

Zeitschrift:	Bulletin suisse de linguistique appliquée / VALS-ASLA
Herausgeber:	Vereinigung für Angewandte Linguistik in der Schweiz = Association suisse de linguistique appliquée
Band:	- (2016)
Heft:	104: Neue Perspektiven in der empirischen Linguistik : Arbeiten von jungen Forschenden in der Schweiz = Nouvelles perspectives dans la linguistique empirique : travaux de jeunes chercheurs en Suisse = New perspectives in empirical linguistics : studies from young researchers in Switzerland
Artikel:	European citizenship policy between building collectives and appealing to individuals : a study of person deixis
Autor:	Putte, Thomas van de
DOI:	https://doi.org/10.5169/seals-978667

Nutzungsbedingungen

Die ETH-Bibliothek ist die Anbieterin der digitalisierten Zeitschriften auf E-Periodica. Sie besitzt keine Urheberrechte an den Zeitschriften und ist nicht verantwortlich für deren Inhalte. Die Rechte liegen in der Regel bei den Herausgebern beziehungsweise den externen Rechteinhabern. Das Veröffentlichen von Bildern in Print- und Online-Publikationen sowie auf Social Media-Kanälen oder Webseiten ist nur mit vorheriger Genehmigung der Rechteinhaber erlaubt. [Mehr erfahren](#)

Conditions d'utilisation

L'ETH Library est le fournisseur des revues numérisées. Elle ne détient aucun droit d'auteur sur les revues et n'est pas responsable de leur contenu. En règle générale, les droits sont détenus par les éditeurs ou les détenteurs de droits externes. La reproduction d'images dans des publications imprimées ou en ligne ainsi que sur des canaux de médias sociaux ou des sites web n'est autorisée qu'avec l'accord préalable des détenteurs des droits. [En savoir plus](#)

Terms of use

The ETH Library is the provider of the digitised journals. It does not own any copyrights to the journals and is not responsible for their content. The rights usually lie with the publishers or the external rights holders. Publishing images in print and online publications, as well as on social media channels or websites, is only permitted with the prior consent of the rights holders. [Find out more](#)

Download PDF: 08.02.2026

ETH-Bibliothek Zürich, E-Periodica, <https://www.e-periodica.ch>

European citizenship policy between building collectives and appealing to individuals: A study of person deixis

Thomas VAN DE PUTTE

King's College London, Department of Culture, Media and Creative Industries
Strand, WC2R 2LS, London, United Kingdom

University of Bern, Walter Benjamin Kolleg
Muesmattstrasse 12, CH-3000 Bern, 9, Switzerland
thomas_vandeputte@hotmail.com

In diesem Artikel wird der Gebrauch der deiktischen Ausdrücke "we" und "you" in einem Korpus analysiert, das aus zentralen politischen Reden und Broschüren anlässlich des Europäischen Jahrs der Bürgerinnen und Bürger 2013 besteht. Dies war ein politisches Projekt der Europäischen Kommission, um dem wachsenden Demokratiedefizit in Europa seit der ökonomischen Krise von 2008 entgegenzuwirken. Die Forschungsresultate zeigen das Wechselspiel zweier unterschiedlicher Strategien politischer Werbung, die darauf abzielen, den Bürger_innen die Institutionen der EU näherzubringen. Einerseits tendieren EU-Kommissionsmitglieder dazu, in politischen Reden ein adressateninklusives "we" einzusetzen, das auf die imaginierte Gemeinschaft der Europäer_innen referiert. Diese Eigen-Gruppe ("we") zeigt, anders als für viele Diskurse zu nationalen Identitäten typisch, keine explizit definierte Fremdgruppe ("them", "they"), sondern wird eher implizit von abstrakten Agenten oder Ereignissen wie "the crisis/die Krise" und "the globalized world/die globalisierte Welt" abgegrenzt. Die zweite politische Marketingstrategie, die von der Europäischen Kommission eingesetzt wird, orientiert sich stark an Werbesprachdiskursen, indem ein direkt adressierendes und appellierendes "you" benutzt wird, das darauf abzielt, das "we" (die Produzent_innen) mit dem "you" (die Konsument_innen) zusammenzubringen, ohne das "you" im "we" zu inkludieren.

Schlüsselwörter:

europäische Integration, Demokratiedefizit, Gruppen-Konstruktion, Personaldeixis.

1. Introduction

The term 'democratic deficit' has often been used to indicate the European Union's lack of democratic accountability. The application of the term to the EU context dates back to the months after the signing of the Maastricht Treaty (1992) which transformed the EU officially into a political union. In the last years, especially since the outburst of the economic crisis in 2008, the discussion about the democratic accountability of EU institutions has become more intense than ever before. But scholars do not always agree on what this 'deficit' entails. According to the different authors it is either non-existent (Dinan 2004; Moravscik 2002), a communication deficit (Meyer 1999), a constitutional deficit (Habermas 2013), a cultural deficit (Shore 2000), or a necessity for the EU to function as it does: as an "authoritarian consortium" (Varoufakis & Zizek 2015).

