

**CONTEMPORARY *HOMO POLITICUS*
AS AN IDEAL ORATOR.
A PRAGMALINGUISTIC ANALYSIS OF THE INAUGURAL
ADDRESSES OF AMERICAN PRESIDENTS
FROM 1981 TO 2021**

ARTUR URBANIAK

Abstract: The article is a pragmalinguistic analysis of the inaugural addresses delivered by U.S. presidents from 1981 to 2021. The study was conducted using Voyant Tools, a computer software used in corpus linguistics. Four aspects/parameters of the text that affect its level of complexity and thus the level of assimilation of the message (reading ease) were examined. The analysis included (1) lexical density; (2) average sentence length; (3) readability indices including: Gunning Fog, Flesch-Kincaid and SMOG Index; and (4) a tag cloud (cirrus). The point of reference is the classical Ciceronian concept of the *Ideal Speaker*, which assumes that the political communicator is both erudite, and linguistically competent, encompassing Latin terms *sapientia* (the personification of wisdom) and *eloquentia* (the art of oratory). It boils down to an assumption that a fully competent political actor knows the rules of making speeches so as to reach both elites (Latin: *optimates*) and ordinary citizens (Latin *populares*). Using a pragmalinguistic approach, it was questioned whether the presidential addresses analyzed provide evidence that the communicators delivering them meet the criteria, fitting into the role of the ideal orator.

Key words: inaugural address; rhetoric; political discourse; discourse analysis; pragmalinguistics

Słowa kluczowe: przemówienie inauguracyjne; retoryka; dyskurs polityczny; analiza dyskursu; pragmalingwistyka

Introduction

Presidential inaugural addresses are an integral part of the political landscape in the United States of America, the country oft-seen as the cradle of modern democracy (Coe and Neumann, 2011; Mohhamadi, Abdi and Eisazadeh, 2020). The American political tradition recognizes the importance of inaugural addresses as bearers of ideas, sources of inspiration, and beacons of hope which are tailored to the times, challenges, and political expectations (cf.

Gleaves, 2009; Campbell and Jamieson, 2008; Coe and Neumann, 2011). The role of this type of political addresses is to unify the audience by reconstituting it as those who witness and ratify the ceremony as well as to enunciate the principles guiding the new administration (Campbell and Jamieson, 1985; Galiakberova, Garifullina and Khismatullina, 2019). In the analyzed period, the length of the presidential address ranges from 1,500 to 2,500 words. Thus making it a tough nut for the newly elected president, on whom the eyes of the whole world are fixed, to outline a clear vision for the development of the superpower whose helm s/he is taking. The longest speeches in the history of the American presidency are those delivered by W. H. Harrison in 1841 (8,460 words), W. H. Taft in 1909 (5,434 words) and J. K. Polk in 1845 (4,809 words). While the speeches of Presidents George Washington from 1793 (merely 135 words), Franklin Delano Roosevelt from 1945 (559 words) and Abraham Lincoln from 1865 (700 words) were considered the most concise. During the period covered by the study (1981-2021), the average length of an inaugural address was 2,093 words. The longest was the one delivered by Ronald Reagan in 1985 (2,564 words), and the shortest was that of Donald Trump in 2017 (1,433 words).¹

Containing one's political agenda and outlining legislative initiatives in a speech of approximately 2,000 words seems a breakneck task. Yet, the inaugural address remains the focal point of each presidency due to its social and political impact (Mohhamadi, Abdi and Eisazadeh, 2020; Tuszyńska, 2021). Thus, Chudinov (2008) argues that one of the core notions in contemporary political linguistic studies should be political discourse. The notion that comprises all speech acts used in political discussions and the rules of public policy (cf. Galiakberova, Garifullina and Khismatullina, 2019). Amongst the research methods most often adapted to analyze political discourse are Discourse Analysis, and its successor, Critical Discourse Analysis (cf. Van Dijk 1992; 1998; 2006; Fairclough, Mulderrig and Wodak, 2011; Gee, 2011). The linguistic portrait outlined by the president in his inaugural address may be a reflection of his national identity, mentality, and the country's socio-political course (Chilton, 2004). Therefore, this study aims to determine the linguistic portrait of US presidents from 1981-2021 using a tool typical of corpus linguistics (Voyant Tools), followed in-depth pragmalinguistic (communicological) analysis included in the commentary.

