

Original Research Article

Trump's Strategies in the First Presidential Debate: A Critical Discourse Analysis

Quang Nhat Nguyen^{1*} & Dr. Murad Hassan Mohammed Sawalmeh

¹Lecturer of English and Head of Academics of The IELTS Workshop, Ho Chi Minh City University of Education, Vietnam

²Assistant Professor of Linguistics and Translation Studies, Dhofar University, Oman

Corresponding Author: Quang Nhat Nguyen, E-mail: quangnguyen@tiw.vn

ARTICLE INFO

Article History

Received: April 08, 2020

Accepted: May 22, 2020

Volume: 3

Issue: 5

DOI: 10.32996/ijllt.2020.3.5.8

KEYWORDS

Critical Discourse Analysis,
Donald Trump, Presidential
Debate, Political Discourse
Analysis, Election

ABSTRACT

The young and vibrant 243-year-old U.S. has long claimed its status as a world power. As stated by the U.S.'s Congressional Research Service (2019), the U.S. shoulders the responsibility of defending and promoting freedom, democracy, and universal values, which means that America, being an active internationalist global leader, a superpower, and a world policeman, has been maintaining the power of manipulating partially, if not most, the whole world. This attention gains more significance as Donald Trump aims to take center stage once more in the presidential campaign in 2020. The way Americans choose their presidents will affect the world situation in many respects. While it is noticeable that there is an anti-intellectual trend in presidential discourse (Lim, 2008), Trump's presidential linguistic style is highly distinctive in terms of its simplicity, anti-elitism, and collectivism (Oliver & Rahn, 2016). Realizing the importance of Donald Trump's linguistic presidential style, the attention that it drew, and the likelihood that Trump may reuse his approach in the 2020 presidential campaign, this study focuses on the first presidential debate's strategies of Donald Trump in 2016. The analysis of the debate's strategies is influenced by the works of Fairclough (1993), Halliday (1971) and Goffman (1967). The results of the study revealed that Trump combined four strategies of presidential debates, including (1) self-acclamation, (2) describing opposing candidates through the verbal attack, (3) self-rectification or image-enhancement through the defense against opposing candidates' blaming argument, and (4) extra-vocalization. Trump's presidential speech is a source of valuable knowledge that makes use of both typical candidates' traditional strategies with a more business-oriented approach. It is hoped that this study might be a valuable foundation on which researchers can rely to consider Trump's changes in linguistic style when he comes to the upcoming presidential campaigns in 2020.

Introduction

The United States of America has long claimed its status as a world power. As stated by the U.S.'s Congressional Research Service (2019), the U.S., shoulders the responsibility of defending and promoting freedom, democracy, and universal values, which means that America, being an active internationalist global leader, a superpower, and a world policeman, has been maintaining the power of manipulating partially, if not most, the whole world. Whatever this country attracts the whole world's attention.

This attention gains more significance as Donald Trump takes center stage in the presidential campaign. Not only is this because of Donald Trump's background as a multimillionaire, a real estate developer, and a television host, but also because of his debatable persona, erotic styles, and unacceptable behaviors to some conservationists. The way Americans choose their presidents will affect the world situation in many respects.

Although previous studies (Alrefaee, Abdul-Ghafour, Alazzany & Alrefaee, 2019; Hussein & Hussein, 2020; Khaled, 2020; Edouihri, 2020; Al-Saedi & Jabber, 2020; Hamdan & Elnadeef, 2020) conducted on different world leaders have revealed interesting findings, little attention so far has been paid to study Trump's Strategies in the First Presidential Debate. Realizing the importance of Donald Trump's linguistic presidential style and the attention that it draws, this investigation, conducted from the Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) perspective, focuses on the first presidential debate of Donald Trump in 2016. While it is noticeable that there is an anti-intellectual trend in presidential discourse (Lim, 2008), Trump's presidential linguistic style is highly distinctive in terms of its simplicity, anti-elitism, and collectivism (Oliver & Rahn, 2016), which provokes both support and critique from all over the world. His unique linguistics style raises the question regarding the relationship between his language his approach in the first presidential debate. This article aims to seek answers to the following questions:

- What strategies did Trump use in his presidential debates?
- Did Trump use different strategies from other conventional politicians?

This paper will first introduce the context of U.S. presidential debates and the attention they draw from the public. After that, there is a thorough review of the existing relevant studies of Critical Discourse Analysis, especially in the political domain, and the frameworks used to analyze the first presidential debate. Following the literature review are the interwoven analysis and discussion of Trump's discourse. The first presidential debates are divided into three parts: discourse as text, discourse as a discursive practice, and discourse as a social practice. The last part of this study gives a conclusion of Trump's discourse analysis and suggests an area of study for further investigations.

