

Pronouns as Power: A Tripartite Linguistic Inquiry into Referent Erasure, Political Distance, and Deixis in Students' English Debates

*Margaret Stevani*¹

*Evi Martiningsih*²

*Tiara Panduwinata*³

*Loso Judijanto*⁴

*Rinovian Rais*⁵

*Suroso*⁶

¹ Corresponding author, English Education Department, Universitas Pembinaan Masyarakat Indonesia, Indonesia; margaretstevani19@gmail.com

² Politeknik Angkatan Laut, Surabaya, Indonesia

³ Sekolah Tinggi Agama Islam Sulthan Syarif Hasyim Siak, Indonesia

⁴ IPOSS Jakarta, Indonesia

⁵ Universitas Indraprasta PGRI Jakarta, Indonesia

⁶ Institut Agama Islam Tarbiyatut Tholabah Lamongan, Indonesia

Received: 10 July 2025

Accepted: 1 June 2026

Published: 30 July 2026

Abstract

This study investigated the ideological functions of pronouns in Indonesian EFL student political debates through a tripartite analytical framework consisting of referent erasure, political distance, and deixis. Grounded in Critical Discourse Analysis, the research examined how pronoun choices functioned not only as grammatical references but also as rhetorical strategies for negotiating power, alignment, and agency. The data were collected from 26 undergraduate students from Universitas Pembinaan Masyarakat Indonesia, Politeknik Angkatan Laut, and Institut Keislaman Tuah Negeri during six real-time English debate sessions conducted in 2026. Debate transcripts were analyzed qualitatively to identify patterns in the use of pronouns such as *we*, *they*, *you*, and impersonal constructions. The findings revealed that students strategically shifted pronoun usage to construct solidarity, distance opposing groups, obscure responsibility, and strengthen persuasive arguments within civic and political discussions. Pronouns thus operated as micro-sites of ideological negotiation that reflected identity positioning and contextual meaning-making. This study contributed to applied linguistics and English language education by demonstrating how EFL learners used grammatical forms to exercise voice, persuasion, and ideological stance in multilingual academic discourse.



Keywords: Bilingual political discourse, critical discourse analysis, deictic positioning, English debates practices

To cite this article: Stevani, M., Martiningsih, E., Panduwinata, T., Judijanto, L., Rais, R., & Suroso. (2026). Pronouns as power: A tripartite linguistic inquiry into referent erasure, political distance, and deixis in students' English debates. *SALEE: Study of Applied Linguistics and English Education*, 7(2), 108–130. [https://doi.org/ 10.35961/salee.v7i2.2291](https://doi.org/10.35961/salee.v7i2.2291)

DOI: 10.35961/salee.v7i2.2291

1. Introduction

Language is never neutral. Within discourse, even the smallest linguistic elements such as pronouns serve as powerful tools for shaping meaning, managing interpersonal dynamics, and constructing ideological positions (Alisoy, 2025). In the context of student political debates, pronouns perform a wide range of functions beyond mere reference; they operate as vehicles of alignment, authority, and resistance. This study investigates how English pronouns are used strategically by students to construct identity, express power, and negotiate group positioning, with particular attention to three interrelated discursive mechanisms: referent erasure, political distance, and deixis.

Pronouns, though often grammatically minimal, carry heavy semiotic weight. They do not simply point to people or objects; they actively situate speakers in relation to others, to time, and to ideas (Azizi et al., 2025). For instance, the shift from “*we*” to “*they*” in political discourse can signal inclusion or exclusion, solidarity or alienation, moral positioning or blame. Similarly, the omission of an agent through passive constructions (e.g., “*Mistakes were made*”) can obscure responsibility and manipulate perception. Such linguistic phenomena are especially relevant in the setting of student debates, where speakers learn to persuade, critique, and perform identity in real time.

Despite an increasing number of studies analyzing the ideological function of pronouns in political and media discourse (Anwar et al., 2025; Adebayo et al, 2025), few have explored this phenomenon in educational settings particularly within student-generated debates in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) context. Much of the existing literature focuses on pronouns in high-level political speeches, institutional communication, or narrative texts, where speakers are often native users of English and highly aware of rhetorical variations (Fatima et al., 2025; Fajri, 2025). By contrast, Indonesian EFL students engage in debate within a pedagogical environment where both linguistic proficiency and ideological awareness are still developing. This creates a unique intersection between language learning, rhetorical experimentation, and discursive identity formation that remains under-researched.

Several prior studies have hinted at the strategic use of pronouns among learners. Saraswati & Pramiyanti (2025) examined Indonesian student speeches and noted shifts in pronoun use to construct alignment and critique, though without a focused analytical framework. Rachma et al. (2025) observed that passive voice was often preferred in controversial topics, indirectly highlighting referent suppression but lacking a broader tripartite model. Similarly, Fidyaningsih & Oktavianti (2024) noted strategic inclusion and exclusion through pronominal

use in group discussions among Asian EFL learners. However, none of these works systematically addressed the combined mechanisms of referent erasure, political distance, and deixis in an integrated, critical framework.

This study addresses a critical gap by offering a tripartite analysis of pronoun usage in EFL student political debates, drawing from multiple theoretical traditions. It is grounded in Critical Discourse Analysis by Fairclough in 1992 (Raza et al., 2025), which views language as a site of power negotiation, and Systemic Functional Linguistics by Halliday in Makhloufi (2025), which frames language as a system of choices that construct meaning through ideational, interpersonal, and textual functions. Within this framework, pronouns are not neutral markers, but strategic tools of ideological alignment, identity construction, and rhetorical control. The analysis is further informed by referent suppression, facework and politeness strategies and indexical anchoring Deichakivska (2024), which together explain how pronouns operate across dimensions of power, distance, and perspective.

The distinctiveness of this research lies in its focus on real-time and student-generated spoken discourse produced by Indonesian learners engaging in English debates on sociopolitical issues such as environmental change, national industry, digital learning, and technological transformation. These debates provide a semi-structured context where pronominal choices reveal patterns of ideological alignment, strategic distancing, and persuasive framing. Rather than analyzing pronouns in isolation, the study examines how they function across stretches of discourse to signal rhetorical stance and shape discursive relationships.

The core objective is to investigate how referent erasure, political distance, and deictic anchoring are realized through pronominal usage. To maintain analytical focus on discourse strategies rather than topic bias, the analysis emphasized recurring linguistic patterns across debates, particularly the strategic use of pronouns in persuasion, ideological framing, inclusion, exclusion, and referential ambiguity. It addresses the following research questions: (1) How are pronouns used to erase or obscure agency in student political discourse? (2) How do speakers construct political distance through pronoun shifts? This inquiry holds significance for applied linguists, educators, and scholars of civic discourse. Understanding how EFL students use pronouns to perform ideological work deepens our insight into how grammar and rhetoric converge in shaping voice, agency, and power. As learners participate in public argumentation, their language choices, particularly pronouns, become vehicles for social positioning and meaning-making. This study therefore contributes to critical pedagogy by illustrating how even seemingly minor linguistic elements encode broader ideological and educational processes.