¹The statistics cited in this section concerning the length of presidential addresses have been cross-checked and reported after the following sources: (a) The portal *Statista*, available here: <https://www.statista.com/statistics/243686/length-of-inaugural-addresses-of-us-presidents/> [DOA: 31.10.2022]; (b) The portal *POTUS*, available here: <https://potus.com/presidential-facts/inaugural-address-length/> [DOA: 31.10.2022].

The linguistic portrait of a contemporary *homo politicus*

The concept of *homo politicus* might be read in two distinct ways; as a notion primarily coined by Aristotle referring to our being ‘political animals’ or as a derogatory term referring to a stereotypical behavior in political setting (Beard, 2000; Lenkiewicz, 2015). Aristotle in *Politics* points out that man is a being created to live in a state, that is, in a hierarchical structure (Aristotle, 1905). And this means that politics, by definition, is a meaningful area of social life for humans; and the pursuit of political roles, or the exercise of power, can become a goal or aspiration in itself. Therefore, by definition, *homo politicus* is interested in politics and has extensive knowledge in this field (cf. Olbromski, 2010; Inabinet, 2011).

The professionalization of a political processes manifests itself in a multitude of ways. Modernization of society, technological development, accelerated pace of life and increasingly shorter attention span determine the need to adapt political communication processes to the needs of a prospect voter.

The emphasis we place on the idea of professionalization is of a process of continual self-improvement and change towards what is deemed to be a better way of doing things, be it winning an election, achieving consensus, gaining support for policies, ensuring successful governance, that is made possible by technological and communications innovations, as well as a more general process of skills specialization (Papathanassopoulos et al., 2007:14).

Within the scope of the so-called ‘skills specialization’ we can classify the ability to compose the public speeches, including presidential inaugural addresses through the means of language that “describes complex phenomena, but is also itself a complex phenomenon” (Hendrikse and Van Zweel, 2010: 409). Therefore, the hypothesis is that a contemporary *homo politicus*, if determined enough to win the election, must develop the specific type of communicative competence as proposed by Puppel (2004). A competent communicator is defined through the lens of effectiveness and congruence of speech with the situational context. Effective communication means that the communicator achieves his or her communicative goal or task, and adequate communication means that the communicator is aware of and respects the norms and expectations of communicating in a given situation (see: Puppel 2004: Morreale, Spitzberg and Barge, 2017).

The Ideal Orator in the world of *optimates* and *populares*

A pivotal question regarding the Ciceronian concept of ideal orator remains unchanged. It seeks an acceptable definition of *mastery* in the context of public speaking, and in this paper the question applies to a specific type of aptitude displayed in the presidential inaugural speeches. The answer might be Cicero’s

Latin term for eloquence [*eloquentia*] which parallels Greek rhetoric and focuses on artful public oratory (Cicero, 2001). The term which also denotes robust emotional, embodied speech (Inabinet, 2011).

A political communicator assuming the office of president becomes the head of state and the representative of society which is by nature a heterogeneous and multifaceted formation. Referring to Barack Obama's inaugural address delivered in 2009, Gleaves Whitney, the director of Grand Valley's Hauenstein Center for Presidential Studies observes:

[...] inauguration of our nation's 44th president will command the world's attention like nothing since 9/11 and the death of Princess Diana. Around the globe, record numbers of people will watch television coverage of the event. Some three to four million U.S. citizens will converge on Washington, DC, to experience the festivities. The National Mall, stretching more than two miles from the Lincoln Memorial to the Capitol's west portico – the “front porch of democracy” – will be packed with onlookers. Indeed, several students from Grand Valley State University have made a special trip to witness this historic civic ritual.²

Each newly elected president does not address only the elite (Latin: *optimates*). On the contrary, the address broadcast on television and social media is consumed by average citizens (Latin: *populares*), both better and less educated. This entails adapting communication (linguistic) resources to the needs/capacities of a heterogeneous audience. Ergo, a savvy political communicator is one who can speak in a concise manner (since inaugural speeches are typically 1,500 to 2,500 words). And the hallmark of a skilful political communicator is the ability to convey political-ideological content in a succinct, transparent manner, comprehensible to the general public, coupled with the ability to use the refined oratory style with tropes and rhetorical figures, allowing to emphasize the solemnity of the moment. Not forgetting the cultural code or shared values in the realm of symbols, for instance the star-spangled banner; the Capitol, dubbed by George Bush as “democracy's front porch”³; or the Founding Fathers (compare: Conelly, 2007; Coe and Neumann, 2011). Therefore, the term ‘ideal orator’ is equivalent to ‘competent communicator’ as devised by Puppel (2004), with the notation that he/she interacts specifically in the political field.

