



## **Discourse Markers in Selected Political Speeches: A Descriptive Analysis**

Bushra Ni'ma RASHID<sup>1</sup>

### **Keywords**

Discourse markers,  
Political discourse,  
Textual DMs,  
Interpersonal DMs.

### **Abstract**

The present study examines the significance and functions of discourse markers (DMs) in political discourse through the analysis of two speeches of the American president Donald J. Trump. The present study addresses the question: How does Trump employ discourse markers as strategies of constructing power and gaining public support throughout his speeches. The study aims at revealing these strategies, their frequencies, and their functions in each speech through a quantitative and qualitative research. The study adopts Hyland and Tse's (2005) functional classification model involving textual and interpersonal discourse markers to investigate the speeches in question. Throughout the study, it is revealed that Trump is keen on using personalization DMs in interaction to influence, persuade and gain the public confidence and support. Trump also focuses essentially on additive DMs as a key factor of a mainstream of promises and pledges.

### **Article History**

Received  
17 Sep, 2020  
Accepted  
30 Dec, 2020

## **1. Introduction**

Since immemorial time, language has functioned in terms of communicating ideas, emotions and behaviours among people. A number of studies have deliberated how the use of language encrypts standards and strengthens the power structures of a society (McClay, 2017). However, there are variances in the discourse between ordinary discourse and the political discourse which is formed for argumentative and persuasive purposes in the political domain. Political discourse is goal-oriented towards constructing ideology and power and influencing the public. Political discourse compromises the reconstruction of political power. So, investigating this discourse can aid to disclose the key principles about how political power have to be planned and how does the structure of the discourse may contribute in planning this power. In this study, one of these key elements in constructing political discourse is to be investigated.

The element selected is the set of linguistic expressions from words' categories called discourse markers (DMs) including conjunctions (e.g. however, or, and), Interjections (e.g. oh), adverbs (e.g. now, then) or expressions such as (well, you know, I mean) that primarily function as cohesive ties which link discourse

---

<sup>1</sup> Corresponding Author. ORCID: 0000-0002-2620-850X. Assist. Prof. Dr., The University of Baghdad, College of Education, Ibn Rushd for Human Sciences, English Department, Bushra.nima@ircoedu.uobaghdad.edu.iq

fragments together to make sense on the textual level and also function as interactive devices on the interpersonal level. On the latter level, discourse markers show participants relationships, attitudes, and styles (Schiffrin, 1989). Many approaches are proposed to study discourse markers and classify them according to their form and function. Hyland and Tse's classification is adopted to analyse the two presidential speeches of Donald J. Trump.

The present study consists of three sections. The first section tackles the theoretical background of discourse markers. The second section is devoted for the methodology while in the third section, conclusions are drawn out.

## **2. Discourse Markers: A Theoretical Background**

### **2.1. Preliminary Remarks**

Discourse markers are those constituents such as 'you know, I mean, well, on...etc.' that link sentences or clauses to those after or before reflecting the attitude of the speaker and act as a coherence device (Trillo, 2006; cited in Mey, 2009)

However, Discourse marker is not the only term used to refer to these expressions due to the lack of agreement upon their definition. Schiffrin (1987) uses 'discourse marker', Fraser (1996) and Brinton (1996) call them 'pragmatic markers', Schourup (1985), Abraham (1991) and Knoon (1995) refer to them as 'discourse particles', Ostman (1981) uses the term 'pragmatic particle', Eman (1987) labels them as 'pragmatic expressions', Blakemore (1987; 1988) calls them as 'pragmatic connectives' whereas Flowerdew (2013) refers to them as conjunctions (cited in Jucker & Ziv, 1998; Flowerdew, 2013).

Flowerdew (2013, p. 38) adopts Christiansen (2011) description of discourse markers or conjunction as "The most explicit and obvious cohesive devices in a text".

Mey (2009) claims that discourse markers function as fillers and supporter for the discourse. In the most influential work investigating discourse markers by Schiffrin (1987), they are directly related to discourse. Dik (1987) defines discourse markers as a form of use of language involving aspects of function in the process of communication. In her definition: "Sequentially dependant elements which bracket units of talk" (p. 31), Schiffrin points that discourse markers are used in discourse to provide "contextual co-ordinates for utterance. She further adds that the significance of discourse markers spring from their essentiality in analysing the coherence of a discourse and how participants in a speech joint forms, meaning and actions to create a whole unified sense out of what is being said by participants.

The wide range of terms and definitions provided for discourse markers (DMs) have their own implication. These various terms reflects the many linguistic approaches studying DMs and their multi-functionality (Jucker & Ziv, 1998).

Mey (2009) lists three approaches of interest which are directed towards discourse markers. In the 1980s and early 1990s, authors were attracted to examine the presence and role of DMs in many languages. The first approach is **the conversational approach** which focuses on the contribution of DMs in the

formation of the conversation, In the light of this approach, Schiffrin (1987) states that conversational DMs aid turn - taking, speech structure and ideas organization, formulating the interactive structure between participants and the introduction of information.

The second model in correspondence to DMs is **the grammatico-syntactic approach**. In the latter approach, discourse markers are described as a homogenous group that functions as 'cue phrase'. Discourse markers act as coordinators, subordinators, conjunct adverbs, and phrases of sentential complement such as 'it may seem that'.

The third approach is **the discourse - cognitive approach** which views discourse markers as fillers for the slots of discourse the speaker and hearer need to build up the network of interaction. It concentrates on the fact that spoken interaction needs to be based on a pragmatic ground to hold it together.

Fraser (1996) provides another view for DMs. It works in the realm of a **grammatical-pragmatic perspective**. Fraser suggests that the meaning of sentence is based on the distinction between propositional and non-propositional parts of the sentence. The latter includes everything rather than parts containing propositional content such as different signals called pragmatic markers or discourse markers.

Fraser Proposes four classes of DMs:

1. Topic change markers: back to my original point, by the way, on the, etc.
2. Contrastive markers: in contrast, nevertheless though.
3. Elaborative markers: above all, what is more, in particular.
4. Inferential markers: all things considered, consequently, therefore.

Fraser characterises DMs by being "lexical expressions drawn from the syntactic classes of adverbs and non- propositional phrases which signal relationship between the interpretations of the segment they introduce S2 and the prior segment, S1". (Fraser, 1999, p. 950). Discourse markers have meaning that is procedural not conceptual (functional).

Halliday and Hasan (2006) work on cohesion as an element of the formation of a text in the linguistic system. They introduce cohesion as including: reference, substitution, ellipsis, conjunction (DMs) and lexical cohesion. They represent the systemic forms of relations in the linguistic system (p. 303).

According to Halliday and Hasan (1976), the conjunctions can be of four types in relation to their function in conveying meaning:

1. Additive (for example, and, in addition, besides, furthermore).
2. Adversative (but, yet, though, however).
3. Casual (so, then, therefore).
4. Temporal (next, after, that, finally, then) (Flowerdew, 2013).