1.1. Theoretical framework

1.1.1. Language and ideology: The non-neutral nature of discourse

Language is never a passive vessel of meaning. In discourse, every linguistic choice carries ideological implications. Bailey et al. (2024) emphasizes that language reflects and reproduces power relations, making elements like pronouns central to ideological struggles. Halliday's systemic functional linguistics reinforces this by showing that pronouns perform interpersonal

functions, shaping relationships of authority, solidarity, and distance. In political speech, for example, shifting from “*we should act now*” to “*they failed to act*” is not merely syntactic: it constructs blame, urgency, or exclusion (Amanda & Handayani, 2024).

For Indonesian EFL students in academic debates, such pronominal shifts reflect how they negotiate global discourse norms while expressing complex views in English. These choices mirror political rhetoric as students adopt strategies to align ideologically. For instance, changing “*we should change*” to “*they should change*” in environmental debates reframes responsibility and draws group boundaries. Hence, pronouns in student discourse serve not just referential purposes but also shape identity and rhetorical stance.

1.1.2. Referential erasure and the displacement of agency

Referent erasure occurs when speakers obscure the agent of an action using passive or impersonal constructions. Lafta’s (2024) terms this the “*semantic deranking of agency*”: a rhetorical strategy used to avoid responsibility, soften blame, or generalize critique. In debates or political apologies, phrases like “*Mistakes were made in managing the waste*” blur causality and shift focus away from the actor while maintaining surface objectivity.

This pattern appears in both institutional and student discourse. Airlangga’s (2024) study of Indonesian university debates found that passive voice was commonly used when addressing controversial topics like government inefficiency or policy failure. Phrases such as “*It has been decided*” or “*It wasn’t handled properly*” allowed students to voice critique without naming individuals or institutions directly. Such choices reveal how learners use grammar not only for structure but to manage face, power, and responsibility in persuasive contexts.

1.1.3. Political distance and strategic alignment

Pronouns play a key role in constructing political closeness or distance. Zhou & Larina’s (2024) politeness theory shows how speakers protect face through indirectness, often via pronominal shifts. Moving from “*we*” to “*they*” can signal dissociation from failure, while “*we*” may express unity or solidarity. These shifts are intentional rhetorical acts that redefine the speaker’s position within the debate.

In student discourse, such strategies help align with certain ideologies while distancing from others. Umam (2025) found that Indonesian student debaters often shifted between first- and third-person pronouns to imply moral authority or indirect blame. For instance, the statement “*We support our industries, but they continue to ignore our potential*” frames the speaker as patriotic while criticizing decision-makers. In EFL debates, these patterns reflect both language learning and local sociopolitical influences, making pronoun choice a subtle yet powerful tool for ideological positioning.

1.1.4. Deixis and temporal-spatial in argumentation

Deixis refers to linguistic elements that situate discourse within specific temporal, spatial, or interpersonal contexts. Lakoff and Johnson (1974) introduced the concept of the “*indexical field*,” where pronouns like “*we*,” “*you*,” and “*our*” gain ideological weight through their anchoring in time and space. In debates, temporal deixis (“*now*,” “*today*”) and spatial deixis (“*in our country*,” “*here*”) amplify urgency and create shared moral positioning. For instance,

“We are now at the edge of a climate emergency” not only informs but also constructs immediacy and collective accountability.

Trisnamayuni et al. (2025) found that Indonesian students used deixis to link global issues to national or personal stakes, often combining “we” with markers like “here” and “today” to build emotional appeal. Fatmah et al. (2024) also observed deixis as a persuasive device, especially when projecting visions of transformation. In Indonesian EFL debates, deixis reinforces urgency and national identification, enabling students to engage in global discourse from a local perspective.

2. Method

This study used a qualitative descriptive design grounded in discourse analysis, specifically drawing from Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) (Fischer et al., 2024). The inquiry centered on the discursive deployment of English pronouns in student political speeches, with the aim of understanding how these linguistic elements operate as tools of power, alignment, and ideological positioning. The methodological approach was interpretive, focusing on the social meanings encoded in language use, rather than statistical generalization. Informed by Halliday’s theory of language metafunctions, the study analyzed how speakers construct referential meaning, distance themselves or others, and anchor ideological stances through pronominal choices (Ali & Saleem, 2024).

The primary data consisted of transcribed utterances produced by 26 undergraduate students from Universitas Pembinaan Masyarakat Indonesia, Politeknik Angkatan Laut, and Institut Keislaman Tuah Negeri. Participants were enrolled in English-related and communication-oriented courses and participated in structured English debate sessions conducted during the 2025 academic year. The debates focused on socio-political and contemporary public issues, including environmental change, digital education, artificial intelligence, nationalism, and future employment challenges. Each debate session lasted approximately 10–20 minutes and was audio-recorded and transcribed for analysis.

The demographic and academic profiles of the debate participants are summarized in Table 1.

Table 1. Participant profiles

Category	Description
Total participants	26 undergraduate students
Institutions	Universitas Pembinaan Masyarakat Indonesia, Politeknik Angkatan Laut, Institut Keislaman Tuah Negeri
Academic backgrounds	English Education, Communication Studies, Maritime Communication, and Islamic Education
Semester levels	3rd to 7th semester
Average age range	19–23 years old
English proficiency level	Intermediate to Upper-Intermediate (CEFR B1–B2)
Debate format	Structured academic English debates
Number of debate sessions	6 sessions
Debate duration	Approximately 10–20 minutes per session
Data type	Audio-recorded utterances and debate transcripts

Category	Description
Debate topics	Environmental change, AI and future work, digital education, nationalism, and socio-political issues
Data collection period	2026 academic year
Analytical focus	Pronoun use related to referent erasure, political distance, and deixis

Data collection involved purposive sampling to ensure a range of debate themes while maintaining linguistic comparability. Audio recordings were transcribed verbatim, with special attention to pronominal usage, clause structures, and co-textual positioning. From these transcripts, pronominal elements were coded manually and categorized into three domains of inquiry: (1) referent erasure (e.g., use of passives and impersonal constructions), (2) political distance (e.g., shifts between “we,” “you,” and “they”), and (3) deixis (e.g., pronouns anchored to spatial or temporal frameworks). Each instance was examined in relation to surrounding clauses to trace rhetorical strategies and ideological implications. The categorization process was iterative, allowing the researcher to refine codes and themes as patterns emerged.

The data analysis employed a multi-step qualitative procedure rooted in critical discourse analysis. The speeches and debate interactions were analyzed qualitatively through repeated close reading and discourse categorization. Pronouns such as *we*, *they*, *you*, *our*, and impersonal constructions were identified and interpreted according to their rhetorical and ideological functions within argumentative contexts. To maintain analytical focus on linguistic behavior, the debate topics were treated as contextual backgrounds rather than primary analytical categories. First, student debate recordings were transcribed verbatim and reviewed to identify pronominal usage, focusing on syntactic form, referential function, and discursive context. This enabled a foundational understanding of how pronouns operated within persuasive speech. In the second step, pronouns were coded into three analytical categories: referent erasure, political distance, and deixis frameworks. Each pronoun was annotated for rhetorical function, alignment, and target referent (Nogue-Serrano, 2024). Third, the data were thematically sorted into sub-patterns, such as inclusive vs. self-exemptive distancing, and organized into nine-column analytical tables capturing speaker, topic, sentence extract, pronoun type, shift pattern, ideological meaning, clarity, alignment, and function. The fourth step involved multi-layered interpretation of each instance through syntactic, functional, and pragmatic lenses. Cross-sample comparisons highlighted recurring and hybrid pronominal strategies, which were then synthesized into ten detailed analytical subsections in Chapter 4. Finally, findings were validated through peer review and theoretical triangulation to ensure consistency and interpretive reliability. This analytical process confirmed that pronouns in student debates serve as strategic tools for ideological positioning, interpersonal negotiation, and rhetorical control.

