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Abstract

Political campaigns are dynamic struggles between candidates to define the informational context for voters. Early studies (Kaid, 1981, 1994a, 1994b) suggested that political advertising has cognitive and behavioral effects on voters. It communicates the brand promise of a candidate blending functional and emotional benefits that voters gain from their relationships with a candidate.

This study, based on Lakoff’s Framing Model (LFM, 2004), proposes a pragmatic model for the analysis of a political election rhetoric. Within this pragmatic model, it is shown that in such a rhetoric the process of choosing variables of mental and psychological strategies is used. Such a process can be understood as the outcome of producers’ choice making, dynamic negotiation and linguistic adaptation. The analysis of a political discourse makes it possible to see how frames are powerful rhetorical entities that motivate audience to filter their perceptions of the world. It presents evidences to the claim that a candidate’s speech using ‘rhetoric of fear’ appeals to the audience. Contradicted reactions appear: some audience react feeling ‘fearful’ while others respond feeling ‘protected’ or ‘heard’ that a candidate is listening to their concerns and willing to fulfil them. It also shows how the institutionalized use of strategy language has implications: some of these emerge from the genre itself while others derive from situation; specific choices.
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1. Introduction

Politics is a struggle for power in order to put certain political, economic and social ideas into practice. In this process, language plays a crucial role. A political action is prepared, accompanied, influenced and played by language. In this season, in which the United States is highly engaged with presidential campaigns, the shaping of arguments to appeal to the citizens is charged. Each of the major political parties, Democrat and Republican, is writing rhetoric to shape arguments to appeal to voters’ hearts and minds. Media Republican show presidential nominee Donald Trump’s speech in which he formally accepted the nomination, writing that it was “intended to instill fear and terrify people,” that it painted the U.S. as a “dystopia” and a “land of horrors”.

1.1 The Objective of the Study

The research aims at conducting a psycholinguistic study of a political candidate’s rhetoric of fear in his presidential election speech within the framework of Lakoff’s LFM. It intends to examine how Language is influenced of such “frames”, to shape his audience’s thought and behavior.

1.2 The Significance of the Study

This study tackles a variety of language, i.e., a political language used in a specific context in the domain of different disciplines: applied linguistics; in the level of semantics, pragmatics, stylistics and psychology.

1.3 Limitations of Study

The study is a psycholinguistic analysis of the Nomination Acceptance Speech of the candidate, Donald Trump, and the reaction of the Editorials after the acceptance of his speech, from major news sources (e.g., Wall Street Journal, New York Times, and Washington Post) within the framework of LFM.

2. Literature Review

The related studies reviewed are classified into two categories: the first is studies on Trump’s use of ‘politics of
fear’ and the second on the LFM proposed by Lakoff.

2.1 Studies on Trump’s Use of ‘Politics of Fear’

2.1.1 Lakoff’s Books and Articles

In *Moral Politics* (2002, pp. 143–176), ‘It is a blend of cognitive science and political analysis. It considers the conceptual metaphors that Lakoff sees as present in the minds of American “liberals” and “conservatives”. Lakoff argues that the differences in opinions between liberals and conservatives follow from the fact that they subscribe with different strength to two different central metaphors about the relationship of the state to its citizens. Both, he claims, see governance through metaphors of the family. Conservatives would subscribe more strongly and more often to a model that he calls the “strict father model” and has a family structured around a strong, dominant “father” (government), and assumes that the “children” (citizens) need to be disciplined to be made into responsible “adults” (morality, self, financing). Once the “children” are “adults”, though, the “father” should not interfere with their lives: the government should stay out of the business of those in society who have proved their responsibility. In contrast, Lakoff argues that liberals place more support in a model of the family, which he calls the “nurturant parent model”, based on “nurturant values”, where both “mothers” and “fathers” work to keep the essentially good “children” away from “corrupting influences” (pollution, social injustice, poverty, etc.).’ (Lakoff, Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia)