This perceived deficit has been of large interest to scholars analysing the construction of national identity from different fields in the humanities and social

sciences. Questions of identification with Europe (Bellier & Wilson 2000; Checkel & Katzenstein 2009) and formation of public spheres across Europe (Sicakkan 2013; Eder 2000; Erikson 2000) have been central in the respective debates. However, not much academic attention has been drawn to the European policies which attempt to tackle these problems of European democracy. Since the 1980s, different policy domains have been created to foster the emergence of an "imagined community" for Europe (Anderson 1982), and in this way connect citizens to European institutions. European citizenship policy is one of those policy domains. In 2013, the European Commission introduced the 'European Year of Citizens 2013' to empower European citizenship because it "(...) promotes a better understanding of the value of European integration as well as citizens' participation in the European project." (European Commission 2011).

This paper employs both quantitative and qualitative methods of discourse analysis to map in-group construction in political discourses of the European Commission before and during the European Year of Citizens 2013. Concretely, I apply both lexicometric methods and qualitative discourse analytical methods to analyse the deictic usage of first person and second person pronouns in speeches of José Manuel Barroso and Viviane Reding in 2012 about European identity, and in three brochures distributed to people during the European Year of Citizens 2013.

2. European Citizenship policy: from vertical to horizontal communication with citizens?

During the last decades, different policy domains have been created to foster the emergence of a European imagined community and increase the democratic legitimacy of European institutions. First of all, steps were taken to formally democratize the institutions. The first European elections, for example, were held in 1979. Since the 1980s, European institutions also engaged in classical 'identity politics' to connect citizens to institutions. The Addonino Report (1985), which reported ways to proceed to a 'People's Europe' to the European Council, especially stressed the importance of cultural policy to engage with Europe's problems of democracy. Also in the 1980s, classic nation building symbols were installed: the EU received a flag and an anthem. By the end of the 1990s, in the wake of a revival of constitutional patriotism (Habermas 2006), the idea of another national symbol was raised: a single European constitution. But once the European constitution was written, its application was turned down in French and Dutch referendums (2005).

After the financial crisis of 2007-2008, we have seen a shift in Europe's identity politics from the cultural policy domain to 'citizenship policy'. Citizenship policy entails all policy that protects and expands the rights of European citizens as they are written down in the European Treaties. But European Citizenship Commissioners also have the task to 'promote' these rights.

It is in this context that Citizenship Commissioner Viviane Reding named 2013 'European Year of Citizens'. In 2013, multiple projects were set up to make people aware of the benefits of their European citizenship especially in connection to free movement. Citizens' Dialogues, town hall meetings organized all over Europe in which Commissioners engaged in dialogues with citizens, were perhaps the most large-scale 'operationalization' of the European Year of Citizens. The choice for the dialogue form reflects a tendency within European institutions, at least on the level of argumentation in official communication, to evolve from top-down, vertical communication and promotion to more horizontal, dialogical forms of communication with citizens. In 1993, when Willy De Clerq wrote his (in)famous report on European communication and information policy, it was still unproblematic to openly argue that "(...) the European Union must be presented and promoted to the public as a 'good product' that has been developed and improved in a progressive process that started with the European Economic Community, and is now evolving into European Union (...)" (De Clerq 1993:13). Only 13 years later the European Commission argued for a completely different approach to (re)connect citizens with institutions: "(...) a fundamentally new approach - a decisive move away from one-way communication to reinforced dialogue, from an institution-centred to a citizen-centred communication, from a Brussels-based to a more decentralised approach." (European Commission 2006). In official documents, the European Commission confirms that the European Year of Citizens 2013 sets forth this tendency from vertical to horizontal communication. But when reading internal documents in preparation of the European Year of Citizens 2013, it becomes clear that vertical communication has never been far away: "by promoting a better understanding of the value of European integration and by demonstrating the concrete impact of Union policies in citizens' lives, the 2013 European Year would highlight the importance of citizens' participation in the European project as well as serve to strengthen tolerance, mutual understanding, social and societal cohesion and, thus, to promote European democracy." (European Commission 2012). In the same document, an ex-ante evaluation of the European Year of Citizens 2013, the authors admit the risk that the press could cover the European Year of Citizens 2013 as a promotional campaign.

The co-existence of both aspects of vertical communication and of horizontal communication is not only reflected on a content level in different policy documents, as I have shown here, but also on a discursive level. Different linguistic devices, such as first person and second person pronouns, may be used in order to connect citizens with institutions and to increase citizens' identification with these institutions. And consequently, using specific linguistic devices in discourses constitutes the extent to which the communication of the European Commission might be perceived as 'top-down' or 'dialogical'. In this paper, I will map and analyze deictically used pronouns indicating different groups. The analysis is executed in two corpora. The first corpus consists of two key speeches: José Manuel Barroso's State of the Union 2012, and Viviane Reding's

university lecture 'Why we need a United States of Europe now' in Passau (2012). The second corpus consists of three brochures distributed to people during the European Year of Citizens 2013. I will argue that both sets of documents incorporate two different discursive strategies to connect citizens to institutions. The speeches partly employ discursive models of national identity, with a strong addressee inclusive 'we', while the brochures borrow from classical advertising discourses utilizing a direct 'you' extensively.

Before comparing both corpora, some introductory remarks have to be made. Texts in both corpora address citizens, but there are some crucial differences between the two corpora. First of all, the corpora are chosen because of their place in the process of policy making. There is a big temporal distance between the moment the speeches were given and the moment brochures were distributed to people. The speeches that I will analyse were given in 2012, before the European Year of Citizens 2013 started. The brochures were distributed to people one year later, after a process of policy making within the European Commission that had processed the ideas reflected in speeches into concrete policy projects with specific aims, which are reflected in the brochures. Closely related to the place of both corpora in the policy making process are the different genres they incorporate. I argue here with Fairclough, Fowler and Chandler that genres serve the efficiency of communication (Chandler 2008: 6; Fowler 1989: 215). Genre is a "(...) socially ratified way of using language in connection with a particular type of social activity" (Fairclough 1995: 14). The usage of different genres in the process of policy making also facilitates ideological 'manipulation': "Genre constrains the possible ways in which a text is interpreted, guiding readers of a text towards a preferred reading (which is normally in accordance with the dominant ideology)" (Chandler 2008: 8).

