-size-fits-all mindset for program design, to local solutions.

91. Indigenous families and communities must be at the centre of this approach.

92. We have started the journey, but there is much work to do.

93. I welcome Professor Ian Anderson into my Department, who will play an important role in leading this new way of working, along with people like Anne-Marie Roberts, who leads a team of passionate and committed staff working in communities across the nation.

94. The Indigenous-led Empowered Communities model is now in eight regions across the country.
95. I met their leaders last month, and it is clear that this approach is generating strong Indigenous governance, and empowering Indigenous people to partner with government and companies.

96. These models, and others such as Murdi Paaki in Western New South Wales, and Ceduna in South Australia, are being driven by local Indigenous leaders.

97. Where communities are ready, we will work with them to build capacity and ensure more responsibility for decision making rests as close to the community as possible.

98. Mr Speaker, my confidence in this comes from seeing firsthand how this approach is working at the community level.

99. I have met mothers like Norma and Lena from Western Australia, who have lost children to suicide.

100. These women have bravely shared their stories, working tirelessly with leaders like Pat Dudgeon, Gerry Georgatos and Adele Cox to find locally-driven solutions.

101. I met Corey McLennan, and the leaders of Ceduna and the Far West Coast as well as Ian Trust from the Kimberley, who have co-designed the trial of the new Cashless Debit Card with the government.

102. We hosted Charlie King and the No More Campaign to end violence against women.

103. In an historic display of support, Parliamentarians, all of us, linked arms and walked with Charlie to end this scourge of violence against women.

104. And I could tell you, Mr. Speaker, many more stories of self-reliance from Fre-gon, Redfern, La Perouse, Scotdesco, Brisbane, Darwin, Perth.

105. It is a very long list as we know.
106. We can learn as much from these successes, as we can from failures.

107. To do so, we must have a rigorous evaluation of programs so we know what is working and what is not.

108. So we will expand the Productivity Commission to include a new Indigenous Commissioner to lead the Commission’s work of policy evaluation.

109. And the Government will invest $50 million for research into policy and its implementation.

110. This will be designed in partnership and with the guidance of the Indigenous Advisory Council.

111. So much is published about Indigenous communities, and as many Indigenous Australians have said to me, not nearly enough is published for Indigenous communities.

112. So the data and research we have, and the evidence we need to build, will be made available to Indigenous communities to empower leadership and support community led-programs.

113. It will assist Government in its next phase of the Closing the Gap, which must focus on regional action and outcomes.

114. Mr. Speaker, I ask that we give credit to the quiet achievers - the Indigenous people who are working on the front line of family violence, who are enabling people with disabilities to gain the services they need, who are starting businesses, employing others, innovating.

115. All people who have expressed their deep desire to work together as committed Australians.

116. And I ask that you seek out people like those I had the honour of addressing last night, every day, Indigenous Australians achieving extraordinary things.
117. Like the Kongs’ a family of firsts.

118. Marilyn and Marlene were the first Indigenous medical graduates from Sydney University.

119. Marlene became a GP and public health expert, Marilyn became the first Indigenous obstetrician and their brother Kelvin, the first Indigenous surgeon in Australia.

120. I ask that we share these stories and those of the entrepreneurs, lawyers, scientists, teachers, nurses, servicemen and women, social service workers, writers, accountants, public servants, Ministers, Members and Senators.

121. Again, their callings and achievements as diverse, as magnificent, as inspiring as those of other Australians.

122. Let us tell the stories of Indigenous achievement and hard work.

123. Because those stories are true markers of progress.

124. They inspire and encourage and they make a difference.

125. This Parliament, Mr. Speaker, has the opportunity, using the knowledge and wisdom of Indigenous people to embark on a new approach to Closing the Gap on Indigenous disadvantage.

126. My Government will not shy away from our responsibility and we will uphold the priorities of education, employment, health and the right of all people to be safe from family violence.