In *Don’t Think of an Elephant: Know Your Values and Frame the Debate*, Lakoff (2004) explains ‘how conservatives think, and how to counter their arguments. He outlines in detail the traditional American values that progressives hold, but are often unable to articulate. He also breaks down the ways conservatives have framed the issues, and provides examples of how progressives can reframe the debate.’ (Lakoff, Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia)

In *Thinking Points: Communicating Our American Values and Vision*, Lakoff (2006) ‘not only offers a deep understanding of the progressive worldview, but also reveals the nature of the so-called political center.’ (Lakoff, Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia)

In *The Political Mind: Why You Can’t Understand 21st Century American Politics with an 18th century Brain*, Lakoff (2008) ‘spells out what cognitive science has discovered about reason, and reveals that human reason is far more interesting than we thought it was.’ (Lakoff, Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia)

In *Metaphors We Live By*, Lakoff and Johnson state (1980) that ‘metaphors are not just matters of language, but are used extensively in reasoning and understanding. Typically, an abstract domain is understood metaphorically in terms of a more concrete domain. To a large degree, they argue, the human conceptual system is metaphorical. They have led many readers to a new recognition of how profoundly metaphors not only shape our view of life in the present but also set up the expectations that determine what life will be in the future. Lakoff argues that in order to persuade a political audience of one side of an argument or another, the facts must be presented through a rhetorical frame. It is argued that, without the frame, the facts of an argument become lost on an audience, making the argument less effective. The rhetoric of politics uses framing to present the facts surrounding an issue in a way that creates the appearance of a problem at hand that requires a solution.’ (Lakoff, Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia)

In *Why Trump Got the Republican Nomination: It's the Metaphors Drawing Us In*, Lakoff states that ‘the job of Trump’s supporters and other radical Republican extremists is to impose their view of strict father morality in all areas of life. They do not need to name policies, because the Republicans already of hundreds of policies ready to go. They just need to be in complete power. Unconscious thought works by certain basic mechanisms. Trump uses them instinctively to turn people’s brains toward what he wants absolute authority, money, power, celebrity.’ (Lakoff, Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia)

2.1.2 Studies by Political Analysts

Editorials

In his article *Media Call out Trump’s ‘Campaign of Fear’ After Convention Speech*, Hargis (2016) mentions that Donald Trump has intended to sow fear in America’s voters: Fear of uncontrolled crime and terrorism that “threaten our very way of life.” Fear of immigrants, including refugees from the civil war in Syria. Fear of Muslims, although instead of the “total and complete shutdown of Muslims entering the United States”. Finally, Trump warned that Americans should fear Hillary Clinton, whom he described as a corrupt politician whose legacy as secretary of State amounted to “death, destruction and weakness.

In his article *How Donald Trump plays the politics of fear*, Zelizer (2015) stated, “Playing to fears can help
candidates gain attention from the news media and the electorate, and it offers an easy way to depict their opposition as incapable of leading. According to a recent New York Times/CBS News poll, fears of terrorism have boosted Trump’s position.

In his article *The scariest thing about Trump’s primary dominance: The GOP still doesn’t understand the monster it created*, Parton (2015) mentioned that Trump declared victory with an odd admission of what really turns him on about running for president, when he said, “It’s tough, it’s nasty, it’s mean, it’s vicious…. it’s beautiful. When one wins, it’s beautiful.” He is very, very good at being mean, nasty and vicious. “Nobody can say that isn’t working for him.”

2.2 Studies on Framing Theory

In *Lakoff: IN Politics, Progressives Need to Frame Their Values*, Karlin (2014) stated that framing means, “Communication itself comes with a frame. The elements of the Communication Frame include a message, an audience, a messenger, a medium, images, a context, and especially, higher, level moral and conceptual frames. The choice of language is, of course, vital, but it is vital because language evokes frames—moral and conceptual frames. Frames form a system.”

In *Framing the issues: Lakoff tells how conservatives use language to dominate politics*, Powell (2003) stated that Lakoff points out that Language always comes with what is called “framing”. Every word is defined relative to a conceptual framework. If you have something like “revolt”, that implies a population that is being ruled unfairly, or assumes it is being ruled unfairly, and that they are throwing off their rulers, which would be considered a good thing. That is a frame.