The approach finally to be mentioned is the study of Blackmore investigation of DMs within the framework of Relevance Theory of Sperber and Wilson (1996.). It was not the discourse which forms the core of the Relevance Theory but "The cognitive process underlying successful linguistic communication" (Cited in Blackmore, 2002, p.5).

Blackmore (1987) states that discourse markers have the role of showing segments relations in a text. They govern the selection of the context related to the utterances being said. He points four roles played by discourse markers (ibid, 1992).

- 1- Deriving a contextual implication (e.g. therefore, too, so).
- 2- Strengthening assumptions given and provide evidence (e.g. after all, moreover, furthermore).
- 3- Contrasting a piece of information given (however, but, therefore).
- 4- Specification of the role of an utterance in a discourse (anyway, by the way, finally).

All in all, discourse markers are linguistic expressions that facilitate text. Range of definitions according to different model is provided by different researcher starting with Schiffrin and others follow.

## **2.2. Characteristic of Discourse Markers**

Brinton (1996) and Jucker and Ziv (1998) list a number of features distinguishing discourse markers (DMs) . These are:

- 1- Discourse markers are mainly concerned with spoken rather than written language.
- 2- They are marked phonologically having different intonations according to their function in a context.
- 3- They tend to occur in different slots in the sentence and discourse, they are mobile.
- 4- Their meaning is hard to be lexically specified.
- 5- They are, as Schiffrin (1987) agrees, syntactically independent or loosely attached with no explicit grammatical function.
- 6- They are optional since their deletion does not affect the structure or meaning of sentence. Though, their absence "removes a powerful clue." (Fraser, 1988, P.22 as cited in Brinton, 1996, P.34).
- 6- DMs are multifunctional performing on different levels.

## **2.3. Functional Classification of Discourse Makers**

Schiffrin (1987) and Brinton (1996) Point that the use of DMs is grammatically optional. Brinton asserts that they are semantically empty, though they have pragmatic function. Different approaches to DMs show their functional aspects in structuring texts and attitudes. Basing her classification on Holliday's (1973), Brinton introduced two major classes of DMs. These classes are mainly derived

from the functions of expressions in question. These classes are: The textual function and the interpersonal function shown in:

**Table 1:** Is Adopted from Brinton (1996, PP. 35-40).

<b>Textual functions</b>	To initiate discourse, including claiming the attention of the hearer	Opening frame marker
	To close discourse	Closing frame marker
	To aid the speaker in acquiring or relinquishing the floor.	Turn takers  (Turn givers)
	To serve as a filler or delaying tactic used to sustain discourse or hold the floor	Fillers  Turn keepers
	To indicate a new topic or a partial shift in topic	Topic switchers
	To denote either new or old information	Information indicators
	To mark sequential dependence	Sequence/relevance markers
	To repair one's own or others' discourse.	Repair markers
<b>Interpersonal functions</b>	Subjectively, to express a response or a reaction to the preceding discourse including also back-channel signals of understanding and continued attention while another speaker is having his/her turn.	Response/reaction markers  Back-channel signals
	Interpersonally, to effect cooperation or sharing, including confirming shared assumptions, checking or expressing understanding, requesting confirmation, expressing difference or saving face (politeness).	Confirmation-seekers  Face-savers

The textual or discursual function indicate the relationship between prior, present, and later discourse signalling text constituents from another, or joining those constituents into larger contexts. In short, textual function is concerned with cohesive ties holding up a text or a discourse attached together.

The interpersonal function aids the speaker to express himself as in opening a discourse and drawing attention of hearers or readers.

Muller (2005) and Aijmer (1996) agree that DMs assist the hearer processing and comprehending of the speaker's speech. DMs are directors of hearer's comprehension.

Hayland and Tse (2004, PP.156-177) further subdivide the textual and interpersonal function classes into more detailed and precise divisions.

### 2.3.1 Textual Discourse Markers

According to Hyland Tse (2004), DMs are divided into seven types:

1. **Logical Markers:** Are those conjunctions denoting meaning and structure relationships between discourse strings and assist readers or hearers to perceive pragmatic links. These are four subcategories:

A- Additive (and, furthermore, besides, in addition, on the top of that...etc.)

This category originally suggested by Halliday and Hassan (1976) which perform cohesive function joining two syntactic elements such as words, phrases, clauses, sentences and even paragraphs.

B- Adversative (but, however, though).

C- Conclusive relationships (finally, in sum).

D- Causatives (So, because, as a result).

2- **Sequencers:** Discourse markers denote a specific place in a sequence to direct the reader across different points and discussions in a certain arrangement (at the first place, secondary,).

3- **Reminders:** Refer back to a former part of the text to emphasize, summarise or support something (as...said, as...mentioned early).

4- **Topicalisers:** Are conjunctions which denote a change of the topic or a move from one to another smoothly (now, concerning, on the,). They indicate the speaker's rule on what is going to come up next in a discourse (Schiffrin, 1987).

5- **Code glosses:** Those conjunctions help illustration, expansion, and exemplification of the content to reflect the speaker's capability to anticipate the hearer or reader's knowledge to process the discourse (for instance, that is, in other words).

6- **Illocutionary markers:** Are those labelling the action performed by the writer within a text (I hope to persuade, I back up this idea).

7- **Announcements:** Markers that signal future parts of the discourse to foreshadow for and prepare the reader for the upcoming information or debate (I will resent, I will outline, later on...).

### 2.3.2. Interpersonal Discourse Markers

Besides the sub-classification of textual markers, Hyland and Tse, sub-classify the interpersonal markers into five major types:

1- **Hedges:** Markers that indicate uncertainty such as (may, might, would, perhaps, maybe, it is likely, it is probable...).

2- **Certainty markers:** are markers opposite to hedges showing that the writer is certain in what he says (undoubtedly, of course, naturally, in fact, you know).

According to Schiffrin (1987, p.268), 'you know' plays two roles, both the speaker and hearer share this piece of knowledge and that this knowledge is common.

3- **Attributors:** Are markers which contribute two functions. First, they indicate from where the information emerges and to give authority and a persuasive power (as president indicates...).

4- **Attitude Markers:** Are markers conveying the writer's attitudes and values to affect the reader; they can be also sub-categorized into:

A- Deontic Verbs: must, have to, ought to, it is a necessity,

B- Attitudinal Adverbs: (Surprisingly, unexpectedly well, with a shock...).

C- Adjectival Construction: (unfortunate case, impossible, it is hard, it is kind...).

D- Cognitive Verb: (I think, I believe, I see...).

5- **Commentaries:** Are markers that support the writer's or speaker's rapport with the audience via means of rhetorical questions (is this the right attitude?),

direct appeals (dear reader, you) or personalisation's (I, we, me, my feelings) personalises help to build a rapport and develop a connection between the speaker and the audience, mainly for a persuasive purposes. It is worth mentioning that the classification above of Hyland and Tse (2004) is the model adopted in this study.

#### **2.4. Political Speeches and Discourse Analysis**

Politics is mainly concerned with the struggle for power and control. It is centred on authority and decision making by influencing the public opinions and attitudes of the citizens. This control seeks to maintain certain concepts and interests in practices. The transformation of politician's will into a social ground needs the linguistic factor to take place. Language is fundamental in preparing the political action and control to influence the public (Schaffner, 1997).