127. We will not waver in our quest to achieve these outcomes.

128. But we will have the humility to admit that we must travel this road together, with open hearts and a determination to ensure that our First Australians, and all Australians, will be able here, more than anywhere, to be their best, and realise their dreams.
129. -FINAL -
Appendix B

Shorten’s Closing the Gap Speech 2017

1. Thank you Mr. Speaker

2. I acknowledge the Ngunnawal and Ngambri peoples, traditional owners of the land on which we meet, I pay my respects to elders past, present and emerging.

3. The tradition of recognition goes back millennia.

4. This parliament and the nation we call home is, was and always will be, Aboriginal land.

5. Where we are, so too are Aboriginal peoples.

6. From the Noonga near Perth.

7. To the Eora of Sydney

8. The Nunga of Adelaide

9. The Kulin around Melbourne

10. The Palawah of Tassie

11. The Murri of Brisbane

12. And Torres Strait Islander peoples

13. We are one country, enriched by hundreds of nations, languages and traditions.

14. Mr. Speaker

15. After the last election, I took on the Shadow Ministry for Indigenous Affairs.

16. My family and I went back to Garma, to listen and learn.

17. I met with Northern Territory leaders, defending the young men being abused in juvenile detention.
18. I travelled to Wave Hill, to commemorate the courage of Vincent Lingiari and the Gurindji.

19. And I looked to my Indigenous colleagues for their wisdom.

20. They are as inspirational as they are modest.

21. A Wiradjuri woman in the House, a Shadow Minister

22. A Yaruwa woman in the Senate, heading our Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Caucus Committee

23. And a Yawuru man, the father of Reconciliation, my mentor and my Assistant Shadow Minister.

24. I also recognize the Member for Hasluck, Ken Wyatt and congratulate him on his historic appointment.

25. I recognize too Senator Lambie.

26. Mr. Speaker

27. I will never forget walking into Cairns West Primary on Djabugay country on the first day of last year’s campaign and seeing the wide-eyed smiles of so many young Aboriginal students, as I introduced them to Senator Patrick Dodson.

28. The value of role models, of the next generation seeing faces like theirs in places of power, cannot be underestimated.

29. It should not be the exception and I want to make it the rule.

30. In the Labor Party, we are doing better than we have - but what we did before was simply not good enough.

31. I want us to improve.

32. Not just at a Federal level at every level of government.

33. So many first Australians are in the galleries today.
34. You, your friends and your peers would elevate and enrich our parliament with your talent, whichever party you chose.

35. And I look forward to the day, and can imagine the day, when one of the first Australians is our Prime Minister or, indeed, our head of state.

36. As the Prime Minister mentioned, the Referendum Council are continuing their important community conversations.

37. And after the Uluru gathering, it will be time for the parliament to step up and draw upon these consultations - and finally agree on a set of words to put to the Australian people.

38. Let me be clear: this parliament, this year must agree on a way forward.

39. Not a vague poetic statement, offending no-one by saying nothing.

40. A meaningful proposition every Australian can understand and - I remain confident - will overwhelmingly support.

41. Recognition is not the end of the road.

42. But it should be the beginning of a new, far more equal relationship between the first peoples of this nation and all of us who have followed.

43. And that is where the listening and the learning must reach beyond the walls of this chamber.

44. Mr. Speaker

45. Today, I do not seek to present a balance sheet of the good and the bad.

46. Not a list of top-down programs, imperfectly managed.

47. Not the same old story, of reports written but not read.

48. Instead, I believe in a new approach.

49. We must forget the insulting fiction that the first Australians are a problem to be solved.
50. And instead, take a new approach, to listen to the people who stand on the other side of the gap.

51. A new approach that from now on, the first Australians must have the first say in the decisions that shape their lives.

52. A new approach that means a stronger voice for the National Congress of Australia’s First People and the resources to make it happen.