Theoretical Framework of the Presidential Discourse Analysis

According to Wodak and Meyer (2009), CDA first appeared in the 1970s and then emerged as a discipline with more refined characteristics in 1991 in Amsterdam. Its development posterior was largely owed to Teun Van Dijk, Norman Fairclough, Gunther Kress, Theo van Leeuwen, and Ruth Wodak. CDA deals with inter-disciplinary and multidisciplinary approaches to language use. Gee and Handford (2012) claim that CDA can be defined as the study of language that goes beyond the level of a sentence, but it takes into account the ways sentences combine to create meaning and, more importantly, accomplish purposes. Wodak and Meyer (2009) define this discipline as the common interest to de-mystifying ideologies and power via analyzing semiotic spoken and written data. Dijk (1993) states that CDA is a type of analytical research that studies primarily social abuse, dominance, and inequality through text and talk in social and political contexts. Fairclough (1993) defines CDA as a discourse analysis that aims to systematically explore often impenetrable relationships of causality and determination among discursive practices, events, and texts that are ideologically shaped by powers and struggles overpowers. In a broader sense, it is believed to disclose complex relations among language, power, social, and historical ideology (Tian, 2018). Fairclough's three-dimensional model can be used in CDA as a fundamental and critical framework. CDA, being an interdisciplinary study, should not only analyze the text, nor should it merely analyze the process of production or interpretation.




Figure 1. 3-dimensional model of texts (Fairclough, 1989)




Figure 2: Discourse as text, interaction, and context

From the diagram by Fairclough, the text is based on discursive practices, including production, distribution, and consumption of language, which are all decided by social practices. Therefore, when analyzing a text from the CDA perspective, Fairclough suggests a stepwise procedure: Description (formal properties of the text such as grammar, vocabulary, text structures), Interpretation (relationship established between text and interaction), and Explanation (the relationship between interaction and social contexts).

Bin (2005) believes that CDA takes language as a multi-functional system that takes the same system of Halliday's systemic-functional grammar to regard English as a reflection of its function. Halliday (1971) proposes three functions of language: (1) ideational function (language serves for the expression of the speaker's experience of the real world and his internal world including his reactions, perceptions and linguistics acts), (2) interpersonal function (language accounts for the relationship of the speaker and the listener and the communication role they adopt), (3) textual function (the speaker or writer can produce text, and the listener and reader can recognize).

Political discourse analysis focuses on the reproduction or contestation of political power through political discourse (Fairclough & Fairclough, 2012). Politics can hardly come across well without language. Chilton and Schäffner (1997) argue that politics cannot be conducted without language, and it is language in the constitution of social groups that creates a broad sense of politics. Pelinka (2007) believes that language extends beyond the domain of linguistics and literature and must be perceived as a political phenomenon. Politicians use political discourse to manipulate social opinions, gather support, and control other political perspectives (Van Dijk, 1992). Political discourse analysis (PDA) investigates how politicians utilize their radical and emotional persuasions. Through this manipulation, politicians can gain voters' trust even when their argument is not rational and logical. In terms of categorization, Van Dijk (2008) states that when investigating Political Discourse, we can study political perspective at the micro and macro levels. The micro-level usually covers politicians' personal opinions about the society, while the macro-level represents the ideologies, philosophy, and political orientation of the whole party that they belong to.

Political debate is a branch of political discourse whose aim is to disseminate the point of view about the direction, the target of a party, or a candidate for a position in the government. Through political debates, the audience can gain an overall insight into contemporary social phenomena, including functional and social conflicts, power dominance, social roles, economic situation, and other current issues. These political debates can also help refer to the current political context and political references in the past to help the voters consolidate their preferences towards a party or a particular candidate. Political debates are usually in the form of direct face-to-face interactions in which the host asks questions about controversial issues, and the candidates answer in a few minutes. In addition to the question-answer format, politicians participating in presidential debates also attack and counterattack each other verbally. Hart and Jarvis (1997) believe that political debates will (1) bring sobriety to a campaign, (2) curb political bombast, (3) bring focus to the message of the campaign, and (4) ensure self-involvement of both the voters and the candidates.