²Whitney, G. (2009) “Anticipating Obama”. Ask Gleaves. Paper 10. Source: http://scholarworks.gvsu.edu/ask_gleaves/10. [DOA: 30.10.2022].

³The Inaugural Address delivered by George Bush sr. on January, 20th 1989. The exact words are as follows: “We meet on democracy's front porch, a good place to talk as neighbors and as friends. For this is a day when our nation is made whole, when our differences, for a moment, are suspended”. Source:

Methodology

The study examines the following text parameters: (1) lexical density, (2) sentence length, (3) readability index, and (4) most frequent lexical words to appear in a given speech sample. These parameters are assumed to reflect the linguistic portrait of the speaker in question (see: Galiakberova, Garifullina and Khismatullina, 2019; Garifullina et al., 2021), as well as indicate the complexity of the speech, which translates into the reception of the message on the part of the recipient. In consequence, the following paradigms were adopted: (1) the longer the sentences, the more demanding the text is to understand; (2) the more lexical (content) words, the more complex the text is to comprehend; (3) the higher the readability index, the more years of formal education it takes to unveil the author's intentions and grasp the nuanced essence of the address.

The corpus included 11 inaugural speeches delivered by 7 US presidents between 1981 and 2021. The details are illustrated in Table 1.

1981-1985	Ronald Wilson Reagan	republican
1985-1989	Ronald Wilson Reagan	republican
1989-1993	George Herbert Walker Bush	republican
1993-1997	William Jefferson Clinton	democrat
1997-2001	William Jefferson Clinton	democrat
2001-2005	George W. Bush	republican
2005-2009	George W. Bush	republican
2009-2013	Barack H. Obama	democrat
2013-2017	Barack H. Obama	democrat
2017-2021	Donald J. Tramp	republican
2021- present	Joseph Biden	democrat

Table 1. U.S. Presidents 1981 – 2021.

The analysis was conducted by means of Voyant Tools, the software available under an open license. It was used as the specialized tool for statistical analysis of the corpus, allowing the parameters listed below to be explored.

i. Lexical density

Originally, text (or lexical) density was defined as a construct for manipulating and reducing the number of words in a text without losing its main idea (Ure, 1971; Halliday, 1985). Yet in the broader sense of the term, text density might be seen as the number of words and meaningful information in a text (Morrison et al., 1988; Ipek, 2011). And as for this reason, the method of measuring lexi-

cal density is based on the number of content words (lexical words) divided by the total number of words in a given sample (Ure, 1971; Johansson, 2008). An analysis of the lexical density of each speech was conducted, and the results are presented in a consolidated form.

ii. Sentence length

Another category is the sentence length, defined as the average number of words in a sentence. Sentence length is seen as a powerful indicator of the syntactic complexity. It is a factor to be considered in a public speech production/reception process. Longer sentences typically contain more clauses, thus, more information is being transferred. The audience must concentrate harder and retain information for an extended period before they fully comprehend the message. The process involves short-term memory to hold and process information. Shorter sentences, in turn, put less burden on short-term memory. Since „complexity plays an important role in how people process information” (Tolochko and Boomgaarden, 2017: 1787), it is hypothesized that shorter sentences meet the criterion of conciseness and clarity of speech. Therefore, the level of complexity of the text does not imply higher communicative competence of the speaker. It does, however, prove the communicator’s knowledge, intelligence or linguistic aptitude, which refers to Ciceronian *sapientia*.

iii. Readability Index

The readability index is another estimate of the text complexity. The assessment is performed by measuring the degree of text complexity using measurable attributes of discourse, such as word length, sentence length or the number of content words. Text complexity is then compared to how well readers understand the text. The tools examining text difficulty were initially developed for testing children, but are now being applied to the broader context of text assimilation (cf. DuBay, 2007).