53. A new approach to extend ourselves beyond hand-picked sources of advice.

54. A new approach to be in the places where our first Australians live, work and play: in Mount Druitt and Logan, in the APY Lands and East Arnhem.

55. Not treating local consultation as a box to be ticked but applying the wisdom of the people who know.

56. Understanding and recognizing there are many Aboriginal nations across this country:

57. Waanyi and Warlpiri

58. Badi and Gumatj

59. Tharawal and Kuarna

60. Yorta-Yorta and Narrunga†

61. And all of these nations have the right to the control of their future.

62. Mr. Speaker

63. The change required is deeper and more profound than where we visit and who we talk to.

64. The first Australians want a way to be heard in a voice they are in control of.

65. And I want Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people to know - Labor hears you.
66. We understand the need for a structure that isn’t at the mercy of cuts, or seen as a gift of largesse.

67. A voice that cannot be kicked to the kerb by a change of government or policy.

68. An entity that recognizes:

69. Culture

70. Kinship

71. Identity

72. Language

73. Country

74. Responsibility

75. And the pride that comes from knowing who you are, where you come from and the values you stand upon.

76. A system where culture is central and fundamental.

77. And, have no doubt, this can be done.

78. We see it when a Pitjantjjarra person seeks out a local healer, a Ngankari, in addition to a GP because their spiritual wellbeing can’t be treated by a packet of Panadol.

79. We see it in the Koori Court in Parramatta, using diversionary sentencing as an alternative to incarceration.

80. Where elders sit on the bench alongside judges.

81. Elders asking the right questions of young people, they give them a sense of belonging.

82. And if they muck-up, the elders address them with the straight-talking freedom of family and culture - a frankness and reassurance that even the judge can learn from.
83. The court, the police, the prosecution and the defense show sensitivity to culture - yet still deal with a young person who has behaved in an anti-social way.

84. This cross-cultural approach enhances the system.

85. Bringing Aboriginal cultures to the centre - allowing justice to be done, without diminishing the individual or denying identity.

86. It Australianises justice - and makes it work better.

87. We see this in the best of Australian theatre, in art, education and literature.

88. And if we can accept the value and richness of the Indigenous cultural genius and allow it to impact and transform our justice system and our arts. We can do it with the Australian parliament too.

89. In this peoples’ place, we can grow an enhanced respect for the first peoples, for their unique societies, for their values, for their experiences.

90. At Redfern, Paul Keating threw down a gauntlet to us, the non-Aboriginal Australians.

91. He posed the question we had never asked.

92. How would I feel, if this were done to me?

93. 25 years later that question stands before Australia still.

94. How would we feel if our children were more likely to go to jail than university?

95. How would we feel if our life expectancy was twenty years shorter than our neighbour?

96. How would we feel if because of our skin colour, we experienced racism and discrimination.

97. And how would we feel if every time we offered a solution, an idea, an alternative approach we were patronizingly told that government knew best?

98. This is about our ability to walk in another’s shoes.
And so our test as a people and a parliament is not just to craft a new response but to rediscover an old emotion.

To recapture the best of Australian compassion.

To wake up brotherhood and sisterhood.

Love for our fellow human being, dedication to our neighbours.

Weary Dunlop’s devotion to his troops, love of others over risk to self.

Fred Hollows life of service, Nancy Wake’s courage.

A spirit we see in millions of ordinary Australians: carers and teachers, volunteers, and emergency service personnel.

It is the story that Pat told me about the matron at his school demanding that this young boy had sheets on his bed like every other young boy.

It was about the lady in Casterton who said no-one was gonna treat Pat different to any other boy.

Courage comes in all forms - that’s the spirit we need.

There’s a spirit of courage which lurks in the hearts of all Australians.

There’s that sense that we, at a certain point, we’ll be pushed no further, that we will not stand for it any more.

It’s that spirit to reject discrimination, it’s that spirit to reject inequality.

To simply say: this cannot continue.

To simply say: Aboriginal people do not have to put up with this rubbish any more.