Presidential debates, conventionally, still share the same characteristics with political debates (Cheng, 2019). Presidential debates help the voters recognize the strengths and weaknesses of the candidates in all aspects, from their experience, ability to deal with domestic and international affairs, and their plan for operating and developing the country. These presidential debates are the foundation on which the candidates can rely to attract more votes, change the voter perspective, or even change the preferred party or their belief about the suitable person for the presidency. Benoit, Hansen, and Verser (2003) and Cheng (2019) reveal three strategies that presidency candidates frequently use in presidential debates, namely (1) self-

acclamation, (2) describing opposing candidate through the verbal attack, (3) and self-rectification or image-enhancement through the defense against opposing candidates' blaming argument. Shibata (2020) also adds another strategy in a presidential debate, that is (4) extra-vocalization. The candidates adopting this method usually cite what other speakers said in the past or in other events to point out their self-contradictory point of view. This strategy is to expose that other opposing candidates are just pretending and beautifying their images through lies and distortion.

When analyzing presidential debates, the researchers usually refer to Goffman's sociological theory (Brown, 2005; Boyd, 2013; Hinck & Hinck, 2017). Goffman (1967) considers the social world a stage where actors play multiple roles to build the image that they want others to see. Likewise, political actors and actresses make efforts to project the best "face" to receive support and ovation from the audience. Based on Goffman's theory, Brown and Levinson's politeness theory (1987) emphasizes on the fact that each person joining a conversation usually tries not to make the others lose face by avoiding imposing and face-threatening action in order to show that they respect the freedom and autonomy of others. This helps preserve interactants' positive "face wants" and "self-esteem." Paradoxically, the presidential candidates have to express opposing views to attack others but still have to maintain the positive self-image in the audience's eyes. In brief, politicians try to maintain their favorable face while conducting face-threatening acts. This principle is also applied by Trump in his debates. Particularly, Trump strategically combined positive politeness, negative politeness, and bald-on-record (Sibarani & Marlina, 2018). While he always shows his respect towards his opponent, he, at times, showed fierce disagreement towards politicians on behalf of ordinary citizens. Nonetheless, research has shown that presidential debates from the reign of George Bush have become less intellectual and academic (Lim, 2008). This is known as populism, where there is a movement away from the idea of being led by a pre-set politically elite group (Inglehart & Norris, 2016). This shift in language stems from the candidates' novel approach to presenting, defending, and attacking arguments (Oliver & Rahn, 2016). Therefore, there would be a large gap in research if previous studies on presidential debate solely focus on common strategies of politicians and conventional political discourses. Especially in the case of Donald Trump, he does not build up his image as a stereotypical politician but polishes his profile as a successful businessman who is tired of the traditional politics.

It is due to Trump's unique persona that requires the analysis of his presidential debates to rest on more different models than those mentioned above, for example, Van Dijk's social cognition (1998, 2001) about positive self-presentation and negative other-presentation. Van Dijk's model expresses the in-group favoritism while drawing a line between in-group and out-groups, good and bad, them and us, superior and inferior. Trump demonstrates his distinction between them and me, we and the politicians, a successful millionaire, and the destroyers of the American economy, and his action plan to bring a new breeze to the political belief of the American. The uniqueness in Trump's debates is that he adopts fear appeals from marketing into politics. Fear-appeal is one of the ubiquitous in the field of commerce, marketing, and economics, and there has been abundant research on this area (Grey, Owen, & Bolling, 2000; Neill, 2001; Hastings, Stead, & Webb, 2004; Simpson, 2017). Marketers use fear as their persuasion by describing the terrible things that may happen if the customers do not follow their recommendations. This method is also applicable in politics where politicians use fear appeals as a motive to decrease people's reliance on traditional habits and increase the openness of the audience. Trump, as an experienced businessman, knew right away that he had to use this method in his presidential debate. Therefore, to analyze Trump's presidential speech, the researchers have to consider multilateral methods based on four basic strategies of presidential debates, the theories of social cognitive, politeness, and the fear-raising approach.

The First Presidential Debate's Analysis and Discussion

The 2016 United States' presidential debates were a series of debates in preparation for the presidential election. The first presidential debate took place on September 26th, 2016. Donald Trump and Hilary Clinton were the opposing candidates that met the standards of inclusion. The topics in the first presidential debate included taxes – jobs, ISIS, racial issues, the economy, and crime, and criminal justice. Competition for power and dominance is highly frequent during this debate. This analysis based on the transcription of the first debate. The researchers made use of Fairclough's three-dimensional model and Van Dijk's model of positive self-presentation and negative other-presentation. Through these models, this analysis aimed to analyze the four strategies used in the presidential discourse of Trump's debate. Other linguistic aspects were also analyzed using the Flesch Reading Ease score and Nvivo version 11.0 sentimental tone test, mainly to prove Donald Trump's fear-appeal approach as well as his portrayal of himself as an outsider of traditional politics.

