

---

Izvorni znanstveni rad  
Rukopis primljen 23. 6. 2023.  
Prihvaćen za tisak 21. 9. 2023.  
<https://doi.org/10.22210/govor.2023.40.04>

**Sandra Lukšić**

*sluksic@ffst.hr*

Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, University of Split  
Croatia

## Rhetorical analysis of two motivational speeches in Croatia

### Summary

The paper examines two motivational speeches delivered by presidential candidates Zoran Milanović and Kolinda Grabar Kitarović during the 2019 presidential election campaign in Croatia. The emphasis is on the use of rhetorical operations and ideology-related vocabulary as a means of persuasion, as motivational speech aims to persuade an audience. The research begins by asking two research questions: RQ1) What principles of strategic communication do presidential candidates use to persuade audience to take a desired course of action? and RQ2) What incentive elements and rhetorical devices are used by each speaker to address the public? To answer the questions, two models of political discourse analysis are used: the persuasion and the lexical-argumentative model. The analysis is based on three hypotheses: H1) Motivational speech, as part of epideictic rhetoric, implements elements of persuasion, direction, intensity and persistence and involves not only linguistic, but also personal and psychological factors, H2) The characteristic structure of elements of incitement includes the use of positively and negatively charged words and phrases to reinforce the feeling of (non-)belonging to a group, and H3) Possible differences between motivational speeches are not gender specific, as both motivational speakers are career politicians with different political affiliations. Within the framework of two models of analysis, 20 excerpts representing 134 speech utterances are selected from each speech. The results show that (i) both motivational speakers use a variety of persuasive tools to attack the opponent(s), introduce electoral policies, legitimize their political positions, or define the ideological groups of belonging and (ii) there are both similarities and differences in the rhetorical design of the speeches analyzed, uncovering various patterns of judgment about political reality.

**Keywords:** election, campaign, speech, rhetoric, design

---

## 1. INTRODUCTION: MOTIVATIONAL SPEECH

Election campaigns, campaign speeches and slogans have become a popular topic of analysis in pragmatics, political linguistics and rhetoric. One part of election campaigns and campaign speeches are motivational speeches, which are considered an important tool when used purposefully to inspire listeners or convince them of certain points of view that they eventually consider their own (cf. Kryknitska, 2020). The high influencing power of the motivational speech is based both on the character and the appearance of the speaker as well as on the rhetoric style of the speech, which is characterized in particular by emotionality and recognition. A good motivational speaker can invoke the listener's willingness and commitment to perform exactly what they are asking in their speech. The interest in the study of motivational speeches (cf. Klein, 2019; Kryknitska, 2020) is predetermined by its ever-growing importance, not only in contemporary politics, but also in other areas of human life. Over time it became important to know how to motivate others towards a certain goal, by using cognition and personal experience, and this is achieved primarily through language. It is no surprise that exploring this genre of political discourse is "in line with contemporary linguistic directions relating to linguistics of emotions, communicative linguistics, speech influence theory, pragmatolinguistics, linguopersonology, semiotics, etc." (Kryknitska, 2020: 168). The classification of motivational speech according to the formal classifications of political discourse types proposed in the literature on language use in politics (Girnth, 2015: 83–89) is not an easy task: It is to assume that its *emitters* (Ger. "Emittent"), rather than speakers or authors, are mostly persons (not institutions), professionally engaged in politics, who present a pre-prepared speech of medium to large size in front of a large or small audience. *Addressees* (Ger. "Adressaten") are visitors to the election event, mostly the supporters of the candidates (ibid.). According to Klein's differentiation of political discourse types (2000), motivational speech can be classified as an outward-facing and voter-oriented type of discourse (cf. Girnth, 2015), along with election slogans and programs that exist mainly in written form. Motivational speech as a type of political speech should be considered a category of oral discourse, which is both dissent- and consensus-oriented at the same time. Respective speeches in the study are classified as motivational, since they belong to the spoken genre of motivational discourse, including "commencement speech, pep talk, keynote speech [...]" (Kryknitska, 2020: 169) and political campaign speeches (cf. Klein, 2019). In addition, the rallies at which these speeches took place are referred to in various media as "motivational events" (Croat. *motivacijski skup*), and the respective speakers themselves described their speeches as "motivational".

---

---

(<https://www.vecernji.hr/vijesti/milanovic-bit-cu-neka-vrsta-hrvatskog-vrhovnog-pravobranitelja-1358250>; <https://dnevnik.hr/vijesti/hrvatska/zoran-milanovic-sluzbeno-pocinje-izbornu-kampanju-skupom-u-zagrebu---582452.html>).

## 2. THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

Girnth (2015: 19) points to six models of analysis that are important for any research on language use in politics and that focus more or less explicitly on its pragmatic aspects: “In diesem Kapitel werden sechs Analysemodelle politischer Sprache vorgestellt, die in der Politolinguistik eine wichtige Rolle spielen”. For the purpose of this analysis, the *persuasion* and the *lexical-argumentative* models are considered the most appropriate, as they embody the elements of political communication that are the focus of research interest. The *persuasion* model (A) is rooted in the theory of persuasive communication, developed by Kopperschmidt (1976) from the point of view of a ‘rhetoric’ that sees itself as “Grammatik des vernünftigen Redens” (Girnth, 2015: 22) (Engl. *the grammar of reasonable speech*). This implies the use of arguments to reach consensus between communication partners – presidential candidates and their supporters – about common goals. Kopperschmidt (1976) sees in the persuasive form of communication an indirect, linguistic and argumentative form of goal attainment. According to him, persuasive communication also has a hermeneutic function, since it clarifies potential goals. Persuasive speech acts occur under specific circumstances and are used to make arguments about a specific topic. The two basic requirements for a persuasive macro-act (cf. Halmari & Virtanen, 2005) to occur are that 1) one of the communication partners is willing to be persuaded by the arguments of the other partner and 2) one of the partners is genuinely interested in reaching consensus with the other partner through arguments. Political actors (presidential candidates) can use arguments to persuade their supporters to carry out a planned action. Each persuasive fragment of discourse (hence motivational speech) contains characteristic incentive elements that can appeal to the recipient’s emotions and lead him to act according to the author’s intention(s) (cf. Bachem, 1979). This is a logical assumption considering that (i) the most common function in political language is the appellative or conative function inherent in political advertising, and (ii) motivational speech is a type of political advertising. The characteristic structure of incentive elements includes the use of explicit/implicit performative verbs implying a command/request or an appeal, and various rhetorical devices.

---

The *lexical-argumentative* model (B) was developed by Grünert (1974) with the aim of analyzing the use of an ideology-related vocabulary. It refers to a political doctrine of evoking positive/negative images and reinforcing a sense of (non-)belonging to a group, community or nation by employing positively/negatively charged words and phrases. Ideology-related vocabulary is widely used in election campaigns and includes positively charged lexemes employed to evoke positive thoughts about a particular political platform and/or a range of negatively charged lexemes used to defame a political rival and evoke negative connotations in relation to the opponent. In that way, ideology-related lexical units can be used as a very effective means of ‘friend-foe’ demarcation for political actors to express their attitudes towards relevant political issues (cf. Klein, 1989).

### 3. SAMPLE AND METHODOLOGY

This rhetorical analysis examines two motivational speeches delivered during the 2019 Croatian presidential election campaign by considering each motivational speech as: (1) A fragment of a spoken discourse, which could trigger further discourse about the 2019 Croatian presidential election and its course and (2) As a tool for building the rhetorical profile of both speakers. The speeches were held two days apart by two candidates from two of Croatia’s strongest political parties, the Croatian Democratic Union (CDU, Croat. HDZ) and the Social Democratic Party (SDP). Kolinda Grabar Kitarović (KGK), candidate of the CDU (conservative, center, Christian Democratic Party), running for a new mandate, gave her motivational speech (*MS2*) on November 11, 2019. Zoran Milanović (ZM), former Prime Minister and SDP candidate (center-left party), gave his speech (*MS1*) two days earlier, on November 9, 2019.