Each readability index (or score) provides an estimate of the level of education (in accordance with U.S. school system) required to understand a text without difficulty. For those outside the United States, the level can be thought of as the number of years of formal education (conducted in English) needed to read and understand the text. Thus, the lower the index, the easier the text is to read, and conversely, the higher the index, the more difficult the text is to read.

iv. Most frequent words

The words most frequently found in corpora also provide an important source of knowledge about a given address delivered at a particular moment in history. The analysis regarding the most frequent terms was conducted for each text separately; and then, the study of the entire corpus, consisting of 11 texts of inaugural speeches, was conducted to find some universal concepts typical of an inaugural speech.

Results

The first criterion under scrutiny was text density or lexical density of a text. Lexical density proposed by Ure (1971) is used to describe the proportion of lexical words (those contributing the content) to the total number of words in a spoken or written form of language. The more lexical words a text contains, the more information we can extract from it. To actually calculate the lexical density of a text, the concept of “lexical words” needs to be clarified. With the introduction of the concept of “lexical density,” Ure (1971) introduced the distinction between lexical words and non-lexical words. Languages consist of lexical words, which are the primary carriers of meaning, and non-lexical words, which do not have a lexical function, but a “purely grammatical” one.

The actual carriers of meaning are lexical words. They provide information about what the text is about. These words are usually nouns, adjectives, verbs and adverbs. In contrast, other types of words, such as partials, prepositions, conjunctions or auxiliary verbs serve a more logical/technical function. That is why these non-lexical words are also referred to as function words. In terms of interpreting the results, a lower vocabulary density indicates a complex text with a large number of unique words, while a higher index indicates a simpler text with repeated words.

An inaugural address delivered by	Average lexical density (%)
Ronald Reagan (1)	46.83
Ronald Reagan (2)	50.10
George Bush, Sr.	46.82
Bill Clinton (1)	49.08
Bill Clinton (2)	50.53
George W. Bush (1)	49.59
George W. Bush (2)	50.05
Barack Obama (1)	47.80
Barack Obama (2)	48.93
Donald Trump	50.72
Joe Biden	47.00

Table 2. Average lexical density of presidential inaugural speeches 1981-2021.

According to this criterion for testing text complexity, the the acquired data allows us to conclude that Bush senior’s 1989 speech is understood as the most accessible to the audience. In contrast, the result for the most difficult speech in terms of lexical density is President Donald Trump’s 2017 speech. However,

the differences for the texts with the highest lexical density are minor; President Trump's speech has a density of 50.72, while President Bush senior's has a density of 50.05. The difference is therefore not significant.

For comparison purposes, a lexically dense encyclopedic text has a density of 60-65%. The score for general prose is 49%, while a statistical article from Wikipedia has a density of 55-58%, as do news articles from the New York Times or BBC, which are estimated at 56-58%. Therefore, we can venture to conclude that, judging upon this criterion, the texts of inaugural speeches are among the average easy ones, at the level easier than that of an article from the daily press or television news.

Another category is sentence length, or the average number of words in a sentence. The shortest sentences statistically most frequent are in President Biden's 2021 speech. The oratorical show-off containing the statistically longest sentences is President Obama's 2014 speech.

Shorter sentences meet the criterion of conciseness and clarity of speech, so the level of complexity expressed by longer and hence more syntactically complex sentences in the text does not necessarily imply higher communication competence of the political communicator. As mentioned above, compound sentences require more effort to understand, both in written and spoken text.

An inaugural address delivered by	Average words per sentence
Ronald Reagan (1)	19.1
Ronald Reagan (2)	21.1
George Bush, Sr.	16.6
Bill Clinton (1)	17.1
Bill Clinton (2)	19.3
George W. Bush (1)	18.8
George W. Bush (2)	21.4
Barack Obama (1)	22.0
Barack Obama (2)	23.5
Donald Trump	16.2
Joe Biden	15.9

Table 3. Average per sentence in presidential inaugural speeches 1981-2021.

The tendency to use short sentences has been revealed in addresses delivered by Presidents Joe Biden, Donald Trump and Bush Sr. Strikingly, there is no zero-one correlation between the average number of words in a sentence, which

would translate into the ease of assimilation of the text. If that were the case, then Biden's and Trump's speeches would be the easiest to digest. However, some correlation can be observed between the number of short sentences in a speech and the complexity of the speech. President Bush Sr. actually manifests a tendency to use short sentences, which is reflected in the fact that according to factors such as lexical density and readability index, his speech is considered the easiest to comprehend.