Political language indicates language use in political contexts and settings. In the latter context, a text involves an ideology and belief of politics and social practices (Schaffner, 1997)

Political actions, as Chilton and Schaffner (2002) put it, would not be present in the absence of language component to achieve the political influence on the nation. Dijk (1997) points that every single political discourse has its own function planned by the politician. Dijk (ibid) further adds that politicians or political actors deliver their speeches in an ultimate correct form to reflect formal style of language as well as an accurate step of choosing words appropriate to the goal desired, audience and situation.

Chruszczewski (2002) points that oriented presidential discourse into a specific aim, can affect a wide range of people. Language is a basic tool for politicians to build rapport with all people receiving their speech, that is, they control what people receive and how people receive it. Politicians make benefits of their political background knowledge, interests, ideologies, needs, beliefs, sacramental and history in their speech to control the receivers.

The significance of language in politics could not be ever described as Chilton and Schaffner (2002) perfectly picture it on (P.30):

Only in and through language can one issue comment and threats. And only through language tied into social and political institutions can one declare war, declare guilty or not guilty, prorogue parliaments, or raise or lower taxes.

Discourse analysis, as Brown and Yule (1983) point, is the analysis of language in use. It does not only describe linguistic forms, but also the function of these forms. Stubbs (1983) states that discourse analysis investigates the structure of the language beyond the sentence such as texts conversations.

Discourse markers are tools of language to achieve certain aims in politics and any field in human's affair. The analysis of DMs is part of the analysis of discourse coherence - how participants join form, meaning and action to frame what is uttered and this is the case of this study.

### 3.1. The Data Selected

The two speeches assigned to be analysed in this study are presented by Donald J Trump as part of his campaign to win the US presidency in 2016 and 2017 . These speeches are presented for the largest range audience and intentionally selected to specify the values considered to be delivered to this wide range of people. The first speech is intended to accept and announce Trump’s nomination for the USA Presidency. In order to guarantee the winning of his campaign, Trump introduces local and nationally vital values of his future rule. Consequently, the second speech is selected to diagnose the consistency of these values after the winning The USA presidential election. The transcripts of these speeches are retrieved from McClay (2017).

### 3.2. The Model Adopted

To study the use of discourse markers in the presidential speeches under examination, Hyland and Tse’s (2004) functional classification is adopted for it covers the wide variety of discourse markers that are commonly used. Discourse markers according to the model adopted are divided into textual and interpersonal DMs. The classification is as shown in the table below:

**Table 2: Hyland and Tse’s (2004) Classification of DMs:**

	Category	Type	Function & Examples
Textual DMs	1 Logical Markers	Additives Adversatives Conclusive Causatives	A-Link syntactic units (and, or). b-Contrast ideas( but, however) C-e.g. In sum, finally. d-indicate cause and result ( so, because)
	2 Sequencer Markers		Denotes the successive of elements or ideas ( first, next, then)
	3 Reminder Markers		Denote back to earlier parts (as... said), amplify or summaries a section.
	4 Topicalisers		Denote a topic move ( now)
	5 Code-glosses Markers		Explain, expand, exemplify and rephrase content (that is)
	6 Illocutionary Markers		Denote the speaker’s performance through discourse (I back up this idea)
	7 Announcement		Denote future sections or discussions (I will present, outline)
Interpersonal DMs	1 Hedges		Denote the speaker’s uncertainty (would, may, perhaps)
	2 Certainty Markers		Denote the speaker’s certainty (of course, in fact)
	3 Attributors		Denote the source of information presented ( as the vice president mentioned)
	4 Attitude Markers	Deontic verbs	Modal verbs of obligation and necessity (must, have).
		Attitudinal adv. Adjectival const. Cognitive verbs	Reflect the speaker’s attitude towards content (surprisingly). e.g. It is not easy to. E.g. I think, I want.
5 Commentaries	a-Rhetorical question b-Direct appeal c- Personalisations	-e.g. Who would think of this? -e.g. Dear audience, you, your - e.g. I, we, my, me	

### 3.3. Samples of Data Analysis

In order not to have so bulky section, the researcher provides an extract of the first speech to be analysed as a standard model for the analysis of the entire two speeches. The data analysis and results discussion are previewed in this section while the full transcript of the speeches texts is included in the appendix at the back of the paper. The research adopts both quantitative and qualitative method to analyse the data manually. First, the frequency of discourse markers used is to be counted and results are to be stated in tables. According to the frequencies of discourse markers found in the speeches, a discussion will be carried out to illustrate the significance of these results to the political speeches of Donald Trump.

#### **Speech Sample: An extract of the Republican National Convention (RNC) speech presented on the 21st of July 2016.**

*Friends, delegates and fellow Americans: I humbly and gratefully accept your nomination for the presidency of the United States. Who would've believed that when we started this journey, June 16th of last year... we and I say we, because we are a team ...would have received almost 14 million votes, the most in the history of the Republican Party. And that the Republican Party would get 60% more votes than it received 8 years ago. Who would've believed this? Who would've believed this? The democrats, on the other hand, received 20% fewer votes than they got 4 years ago. Not so good. Not so good. Together, we will lead our party back to the White House, and we will lead our country back to safety, prosperity, and peace. We will be a country of generosity and warmth. But we will also be a country of law and order. Our Convention occurs at a moment of crisis for our nation. The attacks on our police, and the terrorism in our cities, threaten our very way of life. Any politician who does not grasp this danger is not fit to lead our country.*

*Americans watching this address tonight have seen the recent images of violence in our streets and the chaos in our communities. Many have witnessed this violence personally; some have even been its victims. I have a message for all of: the crime and violence that today afflicts our nation will soon, and I mean very soon, come to an end. Beginning on January 20th 2017, safety will be restored. The most basic duty of government is to defend the lives of its own citizens. Any government that fails to do so is a government unworthy to lead. It is finally time for a straightforward assessment of the state of our nation. I will present the facts plainly and honestly.*

*We cannot afford to be so politically correct anymore. So if you want to hear the corporate spin, the carefully-crafted lies, and the media myths the Democrats are holding their convention next week. Go there. But here, at our convention, there will be no lies. We will honor the American people with the truth, and nothing else. These are the facts: Decades of progress made in bringing down crime are now being reversed by this Administration's rollback of criminal enforcement. Homicides last year increased by 17% in America's fifty largest cities.*

Table 2 shows the results of the analysis of the first extract summarizing the forms, functions and frequencies of the DMs used specifically in the extract above.