Recordings of *MS1* and *MS2* were downloaded from the websites listed below and transcribed according to Dresing and Pehl’s (2015, 2017) Simplified Transcription System (<https://www.audiotranskription.de/wp-content/uploads/2020/11/manual-on-transcription.pdf>), which allows word and sentence breaks to be omitted and syntactic errors to be smoothed out, unless used as stylistic devices:

*MS1*:<https://www.jutarnji.hr/vijesti/hrvatska/video-zoran-milanovic-u-tvornici-odrzao-prvi-predizborni-skup-moj-karakter-nekad-satire-moja-leda-kaomlinski-kamen-ali-bez-karaktera-nema-nicega-9592531> (*MS1* is 00:37:01 minutes long).

*MS2*:<https://www.jutarnji.hr/vijesti/hrvatska/video-kolindin-govor-izvukla-sam-hrvatsku-iz-regiona-komentirala-skoru-i-milanovica-nekima-je-ovo->

blagdan-vinskih-obicaja-a-meni-poseban-dan-9599236 (*MS2* is 00:48:13 minutes long).

The speeches vary in length: the *MS1* recording transcript includes 211 speech utterances and the *MS2* recording consists of 206 utterances. Twenty excerpts were selected from each speech, analyzed according to models (A) and (B) and only partially translated into English due to word limits. The selected excerpts represent episodes of sequences of speech utterances that are more or less coherent in terms of the thematic units defined by the election slogans and macrostructures of the speech (introduction, body and conclusion). Although the number of excerpts in each model is ten, each set of excerpts (E) consists of a different number of speech utterances (SU), so we have:

<i>MS1</i> → Model (A): 10 E/30 SU, → Model (B): 10 E/42 SU = 20 E/72 SU
--

<i>MS2</i> → Model (A): 10 E/25 SU, → Model (B): 10 E/37 SU = 20 E/62 SU
--

<i>MS1</i> + <i>MS2</i> → 40 E/ 134 SU
--

In model (A), the utterances are analyzed with the focus on different persuasion and argumentation strategies and the use of rhetorical figures and argumentation patterns, e.g.: analogy, metaphores, metonymy, rhetorical questions, repetitions, appeals to the audience (*argumentum ad populum*) and their emotions (*argumentum ad passiones*) (cf. Škarić, 2011: 81–97). In model (B), the focus is on the identification of ideology-related vocabulary including stylistic figures of morphological type (“figures of commutation”, Katnić-Bakaršić, 2001: 245). In political rhetoric, stylistic figures of this type most commonly refer to two phenomena: 1) replacing 1P Sg. (*I*) with 1P Pl. (*we*) to emphasize the unity between speaker and listener (cf. Katnić-Bakaršić, 2012), and 2) addition (Lat. *adjectio*) of personal pronouns, especially the pronoun *I* (<https://stilistika.org/stiloteka/rasprave/165-stilske-figure-i-gramatika>).

## 4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### 4.1 *MS1* – Zoran Milanović

#### 4.1.1 Model (A)

The model examines rhetorical devices with an informative-persuasive language function aimed to raise public awareness and used to prepare and justify political action (cf. Grünert, 1984). Typical types of discourse in which this function is implemented are election campaign speeches and election slogans. Election slogans function as catchwords and phrases due to their dependency on political topicality and appellative effect (cf. Girth, 2015; Niehr, 2007; Schröter, 2011). The boundaries

between slogans (i.e. repetitive expressions of an idea or purpose) and catchwords and phrases are fluid: slogans have the same properties as catchphrases in terms of reducing and simplifying complex reality. Niehr (2014) explains that slogans, unlike catchwords, are sentence-like expressions, while catchwords can be expanded into slogans by explicating their illocutionary role. During *MSI*, ZM used seven election slogans: 1) *Normalno, predsjednik s karakterom, država sa stavom.* 2) *Normalno, svatko ljubi koga voli.* 3) *Normalno, zelena, a ne siva ekonomija.* 4) *Normalno, zauzmi stav, a ne ogradu Bijele kuće.* 5) *Normalno, ratovi su gotovi.* 6) *Normalno, živjeti od rada, a ne od zastare.* 7) *Normalno, žena ima pravo na izbor.* They can be seen as highlights of *MSI*, and as such can be viewed as extended catchphrases. Their illocutionary role can be interpreted as follows:

1. *Clear and firm positions* 2. *Human rights* 3. *Sustainable economy* 4. *Political stance, not politicizing* 5. *The future, not the past* 6. *Law and justice* and 7. *Women's right to abortion.*

All slogans start with the adverb “normalno” (Engl. *under normal circumstances*), meaning the unfolding reality is the opposite of it. The juxtapositions such as *>green vs. grey market<* (3), *>taking a stand vs. not occupying the fence of the White House<* (4) or *>living from work vs. living from statute-barred illegal acts<* (6) show pairs of opposites, which form disjunctive statements or “enthymemes” (Škarić, 2011: 58). The fact that (political) reality is mostly more complex than such black-and-white representations is deliberately ignored through the use of appropriate catchwords and phrases aimed at influencing the public both emotionally and intellectually (cf. Strauß, Haß & Harras, 1989). ZM’s persuasion strategy with election slogans has the function of addressing the audience in the hall directly and motivating them to question the previous activities of the President’s office. This can be illustrated by the slogan (4), which implies that the previous presidential mandate lacked clear political stance and statesmanlike qualities. The selected speech excerpts in model (A) contain utterances that are part of the introduction and consist of conventions that usually precede the messages conveyed in the body of the speech – greeting, gratitude and request for change:

1. *Dragi prijatelji (. dragi Zagrebe (. najdraža Hrvatska (. hvala Vam što ste došli i idemo na jedno lijepo putovanje (. idemo učiniti sve da se za malo više od mjesec dana probudimo u jednoj ljepšoj (. mirnijoj i pristojnijoj Hrvatskoj #00:37:02#*

Analysis of the introduction reveals that ZM uses an analogy, a rhetorical device used to relate the date of the speech to some important historical events that took place on the same day:

2. *Današnji datum (.) deveti studenoga je (.) sasvim slučajno odabran za ovaj skup (.) [...] to je datum na koji su se u novijoj povijesti Europe dogodile dvije dalekosežne (.) jedna jeziva (.) a druga veličanstvena stvar* #00:35:50#

3. *Deveti studenog '38. godine započelo je ono pravo (.) bezdušno (.) dušmansko zlo i nasilje u Europi. To je bila Kristalna noć* #00:35:40#

4. *Prije točno 30 godina na današnji dan (.) deveti studenog '89. godine pao je Berlinski zid* #00:35:22#

Analogies are employed to persuade the audience of the importance of the event and its symbolic connection to specific events in the past, even when they appear unrelated. Consequently, the use of analogies in discourse allows the receiver to perceive the conveyed messages 'objectively', as they are often used to clarify and explain things in relation to something else, implying that understanding the importance of one thing will help to understand the other (cf. Škarić, 2000). Accordingly, the speaker in *MSI* considers the current event (his speech) to be a turning point in Croatia's political life. Another rhetorical tool of persuasion are types of questions, which help the speaker reach an instant agreement with the audience when raising a non-existent doubt:

5. *Nove nade (.) velika očekivanja i vrijeme je da se zapitamo [...] gdje smo (.) jesmo li bolji (.) jesmo li sretniji (.) jesmo li pametniji (.) u kakvoj državi živimo (.) da li ta država ispunjava ono (.) što se od nje očekivalo* (0.5) #00:35:02#

Sometimes, to the surprise of the audience, these questions contain an answer. Their function appears to be more 'technical' in nature, as they help the speaker to quickly advance the 'dialogue' and create a smooth transition to another section of speech. This strategy is referred to as *hypophora* and is commonly regarded as a type of rhetorical question (<https://www.thoughtco.com/hypophora-rhetoric-term-1690947>), although the two terms can have one distinct difference: rhetorical questions do not look for answers, while hypophora is a question with an immediate answer (<https://www.yourdictionary.com/articles/hypophora-questions>). We tend to interpret the examples above (in 5) as rhetorical questions, and the examples below (in 6) as a hypophora.