This is especially true for different genres used in political campaigns. Political speeches are oral presentations of written text, mostly given by professional politicians, in order to persuade audiences (Reisigl 2008; Koller 2008). Brochures also have the aim to persuade, but they address the reader more personally than speeches, and they do not necessarily need to take the presence of multiple audiences into account. This is especially true for my specific corpus, in which brochures are either addressing 'young people', 'senior citizens' or 'workers'. Furthermore, they are less general in their aims, and attempt to reach more direct and concrete effects. Therefore, the brochure is a genre that functions best in the implementation phase of a policy project, while the political speech is a broader persuasive tool in other stages of policy making. As I will show in the analysis of both the speeches and brochures, the usage of these specific genres, with their internal 'rules', serve certain discursive strategies used by political and institutional actors, and influence the usage of person deixis.

3. Person deixis and groups: discourses of national identity and advertisement discourses

It might be useful to stress that a single speech or brochure does not possess an inherent ability to impose a certain preference for identification with the European Union on people. I adhere to the view that mechanisms of identification with political levels of government – be it local, regional, national or supranational – are part of people's *habitus* (Bourdieu 1990) and that these complex identifications are formed throughout a long term process of socialization within different public spheres and different societal fields. It is rather doubtful that single speeches or brochures will alter this process of socialization drastically. However, discourses on political identity can reveal how certain political actors construct in- and out-groups, which might be reproduced by other actors in other discourses. Additionally, different ways of in- and out-group creation by European politicians and European institutions might reveal their strategies aiming at connecting citizens more intensively to institutions in order to solve problems of democratic accountability. Wodak, De Cillia, Reisigl and Liebhart have distinguished constructive strategies, perpetuation and justification strategies, transformation strategies and dismantling destructive strategies as types of macro-strategies in the discursive construction of national identities (Wodak et al. 2009: 33). The political advertising strategies I am analysing here are 'constructive strategies': linguistic procedures to build a certain collective identity and establish a 'we-group'.

The first strategy employed by the European Commission has close links with discourses of national identity. In his seminal work *Banal Nationalism* (1995), Michael Billig was one of the first non-linguistic scholars to stress the importance of person deixis as it had been developed by linguists (Levinson 1983; Benveniste 1956), and especially the usage of first person plural pronouns, in national identity discourse: "The deixis of the homeland invokes the national 'we' and places 'us' within 'our' homeland." (Billig 1995: 107). The fact that deictic references require the existence of a common ground of understanding and a shared context between 'sender' and 'receiver', makes it an interesting factor to analyse common identification and groupist discourse. Linguists have broadened Billig's take on the 'we' by analysing the complexities of the interplay between the 'we' (in-group, speaker group) and other personal pronouns ('they', 'you'), tenses and modals in discourses of (national) identity (Wodak et al. 2009; Petersoo 2007). They build on Karl Bühler's notion of 'imagination-oriented deixis', in which the deictically used pronoun is 'pointing to something that is to be looked for and found not at places in the space of actual perception but rather at places within the totality of speech' (Bühler 1990: 137). National and supranational 'imagined communities', referred to with a deictically used 'we', certainly fit into this category.

If the personal pronoun 'we' is to refer to the in-group, then the third person plural 'they' is to refer to the out-group, or defining other. But, as Anna Duszak has

pointed out, in-group creation through the usage of 'we' opens up a lot of referential and pragmatic options (Duszak 2002: 6). The most crucial distinction for the analysis of person deixis in discourses of collective political identities is the inclusive-exclusive distinction. This inclusive-exclusive distinction could be both applied to the speaker as well as to the addressee (Wodak et al. 1999; Pavlidou 2014). In the context of this paper, which looks at the different interactive functions of 'we' and 'you', I will focus on the distinction between addressee inclusive- and exclusiveness. I will first describe the different referents of the 'we' and then look into the extent to which the addressees (the singular and plural 'you') are included or excluded from the 'we'.

When looking into the usage of deictically used pronouns in advertisement discourses, the second person strives for dominance with the first person when it comes to prominence. In advertising, the 'we' refers mostly to the producer or the manufacturer, while the 'you' refers mostly to the consumer (Cook 2001; Susinskiene 2013). The difference between the discourses of national identity that I have described above and advertisement discourses using second person pronouns lays in the 'addressee inclusive-exclusive' distinction. In the case of advertising, the 'we' (producer) is seldomly including the 'you' (consumer). It is the aim of advertising to connect consumers emotionally to products and producers, but not to include them in the in-group of the producer. The producer-consumer connection can be made both by using a one-to-one relationship (specific 'you' in the text) as well as by making general assumptions (empty, general 'you') (Fuertes-Oliveira 2001).