So my message today is not just for the people in this chamber - but for the first peoples of this nation.

We seek your help, your partnership, your inspiration and your leadership.

Because things cannot continue as they are.
The audit of the Indigenous Advancement Strategy tells a worrying, familiar tale:

Concerns about consultation

Cuts

And paternalism a slide backwards.

This is not a comment on the Coalition or Labor.

It's a comment about parliament.

We see too often the legitimate cynicism of our First Australians towards the efforts of this place because there are failures written across the land.

In suburbs and remote communities

In schools and hospitals

In women’s refuges and the courts of this country

In the targets we fall short of today.

In the staggering 440 per cent increase in Aboriginal children in out-of-home care.

Mr. Speaker

It has been twenty years since Bringing them Home, the report that brought tears to this chamber.

Nine years since Kevin Rudd and Jenny Macklin’s apology to the Stolen Generations.

And I wish to acknowledge former Prime Minister Rudd's presence here today in the gallery, visiting his former workplace.

I say this, Kevin: you can take well-deserved pride in your leadership on the 2008 apology.
134. But now, we have more Aboriginal children than ever growing up away from home, away from kin, country and culture.

135. We know many members of the Stolen Generation are still living with the pain of their removal and the harm done by years of having their story rejected and denied.

136. This is why I applaud the State Governments of New South Wales, South Australia and Tasmania who are already taking steps toward providing reparations to families torn apart by the discrimination of those times.

137. Decency demands that we now have a conversation at the Commonwealth level about the need to follow their lead on reparations.

138. This is the right thing to do. It is at the heart of Reconciliation: telling the truth, saying sorry, making good.

139. Mr. Speaker

140. The Closing the Gap Targets were agreed by all levels of government, not just the Commonwealth - the States and Local Government, in partnership with Aboriginal people.

141. Driven by the understanding:

142. that your health influences your education

143. your education affects your ability to get a job

144. and that good jobs make things better for families, relationships and communities.

145. The Closing the Gap framework is an intergenerational commitment to eroding centuries of inequality.

146. It outlives governments, parliaments, prime ministers and opposition leaders - but it also requires renewal.
This year, many of the current targets are due to be renegotiated.

And there are also new areas we must consider:

Labor continues to demand a justice target.

Because incarceration and victimization are breaking families and communities across the country.

Today we propose a new priority on stronger families adding a target for reducing the numbers of Aboriginal children in out of home care.

The Secretariat for National Aboriginal and Islander Child Care, has shone a light on the grim reality:

One in three children in statutory out-of-home care are Indigenous.

And Indigenous children are nearly ten times more likely to be removed by child protection authorities than their non-Indigenous peers.

Labor will listen to, work with SNAICC - and most importantly work with communities themselves - to look at new models and new approaches.

Mr. Speaker

Breaking the vicious cycle:

of family violence

of women murdered and driven from their homes

of unsafe communities

of parents in jail and kids in care

Requires more from us than doubling-down on the current system.

We need to learn from places like Bourke and Cowra and their focus on justice reinvestment on prevention, not just punishment.
164. From Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander communities who are making men face-up to their responsibilities and forcing a change in attitudes, supporting initiatives such as the ‘No More’ campaign.

165. And that should be the story across the board:

166. In preventative health

167. In education

168. In employment

169. And housing

170. It is time for humility.

171. To admit we don’t have the answers here and to go and seek them out.

172. It is time for truth-telling.

173. Our ancestors drove the first peoples of this nation from their bora ring, we scattered the ashes of their campfires.

174. We fenced hunting grounds, we poisoned waterholes, we distributed blankets infected with diseases we knew would kill.

175. And just as much damage has been done in different ways with better intentions, by the belief that forced assimilation was the only way to achieve equality.