6. *Država je tu da s njome budemo zadovoljni i da se u njoj osjećamo sretno (.) je li danas tako (.) nije (.) tko je za to kriv (.) nije ni bitno* #00:33:59#

Another rhetorical device used to contribute to persuasion is implicit argument, specifically appeal to authority. It is a common and popular form of argument that is not difficult to identify, but often difficult to counter: "Die Berufung auf Autoritäten ist eine häufige und beliebte Form der Argumentation, [...] nicht schwer zu identifizieren, aber oft schwer zu kontern" (Bendel Larcher, 2015: 96). To support his slogan (5),

ZM indirectly refers to general Gotovina, a great moral authority in Croatia, who was long imprisoned for war crimes and made a remarkable statement in 2012 after being released from prison in The Hague: “The war belongs to history, let’s turn to the future”:

7. *Imali smo tešku povijest zadnjih trideset godina* (.) [...] (.) *ali s ove govornice poručujem* (.) *ono što su prije mnogi rekli* (.) *možda i sa više razloga i autoriteta od mene* (0.5) *ratovi su* (.) *pobogu gotovi* #00:34:46#

The body of the speech is explanatory, that is, it usually contains implicit explanations of other slogans. The analysis reveals various recurring and overlapping themes reflective of the promises contained in the slogans. Persuasion strategies include repetition, irony, metaphor, and antithesis. The use of repetition and anaphora for emphasis (e.g. *znamo* = ‘we know’) helps create parallel structures that have the same or similar grammatical pattern. The ideas and messages conveyed become more memorable when repeated in a similar way. Additionally, the use of parallelism adds rhythm to the speech, making the repeated words and phrases more compelling:

8. (1.0) *Znamo što su naši interesi* (.) *znamo gdje su naše granice* (.) *znamo kako štitimo svoje more* (.) *znamo kako štitimo i svoje nebo* [...] #00:16:56#

The use of irony is evident in the excerpts related to the presidential mandate of KGK and the election slogan (4):

9. *Biraj društvo* (.) *pazi s kim se fotografiraš* (.) *jer ako te zečja* (.) *magnetska želja za farovima i reflektorima* (.) *previše zavede i opije* (.) *svatko će ti bit’ u kadru* (.) *a nije baš kadar ‘ko je na sve kadar* (.) *je l’ tako* (0.5) #00:16:00#

10. *Svakome se može dogoditi* (.) *svakome ‘ko je stalno među ljudima da mu se podmetne i* (.) *nekvalitetan materijal* (.) *ali baš stalno* (.) #00:15:38#

11. (.) *Što kažu* (.) *‘oće centrala pogriješit’ jednom* (.) *al’ više puta ne* (0.5) #00:15:28#

Irony is achieved through allusions to KGK’s excessive media exposure (e.g. *zečja, magnetska želja za farovima* = ‘a rabbit-like, magnetic craving for the limelight’), often in unworthy company. The reference to a misjudgement is underscored in utterance (11) by a witty remark that takes on a sarcastic and mocking tone. Utterances (12) and (13), which fit THE-BURDEN-OF-CHARACTER metaphor are employed as persuasion tools in excerpts accompanying slogan (1), in which ZM’s character and experience are described as ‘heavy as marble’ (*mramorna gromada*) or ‘millstone’ (*mlinski kamen*):

12. *Moje iskustvo* (.) *koje je golemo kao teret* (.) *kao mramorna gromada katkad na mojim leđima* (.) [...] *stavljam na raspolaganje hrvatskoj državi i* (.) *hrvatskoj* (.) *naciji* #00:30:09#

13. *Dobro znate svi* (.) *i ovdje i u Hrvatskoj* (.) *da moj karakter katkad* (.) *satire moja leđa kao mlinski kamen* [...] *ali bez karaktera* (.) *nema ničega* (.) #00:10:41#



His character and experience are equated with the general trait of “difficult or tough” and “not easy to handle” (Škarić, 2011: 58). The listener can almost feel the weight of a difficult character and a hard experience. The utterance begins with a hedge *dobro znate svi* (‘you all know well’), a “device with a mitigating effect” (Vančura & Tomić, 2013: 240), which in this particular case is used in order to reduce the negative effect of a character trait on the performance of the presidential office, if everyone shares the same knowledge about it. ZM also uses antithesis, defined as a figure in discourse and a means of repair or correction (cf. Bagić, 2012). Corrections are made throughout the speech to emphasize the importance of opposing perspectives and to introduce the audience to the key features of what is being discussed. With this form of antithesis, ZM tries to help spread the discourse and demonstrate his eloquence. Positive-negative rephrasing is also used to show the difference between the country’s two forms of government. In the excerpt below, ZM points to two different ways of conveying political messages: one morally correct and the other morally corrupt. It is up to the audience to recognize which of the candidates is taking which approach. *Onaj tko* (‘the one who’) can be anyone, but the indefinite someone is only seemingly non-referential, has an egocentric meaning, and refers to the speaker himself:

14. *Onaj tko to uspije ljudima ispričati (. ne (. na fintu (. nego iskreno (. ljudski (. koji to uspije ispričati (. ne pročitati iz telepromptera (. ili iz pisanog govora (. taj će zadobiti (. minimum povjerenja naroda (. #00:19:55#*

The rhetorical design of speech excerpts in model (A) is summarized in Table 1:

**Table 1.** The rhetorical design of *MS1* in model (A)

**Tablica 1.** Retoričko oblikovanje MG1 (Motivacijskoga govora 1) u modelu (A)

RHETORICAL DEVICES	INFORMATIVE - PERSUASIVE FUNCTION
1. Election Slogans	Reduction and simplification of reality Motivation Mockery
2. Analogy	Justification of the selected date of speech Symbolic meaning
3. Rhetorical Questions	Reach instant agreement Suggestive effect
4. Appeal to Authority	Make countering impossible
5. Repetition	Convince the audience Better memorability
6. Irony	Criticism, humor and absurdity
7. Metaphor	Permeate perception, thought and behaviour Help look at concepts from another angle
8. Antithesis/Correction Restatements	Emphasis of opposing perspectives