Advertisers tend to use the second person pronoun, both singular as well as plural, quite extensively in their ads. Multiple explanations and perspectives have been offered to explain this phenomenon. Susinskiene states that the usage of the pronoun 'you' in advertising is the most direct, and through making the consumer the grammatical subject, it stresses agency and individuality (Susinskiene 2013: 183). Cook compares the role of this ubiquitous 'you' to other discourses, and has discovered similarities between advertising and religious evangelism, official documents, political rhetoric, recipes, lyric poetry and songs (Cook 1992: 158).

4. Viviane Reding and José Manuel Barroso: who is the European 'we'?

During the policy making process leading towards the European Year of Citizens 2013, and during its execution, two speeches were constantly reproduced by the European Commission on its webpages and social media channels to refer to grand political visions to which the European Year of Citizens 2013 was anchored. The first one was José Manuel Barroso's State of the Union, which was delivered before the European Parliament on the 12th of September 2012. The second one was delivered by Viviane Reding,

European Commissioner for Justice, Citizenship and Fundamental Rights between 2010 and 2014, at the University of Passau on the 8th of November 2012. The speech was entitled 'Why we need a United States of Europe Now'. Both of these speeches tackle the political aspects of the future of the EU. A federal European state, although conceptualized slightly different in the two texts, is proposed as the solution in times of crisis.

Looking into the overall word frequency list of the two speeches (figure 1, obtained with Wmatrix 3 (Rayson 2003)), the high ranking of first person pronouns is significant. The first person plural is used very often: with a frequency of 1.51 times per one hundred words as a personal pronoun, and with a relative frequency of 0.74 as a possessive pronoun. The first person singular ('I') also ranks high (relative frequency of 0.63). In the genre of the political speech, the 'I' mostly refers to the speaker. The extensive usage of first person plural in speeches is thus a genre-specific feature (Knape 2000: 33). Note also the high ranking of 'United States' in the word frequency list, which is meant here in the context of the 'United States of Europe' and not in the sense of 'United States of America'. Especially Viviane Reding widely uses the concept of 'United States of Europe'.

Word	Frequency	Relative frequency
The	886	7.14
of	445	3.59
A	392	3.16
And	366	2.95
To	318	2.56
In	249	2.01
Is	205	1.65
That	203	1.64
We	187	1.51
European	161	1.30
Europe	151	1.22
For	139	1.12
It	128	1.03
This	116	0.94
Be	112	0.90
will	94	0.76
our	92	0.74

Word	Frequency	Relative frequency
not	88	0.71
I	78	0.63
union	73	0.59
can	73	0.59
As	71	0.57
Have	68	0.55
With	68	0.55
Are	63	0.51
On	62	0.50
united_states	60	0.48
But	59	0.48
Was	59	0.48
Political	51	0.41

Table 1: Word frequency in speeches corpus

Considering the comparison of first person pronouns with second and third person pronouns (see below), we see that the second and third person are used to a lesser extent than the first person. Each of them are mentioned to an equal extent, although some objections have to be made about the third person plural ('they', 'their'). 'They' and 'their' do not necessarily have to refer to people, but can also refer to non-human referents, such as laws, regulations, etc. Secondly, the usage of the third person plural is very often used anaphorically, not deictically, referring to a concrete word mentioned earlier in the text or utterance (Halliday 2004: 534-535). As I will show later, 'they' or 'them' is used very often as an anaphoric reference to the word 'citizens' mentioned earlier in the text, both in speeches as well as in brochures.

Word	Frequency	Relative frequency
We	187	1.51
Our	92	0.74
I	78	0.63
You	37	0.30
Their	35	0.28
They	24	0.19

Word	Frequency	Relative frequency
His	20	0.16
Us	16	0.13
Me	12	0.10
My	10	0.08
Your	10	0.08
He	9	0.07
Them	8	0.06
she, her	0	0.00

Table 2: Word frequency list pronouns in speeches corpus

Only counting lexical units to map and explain the usage of person deixis is not sufficient to explain and analyse group construction in discourse. While the insights gained from the quantitative analysis have given us a broad understanding of pronoun use in the two speeches, the following fine-grained qualitative analysis, taking into account co-text and context, further reveals how the speakers made specific use of such pronouns in order to construct an 'imagined community of Europeans'.

The most important context related factor in the analysis of the pronouns used in these two concrete speeches depends on the choice of different addressees by the speaker, which has a serious impact on the meaning of the pronouns 'we', 'you' and 'they'. Political speeches often address multiple audiences. Goffman has made a useful distinction between the ratified audience on the one hand, which is physically present in the room where the speech is held, and those audiences that listen to what is being said to the ratified audience in different mediated forms (Goffman 1981). José Manuel Barroso and Viviane Reding have addressed two different ratified audiences in their speeches. Barroso's State of the Union addresses directly all the members of the European Parliament. But through mediated forms of communication, Barroso also addresses different other audiences outside of the parliamentary arena: European citizens, non-European policy makers, etc. For Reding, university students in Passau serve as a ratified audience. But through video recordings published on Youtube and the degree to which the European Commission has reproduced her speech in textual form on websites, she is also able to address wider audiences than the ratified audience of university students.

Taking this into account, José Manuel Barroso uses a triple 'we', which appears across the text: an addressee inclusive 'we' for all Europeans, an addressee exclusive 'we' referring to the European Commission as an institutional actor, and an addressee inclusive 'we' for all European politicians.