The third criterion analyzed is the readability index. It provides information about the degree of complexity/complicity of the text in reception. Each readability index (or score) shown in the table (see: Table 4) gives an estimate of the level of education (in accordance with American standards) required to understand a text without difficulty.

The study included three well-established indices (Gunning fog index, Flesch-Kincaid index, SMOG Index) and a score from Voyant Tools, referred to as the Automated Index. The various indices differ somewhat in their methodology for examining text complexity. This is illustrated by the formulas below:

i. Gunning Fog Index is expressed as:

$$0.4 \left[\left(\frac{\text{words}}{\text{sentences}} \right) + 100 \left(\frac{\text{complex words}}{\text{words}} \right) \right].$$

The Gunning Fog Index estimates the education level required to understand the given text. The formula generates a grade level between 0 and 20, which is to be read as an equivalent of the years spent at school. Thus, guided by this factor alone, George Bush senior's 1989 speech is considered the easiest to digest (with a score of 9.86), while his son G.W. Bush's second inaugural speech from 2005 is considered the least comprehensible (with a score of 14.04). A score oscillating around 10 reads as high-school sophomore, while a score of 14 translates into a college junior.

ii. Flesch-Kincaid Reading Score is calculated on the basis of the following formula:

$$0.39 \left(\frac{\text{words}}{\text{total sentences}} \right) + 11.8 \left(\frac{\text{total syllables}}{\text{total words}} \right) - 15.59.$$

The Flesch-Kincaid Index was created in the 1940s (Flesch, 1948), yet it still seems a relevant scale for measuring the text complexity. It is a widely used readability formula which assesses the approximate reading grade level of a text. It is based on two variables; sentence length (the average number of words in a sentence) and word length (the average number of syllables in a word). Not surprisingly, again President George Bush senior's speech comes off as the easiest to comprehend. However, according to this index, it is Barack Obama's second inaugural speech that is the most difficult. This means that slightly different methodologies might produce slightly different results.

iii. SMOG Index is estimated according to the following formula:

$$3 + \sqrt{\text{polysyllabic count}}$$

SMOG stands for ‘Simple Measure of Gobbledygook’. The index developed by clinical psychologist G. Harry McLaughlin in 1969 is seen as a tribute to the creator of another measurement system FOG, Robert Gunning. It estimates the years of education the average person needs to understand a text. And again, according to SMOG, President Bush senior 1989’s address scored the lowest (9.78), which means that this speech is relatively the easiest one. While with the score of 12.89, President Bush junior’s 2005’s address seems most challenging.

iii. Automated Readability Index is calculated in the following way:

$$4.71 \left(\frac{\text{characters}}{\text{words}} \right) + 0.5 \left(\frac{\text{words}}{\text{sentences}} \right) - 21.43$$

This system is similar to the previously discussed ones, however, the difference is that instead of counting syllables, it counts characters. The more characters, the harder the word. Then it also counts sentences. However, despite the different survey methodology, the results are the same.

Analyzing the results summarized collectively in the table below (see: Table 4), it can be noticed that the presidential speeches rank in the area of difficulty attainable for high school freshman to college sophomore.

Lp.	An inaugural address delivered by:	Gunning Fog Index	Flesch-Kincaid Index	SMOG Index	Automated Index
1	Ronald Reagan (1)	12.73	9.31	12.5	9.157
2	Ronald Reagan (2)	12.96	9.8	12.07	9.465
3	George Bush, sr	9.86	6.79	9.78	7.308
4	Bill Clinton (1)	11.81	8.74	11.46	9.141
5	Bill Clinton (2)	12.49	9.28	11.8	9.167
6	George W. Bush (1)	12.66	9.46	12.01	9.287
7	George W. Bush (2)	14.04	10.79	12.89	10.233
8	Barack Obama (1)	12.49	9.67	11.34	8.913
9	Barack Obama (2)	13.95	10.88	12.5	9.807
10	Donald Trump	11.8	8.51	11.52	9.583
11	Joe Biden	11.14	6.99	10.21	8.193

Table 4. Readability indices of presidential inaugural speeches 1981-2021.

This means that after 8 years of study in the American education system, the recipient will be able to understand the message of the speech ranked as the easiest, while to understand the message of the most difficult speech, the recipient will have to study for 11 years. Therefore, it should be concluded that the presidential inaugural addresses are structured in an accessible way, which allows the message to reach the public without a university degree.