Discourse as text

Field of discourse

When the researchers analyzed the readability of Trump's speech in the first presidential debates, it ranked A in readability with Flesch Reading Ease at 78.6, which is higher than Clinton's score of 71.3 (the higher the score, the easier for readers to read). It is recognizable that Trump was trying to use straightforward and transparent vocabulary to channel a broader audience. However, to prove his general intellect, Trump, at times, tried to show the public his vocabulary is not limited through the use of an uncommon word such as "underleveraged" or "braggadocios" in the first presidential debate. This is in line with the anti-intellectualism in the American presidential campaigns. First, it is a positive self-presentation that portrays a knowledgeable Donald Trump who is willing to be "by the People, for the People, and of the People." This is characteristic of populism when populists want to use "underclass" and "ordinary people discourse" rather than institutionalized language (Watt, 2008; Gusterson, 2017).

Using Nvivo 21.0 to analyze the sentimental tone of Trump's discourse, the researchers also found evidence of Trump's tendency to threaten the listeners politically with negative word choice. Throughout his speech, Trump's wording shows negative to very negative tone in 142 out of 240 sentences (approximately 60% negative) about the current political, social, and economic situation.

| | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| 1: Internals \\Trump's speech | 66 Very negative | 76 Moderately negative | 60 Moderately positive | 38 Very positive |
|--------------------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------|

Figure 1. The sentimental tone of Donald Trump's discourse

Within this text, Trump strategically used his vocabulary to make America vulnerable, dangerous, and unsafe. For example, Trump chose the word "flee" to talk about a job that is only used when a person tries to escape very quickly from possible danger. For example, the job is "fleeing" from America and "going" Mexico and many other countries. By personifying "jobs" and adding verbs that create the feeling that the American situation was so critical that "job" has to try to escape, Trump attempted to use the "appeals to fear" strategy to attract his audience. Moreover, he used verbs like "take" or "steal" to talk about how other countries attract job opportunities from America. All these words create a feeling of America's being an underdog in the job market, threatened and tricked by all other countries.

But we have to stop our jobs from being **stolen** from us. ...**they're taking our jobs**. They're giving incentives, they're doing things that, frankly, we don't do.... (NYT, 2016)

This "wording of negative meaning" formed an image that America was being endangered by other countries, and the Americans were under the risk of losing all their jobs. Besides, he continually repeated words that created a chaotic and unstable image. Bad (19 times), disaster (6 times), wrong (13 times), and bubbles are some examples of these, and by using these words, he created uncertainty and described America as a country weakened and moving in the wrong direction. He also used a high frequency of negatively attributive language items, which demonstrate a negative-other presentation. Trump even linked the previous president of the United States – Barack Obama, who, by default, was considered a reputable politician— with the word "faults."

Trump also employed his marketers' fear appeal strategy by using fear-raising metaphorical language to describe the situation of America as a "**piggy bank** to rebuild China, and many other countries were doing the same thing." By making a comparison between America and a piggy bank, he showed that America has a lot of money but is useless. Piggy banks to rebuild China and other countries shape the idea that America was being exploited by all countries like a generous source of free loans and financial aids. Another metaphoric word that Trump used was "bubble." By using the word "bubble" twice, Trump signified that America is in an economic bubble. The bubble was on the edge of breaking very soon, which signaled an unstable situation.

In addition to negative vocabulary, Trump also mentioned topics that cause fear. During Trump's presidential debates, he spent much time talking about ISIS and China even when the conversation had nothing to do with terrorism topics. This may sound off-topic at first, but in fact, Trump was very consistent with his fear appeal approach. Not only did Trump repeatedly remind

the audience of the constant threats that Americans faced, but he also made use of extra-vocalization to link these threats to Hillary Clinton and implied that the voters should be cautious with their choices.

CLINTON: And I think it's time that the wealthy and corporations paid their fair share to support this country.

TRUMP: She's going to raise taxes \$1.3 trillion.

HOLT: Mr. Trump, I'm going to...