The most commonly used is an addressee inclusive 'we' addressing 'all Europeans':

- (1) 'What I demand and what I present to **you** today is a Decisive Deal for Europe. A decisive deal to project **our** values, **our** freedom and **our** prosperity into the future of a globalized world.'
- (2) 'The starting point for a new thinking for Europe is to really draw all the consequences of the challenges that **we** are facing and that are fundamentally changing **our** world.'

The 'you' connected to this 'we' could be referring both to the ratified audience of Members of the European Parliament (MEPs), as well as to a larger 'you' as 'all Europeans'. In both cases, the 'you' is included in the 'we'.

Interestingly, this European 'we' is not explicitly defined in interaction with a 'they', as is the case in most discourses of national identity. Instead, in the two speeches analysed here, the defining 'other' is more implicit and abstract. The European defining 'other' seems to be primarily a non-human phenomenon. This finding stands in contrast with previous studies (Wodak 2003) which show that the United States and Japan are commonly used by EU officials as defining 'others'. Recurrent non-human implicit others are 'the globalized world' and the 'crisis':

- (3) 'When we speak about the crisis, and we all speak about the crisis, have we really drawn all the consequences for our action? When we speak about globalisation, and we all speak a lot about globalisation, have we really considered its impact on the role of each of our Member States?'

The lack of an explicit 'human' defining other in these discourses of European identity is one of the features that distinguishes them from discourses of national(istic) identity. I would argue that the main reason for this absence is the strong connection between ideas of European identity and ideas of peace and anti-nationalism. Especially by European federalist institutions, the project of European integration is mostly presented as a political project to prevent the danger of exclusive nationalist ideologies gaining ground. This normative ground of the European project prevents public discourses of European identity produced by the European Commission from employing mechanisms inherent to national and nationalist discourses of identity. The explicit creation of an out-group, for instance by means of a third person plural, is such a necessity in order for a national(istic) identity discourse to function. But because discursive in-group construction cannot exist without out-group construction, European policymakers and their spin doctors have sought for more implicit, non-human 'out-groups' and defining others that could be incorporated in discourses of European identity without violating the normative link between European identity and anti-nationalism.

The second 'we' used by Barroso is an addressee exclusive 'we' referring to the European Commission as an institutional agent in the process of policy making:

(4) 'You are receiving the letter I addressed to the President of the European Parliament, and that sets out the Commission's immediate priorities. We will discuss them with you before adopting the Commission Work Programme later in the autumn.'

In this case, the 'you' refers exclusively to the European Parliament as another institutional actor, which is not a part of the 'we' that refers to the European Commission.

The third 'we' used by Barroso is an addressee inclusive 'we' referring to the unity of all European politicians:

(5) 'Over the last four years, we have made many bold decisions to tackle this systemic crisis. But despite all these efforts, our responses have not yet convinced citizens, markets or our international partners.'

There is no explicit 'you' interacting with this third 'we', but through the usage of a third person pronoun 'they' or 'them' or through mentioning them concretely, 'citizens' are the out-group on the basis of which this in-group of European politicians defines itself. Using the third person plural to address citizens excludes them from the ratified audience, and confines the audience to the people in the room, Members of the European Parliament in this case.

Viviane Reding's 'we' replicates the categories of Barroso. She uses an addressee inclusive 'we' referring to 'the Europeans', and an addressee exclusive 'we' referring to the European Commission as an institutional actor. Reding also uses an addressee exclusive 'we' that refers to the in-group of politicians as such. This 'we' is very similar to Barroso's third 'we' (example 5), but contains some interesting peculiarities. First of all, it broadens Barroso's 'we as European politicians' to 'we as politicians', reinforcing the distinction between politicians and citizens, which is supposed to be bridged in the European Year of Citizens 2013:

(6) 'When people ask **politicians** today "What will become of Europe?" or "Where is European integration heading?", we usually give an evasive answer.'

Interestingly, and this is different than in Barroso's case, Reding's ratified audience members are not politicians, but citizens. She delivered her speech to university students at the University of Passau in Germany. The extensive usage of an addressee exclusive 'we' that constructs an in-group of politicians and an out-group of citizens, might be counter-intuitive when conceiving of a speech that is meant to connect citizens (Reding's ratified audience) with institutions.

Apart from this triple 'we', that functions generally similarly as in Barroso's discourse, Reding also employs a national 'we', seemingly to position herself as a 'normal citizen' in front of audience members that are not politicians. When she gives personal examples in her speech, she argues from a national, Luxemburgish perspective:

(7) 'As a Luxembourger I can well understand that. In my home country, borders are an everyday experience. So we Luxembourgers are in live contact with Europe practically every day.'

(8) '(...) **our** Luxembourg Prime Minister Jean Claude Juncker (...)'

Viviane Reding's 'you' has a double meaning. The first 'you' refers directly to the ratified audience of students in Passau:

(9) 'It was no accident that the 1985 Schengen Agreement on free movement in Europe was signed in Luxembourg, on a boat on the Moselle, right on the Luxembourg-French-German border. So here in **your** beautiful city of Passau, with its three rivers, I feel rather at home.'

The extension of the second 'you' is broader and more general, including the ratified audience but also referring to non-ratified audiences outside of the room. Quite parallel to Barroso's usage of 'you' (example 1), this second you includes 'all Europeans'. Given the context of Reding's speech, with a ratified audience of university students, Barroso's 'you' referring to the Members of the European Parliament is obviously not used.

Reding's usage of the third person plural functions similarly as in Barroso's discourse (example 5). In case it is used to refer to people, it is mostly used anaphorically and refers to the word 'citizens' used previously in the text:

(10) 'The **citizens**' centre is often the place that people in the area go to when **they** encounter day-to-day cross-border problems.'