#### 4.1.2 Model (B)

The analysis focuses on different pronominal and lexical choices: 1P Sg./Pl. ('I', 'we') vs. 3P Pl. ('they') and their variants, positively vs. negatively charged words and phrases used to express collectivism, exclusion, dissent or criticism. By analyzing the use of dichotomous pronouns and ideology-related vocabulary, the dualism of internal (in-group) and external (out-of-group) ideology-related language systems can be reflected: "Ideologiesprachliche Zeichensysteme haben eine doppelte Funktion: Sie dienen zum einen der Selbstidentifikation und zum anderen der Fremdentifikation" (Girnth, 2015: 28). Belonging to a group not only influences the speaker's linguistic decisions, but also the expectations of the addressees: Political actors are expected to follow certain ethical and strategic principles of communication depending on their political affiliation: "Von Politikern und Politikerinnen wird erwartet, dass sie bestimmte kommunikationsethische Maximen [...] erfüllen [...]. Gleichzeitig verfolgen sie [...] aber auch strategische Maximen [...]" (ibid. 42). This includes following the principles of strategic communication, such as presenting one's own political position positively and the position of the political rival as objectionable (cf. Klein, 2009). The excerpts analyzed in model (B) indicate that ZM followed most of the principles, using different linguistic choices. 1P Sg. *I* is used in both the introduction and the conclusion as a marker to express the obligatory aspects of the speech:

15. *Ovdje vam neću pričati stvari koje (.) znam i znate (.) da ne mogu ispuniti odnosno da sam znam da ih nikada neću moći ispuniti* #00:36:40#

16. *Danas ih \* imam također (.) ali sam nešto stariji (.) [...] (.) ali još uvijek tu da se borim (.) [...] da dam sve od sebe (.) da vas povedem [...]* #00:02:54#

1P Sg. is used to establish self-reference and distance from the audience necessary to convey personal responsibility and to express a commitment to the truth of the messages and a zeal to address specific issues. However, the public is not completely excluded, as can be seen in (15) and (16), where 2P Pl. *znate/vas* ('you') implies ZM's attempt to (i) share common knowledge about the president's limited authority and (ii) engage the audience in his speech. 1P Sg. is used in the body of the speech to assert personal authority and power, particularly when expressing firm personal opinions, strong commitment and political responsibility for upholding the Constitution or safeguarding national interests:

17. *Sa vladom ću koliko je to moguće surađivati (.) ne prekoračenjem ovlasti ne formiranjem ilegalnih vlada u sjeni [...] (.) to raditi neću to je moje čvrsto obećanje (.) moj zavjet hrvatskim građanima (.) [...]* #00:30:48#

18. *Predsjednik Republike (.) ja sutra (.) dati ću sve (.) da zajedničkim nastupom i dogovorom s izvršnom vlašću [...] (.) učinim sve da se hrvatski interesi štite* #00:29:33#

The analysis shows signs of pronominal and syntactic enallage that (over) emphasizes the generated utterances. The negated auxiliary verb *neću/nećete* ('I won't') comes at the end of the clause (*to raditi neću, to [...] od mene vidjeti nećete*), which is a deviation from the norm and the conventional word order. In the last sentence 1P Sg. *ja* is appended to the NP *predsjednik Republike* and inserted between NP and VP, which can be seen as a "stylistic device with a functional intention" (Katnić-Bakaršić, 2001: 243; Plett, 2006: 260). In addition, there is also the replacement of 1P Sg. with 1P Pl., e.g. *Danas govorimo o građanskim vrijednostima [...] vs. Danas govorim [...]* and the 2P Sg., e.g. *Ne smiješ to reći [...] uvrijedit ćeš ljude vs. Ne smijem to reći [...] uvrijedit ću ljude.*

1P Pl. *mi* ('we') is present throughout the speech, although its use in the body is slightly more pronounced. Both variants of 'we' are represented: the in-group (inclusive) 'we' is used to show the logic of inclusion – collectivism and solidarity. It usually echoes to forms *naš* ('our') and *nas* ('us'), referring to all citizens of Croatia:

19. *Naša država ima itekako dubok smisao (.) [...] mi se držimo (.) jaki smo i ne damo se i nećemo se dati #00:31:58#*

When expressing distance from those not belonging to the same political circle, the out-of-group (exclusive) 'we' is employed to indicate separation from political opponents (i.e. authority figures) and to refer to the achievements of government during the prime ministerial mandate:

20. *Već godinama gledamo kako ljudi (.) na vlasti (.) oko vlasti i pri vlasti (.) [...] izvlače ogromnu materijalnu korist (.)[...] #00:31:22#*

21. *Migranti (.) već četiri godine gledamo jedan problem (.) s kojim smo se mi (.) ja osobno (.) prije četiri godine nosio (.) [...] (.) i u tome smo uspjeli #00:28:53#*

The analysis of an ideology-related vocabulary continues with a listing of nomination and predication fields that provide information about the speaker's group-specific interpretations and evaluations (cf. Girth, 2015). *Nomination* refers to the way social actors are named as groups or individuals and *predication* to the way positive or negative traits are assigned to social actors: "Unter *Nomination* verstehen wir die Art und Weise, wie soziale Akteure als Individuen oder Gruppen sprachlich konstruiert werden. Unter *Prädikation* verstehen wir die Art und Weise, wie den sozialen Akteuren positive oder negative Eigenschaften zugeschrieben werden" (Bendel Larcher, 2015: 63).

## 1. Social actors, political groups and individuals

Nomination field:

a) in-group: 'I' / 'we' = *spokesperson, advocate, president, minorities, vulnerable social groups*

b) out-of-group: 'they' = *"bad guys", people in authority, elites*

Predication field:

a) positively evaluated (in-group social actors):

[...] (.) mi tražimo prijatelje #00:16:57#

→ 1P Pl. *mi* ('we') is associated with the noble pursuit of friendship.

Bit ću (.) gromki (.) govornik i (.) glasnogovornik (.) ovog svjetonazora [...] #00:25:45#

→ The underlined NPs relate to the protection of minority rights and vulnerable social groups.

[...] onda sam ja zagovornik i predvodnik građanske Hrvatske #00:23:49#

→ The underlined NPs imply the in-group of 'working-class' Croatia.

b) negatively evaluated (out-of-group social actors):

Oni uvijek nalaze neprijatelje (.) [...] #00:16:59#

→ 3P Pl. refers to the out-of-group who see enemies in everyone different.

[...] to su najbolje iskoristili 'loši dečki' (.) i oni danas te platforme u svijetu koriste da bi divljali i širili netrpeljivost i mržnju [...] #00:14:12#

→ The NP *loši dečki* ('bad guys') refers to the abuse of social media involving some major world leaders.

Te takozvane 'elite' [...] uvijek su u povijesti izazivale animozitet (.) i uvijek su na njihovoj kritici profitirali (.) elitisti (.) nacisti (.) fašisti #00:19:37#

→ The underlined NPs have inherent negative connotations and are associated with animosity.

## 2. Politically relevant intentions and interests

Nomination field:

a) in-group: *human rights, faith, values, anti-fascism, resistance*

b) out-of-group: *autocracy, tyranny, corruption, policy of incitement*

Predication field:

a) positively evaluated (in-group intentions and interests):

[...] ali to je vjera (.) u ono što je postignuto i u ono što se treba građanskim načinom (.) braniti #00:25:35#

→ *Vjera* ('faith') implies positive notions of consistency in preserving acquired human rights.

*Ja sam isto tako (.) zagovornik (.) vrijednosti antifašizma [...] antifašizam (.) [...] je otpor nasilju [...] (.) nikakva posebna ideologija #00:21:33#*

→ Anti-fascism, positively defined as non-ideology, embodies the values of resistance to tyranny.

b) negatively evaluated (out-of-group intentions and interests):

*[...] sve druge priče (.) su put u autokraciju i tiraniju [...] #00:36:18#*

→ The underlined NPs have inherently negative connotations and are meant to be attributed to political rivals who make untenable promises.

*Korupcija (0.8) to je (.) lijepo ime (.) za ono što narod zove (.) lopovluk (.) [...] #00:31:43#*

→ *Korupcija* ('corruption'), a euphemism for *lopovluk* ('thievery'), inherently carrying negative connotations, is attributed to 'the powerful' – the members of the ruling party.