In his article *Media Framing of a Civil Liberties Conflict and Its Effect on Tolerance*, Nelson et al. (1997) considered framing to ‘the process by which a communication source … defines and constructs a political issue or public controversy” (1997b, p. 567).

In his book *Deflating the Elephant: Framed Messages Behind Conservative Dialogue*, Lakoff (2009) examines the lexicon of conservative politicians in the U.S. and how phrases such as “pro-life”, “no child left behind” and “the war on terror” dominated the national dialogue with polarizing results. Language is influenced by what is known as “framing”, meaning every word is connected to a concept. How those concepts are used and repeated have proven to shape ideology, behavior and thought, process.

3. Method

3.1 The Model of the Study

3.1.1 Lakoff’s LFM

The study is a psycholinguistic analysis of the Nomination Acceptance Speech of the candidate Donald Trump (Republican) and the Editorials’ reactions to his acceptance speech, from major news sources (e.g., Wall Street Journal, New York Times, Washington Post) within the framework of Lakoff’s LFM.

3.2 The Research Questions

Quantitative research questions:

Q 1: How frequency does Trump use the ‘rhetoric of fear’ in his political speech?

Qualitative Research questions:

Q 2: Why does Trump use a political ‘rhetoric of fear’?

Q 3: What topics does Trump deal with in creating a political ‘rhetoric of fear’?

Q 4: What are the parts of Trump’s speech that trigger fear in the audience?

Q 5: Does Trump use other stylistic strategies to support using the ‘rhetoric of fear’?

3.3 Research Assumptions

Framing is used by a political candidate employing his linguistic repertoire to construct his ‘rhetoric of fear’. Frames are powerful rhetorical entities that induce audience to filter their perceptions of the world in particular ways essentially making some aspects of their multi-dimensional reality more noticeable than other aspects.

A political discourse is analyzed using LFM to have an analysis as evidence to the claim that Trump’s speech using ‘rhetoric of fear’ appeals to the audience. Some may respond feeling ‘fearful’ while others may respond feeling ‘protected’ or ‘heard’ that a candidate is listening to their concerns and going to do something about them.
Audience is a key to the application of LFM since framing of any rhetoric is affecting in moving audience if it is understood who the audience is.

3.4 Data Collection
The data of this study is collected from the presidential election speech of the candidate Donald Trump’s.

3.5 Data Analysis
The study is tackled through a thoroughly linguistic contextual analysis of the presidential election rhetoric from the perspective of LFM perspective in order to get to know how a candidate makes use of the ‘rhetoric of fear’ to make her argument more persuasive and appealing.

3.6 Procedures
Qualitative: Critical discourse analysis for Donald Trump’s acceptance speech
a. Language of fear—what is the language? Who is the target in the fear, producing statements ad premises? Why is it effective?
b. Evidence of exaggeration and omission (e.g., what does the candidate misrepresent or not include in order to make his argument more persuasive, appealing, and compelling?).
Quantitative: Count of frequency of particular words and phrases that carry the message of fear.