3. Findings and Discussion

3.1. Findings

3.1.1. Referential shifting and implicit power dynamics

This data examines how pronouns in student political debates act as tools for referent erasure and relational manipulation. Third-person plural pronouns (*they*, *them*) often blur agency and

avoid direct accountability. In five debates on environmental change, speakers distanced themselves from specific actors, replacing clarity with vagueness. Using Critical Discourse Analysis (Raza et al., 2025), the analysis uncovers a rhetorical pattern that deflects institutional responsibility. This depersonalized narrative disempowers expected actors and reflects symbolic distancing.

Table 2. Pronoun use and power shifting in student political debates

Speaking Extract	Pronoun Type	Referent	Implicit Power	Grammatical Function	Pragmatic Intent	Interpretive Layer
<i>“They continue to harm the environment but we keep silent”</i> (Speaker A)	3rd Person Plural	Low	High	Subject	Obfuscation	Institutional Blame
<i>“They said it’s being handled; yet no one takes action”</i> (Speaker B)	3rd Person Plural	Low	High	Subject	Evasion	Political Delegation
<i>“They created the law but forgot to apply it”</i> (Speaker C)	3rd Person Plural	Medium	Medium	Subject	Irony	Legal Distance
<i>“They promised change, we received excuses”</i> (Speaker D)	3rd Person Plural	Low	High	Subject	Discrediting	Government Accountability
<i>“They banned plastic but the enforcement is weak”</i> (Speaker E)	3rd Person Plural	Low	Medium	Subject	Critique	Institutional Failure

In five student political debates on environmental change, the consistent use of third-person plural pronouns (*“they”*) reveals a clear strategy to obscure agency and deflect direct blame. For example, Speaker A states, *“They continue to harm the environment but we keep silent,”* portraying unnamed institutions as responsible for environmental damage, while framing the public as passive observers. This sentence reflects high implicit power with unclear referents, making it difficult to identify who *“they”* actually are. Similarly, Speaker B’s *“They said it’s being handled; yet no one takes action”* maintains this vagueness by implying inaction without naming specific actors. Speaker D intensifies the critique through contrastive parallelism in *“They promised change, we received excuses,”* which indirectly discredits institutional reliability. Across these examples, the pronoun *they* become a linguistic tool to express dissatisfaction without triggering direct confrontation. This technique reflects a broader pattern of *referential shifting*, where vague pronouns allow speakers to question authority while minimizing personal or political risk. The data ultimately shows that such pronoun use encodes

power dynamics, functioning as an indirect yet powerful way for students to critique institutions and highlight systemic failures through language that distances themselves from the agents being criticized.

3.1.2. Pronoun deixis and ideological anchoring

This data examines how deixis in pronoun uses functions as ideological anchoring in student debates on economic growth and technological development. The pronoun “we” serves as an inclusive marker that builds collective identity and future-oriented vision. Drawing on van Dijk’s socio-cognitive approach and Lakoff’s framing theory (Samar et al., 2025), “we” connects personal experience with national or generational responsibility. It grounds abstract policies in student identity, reinforcing shared agency and deepening rhetorical impact.

Table 3. Ideological functions of pronoun deixis in student debates

Speaking Extract	Pronoun Type	Deixis Category	Ideological Function	Identity Scope	Narrative Framing	Interpretive Layer
“We must prepare ourselves for a new economy” (Speaker A)	1st Person Plural	Inclusive	Mobilization	National	Vision Projection	Economic Anticipation
“We are not ready yet, but we must act fast” (Speaker B)	1st Person Plural	Temporal	Urgency	Generational	Future Framing	Crisis Readiness
“We face automation, but we can adapt” (Speaker C)	1st Person Plural	Situational	Empowerment	Technological	Hopeful Adaptation	Solution-Oriented
“We can’t stop progress, but we can shape it” (Speaker D)	1st Person Plural	Cognitive	Acceptance	Civic	Ethical Responsibility	Democratic Intervention
“We are not victims, we are creators” (Speaker E)	1st Person Plural	Contrastive	Emancipation	Humanistic	Reframing	Redemptive Identity

In student debates on economic growth and technological advancement, the use of pronoun *deixis*, especially the first-person plural “we” functions as a powerful ideological anchor that builds collective identity and forward-looking narratives. For example, when Speaker A says, “We must prepare ourselves for a new economy,” the inclusive pronoun *we* is used to rally a national identity and promote shared responsibility for future economic adaptation. Speaker B echoes this urgency with “We are not ready yet, but we must act fast,” where temporal deixis positions the group in a moment of crisis, urging immediate generational action. Similarly,

Speaker E states, “*We are not victims, we are creators,*” using contrastive deixis to shift from a passive to an empowered identity, framing students as capable agents of transformation. Collectively, these uses of “*we*” connect individual speakers to broader ideological narratives, such as national progress, generational accountability, and human agency. These pronouns do more than signal inclusion: they serve to translate abstract political or economic goals into a shared civic mission, reinforcing the idea that identity, responsibility, and future orientation are constructed and legitimized through language.

3.1.3. Strategic role reversal in second-person pronouns

This data explores how second-person pronouns (*you, your*) function to create rhetorical distance or direct engagement in debates on time management, productivity, and future readiness. In these student-led debates, “*you*” shifts between accusatory and motivational tones. Drawing on positioning theory (Rehnberg, 2025), the analysis highlights how speakers navigate between emotional confrontation and relational alignment. The pronoun “*you*” frames the audience as both the problem and the potential solution, serving as a tool of soft power that assigns responsibility while promoting shared goals.