**Table 3: Textual DMs**

Category	Type	DMs used	Frequency	Percentage	
1	Logical	a-Additive	and	16	64%
		b-Adversative	but	2	12%
			On the other hand	1	
c-causative	so	1	8%		
	because	1			
2	Topicalisers	now	1	4%	
3	Code-glosses	These are	1	4%	
4	Announcements	I have a message	1	8%	
		I will present	1		
Total			25	100%	

**Table 4: Interpersonal DMs**

Category	Type	DMs used	Frequency	Percentage
1	a-Cognitive verbs	Believe	3	23%
		want		
	b-Adjectival construction	Not good	1	
			2	
	c-Attitudinal adverbs	Humbly	1	
Gratefully		1		
Honestly		1		
Plainly		1		
2	a-Rhetorical question	-Who would've believed?	3	
	b-Direct appeal	Friends	1	
		Delegates	1	
		Fellow Americans	1	
		You	1	
		Go there	1	
	c- Personalisation	We	9	77%
		Our	13	
I		5		
Total			45	100%

The results, shown above in the table, reveal that among textual discourse markers, logical connective 'and' is the dominant marker Trump employs to get his speech firmly connected with percentage reached 64%. In this sense, 'and' is employed here as preferable cohesive device. It conveys the sense of continuity and the availability of more chances hopes and repairs as in: "and we will lead our country back to safety, prosperity, and peace."

Coherence, the basic function of textual marker is also provided in the extract by the use of adversative DM 'on the other hand' to contrast ideas presenting the difference in the public response to the Republican Party in comparison to Democratic Party. This comparison in turn, implies the message that democrats lost their popular base because of their failure in running the country. The term 'but' is used for the same function comparing the rule of Trump and the ones before "But here... there will be no lies".

Causative markers 'because' and 'so' indicate causes and results. Here, they are used to underlie Trump accusation for democrats as liars where no lies on his ground. Furthermore, it is used to emphasize unity by using 'we'.

Trump uses the topicaliser 'now' to denote topic shift and in fact to denote a negative shift in the country safety status by the previous administration "*now being reversed by this administration*". The code-glosses 'these are' is used to list the negative points in the ruling of democrats, his opponents. Announcements 'I have a message, I will present the facts' are also used to attract the audience attention to what he will say that is, the weapon he directs against his opponents.

Among Interpersonal markers, commentaries are the dominants. The use of personalisations control the total use of discourse marker reaching 77%. Trump's use of rhetorical questions draws the public's attention to the serious matter beyond the decrease of the percentages of Democratic Party advocators. The use of direct appeals has its function significant. Using 'friends, fellow, delegates' gives (give) the audience the sense of solidarity and get distance between the president and audience closer. These casual expressions Trump used to address his public, will naturally, by human nature, reflect the sense of closeness of the people to their president, being such close, will get them relieved and having (have) more hope of someone knows them better. Trump employs the adjectival construction in the negative aspect to describe the system of his competitors "Not good". Attitudinal adverbs are employed to kindly perform his verbal actions "Humbly, plainly, gratefully and honestly". Additionally, cognitive verb 'believe' is highlighted as a core for support. 'Belief in' something means advocate it even deadly.

Finally, the striking result goes to the use of personalization which fulfills the goal of smoother interaction. The use of 'we' and 'our', normally convey the sense of unity and being (be in) the same level. Trump use of personalisers " We are a team", "we will", "our nation", "our convention" and so on, all denote, as well as the use of "together", that the presidential nominee is part of the nation and then is the best to understand it and protect its interest. Trump uses 'I' to highlight his future actions and powerful promises.

### 3.4. Data Analysis

Speech Sample 1: The Republican National Convention Speech presented by Donald J. Trump as to announce his acceptance for his nomination to the presidency of the United States of America.

**Table 5:** Textual Markers of Speech Sample 1

Category	Type	DMs Used	Frequency	Percentages	
1	Additive	and	226	320 = 86%	
		again	19		
		or	13		
		Also	7		
		another	3		
	Logical	Adversative	But		20
			Instead		4
			On the other hand		4
			While		2
			Yet		2
	Causatives	Because	11		
		So	6		
		As long as	2		
In the cause		1			
2	Sequencers	After	6	14= 4%	
		Then	4		
		Next	1		
		Lastly	1		
		Thereafter	1		
		first	1		
3	Reminders	One more	3	9= 2%	
		One after another	1		
		One such	1		
		America first	2		
		This	1		
		A new step	1		
		Now	3		
4	Topicalisers	This time	1	6= 2%	
		In this race	1		
		On the...	1		
		This includes	5		
5	Code-glosses	These	4	16= 5%	
		That is	3		
		I mean	3		
		Let's review	1		
		I have a message	1		
6	Announcements	I will present	1	6= 1%	
		I will outline	1		
		I say	1		
		I will share	1		
		I will tell	1		
		Total			

**Table 6:** Interpersonal DMs of Speech Sample 1

Category	Type	DMs Used	Frequency	Percentages
Hedges		Would	6	8= 2%
		may	2	
Certainty Markers		I know	2	6= 1%
		I'm certain	1	
		In fact	1	
		Really	1	
Attributers		As usual	1	1= 0.2%
		they	1	
Attitudes	Deontic Verbs	Must	7	53= 11%
	Cognitive Verbs	Think	7	
		Believe	5	
		Remember	4	
		Want	3	
		Know	3	
	Adjectival Construction	Consider	1	
		Good	3	
		True	1	
		Lawful	4	
	Attitudinal Adverbs	Tremendous	1	
		Never	4	
		Ever	4	
Humbly		1		
Gratefully		1		
Plainly		1		
Honestly		1		
Rhetorical Questions	Frankly	1		
	Who would've?	3		
	What do us..?	1		
	Who have?	1		
Commentaries	Direct appeal	Did they do?	1	
		You	49	
		your	14	
		Think of this/ that	7	
	Personalisations	Remember	4	
		Friends	1	
		Delegates	1	
		Fellow American?	1	
		Americans	1	
		Go there	1	
		Our	111	
	I	85		
	We	79		
My	33			
Me	5			
Together	1			
Total			466	100%

Among textual markers, the results show that Trump apparently concentrates on the use of logical additive 'and' which counted 226 times to form 86% of textual markers as a whole. The essential function of logical markers is to get a discourse united and coherent. Trump here employs 'and' to pour continually a mainstream of promises and dreamy pictures of the future. For a closer look: "we will show the

*whole world that America is still free **and** independent **and** strong. ... I am with you **and** I will fight for you **and** I will win for you.”* Moreover, to pour the negative points of his opponent one attached to the other for more powerful influence as in: *“Her bad instinct **and** her bad judgment.... After four years of Hillary Clinton... Libya in ruins **and** our Ambassador **and** his staff were left helpless ...”*

Another logical additive is explicitly used for a purpose. The additive ‘again’ is used to add elements to a list. On the top that, ‘again’ is specifically placed 20 times to denote a case of prosperity to revive after being lost a while. This is explicit in “America first again, America proud again, great again, strong again and America safe again”.