Multiple conclusions can be drawn from this brief analysis. First of all, as previous research has shown, in-group and out-group construction in political speeches depends to a large extent on the different audiences addressed. In the two speeches I have analysed, groups could be constructed on the basis of the concrete connection between the speaker and its ratified audience that is physically present, or could also include or exclude non-ratified audiences that are exposed to the speech in a mediated way. Apart from those audience-dependent factors, some more specific conclusions can be drawn from the analysis of these two speeches. Firstly, the first person plural ('we') is the pronoun that is used most often in both of these discourses, but as referent to different actors. Secondly, when Barroso and Reding address a collective, European 'we', which includes both the ratified audience as well as non-ratified audiences, it does not explicitly interact with a defining other ('they', 'them'). In this paper, I have explained this choice by referring to strong ideas of peace and anti-nationalism which are linked to euro-federalism. Thirdly, in the speeches I have analysed, 'citizens' are referred to in the first person (as being part of the collective European 'we'), in the second person as well as in the third person. This multiple-addressing can both function inclusively and connect citizens to institutions, as it is the case through using a collective European 'we', as well as institutionalizing and reinforcing the 'gap' between citizens and institutions, as is the case when citizens are exclusively referred to as 'you', or 'they'. When looking at the brochures provided to citizens during the European Year of Citizens 2013, this strategy of addressing alters drastically.

5. Information brochures of the European Year of Citizens 2013: Where is the European 'we'?

The second corpus that has been analysed in this study entails three 'Campaign Toolboxes' designed and distributed by the European Commission as brochures. These toolboxes were distributed as brochures to people during the European Year of Citizens 2013 to promote European citizenship rights. The three toolboxes address three different audiences: 'Young People', 'Senior Citizens', and 'Workers'.

Looking into word frequencies of pronouns in the corpus of brochures, the picture is completely different compared to the political speeches. Instead of first person pronouns, it is the second person that leads the word frequency lists: 'you' is used 175 times (relative frequency 3.06), 'your' is used 125 times (relative frequency 2.19).

Word	Frequency	Relative frequency
The	206	3.60
To	205	3.59
You	175	3.06
And	164	2.87
EU	149	2.61
In	138	2.41
A	130	2.27
Your	125	2.19
Of	118	2.06
Country	113	1.98
For	101	1.77
Right	87	1.52
Or	84	1.47
As	70	1.22
On	55	0.96
More	55	0.96
Here	55	0.96
Information	53	0.93
Can	48	0.84
Are	42	0.73

Word	Frequency	Relative frequency
Another	39	0.68
If	38	0.66
That	37	0.65
Rights	37	0.65
Have	32	0.56
Work	31	0.54
An	30	0.52
Is	29	0.51
http	28	0.49
Same	27	0.47

Table 3: Word frequency list brochures corpus

When comparing to other pronouns, we see that in the brochures almost only second person pronouns are used. The first person is completely absent, and only in some cases the third person plural is used.

Word	Frequency	Relative Frequency
You	175	3.06
Your	125	2.19
It	10	0.17
Its	9	0.16
They	6	0.10
Them	4	0.07
We	0	0.00
Our	0	0.00
I/me	0	0.00
He	0	0.00
She	0	0.00
His	0	0.00
Her	0	0.00

Table 4: Word frequency list pronouns in brochures corpus

Exemplary for the usage of the 'you' in the brochures is the overarching slogan of the European Year of Citizens 2013: "It's about Europe, it's about YOU". In

this slogan the 'you' refers to the citizens, and recalls advertising strategies in which the second person is meant to be direct, and appealing to the consumer/addressee. From the English version of the slogan, it is not possible to determine if the 'you' is singular or plural, and consequentially addresses individual citizens or all citizens at once. Looking into other language versions of the slogan, the European Commission has chosen polite forms of addressing in some cases: 'Vous' in French, 'U' in Dutch, 'Sie' in German. This choice might both reflect a certain sense of 'seriousness' given to the topic and the EU, and show a certain degree of respect for the citizen addressed. But in other languages, such as Italian and Swedish, the second person singular has been used. Language internal factors might have influenced the decision of the translator. The usage of the second person singular 'tu' in Italian is more common than in the languages cited above (Renzi 1995). In other languages, such as Swedish, this choice to use the second person plural might have depended on other factors taken into account by the translator.

In the brochures, this 'you' referring to citizens has been reproduced. However, that 'you' can refer to 'all citizens' or to a specific subgroup of citizens to which the brochure is addressed: 'Young People', 'Workers', or 'Senior Citizens':

- (11) 'You can choose to complete university studies or you can go on a short-term exchange programme. The EU makes this possible for **you**!'
- (12) 'Right to move and reside freely within the EU and not to be discriminated against on grounds of **your** nationality'

Further analysis demonstrates that 'you' is mostly subject of the sentence, which is so in 160 cases out of 175. This might lead to the interpretation that this is meant to stress the agency of the 'you': the citizen/consumer. The verb collocated with the 'you' is mostly used in a present, active tense, mostly simple present: 116 times out of 175 times. The verbs most frequently collocated with the 'you' are 'can' (36 times out of 175), as in the example above, and 'have' (22 times out of 175), which also indicates agency and potential of the 'you'.