Table 4. Strategic shifts in second-person pronoun use

Speaking Extract	Pronoun Type	Interaction Type	Role Framing	Stance Orientation	Emotional Load	Interpretive Layer
“ <i>You waste time and blame the system</i> ” (Speaker A)	2nd Person	Confrontational	Accusatory	Critical	High	Personal Accountability
“ <i>You think you’re busy, but you just scroll</i> ” (Speaker B)	2nd Person	Sarcastic	Diagnostic	Mocking	High	Self-Reflection Prompt
“ <i>You must realize this is your moment</i> ” (Speaker C)	2nd Person	Directive	Inspirational	Encouraging	Medium	Self-Empowerment
“ <i>You are stronger than you think</i> ” (Speaker D)	2nd Person	Affirmative	Reassuring	Supportive	Low	Resilience Framing
“ <i>You control more than you believe</i> ” (Speaker E)	2nd Person	Empowering	Reframing	Motivational	Low	Autonomy Emphasis

The data shows that second-person pronouns (*you, your*) function as flexible rhetorical devices that allow speakers to either challenge or motivate their audience. For example, Speaker A uses “*you*” in a confrontational way to assign blame and highlight personal responsibility: “*You waste time and blame the system.*” This statement carries a high emotional

charge, aiming to provoke guilt and self-awareness. Similarly, Speaker B employs “you” with sarcasm: “*You think you’re busy, but you just scroll*” to expose false productivity and trigger self-reflection. In contrast, Speaker C takes a motivational stance: “*You must realize this is your moment,*” using the pronoun to empower the listener and encourage forward-thinking action. These differences demonstrate that “you” is not a neutral term; rather, it acts as a strategic pivot point in discourse. Depending on tone and context, it can frame the audience as either the cause of a problem or the agent of a solution. This supports the conclusion that second-person pronouns are key tools in persuasive speech, enabling speakers to reverse roles: criticizing while also inviting change and thus blending accountability with encouragement.

3.1.4. Ambiguous authority through first-person singular pronouns

This data examines how first-person singular pronouns (*I, me, my*) are used by student speakers to build personal ethos while subtly deflecting accountability. In debates on educational innovation and self-directed learning, “I” often carries dual functions, asserting authority yet distancing from systemic responsibility. Using Goffman and Bakhtin’s dialogic theory (Javed & Shaheen, 2025), the speaker’s voice emerges as both self-assured and institutionally detached. This strategy reflects an individualized stance that veils broader institutional shortcomings. Through expressions of personal insight, speakers maintain credibility while avoiding critique, positioning “I” less as a self-reference and more as a rhetorical mask.

Table 5. Dual functions of “I”: Authority claim and institutional distance

Speaking Extract	Pronoun Type	Role Projection	Institutional Engagement	Voice Type	Dialogic Position	Interpretive Layer
“ <i>I just try my best to make learning fun</i> ” (Speaker A)	1st Person Singular	Humble Leader	Low	Personal	Defensive	Ethos Establishment
“ <i>I design tasks but students complain</i> ” (Speaker B)	1st Person Singular	Active Agent	Medium	Directive	Tensioned	Responsibility Transfer
“ <i>I speak, but they don’t listen</i> ” (Speaker C)	1st Person Singular	Frustrated Initiator	Medium	Expressive	Conflicted	Dialogic Breakdown
“ <i>I never said I could control everything</i> ” (Speaker D)	1st Person Singular	Denial Framing	Low	Evasive	Self-Protective	Institutional Deflection
“ <i>I tried, but maybe it’s not enough</i> ” (Speaker E)	1st Person Singular	Reflective Resigner	Medium	Introspective	Vulnerable	Self-Critique

The data shows that first-person singular pronouns (*I, me, my*) are not used simply for self-reference but serve as strategic tools to shape personal voice while avoiding full responsibility. Speaker A, for example, presents themselves as a humble leader: “*I just try my best to make learning fun*”, using a modest tone and distancing from institutional involvement. This builds personal credibility but subtly avoids addressing larger systemic issues. In contrast, Speaker B adopts a more authoritative stance: “*I design tasks but students complain*” which initially asserts agency but then shifts blame onto students, exposing a conflicted or tensioned position. Speaker D takes this further by using denial framing: “*I never said I could control everything*”, to sidestep responsibility, signaling an evasive posture that protects the speaker from institutional critique. These examples reflect a consistent pattern: the pronoun “*I*” is used not just to express individual experience but to carefully manage accountability. It allows speakers to highlight their efforts or intentions while minimizing their connection to broader institutional shortcomings. This supports the overall finding that first-person singular pronouns function as rhetorical devices for negotiating ambiguous authority, balancing self-assertion with strategic disengagement from the critique.

3.1.5. Shifting solidarity through pronoun alternation

This data examines how student speakers alternate between pronouns to construct and reconstruct solidarity in debates about promoting Indonesian UMKM products. Shifting between “*I*,” “*we*,” and “*you*” enables negotiation of personal stance, shared responsibility, and audience inclusion. Drawing on footing theory and positioning theory (Kyei et al., 2025), such shifts are deliberate rhetorical strategies, not random choices. They recalibrate speaker authority and engagement, moving between introspection and collective action. This pronoun fluidity reflects strong pragmatic competence and discursive flexibility, adjusting social proximity and relational power in student political speech.

Table 6. Pronoun shifts as strategies for solidarity in student political speech

Speaking Extract	Pronoun Shifts	Shift Pattern	Solidarity Strategy	Narrative Arc	Audience Inclusion	Interpretive Layer
“ <i>I started small, but we can grow together if you support</i> ” (Speaker A)	I → we → you	Triadic	Layered Solidarity	Individual to Collective	Explicit	Entrepreneurial Appeal
“ <i>We tried, I failed, you can do better</i> ” (Speaker B)	we → I → you	Reverse	Humble Appeal	Collective to Personal	Encourage	Motivational Reflection
“ <i>You ignore us, we lose visibility, I</i> ”	you → we → I	Declining	Emotional Descent	Audience to Speaker	Implicit	Urgency and Empathy

Speaking Extract	Pronoun Shifts	Shift Pattern	Solidarity Strategy	Narrative Arc	Audience Inclusion	Interpretive Layer
<i>lose hope” (Speaker C)</i>						
<i>“We speak of pride, but I still feel excluded” (Speaker D)</i>	we → I	Contrastive	Unmet Inclusion	Collective to Individual	Subtle	Marginalization Disclosure
<i>“You judge us, we struggle, I stay silent” (Speaker E)</i>	you → we → I	Descending	Vulnerability Layer	Public to Personal	Evocative	Silent Endurance

The data reveals that student speakers deliberately alternate between “I,” “we,” and “you” to build solidarity in debates about supporting Indonesian UMKM. This strategic pronoun shifting allows them to navigate between personal stance, collective identity, and audience engagement. For example, Speaker A moves from individual experience to collective ambition with a triadic structure: “*I started small, but we can grow together if you support.*” This invites the audience into a shared vision of progress. In contrast, Speaker B reverses the sequence: “*We tried, I failed, you can do better*”, using personal accountability to motivate the audience through a humble, reflective tone. Meanwhile, Speaker C starts with audience criticism and moves toward personal despair: “*You ignore us, we lose visibility, I lose hope*”, creating emotional urgency and drawing empathy. These shifting patterns are not random; they are purposeful rhetorical strategies that adjust the speaker’s position and relational dynamics. By manipulating pronouns, the speakers reposition themselves in relation to the audience and broader community. This demonstrates that pronoun alternation is a powerful discursive tool for managing authority, emotional appeal, and group identity, making it central to persuasive and relational political speech.

3.1.6. Constructing collective urgency via inclusive pronouns

This data explores how inclusive pronouns (“we,” “our”) are used to build a shared sense of crisis and urgency in debates on mental preparedness for the workforce. Beyond signaling inclusion, these pronouns embed responsibility within a communal ethos, aligning with performative urgency and stance-taking theory (Cheng et al., 2024). Student speakers craft a unified voice that merges time pressure, emotional stakes, and existential demands. This inclusive form conceals individual anxieties behind collective calls to action, intensifying pressure while diffusing personal burden.