176. So today, I come not to tell but to ask.

177. Because where we have failed the first Australians have succeeded.

178. On the road to Reconciliation, our first Australians who have led the way.

179. Giving forgiveness, as we seek forgiveness.

180. Walking off Wave Hill Station for the right to live on their land, in their way.

181. Charles Perkins and the Freedom Riders who opened the eyes of a generation to racism and poverty.
182. Jessie Street, Faith Bandler, Chicka Dixon, Joe McGinniss and countless others who rallied support for the 67 Referendum under the banner ‘Count us Together’.

183. And Eddie Mabo, who told his daughter Gail:

184. One day, all of Australia is going to know my name.

185. The success of Aboriginal leadership can be found in every corner of the country.

186. I have seen them with my own eyes.

187. Aboriginal Community Controlled Health organizations, providing essential primary care.

188. Indigenous Rangers, in Wadeye and Maningrida, the Central Desert - or the Kimberly working on country and on the seas and waterways doing meaningful jobs for good wages.

189. The Families as First Teachers program which has given culturally-appropriate support to over 2000 young families: helping with health, hygiene and preparing for early childhood education.

190. Money Mob teaching budgeting and planning skills.

191. Deadly Choices, through the Institute for Urban Indigenous Health in Brisbane - improving preventative health.

192. The Michael Long Learning and Leadership Centre in Darwin.

193. The Stars Foundation, inspiring Indigenous girls modelling the success of the Clontarf Academy for Boys.

194. And the Australian Indigenous Mentoring Experience, connecting Aboriginal university students with high-achievers at school.
195. On every issue, at every age, Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people are demonstrating that solutions are within their grasp.

196. Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people know what needs to be done what they need from this parliament is recognition, respect and resources.

197. We cannot swap the tyranny of bureaucracy - for funding cuts and neglect.

198. The people on the frontline, elders, leaders, teachers and health-care workers know what to do.

199. We need to take the time to listen.

200. We need to respect the right of Aboriginal voices to make decisions, control their own lives, give them their own place and space.

201. They just need us to back them up.

202. Mr. Speaker

203. Fifty years ago, Oodgeroo wrote:

204. The victory of the 1967 Referendum was not a change of white attitudes.

205. The real victory was the spirit of hope and optimism.

206. We had won something.

207. We were visible, hopeful and vocal.

208. All too rarely before and since has that been the story for Aboriginal people.

209. Instead, it has been a tale of exclusion.

210. Exclusion from opportunity, from the pages of our history.

211. And exclusion from the decisions which effect their lives.

212. It is time to write a new story.

213. A story of belonging.

214. Because Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples belong to a proud tradition.
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215. To nations who fought the invaders.

216. Brave people who fought and died for their country at Passchendaele, Kokoda and Long Tan and now in the Middle East and Afghanistan.

217. Who have fought and continue to fight for justice, for land, for an apology, for recognition.

218. You belong to a tradition of sporting brilliance, in the face of racism from opponents, teammates, administrators and spectators.

219. You belong to humanity’s oldest continuous culture more famous around the world now than ever before.

220. You do not belong in a jail cell, for an offence that carries an $80 fine.

221. You do not belong strapped to a chair, with a hood on your head.

222. You do not belong in the back of a windowless van, away from your family and loved ones.

223. You do not belong in a bureaucrat’s office, begging for money.

224. You do not belong on the streets, with nowhere to go.

225. You belong here, as members of this parliament, as leaders of this nation.

226. You belong in the Constitution, recognized at last.

227. You belong in schools, teaching and learning.

228. You belong on construction sites, building homes and gaining skills.

229. You belong on country, caring for the land.

230. You belong here, growing up healthy, raising your children in safety, growing old with security.

231. You belong here, strong in your culture, kinship, language and country.

232. You belong here, equal citizens in this great country, equal partners in our common endeavour.
233. This is your place. This is our place.

234. Our future is your future.

235. As Senator Dodson has explained to me in the language of his people, he says:

236. "Let's go. The best advice is - let's get on with it."

237. As he would say:

238. Umba imbalan!

239. FINAL -
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