TRUMP: And look at her website. You know what? It's no difference than this. She's telling us how to fight ISIS. Just go to her website. She tells you how to fight **ISIS** on her website. (NYT, 2016)

Mode of discourse

There are three distinctive items of discourse markers that are characteristic of Trump's presidential debates, namely (1) the limited use of "well," (2) the involvement of the audience with "believe me" and (3) the use of shift indicator "by the way." In terms of discourse makers used to maintain interactivity discourses, "well" is considered when the most accessible context is not the most relevant for the interpretation of the impending utterances (Jucker, 1993: 435). Though frequently used in daily conversations with friends or acquaintances (Chung and Pennebaker, 2007), "well" is less expected in interview contexts (Fuller, 2003). In this case, a debate, its ideational function signifies that the content is uncertain and hesitant. This is well-reflected in Trump's discursive style used in the first presidential debate, which was described as straightforward, bash, and direct. It is noticeable that Hillary Clinton made use of "well" twice as many times as Donald Trump (29 and 16 occasions, respectively). This implies that she had more difficulty giving direct and apparent answers. This also signals that she was challenged more by Donald Trump. This indicates the "aggressive" feature of Trump's political mode of discourse connected a showcase of hierarchy and domination, especially in presidential debates, when immediate answers were sought on pressing contemporary issues. Trump's high frequency of unmarked turns of response to some extent contributes to an image of a decisive, experienced and knowledgeable debater as well as multimillionaire, given the attested role of "well" (and some other D.M.s) in attenuating speaker stance.

It is also believed that leading politicians often display a high level of categorial modality (Tannen, 2007; Fahnestock, 2011), and this is also what Trump usually utilizes to appeal to the audience. During the first presidential debates, "Believe me" was used seven times by Donald Trump. First of all, "believe me" was intended to be mocking

by keeping the interest rates at this level. And **believe me**: The day Obama goes off, and he leaves and goes out to the golf course for the rest of his life to play golf when they raise interest rates, you're going to see some very bad things happen... (NYT, 2016)

By using "believe me," he distanced himself from the perspective of a politician to show that he is a real American citizen that always understands what American thinks: "**And believe me**, this country thinks it's -- really thinks it's disgraceful, also." What's more, Trump uses "believe me" to show the audience that, as a successful businessman, a man of experience, Trump understands what the best option for America is: "And that was -- **believe me** -- I'm sure I'm not going to get credit for it -- but that was largely because of what I was saying and my criticism of NATO." All in all, the discourse marker "believe me" can mean differently in different contexts.

While minimizing the use of turn-initial discourse markers, Trump exploited to a higher degree the turn-medial discourse marker "by the way" to increase the spontaneity of his speech. This may describe the ideational function marking that the upcoming topic is not closely related to the discourse topic. This feature of discourse transitivity was beneficial in shifting the debate topic to a broader or more threatening issue that might back up his point of view as in (1) and (2), supporting his ideas using objective evidence from others, and distracting the host, the audience and his opponent from attacking him on his weaknesses as in (3) and (4).

(1) "...China is totally powerful as it relates to North Korea.

And **by the way**, another one powerful is the worst deal I think I've ever seen negotiated that you started is the Iran deal."

(2) "TRUMP: Your regulations are a disaster, and you're going to increase regulations all over the place.

And **by the way**, my tax cut is the biggest since Ronald Reagan. I'm very proud of it..."

(3) "The other thing, I'm extremely underleveraged. The report that said \$650 -- which, **by the way**, a lot of friends of mine that know my business say, boy, that's really not a lot of money."

(4) "CLINTON: In fact, Donald was one of the people who rooted for the housing crisis. He said, back in 2006, "Gee, I hope it does collapse, because then I can go in and buy some and make some money." Well, it did collapse.

TRUMP: **That's called business, by the way.**" (NYT, 2016)

During Trump's first presidential debate, the mode of discourse is signified by the epistrophe, which is a spontaneous repetition of words, phrases, and sentences to emphasize the situation that the U.S. is in, as in: "Our jobs are fleeing the country. **They're going to Mexico. They're going to many other countries.**" Trump also used repetitions to challenge Hillary Clinton and force her to answer his questions, which is a sign of spontaneity in the Presidential debate mode of discourse:

TRUMP: So is it President Obama's fault?

CLINTON: ... before you even announced.

TRUMP: Is it President Obama's fault?

CLINTON: Look, there are differences...

TRUMP: Secretary, is it President Obama's fault?

CLINTON: There are...

TRUMP: Because he's pushing it.

TRUMP: So is it President Obama's fault?

CLINTON: ... before you even announced.

(NYT, 2016)

Tenor of discourse

Trump differentiates himself from other "typical" politicians who have brought such disappointment to the American citizens and depicts himself as a successful and experienced businessman by saying that he is a "smart" businessman who is very successful with his business. This excerpt also presents the basic strategy of political debate when he rectified the information of the opposing candidate to first defend himself as well as redirect the attack to take advantage of it as an opportunity to polish his millionaire's name.