*Tako velike razlike (.) u zajednici od 4 mil. ljudi (.) može pomiriti samo prosvječena i dobronamjerna politika (.) ne politika huškanja i poticanja najnižih strasti #00:21:46#*

→ Political rivals are credited with a 'politics of incitement' as opposed to a 'politics of benevolence'.

The rhetorical design of speech excerpts in model (B) is shown in Table 2:

**Table 2.** The rhetorical design of *MSI* in model (B)

**Tablica 2.** Retoričko oblikovanje MG1 (Motivacijskoga govora 1) u modelu (B)

#### THE LEXICAL-ARGUMENTATIVE MODEL

##### Ideology-related vocabulary

PRONOMINAL / LEXICAL CHOICES	ARGUMENTATIVE FUNCTION
1. 1P Sg. 'I'	Self-reference Conveying personal responsibilities Assertion of personal authority and power
2. 1P Pl. inclusive 'we'	Collectivism Solidarity
3. 1P Pl. exclusive 'we'	Separation from political opponents in power Taking credit for the right political decisions
4. In-group social actors: 'we' < 'I', spokesperson, advocate, minorities, vulnerable social groups	Positive evaluation: Identification with the in-group Care and protection of human rights
5. Out-group social actors: 'they' > opponents, people in authority, elites, 'bad guys'	Negative evaluation: Animosity Social media misuse
6. In-group political intentions/interests: human rights, faith, values, antifascism, resistance	Positive evaluation: Maintaining acquired human rights Resistance to the rule of violence
7. Out-group political intentions/interests: autocracy, tyranny, corruption, policy of incitement	Negative evaluation: Making untenable promises Bad trends

## 4.2 MS2 – Kolinda Grabar Kitarović

### 4.2.1 Model (A)

The results show that *MS2* is less comprehensive than *MS1* in the sense that it does not deviate from the topics determined by the election slogans. The utterances are closely linked to the respective topic and are structured according to program points, all of which relate to the position of power from which KGK started her election campaign – President of the Republic. In the introduction (and afterwards), numerous expressions of gratitude are given to the audience for their past and current support of her candidacy for the 2019 presidential election. Half of *MS2* was devoted to attempting to summarize the achievements of the first presidential mandate, followed by the presentation of the electoral manifesto with clearly articulated seven electoral slogans: 1. *Hrvatski razvoj* 2. *Hrvatski identitet* 3. *Hrvatska odlučnost* 4. *Hrvatska pravедnost* 5. *Hrvatska demokracija* 6. *Hrvatska sigurnost* and 7. *Hrvatski optimizam*. Slogans are designed to cover a specific part of the campaign program (i.e. *development, identity, determination, justice, democracy, security* and *optimism*) with the least possible linguistic material, allowing a smooth transition to the next section, which makes them easily memorable for the listener. Each slogan starts with the adjective *Croatian*, consistent with the campaign claim *Hrvatska zna i mora dalje* ('Croatia knows and must move on'), which manages to capture the diverse national sentiments and goals at the heart of the campaign. Although the slogans may not seem as catchy as the slogans in *MS1*, they reveal their full semantic potential during the speech. A short, salient sentence chosen for the campaign claim becomes a short "quote text" (cf. Fix, 2009). The rhetorical figure employed to emphasize campaign claim is metonymy, humanizing Croatia and depicting it as a living being. Metonymy is used in several other places in *MS2* when using the country's name for its citizens and all persons residing in Croatia and on whose behalf it is spoken:

1. *Svoju aktivnu ulogu i stav Hrvatska je pokazala i kroz Inicijativu triju mora (.) s kojom sam Hrvatsku (.) napokon iščupala iz takozvanog 'regiona' #00:19:48#*

In (1) the stylistic figure of the REGION-IS-A-MONSTER metaphor is combined with metonymy in the depiction of a humanized Croatia that had to be 'saved' (*Hrvatsku sam iščupala [iz regiona]* > 'I have uprooted Croatia [from the region]'). KGK presents herself as a courageous heroine who defied 'the evil region' and set Croatia on the right path. The analysis shows that analogy as in *MS1* was used in the introduction as a persuasive device, not to link the date of the speech to an

important historical event, but to refer to the presentation of the election program *Za bolju Hrvatsku* ('For a better Croatia') five years earlier:

2. Upravo (.) na današnji dan (.) prije (.) točno pet godina predstavila sam izborni program 'Za bolju Hrvatsku' #00:45:25#

The aim is to express personal satisfaction with one's own work and the results achieved in the first mandate, which is convincing enough to be entrusted with the second mandate. In the same section, repetition of words and phrases is used as a persuasive tool, as in *MS1*. When words and phrases are repeated, the ideas and messages conveyed by repeated words and phrases are more easily remembered and stay in people's minds longer:

3. Tada sam zatražila (.) vaš glas (.) vaše povjerenje [...] #00:45:17#

4. Tada sam rekla da neću biti predsjednica ni jedne političke stranke [...] #00:45:03#

KGK also uses hyperbole at the end of the introductory part when she aims to reinforce the negative impact of her rival's past prime ministerial mandate (e.g. *pessimism, despondency, status quo*). The use of hyperbole is an indicator of strong emotional involvement, reflecting an affective attitude towards the topic (cf. Bagić, 2012):

5. Vladalo je ozračje pesimizma (.) malodušja (.) i bezidejnosti #00:41:03#

6. Vladalo je beznađe i osjećaj kako se ništa ne može napraviti (.) kako promjena nije moguća #00:40:57#

To further distance herself from her opponent, KGK appeals to the authority of Prime Minister and party leader Andrej Plenković as a witness to Croatia's new, improved image in the world:

7. Danas je ugled i utjecaj Hrvatske u svijetu veći nego ikada prije (.) rekao je to (.) evo i predsjednik stranke i predsjednik vlade [...] #00:36:51#

KGK also uses rhetorical questions and hypophora (8), elaborated with a figure of thought—an allusion. It addresses a topic indirectly, referring to a relevant situation, event or person. Allusion also triggers another figure of thought, irony, which requires the recipient to know the context:

8. Je li TO (.) ono što je NORMALNO (.) možda (.) ali samo onima (.) koji se usude reći kako je Hrvatska (.) slučajna država #00:39:54#

Statements in (8) contain allusions to ZM, his campaign slogan *Normalno* and the expression *slučajna država* ('country created by chance') from 2012, the first year of his tenure as Prime Minister. By recalling the phrase as his political legacy, KGK

seeks to disqualify ZM as a presidential candidate. Other candidates are also alluded to when expressions such as *eksperiment* ('experiment'), *površni populizam* ('shallow populism') and *olako shvaćanje upravljanja politikama* ('a light-hearted understanding of political leadership') are used to predict what effect their election would mean. Euphemism is used as a persuasion tool when neutral expressions are used instead of direct references to military and police forces that should be deployed at Croatia's external borders as a shield against migrant flows. The euphemistic expressions *dodatno osnaživanje* ('additional empowerment') and *angažiranje elemenata sustava domovinske sigurnosti* ('inclusion of elements of the homeland security system') can be interpreted as a means of manipulating the underlying portrayal of political reality and ideology in Croatia (cf. Hodge & Kress, 1993):

9. Zauzimat ću se i za *dodatno osnaživanje hrvatske državne granice* (.) *angažiranjem svih elemenata sustava domovinske sigurnosti* #00:07:03#