The obvious logical adversative marker used is ‘but’ which counted 20 times. The main function of adversatives is to contrast ideas. In this speech, ‘but’ is essentially placed to state the difference between the democrats rule and the republican vision as in “*politicians have talked about this for years, **but** I’m going to do it”* and “*if you want to hear ...lies,... the Democrats are holding their convention next week. Go there. **But** here, no lies.”* Another placement of adversatives is by using ‘instead’ which explicitly suggests alternative matters that may gain the public satisfaction, attraction and support as in “***Instead**, we must work with all of our allies who share our goal of destroying ISIS.”*

The discussion concerning logical markers will end up at the station of causatives. The dominant logical causatives are ‘because’ of 11 times use and ‘so’ of 6 times use. Their major function is to relate causes and results. Here, in the speech sample one, ‘because’ mostly serves purposes against Trump’s opponent as in “*They are throwing money at her **because** they have total control over everything single she does.”*

Sequencers are used only 14 times to show the order of events and ideas and the mostly frequent sequencer are ‘after’ of 6 times frequency and ‘then’ of 4 times only. Reminders are used 9 times to amplify or summarize previous piece of discourse as in “*their amazing daughter was just **one more** American life that wasn’t worth protecting. **One more** child to sacrifice”*. Topicalisers are used 6 times forming 2% only. Their basic function is to mark shift of topics and here the mostly used topicaliser is ‘now’ with 3/6 frequency. It is intentionally assigned to mark the new era of the prospective administration presented by Trump as it is clear in “***Now** I’m going to make our country rich again”* and to change the direction of the speech as in “***Now** let us consider the state of affairs abroad.”*

Announcement is the last textual category to discuss. Announcements are used to declare the next statement forward. To get the audience attention to specific pieces of discourse as in: “*Tonight, **I will share with you my plan** for action for America.”*

Among the interpersonal markers, the commentaries occupy the first rank with 86%. Interpersonal markers’ main function is to strengthen the interaction between the participants in a discourse and to shorten distances. Here, Trump waters the public’s thirst for a president who feels their sufferings, needs and hopes; a president who is closer to them than all those before to trust. Trump, perfectly brings down all barriers between him and his public using language full of ‘we, our’ to build unity and draw the common dream forward. Using ‘our’ 111

times and 'we' 79 times, the presidential nominee suggests that he is neither split nor different. Instead, Trump introduces himself as part of the American body, feels what the whole country feels and wants and does what all Americans benefit from. Trump achieves that by employing 'we, our' as in: "**we are a team, We will be a country of generosity and warmth, we will build, we will rebuild, we will fix, we will take care, we can accomplish, our country, our nation**" And so on. Not only to enhance relationships, but also to gain support to. With the use of 'we and our', Trump hints that Americans are part of every step and responsibility forward via supporting their future leader.

The employment of 'I' has its own significant of 85 frequencies. As the core function of 'I' is to attribute to one's self, Trump uses 'I' to introduces a glittering necklace of pledges and promises that are powerful to persuade the public hearing , as in "**I AM your VOICE, I alone can fix it, , I am the Law and Order candidate, I can be your champion, I am With you.**"

The presidential nominee cleverly uses direct appeal markers to get himself closer to his hearers. Trump addresses American audience with 'friends, delegates and fellow' to show closeness, equivalence, and solidarity. Being the same level with the public, will surely gain the speaker the audience support. That is, naturally, people are the farthest for arrogant leaders. Trump directs the ball into the public ground using 'you' 49 times to attract their attention to some points in specific, to tell their dreams as true under his future lead and to strengthen the relationship between him and his supporters "*I love you, I will always give you my love.*"

*Trump uses rhetorical questions in the RNC speech for 6 times mainly to draw the attention to the radical change of people's choice which is altered from democrats to republican, to stimulate them thinking why. This is a smart way getting the public find, by them, encouraging matters to abandon democrats and invest their hopes in the republicans.*

Concerning markers of attitude, whose function is to convey the speaker's attitude towards the events and the content of discourse? Trump posits 7 uses of the deontic verb 'must' to highlight the high necessity of the steps and ideas he assigns to be the torch of his leadership as in: " We must have the best , We must abandon the failed policy , we must work." In addition, Trump (be consistent in writing the names) employs the cognitive verbs in 23 positions, especially the verb 'think' with 7 times usage and the verb 'believe' with 5 times usage to persuade the audience and gain their confidence as in : "*think of this, think of that.*" Or in "Believe me, believe me."

Adjectival constructions basically function to describe what is being told, and in this speech, they are directed successfully to amplify the attitudes towards some actions as in: "*and will work directly with them to protect the integrity of our **lawful lawful** immigration system. **Lawful.***" Attitudinal adverbs have the function of reflecting the speaker's attitude towards actions or statements being told. In the RNC speech, Trump uses kind words to reflect his attitude towards how he accepts nomination 'humbly and gratefully' and to present facts 'plainly and honestly' to affect emotionally the public.

**Speech Sample 2: Inaugural Address Transcript, January 20th 2017 Which was Presented by Donald J. Trump after the Announcement of his Four Years as the President of the American United States.**

**Table 7: Textual Markers of Speech Sample 2**

Category	Type	DMs Used	Frequency	Percentages
1	Additive	and	74	113= 90%
		again	9	
		or	4	
		another	2	
	Adversative	But	13	
		While	6	
		However	1	
	Causatives	Because	2	
		As long as	1	
	Conclusive	Finally	1	
2	Sequencers	Then	1	1= 0.8%
3	Reminders	America first	3	5= 4%
		These	2	
4	Topicalisers	Now	6	6= 5%
5	Code-glosses	At the center of this	1	1= 0.8%
6	Announcements	From this day forward	2	1= 0.8%
		Hear these words	1	
Total			127	100%

**Table 8:** Interpersonal DMs of Speech Sample 2

Category	Type	DMs Used	Frequency	Percentages	
1	Attitudes	Deontic Verbs	Must	3	7 = 5%
			Should	1	
	Attitudinal Adverbs	Honestly	1		
		Importantly	1		
		Truly	1		
Commentaries	Direct appeal	You	13		
		your	11		
		Remember	2		
		Chief	1		
		President	4		
		Fellow	1		
		Americans	2		
		people	1		
		Personalisations	Our	48	
			I	3	
We	45				
My	1				
Together	4				
Total			143	100%	

In the second speech of Trump and amongst the textual markers, the logical additive wins the race with frequent use that reached 112 times forming 90% of the whole use of textual markers through the speech. Additive ‘and’ comes first with 73 times frequent. Trump concentrates on using ‘and’, as it is in the first speech, to get his speech firmly attached together and to draw a list of future actions: *“We will build new roads, **and** highways, **and** bridges, **and** airports, **and** tunnels, **and** railways.”* For adversatives, Trump uses ‘but’ 13 times and ‘while’ for 6 times. Adversatives serve to show contradiction and in the next quotation, adversative is directed to contrast the previous administration to the vision of the new administration as in *“Washington flourished but the people did not share in its wealth. Politicians prospered **but** the jobs left, and the factories closed. The establishment protected itself, **but** not the citizens.”* Also, it is clear in: *“nation's Capital has reaped the rewards of government **while** the people have borne the cost. ... **while** they celebrated in our nation's capital, there was little to celebrate for struggling families.”*

The president moves among topics using the topicaliser ‘now’ for 6 times. He indicates not only the new points in his speech, but the new beginnings *“**Now** arrives the hour of action.”* Trump makes two announcements in his speech to declare his vision and future actions. *“From this day forward, it's going to be only America First.”*

Concerning interpersonal markers, the president employs as much as possible of personalization and direct appeal markers which are counted 136 of 143 to form the highest percentage of 95% of the whole use of Trump use ‘our’ 48 times and ‘we’ for 45 times to shortening the distance and strengthening relationships with his public reflecting unity, solidarity and the sense of teamwork as in *“**Together, we** will determine the course of America and the world for years to come. **We** will*

*face challenges. We will confront hardships.*” He uses the term ‘together’ to distribute responsibilities that are; the government can do the job towards the nation with the cooperation of the citizens. Less use of ‘I’ is noticed to attribute actions to him.