"CLINTON: ...they showed he didn't pay any federal income tax.

TRUMP: That makes me **smart**.

[..]But I could give you a list of banks, I would -- if that would help you, I would give you a list of banks. These are very **fine** institutions, very **fine** banks. I could do that very quickly.

TRUMP: ... I built an **unbelievable** company. Some of the **greatest assets** anywhere in the world... It's an **unbelievable** company."

(NYT, 2016)

Furthermore, Trump wanted to make an apparent distinction between himself and politicians through the term he chose to address Hillary Clinton as "Secretary Clinton" (24 times during the first debates). Trump intentionally proved that Hillary Clinton had been a politician for a really long time, but she had not been very effective with her work. This is shown by his mentioning of "politicians like Secretary Clinton" or "Secretary Clinton and others, politicians, should have been doing this for years," or "Typical politician. All talk, no action. Sounds good, doesn't work." Trump distanced himself from traditional politicians to show that he was not the kind of person that would bring disappointment to the voters. This is an example of positive-self- and negative-other self-presentation.

Discourse as a discursive practice

The discursive practice is a bridge that connects linguistic features with social practice to persuade the audience to believe that the candidate is suitable to be president. The discourse follows the patterns of question-answer, in which questions are

provided by the host, and the two candidates take turns to justify their political points. Technically speaking, the topics are initiated by the host, while issues are then approached, tackled, and distributed alternatively by the two candidates. However, there are occasions where the initiation and production of the topic do not come from the host but from the candidates as they use questions and arguments to attack each other.

The consumption of text is then largely aimed at the audience. Trump's linguistic style was aimed at a large audience; therefore, he usually utilized simple language, vivid and lively examples, and discourse markers, which shows an anti-intellectual tendency of the presidency. The main "consumer" of the text—the audience—however, was requested to remain silent rather than to react to what the candidates are trying to explain. Thus, the candidates have to take notice of other semiotic factors such as gestures, sounds (applause), and facial expressions from the audience to formulate their speech. Still, it is undeniable that the text is also consumed by the candidates as well as the host. This is because the candidates have to be attentive to other's arguments to counterattack, and the host needs to consume the text to maintain the sequence and the logic of the debate, which creates intertextuality. As the debate is closely monitored by the host, there is an overall coherence and cohesion. However, Trump diverged the attention from his weaknesses by using shift indicators like "by the way." This divergence seemed to disturb the sense of coherence and cohesion of the debate but was beneficial in protecting Trump's political persona.

Discourse as social practice

Trump also used a lot of interruptions and questions to take control of the debate. We can notice that he used many questions to distract or intrude in Hillary Clinton's speech. Although this may seem disturbing to some, other listeners may tolerate it because Hillary's logic in what she said seemed so weak that it became vulnerable to Trump's argument. Instead, Trump's linguistic styles showed that he considers questions and interruptions as a means of power control in a debate (Sclafani, 2017). However, Trump did not depict himself as an unbearable person in the audience's eyes as he always signaled his interruption and added humor to his speech:

CLINTON: I have a feeling that by the end of this evening, I'm going to be blamed for everything that's ever happened.

TRUMP: Why not?

CLINTON: Why not? Yeah, why not?

(NYT, 2016)

The transcript analysis of the text shows that there is an imbalance in the turns, and therefore, in power domination between Trump (91) and Clinton (71). This shows the inequality in power between the two candidates, and power was located with Trump. Trump was unwilling to give away his power as he tried to interrupt and talk more, thereby giving him more time to express his ideas regarding how to "make America great again." The audience, although asked to refrain from speaking, sometimes applauded to show their support for Trump's speech.

Conclusion

Trump's discourse in the first presidential debate shows diverse aspects of how a media star and multimillionaire approach politics. Just as appealing to the public as Trump is on television shows, when it comes to politics, not many people believed that Trump would be the next president. Trump strategically combined the four strategies of presidential debates, including (1) self-acclamation, (2) describing opposing candidates through the verbal attack, (3) and self-rectification or image-enhancement through the defense against opposing candidates' blaming argument, and (4) extra-vocalization. Trump depicted himself as a straightforward and tentative discourse marker user. He also used the interaction and spontaneity of speech to constantly attack and counterattack Hillary Clinton. Through answering Hillary's accusations, Trump was able to establish his image as the atypical candidate. Trump also cited what Clinton wrote on her website to expose to the audience that she was too naïve with her presidential plan to run the government. Also, one novel strategy that Trump used was the marketing strategy of "fear appeals" in his presidential debate that implicitly created fear among the public to persuade them to vote for him. Trump showed a tendency to interrupt more than the other candidates did, which was demonstrated by linguistics signals such as "by the way" and accompanied by his sense of humor. All of these factors led to the conclusion that Trump is an expert in debate and public speaking. Moreover, fear appeals and polite strategies were also successful in his presidential debate. It can be argued that Trump's discourse is an interesting material for analysts as it provides additional knowledge about how politicians use language and discourse strategies. In Trump's case, he used traditional strategies mixed with a more business-oriented approach. This is a valuable impetus on which researchers can rely to consider Trump's changes in linguistic style when he comes to the upcoming presidential campaigns in 2020.