Table 1. The analysis of the nomination acceptance speech of the candidate Donald Trump within the framework of LFM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Discourse</th>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>How the theme is framed by Trump</th>
<th>The effect of the framing on the audience</th>
<th>Attitude</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>we will lead our country back to safety, prosperity, and peace. ... But we will also be a country of law and order.</td>
<td>Show his ability to change the country’s political condition: lack of safety, prosperity, peace.</td>
<td>• Use of contradictory discourses &lt;br&gt; • Use of distinct words: safety, prosperity, peace. &lt;br&gt; • Repetition of a key word: ‘lead’. &lt;br&gt; • High frequency of the use of the obligatory modal: ‘will’.</td>
<td>“I really do not like Trump’s most offensive comments on Muslims and immigration, “He’s authentic, “he is not talking like politicians talk. Trump’s popularity rests on his approach and delivery, regardless how ridiculous, offensive, or even untruthful his statements may be. &lt;br&gt; • the thought of Trump following through is scary to many (1).</td>
<td>neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>To protect us from terrorism ... We must abandon the failed policy of nation building and regime change that Hillary Clinton pushed in Iraq, Libya, Egypt and Syria. Lastly, we must immediately suspend immigration from any nation that has been compromised by terrorism.</td>
<td>Show his determination to change the current political condition and protect America from terrorism.</td>
<td>• Repetition of a distinct emphatic word: ‘Terrorism’.</td>
<td>Donald Trump’s acceptance speech played like a best-of episode of his dark reality TV primary season. Immigration = crime = terrorism = political correctness = economic decline (2).</td>
<td>Against</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Any politician who does not grasp this danger is not fit to lead our country.</td>
<td>Confirm the fact that the country is facing danger and the current politicians are not qualified to lead it.</td>
<td>• Use of a striking word: ‘danger’.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>After fifteen years of wars in the Middle East, after trillions of dollars spent and thousands of lives lost, the situation is worse than it has ever been before.</td>
<td>Use of intertextuality of scaring facts.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>I will present the facts plainly and honestly. ... at</td>
<td>Confirm the fact that the Democrats' policy is not Lies=truth</td>
<td>Many supporters do take Trump’s promise to build a wall literally, for</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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our convention, there will be no lies. We will honor the American people with the truth, and nothing else.

6 My plan will begin with safety at home—which means safe neighborhoods, secure borders, and protection from terrorism. • Confirm the fact that America lacks ‘safety.’

7 I have embraced crying mothers who have lost their children because our politicians. Show that he is courageous enough to change the country’s political condition. • Use of distinct phrases: ‘crying mothers’ ‘lost their children’.

8 I have no patience for injustice, no tolerance for government incompetence, no sympathy for leaders who fail their citizens. Use of striking phrases: ‘injustice’, ‘no patience’, ‘no tolerance’, ‘government incompetence’, ‘no sympathy’.

9 When I am President, I will work to ensure that all of our kids are treated equally, and protected equally. Make the American people worried about future and confirm the fact that he is the one who will create safety and justice in America.

10 The irresponsible rhetoric of our President… has made America a more dangerous environment for everyone. • Confirm the fact that there are people in America who have been suffering because of their incompetent politicians.

11 …determined deliver a better life for the people all across this nation that have been ignored, neglected and abandoned. • Confirm the fact that there are people in America who have been suffering from ignore, neglect, and abandon and determined to change the current political condition of Americans to a better one.

12 I have joined the political arena so that the powerful can no longer beat up on people who cannot defend themselves. • Use of distinct phrases: ‘beat up on people’, ‘defend themselves’.

13 The first task for our new administration will be to liberate our citizens from the crime, terrorism, and lawlessness that threatens their communities. • Frighten the American people about future confirming the fact that America is afflicted by crime, terrorism and lawlessness.

example, and they are right to do so. But this is the truth that “seriously not literally” gestures to: Identifying a problem in American life—whether it is real, imaginary, or exaggerated—became synonymous with caring about the people worrying about those things. (3)

Donald Trump’s speech can be best summed up as “Be afraid. Be very afraid.” Trump was peddling fear at levels we had never seen before. Trump’s “dark” speech truly “terrified” him. (8)

“But his core strategy is rooted not only in exploiting the fears of Americans but in heightening them.” (9)

Trump put it all together in one scary ball that defined a moment of crisis in the country. Unemployment is falling; the supposedly ignored border is well fortified. (10)

Trump … will do it. “I alone can fix it,” —but still had not come up with a plan for who else could. (11)

Obama largely shied away from using fear as a political weapon, Critics often excoriated him for his sanguine comments about the state of the war on terrorism. (12)

Trump’s voters are looking forward to him bringing back jobs, securing the border, and deporting people. (13)