Trump uses direct appeal to address his audience and attract their attention to specific points. The president uses ‘you’ mostly to raise the public’s awareness to his intended points and to influence them as in “*you will never be ignored again.*”

### **3.5. Comparative Analysis**

The first speech was presented by Trump as a candidate for presidency while the second was presented by Trump as the president of the United States of America. The main and only difference is the briefness of the second speech than the first. In terms of DMs, both speeches are distinguished by the dominance of logical markers as cohesive ties with percentage of 87% in the first speech and 90% in the second speech. To consider interpersonal discourse markers, in both speeches under examination, commentaries and specifically personalisation markers occupy the first rank in use with 86% percentage in the first speech and 95% percentage in the second speech. In both occasions, Trump insists on a progressive flow of future achievements and comparative statements with the previous administration using additive and adversative markers. Both speeches in concern are loaded with the use of personalisation markers to establish closeness and gather support.

### **Conclusion**

The investigation of the speeches of the presidential nominee Trump reveals his pattern of using discourse markers by Trump to influence his public and guarantee their voices and then supports. Trump employs logical markers as cohesive devices keeping his speech in progress for more effect and to his pledges, promises and future achievements. Moreover, Trump makes a list of comparisons with the opponent party represented by ‘Hillary Clinton’ in order direct the voters thinking towards him as the saver. Trump also, loads the two speeches with personalisation markers to build rapport with his audience and persuade them to gain their votes and supports. This pattern formulates the answer to the research question.

## Bibliography

- Aijmer, Karin (1996). *Conversational Routines in English: Convention and Creativity*. London: Longman.
- Blakemore, D. 1987. *Semantic Constraints on Relevance*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Blakemore, D. 1992. *Understanding utterances*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Blakemore, Diane. (2002). *Relevance and Meaning: The Semantics and Pragmatics of Discourse Markers*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Brinton, L. (1996). *Pragmatic markers in English. Grammaticalization and discourse functions*. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Brown, G. & Yule, G. (1983). *Discourse Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Chilton, P. & Schaffner, C. (2002). *Politics as Text and Talk: Analytic Approaches to Political Discourse*. Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Chruszczewski, Piotr (2002). *The Communicational Grammar of Political Discourse*. Berlin: Logos.
- Dik, Simon, C (1987). "Some principles of functional grammar". In: *Functionalism*
- Flowerdew, J. (2013). *Discourse in English Language Education*. NY: Routledge.
- Fraser, B. (1996). "Pragmatic Markers". *Journal of Pragmatics*, 6(2), 167-190 .
- Fraser, B. (1999). What are discourse markers?. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 31, 931-952.
- Halliday, M., A., K. & Hasan, R. 2006. *Cohesion in English*. Harlow: Pearson Education
- Halliday, M.A.K. and Hasan, R. (1976). *Cohesion in English*. London: Longman.
- Hyland, K., & Tse, P. (2004). *Metadiscourse in academic writing: A reappraisal in Applied Linguistics*: Oxford
- in *Linguistics*. (Eds). René Dirven and Fried, V. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Jucker, A., & Ziv, Y. (1998). *Discourse markers: Descriptions and theory*. Amsterdam/ Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- McClay, R. (2017). *Us and Them: A Descriptive Analysis of Donald Trump's Campaign Speeches*. (MA. Published Dissertation). College of Arts. University of Birmingham.
- Mey, J. L. (2009). *Coincise Encyclopedia of Pragmatics*. UK: Elsevier.
- Muller, S. (2005). *Discourse markers in native and non- native English discourse*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Schaffner, C. (. (1997). *Analysing Political Speeches*. Frankfurt Lodge: Short Run Press.
- Schiffrin, D. (1987). *Discourse markers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Schourup, L. C. (1999). Discourse markers, *Lingua*, 107: 227-265.
- Sperber, D. and Wilson, D. (1986). *Relevance: Communication and Cognition*. Oxford: Blackwell, Second Edition 1995.
- Stubbs, M. (1983). *Discourse analysis: The sociolinguistic analysis of natural language*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (1997) "What is the Political Discourse?" In: *Belgian Journal of Linguistics: Political Linguistics*. (Eds.). J. Bloom mart and Ch. Bulcaen. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Company.

## Appendix 1: Republican National Convention (RNC) Speech Transcript, July 21st 2016

Friends, delegates and fellow Americans: I humbly and gratefully accept your nomination for the presidency of the United States. Who would've believed that when we started this journey, June 16th of last year... we and I say we, because we are a team ...would have received almost 14 million votes, the most in the history of the Republican Party. And that the Republican Party would get 60% more votes than it received 8 years ago. Who would've believed this? Who would've believed this? The democrats, on the other hand, received 20% fewer votes than they got 4 years ago. Not so good. Not so good. Together, we will lead our party back to the White House, and we will lead our country back to safety, prosperity, and peace. We will be a country of generosity and warmth. But we will also be a country of law and order. Our Convention occurs at a moment of crisis for our nation. The attacks on our police, and the terrorism in our cities, threaten our very way of life. Any politician who does not grasp this danger is not fit to lead our country.

Americans watching this address tonight have seen the recent images of violence in our streets and the chaos in our communities. Many have witnessed this violence personally; some have even been its victims. I have a message for all of: the crime and violence that today afflicts our nation will soon, and I mean very soon, come to an end. Beginning on January 20th 2017, safety will be restored. The most basic duty of government is to defend the lives of its own citizens. Any government that fails to do so is a government unworthy to lead. It is finally time for a straightforward assessment of the state of our nation. I will present the facts plainly and honestly.

We cannot afford to be so politically correct anymore. So if you want to hear the corporate spin, the carefully-crafted lies, and the media myths the Democrats are holding their convention next week. Go there. But here, at our convention, there will be no lies. We will honor the American people with the truth, and nothing else. These are the facts: Decades of progress made in bringing down crime are now being reversed by this Administration's rollback of criminal enforcement. Homicides last year increased by 17% in America's fifty largest cities. That's the largest increase in 25 years. In our nation's capital, killings have risen by 50 percent. They are up nearly 60% in nearby Baltimore. In the President's hometown of Chicago, more than 2,000 have been the victims of shootings this year alone. And more than 3,600 have been killed in the Chicago area since he took office. The number of police officers killed in the line of duty has risen by almost 50% compared to this point last year. Nearly 180,000 illegal immigrants with criminal records, ordered deported from our country, are tonight roaming free to threaten peaceful citizens.