When focusing on how the possessive pronoun 'your' is used in the brochures, we see that the noun mostly connected to 'your' is 'right' or 'rights' (33 times out of 125 times). The direct aim of the European Year of Citizens 2013 was increasing the knowledge about the European citizenship rights, especially those rights connected to free movement of people. The relative high occurrence of the collocation 'your' + 'right' is easily explained on that basis. The stress, on a content level, on free movement and the European citizenship rights connected to it, are further exemplified when looking further into collocation patterns of 'your' and other nouns. 'Your' + home country (or other combinations of words referring to home country, such as 'country of origin' or just 'country') appears 8 out of the 125 times 'your' is used, and 'your' + host

country (or equivalents such as 'country of residence') occurs 9 times out of the 125 times the possessive pronoun 'you' is used.

The first person plural 'we' and the third person 'they' are largely absent in the brochures. As a consequence, explicit in- and out-group creation through the usage of pronouns is also absent in the discourse. Only the second person pronoun, whose referent might be part of the in-group as well as the out-group, is present. Searching for a more implicit in-group in the discourses in brochures of the European Commission, might be done through looking at how the author of the text is represented in the text:

(13) 'You can choose to complete university studies or you can go on a short-term exchange programme. The EU makes this possible for you! Don't miss the chance to study in another EU country, discover new cultures and create your own network in view of a future job.'

Although the 'European Commission' is the official author and distributor of these brochures, it is clear that who is 'speaking' to those people reading the brochures is the 'EU', or 'Europe' such as in the slogan. Very similar to advertising discourse it is this 'Europe' or the 'EU' that connects to its consumer through the usage of a direct and appealing 'you'. This synecdochic use of 'Europe', which serves as a *totum pro parte* to represent a collective agent, will form the object of further study.

6. Conclusion

Being constantly reminded of its 'ivory tower' and 'bureaucratic' perception, officials in European institutions have felt the need to (re)connect to citizens since decades. But especially since the economic crisis of 2008, the European Commission has set up initiatives to reach out to citizens. The European Year of Citizens 2013 has been the largest of those initiatives so far.

Through researching person deixis in a selection of texts that have been produced in connection with the European Year of Citizens 2013, we are able to analyze how the European Commission tries to connect to its citizens. The findings presented in this paper suggest that the European Commission employs multiple 'constructive strategies' to enable these connections. In key speeches of the European Year of Citizens 2013, José Manuel Barroso and Viviane Reding tended to use a European collective 'we' which includes 'you' the citizens. The prominence of the European 'we' in these two speeches is significant when compared to other 'we'-s that are used. When compared to national 'we'-s the European 'we', at least in the speeches of Barroso and Reding, has no explicit out-group. More implicit, non-human phenomena, such as 'crisis' and 'globalized world', serve as defining others. A second strategy, employed in brochures distributed during the European Year of Citizens 2013, is the exhaustive usage of a direct and appealing 'you' which is reminiscent of classical advertising strategies.

As I have shown in this paper, the reasons for this discrepancy are manifold. First of all, the function and timing of these two discourses in the process of policy making is different. Although both of the corpora consist of persuasive texts, they serve different aims. The speeches I have analyzed present 'grand visions' on European citizenship. They were held before the phase of policy implementation and address multiple audiences. Consequentially, they also construct different in- and out-groups and refer to different 'groups' when using pronouns. Brochures serve more concrete goals during policy execution and address specific target groups or individual readers. As a result, their persuasiveness might be constituted by a direct and appealing 'you' referring to the addressee of the brochure.

The findings in this paper offer impetuses for further research. Brochures and speeches are only two genres of the broad range of genres employed in the policy making process to reach certain goals. In the case of the European Year of Citizens 2013, Citizens' Dialogues have functioned as very important means for the European Commission to connect to citizens. Interestingly, the timing of these dialogues in the policy making process is the same as the one of the brochures. In further research, I will analyze whether the usage of person deixis in the dialogues bears similarity with the usage in speeches or brochures. Furthermore, the concept of a dialogue allows us to study the reception and reproduction of groups constructed by European Commissioners as citizens participating in the dialogues. Such an analysis of discourse reproduction could lead to results about the effect of policy projects such as the European Year of Citizens 2013. A second pathway for further research is broadening the corpus from those texts that are directed towards citizens to texts that are directed towards other institutions and/or expert audiences such as journalists and think tanks. In between the moment the political speeches that I have analysed were held and the moment brochures were published, different officials in the European Commission have processed these ideas in multiple forms. First as working papers, then as ex-ante evaluations, inter-institutional communication, and finally policy publications. In order to see how officials process 'grand ideological narratives' into concrete policy projects, and to understand how they impact group construction during the implementation phase of the research, it might be very useful to research how group construction evolves through policy making in its purely institutional phase. Lastly, I have stressed the fact that not only pronouns are important linguistic devices in discourses of collective identity, but also other devices might play crucial roles. Metonymy, and especially the synecdoche as the ultimate figure of speech of representation, are crucial in naming collective actors such as 'Europe'.

REFERENCES

Anderson, B. (2006). *Imagined communities. Reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism*. London: Verso.

Benveniste, E. (1956). *La nature des pronoms*. The Hague: Mouton.

Bellier, I. & Wilson, T.M. (2000). *An anthropology of the European Union. Building, imagining and experiencing the new Europe*. Oxford: Berg.

Billig, M. (1995). *Banal nationalism*. London: Sage.