Table 7. Inclusive pronouns as tools for urgency and collective identity

Speaking Extract	Pronoun Type	Urgency Index	Emotional Tone	Temporal Frame	Identity Cohesion	Interpretive Layer
<i>“We have no time left, our moment is</i>	1st Person Plural	High	Alarmed	Imminent	Strong	Existential Framing

Speaking Extract	Pronoun Type	Urgency Index	Emotional Tone	Temporal Frame	Identity Cohesion	Interpretive Layer
<i>now” (Speaker A)</i>						
<i>“We either adapt now or fall behind forever” (Speaker B)</i>	1st Person Plural	High	Pressured	Binary	Strong	Temporal Crisis
<i>“Our choices now will haunt us later” (Speaker C)</i>	1st Person Possessive	Medium	Warning	Long-Term	Moderate	Strategic Forecasting
<i>“Our fears must not define us” (Speaker D)</i>	1st Person Possessive	Medium	Uplifting	Ongoing	Moderate	Identity Empowerment
<i>“We are the future, unless we give up” (Speaker E)</i>	1st Person Plural	High	Paradoxical	Conditional Future	Strong	Generational Challenge

The data shows how inclusive pronouns like “we” and “our” are used to build a sense of collective urgency, particularly in discussions about preparing for the workforce. For example, Speaker A declares, “We have no time left, our moment is now,” combining intense emotional tone with a sense of immediate action to evoke existential pressure. Speaker B reinforces this urgency by stating, “We either adapt now or fall behind forever,” creating a high-stakes, binary scenario that places shared responsibility on the group. Meanwhile, Speaker C says, “Our choices now will haunt us later,” framing urgency with a long-term perspective that warns of future consequences, urging thoughtful and proactive behavior. These uses of inclusive pronouns do more than create unity: they embed a sense of crisis and obligation into group identity. As such, “we” and “our” become tools to amplify collective responsibility while easing individual pressure, aligning with the broader argument that pronouns can shape how urgency and accountability are emotionally distributed across a community.

3.1.7. Pronoun minimization as a strategy of disengagement

This data explores how students use pronoun minimization through avoidance or omission as a rhetorical strategy of disengagement in debates on transforming social media into educational spaces. Rather than explicitly using “I,” “we,” or “you,” speakers employ passive constructions, nominalizations, or impersonal references. Informed by syntactic ellipsis and Critical Discourse Analysis (O’rinbekovna, 2025), this strategy creates a depersonalized narrative that veils responsibility and suppresses emotional tone. By omitting explicit referents, speakers reduce perceived agency and deflect accountability. This rhetorical silence subtly communicates discomfort, disconnection, or deliberate withdrawal through what remains unsaid.

Table 8. Pronoun avoidance as a marker of disengagement in student debates

Speaking Extract	Pronoun Presence	Voice Type	Engagement Level	Grammatical Structure	Emotional Visibility	Interpretive Layer
“Mistakes were made, lessons unclear, effort lacking” (Speaker A)	None	Passive	Low	Nominalization	Low	Institutional Evasion
“Nothing was said. Nothing was done.” (Speaker B)	None	Passive	Minimal	Repetition	Absent	Moral Apathy
“Content spreads, people forget” (Speaker C)	None	Impersonal	Moderate	Zero Pronoun	Low	Agency Dilution
“It was supposed to change something” (Speaker D)	Implicit “it”	Ambiguous	Low	Anaphoric Reference	Low	Unclear Responsibility
“Some things just happen online” (Speaker E)	Impersonal	Detached	Low	Generalization	Minimal	Digital Fatalism

The data reveals that speakers deliberately minimize pronoun use to avoid direct accountability when discussing the educational potential of social media. Speaker A exemplifies this by entirely omitting pronouns in the passive construction “*Mistakes were made, lessons unclear, effort lacking,*” which creates a detached and emotionally neutral tone. This lack of clear agency suggests an attempt to evade institutional responsibility. Speaker B takes this further with repetitive, agentless statements like “*Nothing was said. Nothing was done,*” conveying a sense of moral indifference and collective inaction without pointing to any specific actor. Speaker C, on the other hand, uses impersonal phrasing “*Content spreads, people forget*” which still acknowledges consequences but shifts focus away from who is responsible. These patterns indicate that pronoun minimization is not accidental but a strategic rhetorical choice. By omitting explicit references to “*I,*” “*we,*” or “*you,*” speakers create a distancing effect, diluting agency and reducing the emotional and ethical pressure of accountability. This supports the view that pronoun avoidance serves as a subtle yet powerful mechanism for strategic disengagement in discourse.

3.1.8. Repositioning identity through reflexive pronouns

This data explores how student speakers use reflexive pronouns (*myself, ourselves*) to renegotiate identity and agency in discussions on student roles as learning experience designers. Reflexives here act not only as grammatical intensifiers but as performative identity markers. Drawing on performativity theory and positioning theory (Zhao et al., 2024), they function as tools of self-recalibration, allowing students to reframe themselves as autonomous

agents in educational reform. These pronouns often occur in contexts that shift learner roles from passive recipients to critical co-constructors, simultaneously highlighting subjectivity, transformation, and ownership.

Table 9. Use of reflexive pronouns to redefine learner identity and agency

Speaking Extract	Pronoun Type	Reflexive Role	Identity Shift	Syntactic Function	Empowerment Level	Interpretive Layer
<i>"I challenged myself to rethink how learning feels" (Speaker A)</i>	Myself	Agentive	Passive to Active	Object	High	Pedagogical Self-Agency
<i>"We organized ourselves into working teams" (Speaker B)</i>	Ourselves	Collective	Fragmented to Structured	Object	Medium	Coordinated Identity
<i>"I told myself this failure is part of the process" (Speaker C)</i>	Myself	Reassuring	Insecure to Resilient	Object	High	Self-Affirmation
<i>"We held ourselves responsible" (Speaker D)</i>	Ourselves	Ethical	Detached to Accountable	Object	High	Internalized Responsibility
<i>"We reminded ourselves why this matters" (Speaker E)</i>	Ourselves	Reflective	Unmotivated to Purposeful	Object	Medium	Collective Introspection

Reflexive pronouns emerge as effective linguistic tools for reshaping identity in student discourse. They allow speakers to reframe themselves not just grammatically, but also ideologically as active, responsible agents in their learning journey. For instance, Speaker A uses *myself* in *"I challenged myself to rethink how learning feels,"* marking a personal shift from passive recipient to active learner. This illustrates strong pedagogical self-agency. Speaker B, with *"We organized ourselves into working teams,"* uses *ourselves* to highlight a transition from individual effort to collective coordination, showing how students can redefine their roles as collaborative agents. Speaker C states, *"I told myself this failure is part of the process,"* using *myself* to navigate emotional growth from insecurity toward resilience. These uses show how reflexive pronouns are more than grammatical forms; they serve as performative markers of internal transformation. By narrating change, self-reflection, or responsibility, reflexive pronouns support a shift in how students position themselves in academic and social settings. This reinforces the argument that reflexives are powerful discourse tools for identity recalibration, allowing speakers to claim personal growth, ownership, and evolving agency within educational contexts.