The last factor considered in the study is the key words that appear most frequently in the examined texts. They might be seen as the common denominator of a contemporary inaugural speech, and they reflect a specific American way of pursuing politics. The top ten key words include such notions as *America* (115), *people* (101), *new* (96), *world* (95), *nation* (92), *time* (69), *Americans/freedom* (69), *government* (68), *work/today* (60), *American* (56). And these were closely followed by *great* (50), *citizens* (48), *country/let* (46), *history* (43), and *God* (37) (see: Fig. 1).



Figure 1. Cirrus depicting the most frequently used words in sampled speeches (1981-2021).

The focus is on concepts such as country, understood as a community, and man, understood as its representative. This is evidenced by the frequent use of words *America*, *Americans*, *people*, *nation* or *freedom*.

Conclusion

Eleven presidential inaugural addresses from 1981 to 2021 were analyzed with the aim to investigate whether they are formally structured according to the principles of modern rhetoric. Synthesizing the data obtained, it was noted that political communicators have mastered the knowledge of oratory and speech formulation. Based on the data collected, it was noted that the speeches vary little in terms of complexity and are written in a way that is fairly accessible to the

average recipient, even one without higher education diploma. Interpreting the results from the readability indices, it can be concluded that after 8 - 10 years of formal education, the recipient is able to understand the text of the speech without difficulty. Inferring from lexical density, it was similarly noted that the text of a typical inaugural speech is similar in level to that of a daily newspaper article or a text typical of popular fiction. Therefore, it should be considered that abstruse speeches, saturated with incomprehensible terminology and metaphors beyond the comprehension of the average citizen are gone for good.

It seems that the demands of the modern political market, which are also expressed in the professionalization of political processes, have required political actors to change their discourse. However, this does not mean that communicative competence has become impoverished or disappeared; on the contrary, modern *homo politicus* has acquired the ability to communicate with voters in a manner befitting reality. S/he speaks in shorter, more precise terms, using shorter sentences, making their messages more easily digestible. The speeches are more concise, succinct, and they are based on the same key words reflecting common symbols and values. And the Presidents who deliver them are characterized by an above-average aptitude to speak about lofty matters in a way that can be understood by the general public. And, although they use some rhetorical figures and tropes (such as rhetorical questions, metaphors, anaphora, catachresis or epizexus) still their addresses are fairly comprehensible.

And finally, evoking a Russian proverb, a spoonful of tar should be added to the barrel of honey. As Krawczak, Wróbel and Laskowski (2022: 82) aptly observe “seeking a reference to contemporary political communication, one can say without reservation that demagoguery has reached its most perfect form. Unfortunately, this is not an endorsement, but only a sorrowful statement of the current political culture”.

References

- Aristotle. 1916. *Aristotle's politics*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Beard, A. 2000. *The Language of politics*. New York: Routledge.
- Campbell, K. and K. Jamieson. 2008. *Presidents creating presidency: deeds done in words*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Campbell, K.K. and K.H. Jamieson. 1985. “Inaugurating the presidency”. *Presidential Studies Quarterly* 15.2. 394-411.
- Chudinov, A.P. 2008. *Politicheskaya lingvistika* [Political linguistics]. Moscow: Flinta.
- Cicero, M.T. 2001. *On the Ideal Orator*. Translated by May, J. M. and Wisse, J. London: Oxford University Press.
- Coe, K. and R. Neumann. 2011. “The major addresses of modern presidents: Parameters of a data set”. *Presidential Studies Quarterly* 41.4. 727-751.
- Connolly, J. 2007. *The state of speech: Rhetoric and political thought in Ancient Rome*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