The number of new illegal immigrant families who have crossed the border so far this year already exceeds the entire total from 2015. They are being released by the tens of thousands into our communities with no regard for the impact on public safety or resources. One such border-crosser was released and made his way to Nebraska. There, he ended the life of an innocent young girl named Sarah Root. She was 21 years-old, and was killed the day after graduating from college with a 4.0 Grade Point Average. Number one in her class. Her killer was then released a second time, and he is now a fugitive from the law. I've met Sarah's beautiful family. But to this Administration, their amazing daughter was just one more American life that wasn't worth protecting. One more child to sacrifice on the order and on the altar of open borders. What about our economy? Again I will tell you the plain facts that have been edited out of your nightly news and your morning newspaper: Nearly Four in 10 African-American children are living in poverty, while 58% of African American youth are now not employed. Two million more Latinos are in poverty today than when the President took his oath of office less than eight years ago. Another 14 million people have left the workforce entirely. Household incomes are

down more than \$4,000 since the year 2000. That's 16 years ago. Our trade deficit in goods reached nearly... think of this, think of this, our trade deficit is \$800 billion, yeah, think of that, \$800 billion dollars last year alone. We're gonna fix that. The budget is no better. President Obama has almost doubled our national debt to more than \$19 trillion, and growing. And yet, what do we have to show for it? Our roads and bridges are falling apart, our airports are in Third World condition, and forty-three million Americans are on food stamps. Now let us consider the state of affairs abroad. Not only have our citizens endured domestic disaster, but they have lived through one international humiliation after another. One after another. We all remember the images of our sailors being forced to their knees by their Iranian captors at gunpoint. This was just prior to the signing of the Iran deal, which gave back to Iran \$150 billion and gave us absolutely nothing – it will go down in history as one of the worst deals ever negotiated. Another humiliation came when president Obama drew a red line in Syria – and the whole world knew it meant absolutely nothing. In Libya, our consulate – the symbol of American prestige around the globe – was brought down in flames. America is far less safe – and the world is far less stable – than when Obama made the decision to put Hillary Clinton in charge of America's foreign policy. Let's defeat her in November, ok? I am certain it is a decision that president Obama truly regrets. Her bad instincts and her bad judgment – something pointed out by Bernie Sanders – are what caused many of the disasters unfolding today.

Let's review the record. In 2009, pre-Hillary, ISIS was not even on the map. Libya was stable. Egypt was peaceful. Iraq was seeing a really big big reduction in violence. Iran was being choked by sanctions. Syria was somewhat under control. After four years of Hillary Clinton, what do we have? ISIS has spread across the region, and the entire world. Libya is in ruins, and our Ambassador and his staff were left helpless to die at the hands of savage killers. Egypt was turned over to the radical Muslim brotherhood, forcing the military to retake control. Iraq is in chaos. Iran is on the path to nuclear weapons. Syria is engulfed in a civil war and a refugee crisis that now threatens the West. 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. This includes the legacy of Hillary Clinton: death, destruction terrorism and weakness. But Hillary Clinton's legacy does not have to be America's legacy.

The problems we face now – poverty and violence at home, war and destruction abroad – will last only as long as we continue relying on the same politicians who created them in the first place. A change in leadership is required to produce a change in outcomes. Tonight, I will share with you my plan for action for America. The most important difference between our plan and that of our opponents, is that our plan will put America First. Americanism, not globalism, will be our credo. As long as we are led by politicians who will not put America First, then we can be assured that other nations will not treat America with respect. The respect we deserve. The American People will come first once again. My plan will begin with safety at home – which means safe neighborhoods, secure borders, and protection from terrorism. There can be no prosperity without law and order. On the economy, I will outline reforms to add millions of new jobs and trillions in new wealth that can be used to rebuild America.

A number of these reforms that I will outline tonight will be opposed by some of our nation's most powerful special interests. That is because these interests have rigged our political and economic system for their exclusive benefit. Believe me, it's for their benefit. Big business, elite media and major donors are lining up behind the campaign of my opponent because they know she will keep our rigged system in place. They are throwing money at her because they have total control over everything single she does. She is their puppet, and they pull the strings. That is why Hillary Clinton's message is that things will

never change. Never ever. My message is that things have to change – and they have to change right now. Every day I wake up determined to deliver a better life for the people all across this nation that have been neglected, ignored, and abandoned. I have visited the laid-off factory workers, and the communities crushed by our horrible and unfair trade deals. These are the forgotten men and women of our country. And they are forgotten, but they're not gonna be forgotten long. These are people who work hard but no longer have a voice. I AM your VOICE. I have embraced crying mothers who have lost their children because our politicians put their personal agendas before the national good. I have no patience for injustice,... (Protester interruption) How great are our police and how great is Cleveland. I have no patience for injustice, no tolerance for government incompetence, no sympathy for leaders who fail their citizens. When innocent people suffer, because our political system lacks the will, or the courage, or the basic decency to enforce our laws – or still worse, has sold out to some corporate lobbyist for cash – I am not able to look the other way and I won't look the other way. And when a Secretary of State illegally stores her emails on a private server, deletes 33,000 of them so the authorities can't see her crime, puts our country at risk, lies about it in every different form and faces no consequence – I know that corruption has reached a level like never before in our country. When the FBI Director says that the Secretary of State was “extremely careless” and “negligent,” in handling our classified secrets, I also know that these terms are minor compared to what she actually did. They were just used to save her from facing justice for her terrible terrible crimes.

In fact, her single greatest accomplishment may be committing such egregious crime and getting away with it – especially when others, who have done far less, have paid so dearly. When that same Secretary of State rakes in millions of dollars trading access and favors to special interests and foreign powers I know the time for action has come. I have joined the political arena so that the powerful can no longer beat up on people that cannot defend themselves. Nobody knows the system better than me, which is why I alone can fix it. I have seen firsthand how the system is rigged against our citizens, just like it was rigged against Bernie Sanders – he never had a chance. Never had a chance. But his supporters will join our movement, because we will fix his biggest single issue: trade deals that strip our country of its jobs and strip us of our wealth as a country. Millions of Democrats will join our movement because we are going to fix the system so it works fairly and justly for each and every American. In this cause, I am proud to have at my side the next Vice President of the United States: Governor Mike Pence of Indiana. And a great guy. We will bring the same economic success to America that Mike brought to Indiana, which is amazing. He is a man of character and accomplishment. He is the man for the job. The first task for our new Administration will be to liberate our citizens from the crime and terrorism and lawlessness that threatens our communities. America was shocked to its core when our police officers in Dallas were so brutally executed. Immediately after Dallas, we have seen continued threats and violence against our law enforcement officials.