Bourdieu, P. (1990). *The logic of practice*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Bühler, K. (1990). *Theory of language. The representational function of language*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing.

Chandler, D. (2008). *An introduction to genre theory*, http://visual-memory.co.uk/daniel/Documents/intgenre/chandler_genre_theory.pdf, last consulted on 27.11.2015.

Checkel, J.T. & Katzenstein, P.J. (2009). *European identity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cook, G. (2001). *The discourse of advertising*. Routledge: London.

De Cillia, R., Reisigl, M. & Wodak, R. (1999). The discursive construction of national identities. *Discourse and Society*, 10(2), 149-173.

De Clerq, W., et al. (1993). *Reflection on information and communication policy of the European Community*. EU European Parliament Document.

Dinan, D. (2004). *Europe recast. A history of European Union*. Hounds Mills: Palgrave Macmillan.

Duszak, A., (2002). *Us and others*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Eder, K. & Kanter, C. (2000). Transnationale Resonanzstrukturen in Europa. Eine Kritik der Rede vom 'Öffentlichkeitsdefizit'. *Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie*, 40, 277-305.

Eder, K., Kanter, C. & Trenz, H.-J. (2000). *Transnationale Öffentlichkeiten und die Strukturierung politischer Kommunikation in Europa*. Antrag auf Forderung eines Forschungsvorhabens im Rahmen des DFG-Schwerpunkts Regieren in Europa.

European Commission (2006). *White paper on communication policy*.

Fairclough, N. (1995). *Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language*. London: Longman.

Fuertes-Olivera, P. et al. (2001). Persuasion and advertising English: Metadiscourse in slogans and headlines. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 33, 1291-1307.

Fowler vor Fuertes, A. (1989). Genre. In E. Barnouw (ed.), *International encyclopedia of communications, volume 2*, (pp. 215-217), New York: Oxford University Press.

Goffman, E. (1981). *Forms of talk*. University of Pennsylvania Press.

Habermas, J. (2006). Nation-state or global state? In B.E. Brown (ed.), *Comparative politics. Notes and readings* (pp. 114-123), Belmont California: Thomson.

Habermas, J. (2013). *Democracy, solidarity and the European crisis*. <http://www.kuleuven.be/communicatie/evenementen/evenementen/jurgen-habermas/democracy-solidarity-and-the-european-crisis>, last consulted on 15.11.2013

Halliday, M.A.K. (2004). *An Introduction to functional grammar*. London: Arnold.

Imig, D. & Tarrow, S. (2001). *Contentious Europeans: protests and politics in an integrating Europe*. Lanham: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers.

Koller, V., & Wodak, R. (2008). Handbook of communication in the public sphere. In R. Wodak & V. Koller (eds.), *Handbooks of Applied Linguistics, volume 4* (pp. 1-17). Berlin: De Gruyter.

Knape, J. (2000). *Was ist Rethorik?* Leipzig: Reclam.

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

Meyer, C. (1999). Political legitimacy and the invisibility of politics: exploring the European Union's communication deficit. *Journal of Common Market Studies*, 37(4), 617-639.

Moravcsik, A. (2002). In defence of the "democratic deficit": reassessing the legitimacy of the European Union. *Journal of Common Market Studies*, 40(4), 603-634.

Pavlidou, T.-S. (2014). *Constructing collectivity. 'we' across languages and contexts*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Petersoo, P. (2007). What does 'we' mean? National deixis in the media. *Journal of Language and Politics*, 6(3), 419-436.

Rayson, P. (2003). *Matrix: A statistical method and software tool for linguistic analysis through corpus comparison. Ph.D. thesis*. Lancaster University.

Rayson, P. (2008). From key words to key semantic domains. *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics*, 13(4), 519-549.

Reisigl, M. (2008). Analyzing political rhetoric. In R. Wodak & M. Krzyżanowski (eds.), *Qualitative Discourse Analysis in the Social Sciences* (pp. 96-120). London: Palgrave.

Renzi, L. (1995). La deissi personale e il suo uso sociale. In L. Renzi, G. Salvi & A. Cardinaletti (eds.), *Grande grammatica italiana di consultazione volume 3* (pp. 350-375). Bologna: Il Mulino.

Shore, C. (2000). *Building Europe. The cultural politics of European integration*. London: Routledge.

Sicakkan, H. (2013). *Linking the European Union with citizens. evaluation of EU policies aiming to create a democratic European public sphere*. Eurosphere.

Susinskiene, H. (2013). The usage of deixis in advertising slogans related to fragrance. *Acta humanitarica universitatis Saulensis*, 17, 179-187.

Triandafyllidou, A., Wodak, R. & Kryżanowski, M. (2009). *The European public sphere and the media*. New York: Palgrave.

Weiler, J.H.H. (1995). After Maastricht: community legitimacy in post 1992 Europe. In W.J. Adams (ed.), *Singular Europe* (p. 11-44). University of Michigan Press.

Wodak, R., De Cillia, R., Reisigl, M. & Liebhart, K. (1999/2009). *The discursive construction of national identity*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Wodak, R. (2003). Europaïsche Sprachenpolitik und Europaïsche Identität. In H. van Uffelen, M. E. Weissenböck & C. van Baalen (eds), *Sprache und Identität* (pp. 249-261). Vienna: Edition Praesens.

Zizek, S. & Varoufakis, Y. (2015). *Europe is kaput. Long live Europe!* London, Southbank Centre, 16.11.2015.