- DuBay, W.H. 2007. *Smart language readers, readability, and the grading of text*. Costa Mesa, CL: Impact Information.
- Fairclough, N., Mulderrig, J. and R. Wodak. 2011. "Critical Discourse Analysis". In: T. A. van Dijk, (ed.). *Discourse studies: A Multidisciplinary Introduction*. London: Sage Publication. 357–378.
- Flesch, R. 1948. "A new readability yardstick". *Journal of Applied Psychology* 32.3. 221–233.
- Garifullina, D.B., Khismatullina, L.G., Giniyatullina, A.Y., Garaeva, M.R. and A.A. Gimadeeva. 2021. "Inaugural speech as a tool of forming speech portrait of the president". *Linguistics and Culture Review* 5.S1. 413-421. <https://doi.org/10.37028/lingcure.v5nS1.1429>
- Gee, J.P. 2011. *An introduction to discourse analysis: Theory and method* (3rd ed.). New York: Routledge.
- Halliday, M.A.K. 1985. *Spoken and written language. Waurin Ponds, Vic: Deakin University*.
- Hendrikse, R. and H. Van Zweel. 2010. "A phylogenetic and cognitive perspective on linguistic complexity". *Southern African Linguistics and Applied Language Studies* 28.4. 409-422.
- Inabinet, B. 2011. "The stoicism of the ideal orator: Cicero's Hellenistic ideal". *Advances in the History of Rhetoric* 14.1. 14–32.
- Ipek, I. 2011. "The effects of text density levels and the cognitive style of field dependence on learning from a CBI tutorial". *The Turkish Online Journal of Educational Technology* 10.1. 167-182.
- Johansson, V. 2008. "Lexical diversity and lexical density in speech and writing: a developmental perspective". *Lund University Department of Linguistics Working Papers* 53. 61-79.
- Klimkiewicz, A. (ed.). *Perswazja językowa w różnych dyskursach* 7. Gdańsk: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Gdańskiego.
- Krawczak, M., Wróbel, A. and M. Laskowski. 2022. "Parezja w starożytnym i współczesnym dyskursie politycznym" [Parrhesia in ancient and modern political discourse]. In: Klimkiewicz, A. (ed.). *Perswazja językowa w różnych dyskursach* 7. 77-84.
- Lenkiewicz, T. 2015. "Homo politicus jako podmiot życia kulturowo-cywilizacyjnego". *Studia Gdańskie. Wizje i rzeczywistość* XII. 287-294.
- Mohammadi, V., Abdi, R. and H. Eisazadeh, H. 2020. "Inaugural Addresses of American Presidents: A CDA-oriented Analysis of Party Affiliation". *Applied Research on English Language* 9.4. 539-560.
- Morrison, G.R., Ross, S.M. and J.K. O'Dell. 1988. "Text density level as a design variable in instructional displays". *Educational Communications Technology Journal* 36.1. 103-115.
- Morreale, S.P., Spitzberg, B.H. and J.K Barge. 2017. *Human communication: motivation, knowledge, and skills*. (Second Edition). Belmont: Thomson Wadsworth.
- Negrine, R., Holtz-Bacha, Ch. and S. Papathanassopoulos. (eds). 2007. *The professionalization of political communication*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Olbromski, C.J. 2010. "Homo figurativus versus homo politicus – rozważania na temat kryzysu polityczności". *Środkowoeuropejskie Studia Polityczne* 4. 5-24.
- Oliver, S. 2007. "Lexical density in oral versus written Rangi texts". *SOAS Working Papers in Linguistics* 15. 173-184.
- Papathanassopoulos, S., Negrine, R., Mancini, P. and Ch. Holtz-Bacha. 2007. "Political communication in the era of professionalisation". In: Negrine, R., Holtz-Bacha, Ch. and S. Papathanassopoulos. (eds). *The professionalization of political communication*. 9-25.
- Puppel, S. 2004. "An outline of a domain-resource-agent-access-management (DRAAM) model of human communication: Towards an ecology of human communication". *Oikeios Logos* 1. 1-27.
- Sheckels, T.F. (ed.). 2012. *Political communication in the Anglophone world: case studies*. New York: Lexington Books.

- To, V., Fan, S. and D. Thomas. 2013. "Lexical density and readability: a case study of English textbooks". *Internet Journal of Language, Culture and Society* 37. 61-71.
- Tolochko, P. and H.G. Boomgaarden. 2018. "Analysis of linguistic complexity in professional and citizen media". *Journalism Studies* 19.12. 1786-1803.
- Tuszyńska, K. 2021. „Uwagi na temat inaugural speech Joe Bidena jako aktu retorycznego w świetle klasycznej teorii retoryki”. *Scripta Neophilologica Posnaniensia* XXI. 335-356.
- Ure, J. 1971. "Lexical density and register differentiation". In: Perren, G. and J.L.M. Trim (eds). *Applications of Linguistics*. London: Cambridge University Press. 443-452.
- Whitney, G. 2009. "Anticipating Obama". *Ask Gleaves. Paper* 10. Source: http://scholarworks.gvsu.edu/ask_gleaves/10. [DOA: 30.10.2022].