An oxymoron, a syntactic combination of contradictory elements (cf. Bagić, 2012), such as the clichéd expression *srebro zlatnoga sjaja* ('silver with a golden sheen') is used in reference to Croatia's silver medal at the World Cup, symbolizing national success:

10. *Srebro zlatnoga sjaja hrvatske nogometne reprezentacije* (0.5) *pokazalo je koliko takav uspjeh može osnažiti vjeru u bolje sutra* (.) *vjeru u Hrvatsku* [...] #00:05:27#

KGK's credibility is based on her social recognition and sympathy, her previous reputation and the comprehensibility of her speech. The linguistic devices used to reflect credibility in MS2 are appeals to the audience (*argumentum ad populum*) and their emotions (*argumentum ad passiones*), so MS2 is oriented towards national pathos, the glorification of patriotic feelings and national unity:

11. *Stojim* (.) *stoga* (.) *danas* (.) *ovdje* (.) *pred vama jer znam* (.) *kao što i Hrvatska zna* (.) *da o nama ovisi* (.) *kakvu ćemo Hrvatsku graditi* (.) [...] #00:02:26#

12. *Pokažimo da Hrvatska zna i što* (.) *sve* (.) *Hrvatska zna* #00:01:53#



The rhetorical design of speech excerpts in model (A) is summarized in Table 3:

**Table 3.** The rhetorical design of *MS2* in model (A)

**Tablica 3.** Retoričko oblikovanje MG2 (Motivacijskoga govora 2) u modelu (A)



RHETORICAL DEVICES	INFORMATIVE -PERSUASIVE FUNCTION
1. Election Slogans	Summing up election program Stirring up national feelings Creating strong attitudes
2. Analogy	Justification of the selected date of speech Symbolic meaning
3. Repetition	Emphasis Better memorability
4. Hyperbole	Expressing affective attitude
5. Appeal to authority	Confirmation of credibility Simplification of circumstances
6. Allusion	Defamation of rivals
7. Euphemism	Disguising the truth Political framing
8. Oxymoron	Enhancing the concept of success

#### 4.2.2 Model (B)

Analysis shows that 1P Sg. *ja* ('I') is used in combination with 2P Pl. *vi* ('you') in the introduction to draw attention to the personal responsibility assumed in the first mandate and to express mutual understanding and gratitude to the supporters:

- |  |
|--|
| 13. <i>Svi vi dragi prijatelji koji ste se danas okupili [...] kako biste podržali (.) ne samo ovaj program [...] već (.) i sve ono što sam učinila [...] #00:46:54#</i> |
| 14. <i>Proputovala sam (.) cijelu Hrvatsku [...] i slušala (.) vas #00:43:17#</i>  |
| 15. <i>Željela sam biti (.) vaša predsjednica (.) jedna od vas #00:43:05#</i>  |

Gradually, in the body of the speech, there is a shift from *ja* ('I') + *vi* ('you') to 1P Pl. *mi* ('we') aimed to appeal to the common interests of the speaker and her audience (cf. Charteris-Black, 2005) when it comes to discrediting ZM's prime ministerial mandate and legacy:

- |   |
|---|
| 16. <i>Ne smijemo (.) međutim zaboraviti (.) kako je Hrvatska izgledala tada [...] #00:41:18#</i> |
| 17. <i>Hrvatska (0.5) se ne smije vratiti u to teško razdoblje [...] #00:39:27#</i>               |
| 18. <i>TO ne smijemo i nećemo dopustiti #00:39:19#</i>  |

1P Sg. dominates the body of *MS2* as it summarizes the accomplishments of the President's term. Occasionally 1P Sg. *I* is replaced by *we*, e.g. *Nametrnuli smo* ('we') *to pitanje na europsku agendu* vs. *Nametrnula sam* ('I') [...], sharing responsibility. The use of 1P Sg. throughout *MS2* signifies trust and a willingness to take personal responsibility not only for the governance strategy in the previous mandate but also

for the policies presented. 1P Pl. is used in the conclusion to clarify the extent to which KGK is willing to take responsibility and adhere to the ideas presented when it comes to citizens' dissatisfaction with the functioning of the political system:

19. *Istina je (.) da su građani nezadovoljni funkcioniranjem našeg političkog sustava (.) a to je jasan signal (.) svima nama (.) [...] da moramo (.) više oslušivati bilo naroda #00:12:21#*

20. *Na nama je dužnosnicima poboljšati taj sustav #00:12:03#*

The out-of-group 'we' refers to an exclusive group of people (e.g. government officials) that includes the speaker herself. It is implied that a better perception of the functioning of the Croatian political system cannot be achieved without involving all political actors. The in-group 'we' is also employed when presenting the logic of inclusion – group priority and unity. It usually echoes to forms *mi sami* ('we alone') and *nama samima* ('ourselves'), referring to all citizens of Croatia:

21. *Ipak (.) budimo potpuno svjesni (.) kako [...] samo mi sami (.) možemo potpuno osiguravati svoj mir [...] #00:9:45#*

The analysis of lexical choices provides information about group-specific interpretations and evaluations. The in-group nominations are closely related to the nominations of politically relevant systems and institutions, i.e. forms and processes of political rule:

### 1. *Social actors, political groups and individuals*

Nomination field:

- a) in-group: *you, friends, I, Croatian president, 'better Croatia', 3S<sup>1</sup>, European agenda*
- b) out-of-group: *Croatia five years ago, former government, 'region'*

Predication field:

- a) positively evaluated

*Svi vi dragi prijatelji [...] #00:46:54#*

→ The underlined NP refers to the immediate audience in the hall, including party officials, members and supporters of KGK's renewed candidacy, whom she feels indebted to.

*Bila sam predsjednica iznad stranačkih i ideoloških podjela i uvijek sam poticala konstruktivni dijalog [...] #00:37:56#*

*[...] pokazala sam i dokazala sposobnost (.) da uspješno predstavljam i zastupam Hrvatsku (.) [...] #00:32:05#*

*[...] iskustvo koje sam stekla (.) omogućuje mi (.) još bolje obnašati dužnost predsjednice Republike Hrvatske u drugom mandatu #00:28:02#*

<sup>1</sup> Three Sees Initiative

→ The nomination of the speaker takes place in an institutionalized form ('Croatian president'), complemented by the attributes *iznad stranačkih i ideoloških podjela* ('across party and ideological boundaries'). The actions taken, e.g. *poticala* ('encouraged'), *dokazala* ('proved'), *uspješno predstavljam* ('I successfully present') and *zastupam* ('represent') are expressed by positively evaluated VPs. The speaker's 'acquired experience' (*iskustvo koje sam stekla*) represents added value, quality and advantage over the opposing candidates.

Other nomination expressions ('better Croatia', 'European agenda', '3SI') also nominate the in-group in an institutionalized form. They function as (supranational) institutions and (superior) authorities that are automatically evaluated positively.

b) negatively evaluated

Hrvatska (.) u teškoj socijalnoj i gospodarskoj krizi i (.) [...] u teškoj (.) moralnoj krizi  
#00:41:11#  
Hrvatska je u mnogočemu kaskala za drugima (.) i bila na dnu ljestvica pozitivnih pokazatelja u Europi #00:40:29#

→ The nomination expression 'Croatia' belongs to the out-of-group as it refers to the period when the country was ruled by political opponents. Their mandate is evaluated negatively due to 'bad economic policy' (*teška gospodarska kriza*) and a 'severe moral crisis' (*teška moralna kriza*).