For Trump to justify scaring us, he needs to be able to deliver on his promise to keep us safe. … Trump was focused primarily on one thing: making money. (14)
<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>we have seen continued threats and violence against our law enforcement officials. Law officers have been shot or killed in recent days …, more police were gunned down … An attack on law enforcement is an attack on all Americans.</td>
<td>• Use of hyponymous words and phrases: ‘shot’, ‘killed’, ‘attack’, ‘gunned down’, and ‘badly injured’ under the hypernymous noun ‘violence’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Nobody knows the system better than me, which is why I alone can fix it. Confirm the fact that he is the only one who will create safety in America. Use of synonymous statements: ‘Nobody knows the system better than ME’; ‘I ALONE can fix it.’</td>
<td>What in Trump’s background would even suggest that he has any understanding of how to deal with the threats facing our nation? (16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>In this race for the White House, I am the Law and Order candidate.</td>
<td>• Use of a striking statement: ‘I am the Law and Order candidate’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>This Administration has failed America’s inner cities. It’s failed them on education. It’s failed them on jobs. It’s failed them on crime. My opponent wants Sanctuary Cities. … Where was the Sanctuary for all the other Americans who have been so brutally murdered, and who have suffered so horribly? Make American people worried about future and makes them reject democracies confirming the fact that the reflections of their policy are failure and corruption.</td>
<td>• Confirm the fact that the democratic politicians do not care about people’s life and they manipulate the American laws for their own benefits. • Use of an emphatic phrase: ‘brutally murdered’, ‘suffered so horribly.’ • Use rhetorical questions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Every action I take, I will ask myself: does this make life better for young Americans in Baltimore, Chicago, Detroit, Ferguson who have the same right to live out their dreams as any other child in America?</td>
<td>• Repetition of a key word: ‘failed’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>We must also address the growing threats we face from outside the country. A nation in mourning. The damage and devastation that can be inflicted by Islamic radicals has been proven over and over.</td>
<td>• Use of striking words: ‘safe’, ‘threats’, and ‘defeat’. • Use of distinct words and phrases: ‘A nation in mourning’. ‘The damage and devastation’, ‘savagely murdered’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>As your President, I will do everything in my power to protect our LGBTQ citizens from the violence and oppression of a hateful foreign ideology.</td>
<td>• Frighten the LGBTQ citizens about their future and confirm the fact that he is the one who will create safety and defense for them. • Repetition of an emphatic word ‘terrorism’. • Use of striking phrases: ‘my power to protect’ ‘violence and oppression’ ‘a hateful foreign ideology’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>we have seen continued threats and violence against our law enforcement officials. Law officers have been shot or killed in recent days …, more police were gunned down … An attack on law enforcement is an attack on all Americans.</td>
<td>• Frighten the people about future and confirms the fact that the reflections of Hillary Clinton s’ policy are death, destruction, terrorism and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Nobody knows the system better than me, which is why I alone can fix it. Confirm the fact that he is the only one who will create safety in America. Use of synonymous statements: ‘Nobody knows the system better than ME’; ‘I ALONE can fix it.’</td>
<td>What in Trump’s background would even suggest that he has any understanding of how to deal with the threats facing our nation? (16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>In this race for the White House, I am the Law and Order candidate.</td>
<td>• Use of a striking statement: ‘I am the Law and Order candidate’.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
of many thousands who have suffered so gravely.

24 These wounded American families have been alone. But they are alone no longer. Tonight, this candidate and the whole nation stand in their corner to support them, to send them our love, and to pledge in their honor that we will save countless more families from suffering the same awful fate.

I am your voice. So to every parent who dreams for their child, and every child who dreams for their future, I say these words to you tonight: I’m with you, I will fight for you, and I will win for you.

26 We Will Make America Strong Again. We Will Make America Proud Again. We Will Make America Safe Again. And We Will Make America Great Again.

4. The Results and Discussion

Frames are powerful rhetorical entities that induce audience to filter their perceptions of the world in particular ways essentially making some aspects of their multi-dimensional reality more noticeable than other aspects.

Communication through the functioning of a political discourse is a dynamic process of mutual recognition of a candidate and her/his audience’s motivation.