References

- [1] Alrefaee, Y., Khaleel Mohammed Abdul-Ghafour, A. Q., Alazzany, M., & Alrefaee, S. (2019). A Critical Discourse Analysis of the Selected Opposition and State Printed Media on the Representation of Southern Mobility in Yemen. *International Journal of Linguistics, Literature and Translation*, 2(2), 116-124.
- [2] Al-Saedi, H. T. J., & Jabber, K. W. (2020). A Pragmatic Study of Newspaper Headlines in Media Discourse: Iraq as a Case Study. *International Journal of Linguistics, Literature and Translation*, 3(3), 48-59.
- [3] Benoit, W. L., Hansen, G. J., & Verser, R. M. (2003). A Meta-Analysis of the Effects of Viewing U.S. Presidential Debates. *Communication Monographs*, 335-350. doi:http://doi.org/10.1080/0363775032000179133
- [4] Bin, X. (2005). *Critical linguistics: Theory and application*. Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press. doi:http://doi.org/10.37028/lingcure.v3n1.7
- [5] Boyd, M. S. (2013). Reframing the American Dream. In P. Cap, & U. Okulska (Eds.), *Analyzing Genres in Political Communication: Theory and practice* (p. 300). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- [6] Brown, P., & Levinson, S. (1987). *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [7] Brown, R. E. (2005). Acting Presidential: The Dramaturgy of Bush Versus Kerry. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 78-91. doi:http://doi.org/10.1177/0002764205279397
- [8] Cheng, C. M. (2019). Acclaims, attacks, defenses: discourse analysis of Ma Ying-jeou's 2012 Taiwan presidential debates discourse. 19-43. doi:https://doi.org/10.1177/0957926519877696
- [9] Chilton, P., & Schäffner, C. (1997). Discourse as social interaction: discourse as social interactions. In T. A. Dijk (Ed.), *Discourse Studies: A Multidisciplinary Introduction* (pp. 206-230). London: Sage.
- [10] Chung, C. K., & Pennebaker, J. W. (2007). The Psychological Functions of Function Words. *Social Communication*, 343-359.
- [11] Chung, C., & Pennebaker, J. (2007, January). The Psychological Functions of Function Words. (K. Fiedler, Ed.) *Social Communication*, pp. 343-359.
- [12] Dijk, T. A. (1993). Principles of Critical Discourse Analysis. *Discourse & Society*, 249-283. doi:http://doi.org/10.1177/0957926593004002006
- [13] Dijk, T. A. (1998). *Ideology*. London: Sage Publications.
- [14] Edouihri, A. (2020). The Power of Political Persuasion: A Content Analysis of the Former Moroccan Prime Minister's Speeches. *International Journal of Linguistics, Literature and Translation*, 3(4), 134-148.
- [15] Fahnestock, J. (2011). *Rhetorical Style: The Uses of Language in Persuasion*. New York: Oxford University Press. doi:http://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199764129.001.0001
- [16] Fairclough, N. (1993). Critical Discourse Analysis and the Marketization of Public Discourse: The Universities. *Discourse and Society*, 133-168. doi:http://doi.org/10.1177/0957926593004002002
- [17] Fuller, J. M. (2003). Discourse marker use across speech contexts: A comparison of native and non-native speaker performance. *Multilingua - Journal of Cross-Cultural and Interlanguage Communication*, 2(22), 185-208. doi:http://doi.org/10.1515/mult.2003.010
- [18] Gee, J. P., & Handford, M. (2013). *The Routledge Handbook of Discourse Analysis*. Abingdon-on-Thames: Routledge.
- [19] Goffman, E. (1967). *Interaction ritual: essays in face-to-face behavior*. Chicago: Aldine Pub Co.
- [20] Grey, A., Owen, L., & Bolling, K. (2000). *A breath of fresh air: Tackling smoking through the media*. London: Health Development Agency.
- [21] Gusterson, H. (2017). From Brexit to Trump: Anthropology and the rise of nationalist populism. *Journal of the American Ethnological Society*, 209-214. doi:https://doi.org/10.1111/amet.12469
- [22] Halliday, M. A. (1971). *Linguistic function and literary style: An inquiry into the language of William Golding's The Inheritors*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- [23] Hamdan, A. H. E., & Elnadeef, E. A. E. (2020). Analysis of the Prime Minister Abdulla Hamdok's Speech from Rhetoric and Linguistic Perspective. *International Journal of Linguistics, Literature and Translation*, 3(27), 30-34.