## 2. Politically relevant intentions and interests

Nomination field:

a) in-group: *optimism, dialogue, repositioning Croatia, improving the political system*

b) out-of-group: *negative decisions, ruining the country, return to the region*

Predication field:

a) positively evaluated

I tada sam bila uvjerena (.) [...] kako samo zajedno (.) možemo ostvariti bolju budućnost  
#00:43:38#

→ The NP *budućnost* ('future') has a positive connotation, implying optimism, progress and ongoing development. Its positive connotation is reinforced by the attribution *bolja* ('better') in *ostvariti bolju budućnost* ('achieve a better future'), suggesting that KGK can achieve this by appealing to the audience.

I to sam uvijek iznova ponavljala (.) šireći optimizam [...] #00:38:51#  
[...] i uvijek sam poticala konstruktivni dijalog [...] #00:37:51#

→ The underlined NPs are inherently positive embodying hope (*optimizam*), understanding, and leadership that gathers rather than divides (e.g. *konstruktivni dijalog* = 'constructive dialogue').

The NP ‘Croatia’s repositioning’ and ‘better political system’ are both evaluated positively as they relate to the intention to bring Croatia back to its natural environment (Central Europe and the Mediterranean) and restore citizens’ trust in politics.

b) negatively evaluated

[...] *vlada koja nas je zadužila preko 70 milijardi kuna* (.) *povećani PDV* [...] *katastrofalni kreditni rejting* (.) *vanjska politika koja nas je stalno vraćala u taj nekakav ‘region’* (.) *babato i arogantno vođenje države u propast* #00:40:17#

→ The nomination expressions *vlada* (‘government’) and *vanjska politika* (‘foreign policy’) refer to state institutions characterized by attributive relative clauses containing descriptions of the political decisions and activities made at the time and pointing to their negative effects from over-indebtedness to the collapse of the state. The argumentative function of these evaluations is to discredit opponents as incompetent to govern.

The rhetorical design of *MS2* in model (B) is shown in Table 4:

**Table 4.** The rhetorical design of *MS2* in model (B)

**Tablica 4.** Retoričko oblikovanje MG2 (Motivacijskoga govora 2) u modelu (B)

<b>Ideology-related vocabulary</b>		
PRONOMINAL / LEXICAL CHOICES	ARGUMENTATIVE FUNCTION	
1.	<p style="text-align: center;">1P Sg. ‘I’</p> <p style="text-align: center;">2P Pl. ‘you’</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Conveying personal responsibilities Recapping the achievements Assertion of personal authority and power</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Mutual understanding &amp; gratitude</p>
2.	<p style="text-align: center;">1P Pl. inclusive ‘we’</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Collectivism Shared responsibility</p>
3.	<p style="text-align: center;">1P Pl. exclusive ‘we’</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Appealing to government officials → Improving the political system</p>
4. In	<p style="text-align: center;">-group social actors: ‘I’: president, factor of gathering, flywheel of new Croatian unity ‘we’: you + I, ‘better Croatia’, 3SI</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Positive evaluation: National and supranational institutions Superior authorities inherently positive</p>
5.	<p style="text-align: center;">Out-group social actors: ‘they’: former government, “region”, Croatia 5 years ago</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Negative evaluation: Bad economic policy Severe moral crisis</p>
6. In-group political intentions/interests:	<p style="text-align: center;">optimism, dialogue, repositioning Croatia improvement of the political system</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Positive evaluation: Achievement of progress Commitment to 3SI Restoring trust</p>
7. Out-group political interests/intentions:	<p style="text-align: center;">public debt, low credit rating, arrogant leadership, return to the “region”</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Negative evaluation: Negative effects of political decisions Incompetence</p>

---

## 5. CONCLUSION

The results of the analysis answer the research questions and confirm all the hypotheses which the research is based on. The respective speakers (i.e. presidential candidates) follow certain principles of strategic communication, which are characteristic constitutive components of any political discourse: presenting one's own political position positively and the position of the political rival as objectionable. In order to do so, motivational speech is used as a form of political advertising in which public opinion and behavior are influenced by assuming that there is public dissatisfaction with the policies and achievements of the political opponent and by providing the benefits of potential change, namely the election of the new president. To achieve this political goal, presidential candidates employ elements of persuasion, intensity, and persistence based not only on their rhetorical speaking style, but also on their character and appearance. This supports the first hypothesis (H1) that motivational speech includes linguistic and personal elements as well as psychological factors. According to the results obtained in Model A, there are certain similarities in the rhetorical design of the motivational speeches. As a means of persuasion, both speakers use the same number of election slogans, each representing seven focal points with the same persuasive-informative function: to reduce the complex reality and summarize the key points of the election program. In addition, the same rhetorical figures such as analogy, repetition and appeal to authority are used. Analogies are used to justify the chosen date of each speech and to provide a specific symbolic meaning, while repetitions are used to create parallelism, one of the main strategies for drawing attention to preferred meanings, improving their construction in mental models and memorization in persuasion attempts (cf. Allen, 1991). Both candidates tend to discredit each other by appealing to authority and the emotions of the audience, reducing complex issues to just one or two courses of action through election slogans and questioning the opponent's character by scrutinizing his/her social behavior or previous statements. The results in Model (B) show the differences in the rhetorical design of the two speeches, which are related to the semantic polarization of the nominated topics and their evaluative dimension (predications). Although similar pronominal choices are made to nominate social actors as groups or individuals, different interpretative repertoires are used to assign positive or negative traits. These results support the second hypothesis (H2): The characteristic structure of elements of incitement involves the use of ideology-related vocabulary or sets of positive or negative lexemes, employed as an effective means of 'friend-foe' demarcation. The analysis within Model (B) reveals differences in the

---

speakers' interpretative repertoires with regard to the choice of their lexicon or register of terms to characterize and evaluate social actors, politically relevant intentions and interests. The data obtained make it possible to identify characteristic patterns of each candidate's self-construction, the construction of the other, and the way of talking about issues and events in the world. There are at least six interpretative repertoires of politically relevant intentions and interests in the 2019 Croatian presidential election. Central to ZM's interpretative repertoire are (1) upholding acquired human rights, including women's right to an abortion, (2) anti-fascism as a non-ideology of resistance to violence and tyranny, and (3) the fight for a decent civil state. At the heart of KGK's interpretative repertoire are (1) compliance with supranational institutions and the European agenda, (2) participation and partnership within the '3SI' platform, and 3) restoring trust in Croatia's political system. These findings support the study's third hypothesis (H3), namely that the differences in the rhetorical design in Model B are not gender specific, but are related to each speaker's interpretative repertoires. Interpretative repertoires are organized around the focal points of each candidate's electoral manifesto and political platform. They are used to construct political reality and develop accounts and versions of significant events and processes in Croatian political life.

It is believed that the results obtained in this study can contribute to existing and new insights into political discourse and language use from various other perspectives.