A political discourse is analyzed using LFM to have an evidence to the claim that a candidate’s speech using ‘rhetoric of fear’ appeals to the audience. Some may respond feeling ‘fearful’ while others may respond feeling ‘protected’ or ‘heard’ that a candidate is listening to their concerns and going do something about them.

A political candidate employs his linguistic repertoire to construct his rhetoric of fear using framing. He frames his theme regarding the choice of vocabulary, semantic relations and syntactic structures, and that these frames are consciously or unconsciously principled and systematic: the choice of vocabulary, the use of distinct words: safety, prosperity, peace, generosity, warmth, and the repetition of a key word: ‘lead’, as in, 1; the use of striking word: ‘danger’, as in, 2; 9; the use of juxtaposition: Lies # truth, as in, 5; the use of intertextuality of scaring...
facts, and ‘wars in the Middle East’, as in, 4. The main topics that the political candidate of the study dealt with in creating a political ‘rhetoric of fear’ are the following:

- Shows his ability to change the country’s political condition: lack of safety, prosperity, peace, generosity and warmth.
- Shows his mechanism of protecting America from terrorism to reflect his ability to be the president of America.
- Confirms the fact that the country is facing danger and the current politicians are not qualified to lead it.
- Intends to evoke the fear and worries of parents and of youths towards the life of their children.

For the sake of making the American people reject Hillary Clinton to be a president, he confirms the following facts:

- the reflections of Hillary Clinton’s policy are ‘poverty’, ‘violence at home’, crime, lawlessness, ‘war’, death, terrorism, weakness, ‘destruction abroad’, illegal acts and lies that have put America at risk and created corruption.
- the democrats’ policy is not straightforward and not honest and is based on lies and myths.
- the democratic politicians do not care about people’s suffer and do not enforce the American laws, but they manipulate it for their own benefits.
- there are people in America who have being suffering from ignorance, neglect, and abandon.
- the law and order must be applied for the sake of creating justice, safety and prosperity in America and he is the one who will do it.
- the necessity of the availability of defense for the people who cannot defend themselves.

A critical discourse analysis (CDA) does not solely analyze and interpret a discourse, but also explains them. Therefore, an awareness of unequal relations of power in a political context, involving hierarchical dimensions of domination and subordination, helps in realizing how language contributes to the domination of some people by others, as in, 1, 6, 7, 11, 14 and 25.

CDA reflects how social relations of power are framed in a discourse. In the data analysis of the study, the focus has been given to the power of a candidate and how he frames his speech in the force potential of the linguistic strategies he uses in order to show his power potential that helps him dominate the political context and make changes, as has been shown in the following: the use of contradictory discourses, as in, 1; the use of distinct words, as in, 1; the use of distinct clauses, as in, 9; the use of repetition of a key word, as in, 1, 2, 16, 18, 24, 21, 22, 23; the use of repetition of synonymous distinct words, as in, 1, 15; the use of repetition of an emphatic word, as in, 2, 14, 24; the use of an emphatic statements, as in, 17; the use of the obligatory modal: ‘will’, as in, 1, 15; the use of the obligatory modal: ‘must’, as in, 2; the use of a striking word, as in, 11, and 22; the use of striking phrases, as in, 2, 24; the use of a striking statement, as in, 16, 23; the use of synonymous statements, as in, 11; the use of synonymous modifiers, as in, 11; make a comparison between America in the present time and America in the time during which Hillary Clinton was in charge of America’s foreign policy confirming the fact that both periods are bad but the present time is worse, as in, 4; the use of intertextuality, as in, 4; the use of hyponymous words and phrases, as in, 14; the use of decisive statements, as in, 9; the use rhetorical questions, as in, 19; the use of juxtaposition, as in, 24.

5. Conclusion

CDA of a political discourse makes it possible to see how the institutionalized use of strategy language has implications: some of these emerge from the genre itself while others derive from situation, specific choices. In any case, one thing is certain: strategy documents should not be treated as just any texts, but understood as powerful devices through which specific objectives, values and ideologies are promoted and legitimated.
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