3.1.9. Pronouns as narrative anchors in temporal framing

This data examines how pronouns serve as temporal anchors in student speeches about time management and productivity. First- and second-person pronouns guide listeners through past reflections, present realizations, and future intentions. Drawing on narrative theory and tense-aspect-pronoun alignment (Flusberg et al., 2024), the analysis shows that pronouns assign agency across shifting time frames, helping structure personal growth. Used not only grammatically but narratively, these pronouns shape stories of failure, learning, and ambition through deliberate sequencing. Their use is tightly linked to how time is framed, experienced, and projected in discourse.

Table 10. Pronouns structuring time and agency in student narratives

Speaking Extract	Pronoun Type	Time Frame	Narrative Stage	Temporal Contrast	Agency Location	Interpretive Layer
"I wasted hours, but now I tell you to act before it's too late" (Speaker A)	I → you	Past → Present → Future	Reorientation	Explicit	Shifted	Transformational Arc
"We knew the risks, but we ignored them" (Speaker B)	We	Past	Complication	Implicit	Internal	Collective Regret
"You didn't care, now you struggle" (Speaker C)	You	Past → Present	Climax	Contrastive	External	Causal Blame
"I've changed. I manage myself hourly" (Speaker D)	I → myself	Present Continuous	Resolution	Embedded	Internal	Behavioral Reprogramming
"We plan today to shape our tomorrow" (Speaker E)	We	Present → Future	Evaluation	Intentional	Shared	Future Mapping

This data shows how pronouns function as narrative anchors that help structure personal growth and development across time in student speeches. For example, Speaker A moves from “I” to “you” in the sentence “*I wasted hours, but now I tell you to act before it’s too late,*” marking a shift from past regret to a forward-looking warning. This transition highlights personal learning and transfers responsibility to the audience, creating a strong temporal and motivational arc. Similarly, Speaker C uses “you” across time in “*You didn’t care, now you struggle,*” directly linking past inaction to present difficulty. This reinforces causal accountability and positions the listener as responsible for current challenges. Meanwhile, Speaker E uses “we” in “*We plan today to shape our tomorrow*” to emphasize collective agency and shared responsibility for future outcomes. This future-oriented framing unites the speaker and audience around a common goal. These examples demonstrate that the strategic use of pronouns, when tied to past, present, and future contexts, serves to frame time-bound narratives that clarify responsibility, signal transformation, and encourage behavioral change.

3.1.10. Fragmented alignment and shifting blame through mixed pronouns

This data examines the strategic use of mixed pronouns within single utterances to subtly shift blame and fragment responsibility in student debates on waste management, zero-waste lifestyles, and environmental habits. Shifts such as “you” to “they” or “we” to “I” act as linguistic pivots that blur agency and reposition culpability. Guided by stance theory and mitigation theory (Stepkowska, 2024), the analysis reveals that such pronoun fragmentation functions as a defensive strategy to deflect judgment and protect speaker ethos. These shifts reflect students’ pragmatic awareness of face threats and their effort to avoid full alignment with any single role or group.

Table 11. Shifting agency and responsibility through pronoun changes

Speaking Extract	Pronoun Mix	Shift Pattern	Blame Distribution	Mitigation Strategy	Alignment Clarity	Interpretive Layer
“You dump the trash, they get blamed, and I’m told to solve it” (Speaker A)	You → they → I	Externalizing	Triadic	Displacement	Low	Role Fragmentation
“We obey rules, I do my part, but they ruin it” (Speaker B)	We → I → they	Segmented	Othering	Contrastive	Medium	Ethical Hierarchy
“You promise to recycle, but I still see trash” (Speaker C)	You → I	Reversal	Confrontation	Responsibility Shift	Low	Civic Irony
“They pass laws, we don’t	They → we	Institutional Gap	Collective Evasion	Structural Critique	Medium	Shared Hypocrisy

Speaking Extract	Pronoun Mix	Shift Pattern	Blame Distribution	Mitigation Strategy	Alignment Clarity	Interpretive Layer
follow” (Speaker D)						
“I stopped using plastic, they still sell it” (Speaker E)	I → they	Isolating	Disillusionment	Divided Accountability	High	Consumer-Producer Gap

The data demonstrates how student speakers in environmental debates use mixed pronouns within single utterances to fragment alignment and strategically shift blame. For example, Speaker A transitions from “you” to “they” to “I” (“*You dump the trash, they get blamed, and I’m told to solve it*”), spreading responsibility across multiple actors to avoid direct accountability, highlighting *role fragmentation*. Speaker B moves from “we” to “I” to “they” (“*We obey rules, I do my part, but they ruin it*”), constructing an *ethical hierarchy* that positions the speaker as responsible while distancing from those considered at fault. Meanwhile, Speaker C’s shift from “you” to “I” (“*You promise to recycle, but I still see trash*”) uses irony to expose the gap between public declarations and observed reality, emphasizing broken civic responsibility. These pronoun shifts obscure clear agency and alignment, allowing speakers to manage face-threatening topics and deflect judgment. The data supports that mixed pronoun use is a deliberate rhetorical strategy to redistribute blame and construct ambiguous responsibility in student political discourse.

3.2. Discussion

The use of pronouns in student political debates serves as a linguistic strategy that reveals deep patterns of ideological alignment, power negotiation, and responsibility management. The present analysis addresses two core research questions: (1) *How are pronouns used to erase or obscure agency in student political discourse?* and (2) *How do speakers construct political distance through pronoun shifts?* Findings from the debates analyzed show that pronouns are not merely grammatical elements but discursive tools employed to perform social positioning, obscure institutional accountability, and engage in soft persuasion.

The first key finding highlights the role of *referent erasure*, especially through third-person plural pronouns like *they* and *them*. Speakers frequently used these pronouns without specifying institutions, individuals, or authorities, resulting in a discursive gap that obscures who holds responsibility. For instance, in “*They promised change, we received excuses*,” the speaker constructs a contrast between an unnamed authority and a passive public. This vague reference avoids direct confrontation while undermining institutional credibility. As Samar et al. (2025) explains in socio-cognitive discourse model, such ambiguity builds ideological distance yet still provokes social frustration. Similarly, Dilkes (2024) argues that depersonalization in discourse is a strategy for preserving institutional power, allowing criticism without direct opposition. In repeated use across debates, *they* become a symbolic proxy for unreachable authority, stripping both speaker and audience of clear agency.

Alongside this, first-person plural pronouns (*we*, *our*) were also prominent and served dual purposes. In some contexts, “*we*” created a sense of collective identity and action, as in “*We*

must prepare ourselves for a new economy”, anchoring speaker and audience in shared generational or national goals. This reflects Thy’s et al. (2024) concept of *deictic anchoring*, where pronouns reinforce communal vision and responsibility. According to van Dijk, such group-based referential strategies embed ideological meaning into language. However, in other instances, *we* blurred the boundary between public shortcomings and institutional failure, creating the illusion of shared blame. This ambiguity aligns with Bailey’s et al. (2024) view that collective pronouns can function either as unifying devices or as evasive maneuvers, depending on how they are ideologically framed.