## REFERENCES

- Allen, J.** (1991). Thematic repetition as rhetorical technique. *Journal of Technical Writing and Communication*, 21(1), 29–40. <https://doi.org/10.2190/NV1N-BJUQ-RGD2-YNQM>
- Bachem, R.** (1979). *Einführung in die Analyse politischer Texte*. München: Oldenburg.
- Bagić, K.** (2012). *Rječnik stilskih figura*. Zagreb: Školska knjiga.
- Bendel Larcher, S.** (2015). *Linguistische Diskursanalyse*. Tübingen: Narr Francke Attempto Verlag.
- Charteris-Black, J.** (2005). *Politicians and rhetoric: The persuasive power of metaphor*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Dresing, T., Pehl, T., & Schmieder, C.** (2015). Manual (on) Transcription. Transcription Conventions, Software Guides and Practical Hints for Qualitative Researchers. 3<sup>rd</sup> English Edition. Marburg. Retrieved November, 30, 2022, from <http://www.audiotranskription.de/english/transcription-practicalguide.htm> (see p. 6)

- 
- Fix, U.** (2009). Zitier-, Reproduzier- und Mustertextsorten. In A. Linke, & H. Feilke (Eds.), *Oberfläche und Performanz, Untersuchungen zur Sprache als dynamischer Gestalt* (pp. 353–368). Berlin/New York: Niemeyer. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783484971240.4.353>
- Girnth, H.** (2015). *Sprache und Sprachverwendung in der Politik. Eine Einführung in die linguistische Analyse öffentlich-politischer Kommunikation*. Berlin/Boston: de Gruyter. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110338669>
- Grünert, H.** (1974). *Sprache und Politik. Untersuchungen zum Sprachgebrauch der 'Paulskirche'*. Berlin/New York: de Gruyter.
- Grünert, H.** (1984). Deutsche Sprachgeschichte und politische Geschichte in ihrer Verflechtung. In W. Besch et al. (Eds.), *Sprachgeschichte. Ein Handbuch zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache und ihrer Erforschung*, 1. Halbband (pp. 29–37). Berlin/New York: HSK 2.1/2.
- Halmari, H., & Virtanen, T.** (2005). *Persuasion across genres: A linguistic approach*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publ. Company. <https://doi.org/10.1075/pbns.130>
- Hodge, R., & Kress, G.** (1993). *Language as Ideology*. London: Routledge.
- Katnić-Bakaršić, M.** (2001). *Stilistika*. Sarajevo: Naučna i univerzitetska knjiga.
- Katnić-Bakaršić, M.** (2012). Uloga zamjenica mi i oni u konstrukciji odnosa moći u diskursu. In S. halilović, & M. Oremović (Eds.), *Zbornik radova Bosanskohercegovački slavistički kongres* (Knjiga 1) (pp. 399–405). Sarajevo: Slavistički komitet.
- Klein, J.** (1989). Wortschatz, Wortkampf, Wortfelder in der Politik. In J. Klein (Ed.), *Politische Semantik. Bedeutungsanalytische und sprachkritische Beiträge zur politischen Sprachverwendung* (pp. 3–50). Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag.
- Klein, J.** (2000). Textsorten im Bereich politischer Institutionen. In K. Brinker, G. Antos, W. Heinemann, & S. F. Sager (Eds.), *Text- und Gesprächslinguistik. Ein internationales Handbuch zeitgenössischer Forschung* (pp. 732–755). Berlin/New York: de Gruyter. <https://doi.org/10.1515%2f9783110194227>
- Klein, J.** (2009). Rhetorisch-stilistische Eigenschaften der Sprache der Politik. In U. Fix, A. Gardt, & J. Knappe (Eds.), *Rhetorik und Stilistik. Ein internationales Handbuch historischer und systematischer Forschung* (pp. 2112–2130). Berlin/New York: de Gruyter. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110213713.1.7.2112>
- Klein, J.** (2019). *Politik und Rhetorik: Eine Einführung*. Berlin: Springer VS. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-658-25455-1>
- Kopperschmidt, J.** (1976). *Allgemeine Rhetorik. Einführung in die Theorie der persuasiven Kommunikation*. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer.
-

- Kryknitska, I.** (2020). Language portrait of motivational speaker. *Euromentor Journal*, (XI)3, 167–185.
- Niehr, T.** (2007). Schlagwort. In G. Ueding (Ed.), *Historisches Wörterbuch der Rhetorik* (pp. 496–502). Berlin/Boston: Max Niemeyer Verlag.
- Niehr, T.** (2014). *Einführung in die Politolinguistik: Gegenstände und Methoden*. Göttingen/Bristol: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Plett, H. F.** (2006). Enallage. In T. O. Sloane (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of Rhetoric* (p. 260). Oxford: OUP.
- Pranjković, I.** (2007). Stilske figure i gramatika. In K. Bagić (Ed.), *Jezik književnosti i književni ideologemi: zbornik radova 35. seminara Zagrebačke slavističke škole* (pp. 21–25). Zagreb: Zagrebačka slavistička škola. Retrieved February, 12, 2023, from <https://stilistika.org/stiloteka/rasprave/165-stilske-figure-i-gramatika> (see p. 7)
- Schröter, M.** (2011). Schlagwörter im politischen Diskurs. In C. Domke, & J. Kilian (Eds.), *Sprache in der Politik. Aktuelle Ansätze und Entwicklungen der politolinguistischen Forschung* (pp. 249–257). Göttingen: Mitteilungen des DGV 58(3).
- Strauß, G., Haß, U., & Harras, G.** (1989). *Brisante Wörter von Agitation bis Zeitgeist. Ein Lexikon zum öffentlichen Sprachgebrauch (Schriften des Instituts für Deutsche Sprache)*. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Škarić, I.** (2000). *Temeljni suvremenog govorništva*. Zagreb: Školska knjiga.
- Škarić, I.** (2011). *Argumentacija*. Zagreb: Nakladni zavod Globus.
- Vančura, A., & Tomić, D.** (2013). The analysis of insulting practices – sticks and stones in the Croatian Parliament. In G. Kišiček, & I. Ž. Žagar (Eds.), *What do we know about the world? Rhetorical and argumentative perspectives* (pp. 226–244). Ljubljana: Pedagoški inštitut/Educational Research Institute.
-



**Sandra Lukšić**

*sluksic@ffst.hr*

Filozofski fakultet Sveučilišta u Splitu  
Hrvatska

## Retorička analiza dvaju motivacijskih govora u Hrvatskoj

### Sažetak

U radu se analiziraju dva motivacijska govora predsjedničkih kandidata Zorana Milanovića i Kolinde Grabar Kitarović tijekom kampanje za predsjedničke izbore u Hrvatskoj 2019. Naglasak je na uporabi retoričkih operacija i ideološkoga vokabulara kao sredstava uvjeravanja, budući da motivacijski govor ima za cilj uvjeriti publiku. Istraživanje započinje postavljanjem dvaju istraživačkih pitanja: 1) Koja načela strateške komunikacije koriste predsjednički kandidati kako bi uvjerali publiku u željeni smjer djelovanja? i 2) Koje elemente poticanja i koja retorička sredstva koristi svaki govornik u svom obraćanju javnosti? Kako bi se odgovorilo na postavljena pitanja u radu su primijenjena dva modela analize političkoga diskursa: model uvjeravanja i leksičko-argumentacijski model. Analiza se temelji na tri hipoteze: H1) Motivacijski govor, kao dio epideiktičke retorike, implementira elemente uvjeravanja, usmjeravanja, intenziteta i postojanosti te uključuje ne samo jezične, već i osobne i psihološke čimbenike, H2) Karakteristična struktura elemenata poticanja uključuje uporabu pozitivno i negativno nabijenih riječi i fraza za jačanje osjećaja (ne)pripadnosti skupini i H3) Moguće razlike između motivacijskih govora nisu rodno specifične, budući da su oba motivacijska govornika karijerni političari s različitim političkim opredjeljenjima. U okviru dvaju modela analize iz svakoga govora odabrano je 20 ulomaka koji predstavljaju 134 govorna iskaza. Rezultati pokazuju da (i) oba motivacijska govornika koriste razne mehanizme uvjeravanja kako bi napali protivnika(e), predstavili izbornu politiku, legitimizirali svoje političke pozicije ili definirali ideološke skupine pripadnosti te da (ii) postoje i sličnosti i razlike u retoričkom dizajnu analiziranih govora, koje otkrivaju različite obrasce prosuđivanja političke zbilje.

**Ključne riječi:** izbori, kampanja, govor, retorika, dizajn