- [24] Hastings, G., Stead, M., & Webb, J. (2004). Fear appeals in social marketing: Strategic and ethical reasons for concern. 21(11), *Psychology and Marketing*, 961-986. doi:http://doi.org/10.1002/mar.20043
- [25] Hinck, S. S., & Hinck, E. A. (2017). Politeness Strategies in the 1992 Vice Presidential and Presidential Debates. *Argumentation and Advocacy*, 234-250. doi:https://doi.org/10.1080/00028533.2002.11821570
- [26] Hussein, A. L., & Hussein, M. M. (2020). Pragma-Linguistic Analysis of Assertion in May's and Trump's Inaugural Addresses. *International Journal of Linguistics, Literature and Translation*, 3(2), 78-88.
- [27] Inglehart, R. F., & Norris, P. (2016). Trump, Brexit, and the Rise of Populism: Economic Have-Nots and Cultural Backlash. *HKS Working Paper No. RWP16-02*. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/
- [28] Jucker, A. H. (1993). The discourse marker well: A relevance-theoretical account. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 435-452. doi:http://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166(93)90004-9
- [29] Khaled, D. Y. A. (2020). A Critical Discourse Analysis of Benjamin Netanyahu's Speech at the United Nations General Assembly in 2014. *International Journal of Linguistics, Literature and Translation*, 3(3), 34-47.
- [30] Lim, E. T. (2008). *The Anti-Intellectual Presidency: The Decline of Presidential Rhetoric from George Washington to George W. Bush*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- [31] Neill, W. J. (2001). Marketing the Urban Experience: Reflections on the Place of Fear in the Promotional Strategies of Belfast, Detroit and Berlin. *Urban Studies*, 815-828. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1080/00420980125183>
- [32] NYT. (2016, September 27). *The New York Times*. Retrieved from Transcript of the First Debate: <https://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/27/us/politics/transcript-debate.html>
- [33] Oliver, J. E., & Rahn, W. M. (2016). Rise of the Trumpenvolk: Populism in the 2016 Election. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 189-206. doi:<http://doi.org/10.1177/0002716216662639>
- [34] O'Rourke, R., & Moodie, M. (2019). *U.S. Role in the World: Background and Issues for Congress*. Washington, DC: Congressional Research Service .
- [35] Pelinka, A. (2007). Language as a political category: The viewpoint of political science. *Journal of Language and Politics*, 129-143. doi:<http://doi.org/10.1075/jlp.6.1.09pel>
- [36] Sclafani, J. (2017). *Talking Donald Trump: A Sociolinguistic Study of Style, Metadiscourse, and Political Identity (Routledge Focus on Linguistics)*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- [37] Shibata, M. (2020). A functional analysis of reported speech in a Japanese political debate. *Journal of Language and Politics: Online-First Articles*. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1075/jlp.19061.shi>
- [38] Sibarani, J. G., & Marlina, L. (2018). POLITENESS STRATEGY USED IN REPUBLICAN DEBATE BY DONALD TRUMP. *E-Journal of English Language & Literature*, 531-535. Retrieved from <http://ejournal.unp.ac.id/index.php/ell/article/download/102007/100769>
- [39] Simpson, J. K. (2017). Appeal to fear in health care: appropriate or inappropriate? *Chiropractic & Manual Therapies*, 2-10. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1186/s12998-017-0157-8>
- [40] Tannen, D. (2007). *Talking Voices: Repetition, Dialogue, and Imagery in Conversational Discourse*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [41] Tian, X. (2018). Critical Discourse Analysis of News Reports— Based on the Guardian News Report of China's Military Parade to Mark the 70 Years of Second World War. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 433. doi:<http://doi.org/10.17507/tpls.0804.11>
- [42] Watt, P. (2008). 'Underclass' and 'ordinary people' discourses: Representing/representing council tenants in a housing campaign. *Critical Discourse Studies*, 345-357. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1080/17405900802405288>
- [43] Wodak, R., & Meyer, M. (2009). *Methods for Critical Discourse Analysis*. California: SAGE.