The second-person pronoun *you* appear as a key rhetorical tool in student debates, functioning flexibly between confrontation and motivation. For example, in “*You waste time and blame the system*,” the pronoun conveys an accusatory tone that imposes individual accountability. In contrast, the statement “*You control more than you believe*” empowers the audience by positioning them as capable change agents. This dual use aligns with *positioning theory* (Rehnberg, 2025), which explains how speakers shift relational roles to negotiate authority and engagement. In political discourse, “*you*” helps create temporary distance for critique while still drawing the audience in. This ability to challenge without alienating supports Deichakivska’s (2024) notion of *soft power*, where persuasion and influence operate through moral appeals rather than forceful confrontation.

Additionally, the data revealed the use of *pronoun minimization*, a strategy that suppresses agency by avoiding explicit personal or institutional references. In data like “*Mistakes were made, effort lacking*,” passive structures and nominalizations erase accountability. This reflects *politeness theory* (Zhou & Larina, 2024), which views such avoidance as a face-saving move to minimize social threat. Cheng et al. (2024) further emphasizes in her theory of performativity that silence or omission can carry significant meaning: what is left unsaid may signal critique, disconnection, or strategic retreat, especially when open blame is socially risky.

Most notably, some speakers employed *mixed pronouns* within a single sentence to distribute blame and construct layered responsibility. In “*You dump the trash, they get blamed, and I’m told to solve it*,” the shift from “*you*” to “*they*” to “*I*” fragments alignment and disperses agency across different actors. This strategy aligns with Stepkowska (2024) *stance triangle*, where speakers position themselves in relation to others’ actions and evaluations. The mixed pronoun structure enables speakers to preserve moral authority, critique institutions indirectly, and reduce personal vulnerability. This technique, underpinned by mitigation strategies, reflects a sophisticated awareness of rhetorical risk and a deliberate effort to manage power, critique, and identity through language.

Another important finding lies in the use of reflexive pronouns (*myself, ourselves*), which served as tools for identity recalibration. For example, when a student states, “*I challenged myself to rethink how learning feels*,” the reflexive pronoun highlights internal agency and signals personal transformation. This aligns with Zhao’s et al. (2024) theory of performativity, where identity is not fixed but formed through repeated and self-aware actions. Reflexives mark a moment of becoming: where learners position themselves not as passive recipients of knowledge but as active co-constructors of meaning. These pronouns intensify the speaker’s accountability, projecting a form of responsible individualism that subtly resists institutional

dependence and reinforces learner autonomy. Overall, the findings answer both research questions clearly. First, pronouns obscure or erase agency through vague references, passive structures, and mixed-pronoun shifts that fragment responsibility. Second, political distance is constructed through strategic alternation of pronouns, deixis, and rhetorical framing, enabling speakers to realign their stance toward audiences while avoiding direct criticism of authority.

The findings also offer practical benefits for debate pedagogy and adjudication. For student debaters, awareness of pronoun strategies can improve persuasive clarity, audience alignment, and argumentative precision during competitive and classroom debates. Students may become more conscious of whether we include or exclude the audience, whether they unfairly obscure accountability, or whether you create engagement or confrontation. For debate coaches and English lecturers, the study provides insight into how EFL learners negotiate ideology and interpersonal meaning in spoken argumentation, thereby supporting more targeted training in rhetorical positioning, critical speaking, and pragmatic competence. Furthermore, debate judges may use these findings to better evaluate how linguistic choices influence audience perception, emotional appeal, and ideological framing beyond surface-level fluency or grammar accuracy.

In conclusion, pronouns in student political debates function as more than referential tools: they are rhetorical instruments that conceal or reveal agency, build or dissolve solidarity, and assign or deflect responsibility. These insights suggest future research should explore how pronouns interact with other linguistic features like metaphor, modality, and repetition to reinforce or challenge ideologies. Additionally, longitudinal studies may track how students' pronoun strategies evolve alongside their political literacy and communicative competence. Since language shapes power and participation, understanding pronoun use is key to nurturing reflective, empowered, and ethically aware communicators, not only in debates, but across journalism, civic discourse, and academic writing.

4. Conclusion

This study demonstrates that pronouns in student English debates function not merely as grammatical elements, but as strategic instruments of discursive power that reveal how young speakers internalize, negotiate, and perform ideology through language. The findings show that students consciously manipulate referents, group alignment, and temporal framing to construct persuasive political discourse. Through mechanisms such as referent erasure, political distancing, and deixis, speakers use pronouns to obscure agency, shift blame, reinforce solidarity, and negotiate authority within debate settings. Third-person pronouns such as “*they*” frequently functioned to deflect institutional accountability, while *you* was used to alternate between confrontation and motivational engagement. Meanwhile, first-person forms (*I*, *we*) reflected efforts to construct ethos, collective identity, or strategic ambiguity, particularly among Indonesian EFL learners who may experience pragmatic interference between the inclusive “*kita*” and exclusive “*kami*” in Bahasa Indonesia, distinctions that English does not explicitly encode. This study also provides practical implications for student debaters, debate coaches, lecturers, and adjudicators by increasing awareness of how pronoun choices influence audience alignment, persuasive effectiveness, and ideological framing in argumentative communication. Nevertheless, the study is limited by its relatively small dataset and focus on

a specific academic-cultural context, which may not fully represent wider discourse practices across Indonesia. Future studies may expand the data sources by examining English debates in National University Debating Championship (NUDC) communities, student organization forums, classroom discussions, WhatsApp group interactions, online civic discussions, podcasts, or social media platforms such as Twitter, TikTok, Instagram, and YouTube commentaries, where pronoun negotiation and political positioning are increasingly visible in digital communication. In addition, future researchers may combine qualitative discourse analysis with corpus linguistics, multimodal discourse analysis, or experimental pragmatics to generate broader and more measurable insights into how pronouns function across spoken and digital discourse environments.

References

- Adebayo, D. O., Sarah, I. O., Bassey, A. K., Omonfomhan, I. O., Bashir, P. I., Kehinde, O. A., & Chioma, I. (2025). Rhetoric of transition: A pragmatic analysis of inaugural speeches under extraordinary political succession in Nigeria. *Path of Science*, 11(5), 8006–8027.
- Airlangga, S. A. (2024). Neoliberalism, governance, & capital accumulation: A study of development debates and social dynamics in Indonesia. *JKAP (Jurnal Kebijakan dan Administrasi Publik)*, 28(2), 91–106.
- Ali, S. I., & Saleem, A. (2024). Imran Khan's and Narendra Modi's speeches at the United Nations General Assembly: A meta-functional analysis. *Pakistan Journal of Society, Education and Language (PJSEL)*, 10(2), 513–523.
- Alisoy, H. (2025). Cohesion, persuasion, and ideology: The pragmatic functions of repetition in Trump's rhetoric. *Porta Universorum*, 1(3), 80–86.
- Amanda, R. A., & Handayani, T. (2024). Language, power, and ideology on Joe Biden's speech: A critical discourse analysis. *ELTALL: English Language Teaching, Applied Linguistic and Literature*, 5(2), 192–211.
- Anwar, M. S., Bibi, S., & Mahboob, T. (2025). Analyzing language as a reflection and construction of individual and group ideologies in Pakistan and India conflict: A discourse-based study. *Pakistan Social Sciences Review*, 9(2), 677–697.
- Azizi M. G. (2025). The Dialectic of Deep Structure and Surface Structure in the Semantic Representation of Syntactic Constructions Based on Formalist Linguistics: A Case Study of Verb Reduction Transformation in the Substitute for the Cognate Accusative in Ayati's Translation of the Qur'an. *Translation Researches in the Arabic Language And Literature*, 15(33), 102-123.
- Bailey, A. H., Dembroff, R., Wodak, D., Ikizer, E. G., & Cimpian, A. (2024). People's beliefs about pronouns reflect both the language they speak and their ideologies. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, 153(5), 1388.
- Cheng, L., Liu, X., & Si, C. (2024). Identifying stance in legislative discourse: A corpus-driven study of data protection laws. *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications*, 11(1), 1–13.
- Deichakivska, O. (2024). Predicative adjectives in the composition of expressions as tactics of positive and negative politeness strategies. *Amazonia Investiga*, 13(74), 239–247.
- Dilkes, J. (2024). Metaphor signalling constructions in discourse related to the experience of depersonalization/derealization. *Metaphor and Symbol*, 39(4), 223–241.

- Fajri, A. (2025). Rhetorical study of ideological representation in public discourse: A critical analysis of socio-cultural discourse: Studi retorika atas representasi ideologi dalam wacana masyarakat: Analisis kritis terhadap diskursus sosial budaya. *ARSALINGUA: Jurnal Bahasa dan Sastra*, 1(1), 61–71.
- Fatima, N., Ejaz, S. J., & Miran, G. (2025). Exploring the role of visual semiotics analysis in digital communication for ideological purposes; A study of memes and emojis. *Liberal Journal of Language & Literature Review*, 3(1), 345–364.
- Fatmah, F., Lutpiah, I., Laden, S. S., Mulatsih, D., & Jaufillaili, J. (2024). A pragmatic study: Investigating the meaning of social deixis in spoken discourse. *International Journal of Linguistics and Translation Studies*, 5(3), 96–107.
- Fidyaningsih, A., & Oktavianti, I. N. (2024). Gender representation in Indonesian ELT textbooks of junior high school: A corpus-assisted critical discourse analysis. *IDEAS: Journal on English Language Teaching and Learning, Linguistics and Literature*, 12(2), 1945–1962.
- Fischer, A., Joosse, S., Strandell, J., Söderberg, N., Johansson, K., & Boonstra, W. J. (2024). How justice shapes transition governance: A discourse analysis of Swedish policy debates. *Journal of Environmental Planning and Management*, 67(9), 1998–2016.
- Flusberg, S. J., Holmes, K. J., Thibodeau, P. H., Nabi, R. L., & Matlock, T. (2024). The psychology of framing: How everyday language shapes the way we think, feel, and act. *Psychological Science in the Public Interest*, 25(3), 105–161.
- Javed, M., & Shaheen, T. (2025). Dialogic reflection and discursive layers: A critical discourse analysis of Virginia Woolf's *The Mark on the Wall* through Fairclough and Bakhtin. *Journal of Language, Literature & Social Affairs*, 1(2), 19–25.
- Kyei, E., Afreh, E. S., Akoto, O. Y., Jujugenia, W. A., & Soadwah, K. (2025). A corpus-based cross-disciplinary study of unattended anaphoric pronouns in L2 postgraduate theses. *Journal of English Language and Pedagogy (JELPA)*, 3(1), 1–14.
- Lafta, H. T. (2024). Discursive tactics in political rhetoric: A Van Dijk framework analysis of the Trump-Biden debate 2024. *International Journal of Linguistics Studies*, 4(3), 89–94.
- Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1984). *Metaphors we live by*. The University of Chicago Press.
- Makhloufi, I. B. M. (2025). A critical discourse analysis of modality in COVID-19 speeches: A systemic functional grammar perspective. *Jordanian Educational Journal*, 10(1), 331–353.
- Nogue-Serrano, N. (2024). Participant self-reference, under-determination, generalisation, vagueness, and ambiguity in political discourse: A contrastive analysis of parliamentary debate and Twitter usages. *Studia Linguistica*, 78(1), 107–127.
- O'rinbekovna, U. M. (2025). Grammatical, component, discourse, and conceptual ellipsis are examples of communicative gaps. *Pedagogical Sciences and Teaching Methods*, 4(41), 48–50.
- Rachma, N. S., Fadila, A., Mar'an, D. A., & Dashela, T. (2025). The use of passive voice in political newspaper articles: A descriptive analysis of its frequency and functions. *EDU SOCIETY: Jurnal Pendidikan, Ilmu Sosial dan Pengabdian kepada Masyarakat*, 5(1), 948–953.
- Raza, A., Shah, U. H., & Arshad, H. (2025). Critical discourse analysis of Quaid-e-Azam Muhammad Ali Jinnah's speech on 11th August 1947. *Journal of Applied Linguistics and TESOL (JALT)*, 8(1), 414–424.
- Rehnberg, H. S. (2025). Positioning of applicants in asylum interviews: Case officers as recontextualising agents. *Language in Society*, 54(2), 343–365.

- Samar, S., Ali, M., & Gul, N. (2025). Analysis of deixis in the speeches of Pakistani politicians at United Nations General Assembly. *Journal of Applied Linguistics and TESOL (JALT)*, 8(1), 1238–1251.
- Saraswati, P. I., & Pramianti, A. (2025). Critical discourse analysis news coverage on the Palestina-Israeli conflict: An Indonesia media perspective. *Media Komunikasi FPIPS*, 24(1), 07–20.
- Stepkowska, A. (2024). Some bilingual couples speak lingua francas: Personal pronoun indexicality in the light of positioning theory. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 27(6), 870–881.
- Thy, A. D. M., Gerona, J., Martínez-Ferreiro, S., Popov, S., & Boye, K. (2024). Deictic vs. anaphoric pronouns: A comparison of fluent and non-fluent aphasia in English and Tagalog. *Language, Cognition and Neuroscience*, 39(7), 909–923.
- Trisnamayuni, A. M., Kadana, I. N., & Sujaya, I. N. (2025). Persona deixis in the Balinese script dialogue “Bogolan” by A. Wiyat S. Ardhi. *RETORIKA: Jurnal Ilmu Bahasa*, 11(1), 343–355.
- Umam, K. (2025). Populism and the language of power: An analysis of critical discourse on the political speech of the president of the Republic of Indonesia. *Journal of Language and Letters Education*, 1(1), 30–40.
- Zhao, H., Zhang, X., & Lee, Y. (2024). Transform the interchangeability of ‘we’ and ‘I’ for an ‘I write’ identity and authorial voice. *American Journal of Educational Research*, 12(3), 109–117.
- Zhou, Q., & Larina, T. V. (2024). Power and solidarity in pronominal forms of address: A case study of Chinese and Russian teacher-student interactions. *Training, Language and Culture*, 8(1), 87–100.