Law officers have been shot or killed in recent days in Georgia, Missouri, Wisconsin, Kansas, Michigan and Tennessee. On Sunday, more police were gunned down in Baton Rouge, Louisiana. Three were killed, and three were very very badly injured. An attack on law enforcement is an attack on all Americans. I have a message to every last person threatening the peace on our streets and the

Safety of our police: when I take the oath of office next year, I will restore law and order to our country. Believe me. Believe me. I will work with, and appoint, the best and brightest prosecutors and law enforcement officials to get the job done. In this race for the White House, I am the Law and Order candidate. The irresponsible rhetoric of our

President, who has used the pulpit of the presidency to divide us by race and color, has made America a more dangerous environment than frankly I have seen and anybody in this room has every watched or seen. This Administration has failed America's inner cities. Remember, it has failed America's inner cities. It's failed them on education. It's failed them on jobs. It's failed them on crime. It's failed them in every way and on every single level.

When I am President, I will work to ensure that all of our kids are treated equally, and protected equally. Every action I take, I will ask myself: does this make better for young Americans in Baltimore, in Chicago, in Detroit, in Ferguson who have, really, in every way folks, the same right to live out their dreams as any other child America? Any other child. To make life safe for all of our citizens, we also address the growing threats we face from outside the country: We are going to defeat the barbarians of ISIS and we're going to defeat them fast. Once again France is the victim of brutal Islamic terrorism. Men, women and children viciously mowed down. Lives ruined. Families ripped apart. A nation in mourning. The damage and devastation that can be inflicted by Islamic radicals has been proven over and over – at the World Trade Center, at an office party in San Bernardino, at the Boston Marathon, at a military recruiting center in Chattanooga, Tennessee and many many other locations. Only weeks ago, in Orlo, Florida, 49 wonderful Americans were savagely murdered by an Islamic terrorist. This time, the terrorist targeted LGBTQ community. No good. And we're gonna stop it. 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. And I have to say as a Republican, it is so nice to hear you cheering for what I just said.

Thank you. Thank you. To protect us from terrorism, we need to focus on three things. We must have the best absolutely the best gathering of intelligence anywhere in the world. The best. We must abandon the failed policy of nation building and regime change that Hillary Clinton pushed in Iraq, in Libya, in Egypt and in Syria. Instead, we must work with all of our allies who share our goal of destroying ISIS and stamping out Islamic terrorism and doing it now and doing it quickly. We're going to win. We're going to win fast. This includes working with our greatest ally in the region, the State of Israel. Recently, I have said that NATO was obsolete, because it did not properly cover terror. And also that many of the member countries were not paying their fair share. As usual, the United states has been picking up the cost. Shortly thereafter it was announced that NATO was setting up a new program in order to combat terrorism. A new step in the right direction. Lastly, we must immediately suspend immigration from any nation that has been compromised by terrorism until such time as proven vetting mechanisms have been put in place. We don't want them in our country. My opponent has called for a radical 550% increase in Syrian, think of this, think of this, this includes not believable but this includes happening, a 550% increase in Syrian refugees on top of existing massive refugee flows coming into our country already under the "leadership" (air-quotes) President Obama. She proposes this despite the fact that there's no way to screen these refugees in order to find out who they are or where they come from. I only want to admit individuals into our country who will support our values and love our people.

Anyone who endorses violence, hatred or oppression is not welcome in our country and never ever will be. Decades of record immigration have produced lower wages and higher unemployment for our citizens, especially for African-American and Latino workers. We are going to have an immigration system that works, but one that works for the American people. On Monday, we heard from three parents whose children were killed by illegal immigrants Mary Ann Mendoza, Sabine Durden, and my friend Jamiel Shaw. They are just three brave representatives of many thousands who have suffered so gravely. Of all my

travels in this country, nothing has affected me more, nothing even close, I have to tell you , than the time I have spent with the mothers and fathers who have lost their children to violence spilling across our borders which we can solve. We have to solve it. These families have no special interests to represent them. There are no demonstrators to protect them and certainly to protest on their behalf.

My opponent will never meet with them, or share in their pain. . Believe me. Instead, my opponent wants Sanctuary Cities. But where was the sanctuary for Kate Steinle? Where was the Sanctuary for the children of Mary Ann, Sabine and Jamiel? Where was the sanctuary for all the other?... ahh it's so sad to even be talking about it, cause we could solve this problem so quickly Where was the sanctuary for all of the other Americans who have been so brutally murdered, and who have suffered so so horribly? These wounded American families have been alone. But they are not alone any 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 in the same awful fate.

We are going to build a great border wall to stop illegal immigration, to stop the gangs and the violence, and to stop the drugs from pouring into our communities. I have been honored to receive the endorsement of America's Border Patrol Agents, and will work directly with them to protect the integrity of our lawful lawful lawful immigration system. Lawful. By ending catch-and-release on the border, we will end the cycle of human smuggling and violence. Illegal border crossings will go down. We will stop it. It won't be happening very much anymore. Believe me. Peace will be restored. By enforcing the rules for the millions who overstay their visas, our laws will finally receive the respect they deserve. Tonight, I want every American whose demands for immigration security have been denied – and every politician who has denied them – to listen very closely to the words I am about to say.

On January 20th of 2017, the day I take the oath of office, Americans will finally wake up in a country where the laws of the United States are enforced. We are going to be considerate and compassionate to everyone. But my greatest compassion will be for our own struggling citizens. USA! USA! USA! My plan is the exact opposite of the radical and dangerous immigration policy of Hillary Clinton. Americans want relief from uncontrolled immigration, which is what we have now. Communities want relief. Yet Hillary Clinton is proposing mass amnesty, mass immigration, and mass lawlessness. Her plan will overwhelm your schools and hospitals, further reduce your jobs and wages, and make it harder for recent immigrants to escape from the tremendous cycle of poverty their going through right now and make it almost impossible for them to join the middle class. I have a different vision for our workers. It begins with a new, fair trade policy that protects our jobs and stands up to countries that cheat, of which there are many. It's been a signature message of my campaign from day one, and it will be a signature feature of my presidency from the moment I take the oath of office. I have made billions of dollars in business making deals – now I'm going to make our country rich again. Using the greatest business people in the world, which our country has, I am going to turn our bad trade agreements into great trade agreements. America has lost nearly-one third of its manufacturing jobs since 1997, following them enactment of disastrous trade deals supported by Bill and Hillary Clinton.

Remember, it was Bill Clinton who signed NAFTA, one of the worst economic deals ever made by our country or frankly by any other country. Never ever again. I am going to bring our jobs back to Ohio and Pennsylvania and New York and Michigan and all of America – and I am not going to let companies move to other countries, firing their employees along the way, without consequence. Not gonna happen anymore.

My opponent, on the other hand, has supported virtually every trade agreement that has been destroying our middle class. She supported NAFTA, and she supported China's entrance into the World Trade Organization –another one of her husband's colossal mistakes and disasters. She supported the job killing trade deal with South Korea. She supported the Trans-Pacific Partnership, which will not only destroy our manufacturing, but it will make America subject to the rulings of foreign governments and it's not going to happen. I pledge to never sign any trade agreement that hurts our workers, or that diminishes our freedom and independence. We will never ever sign bad trade deals. America first again America first. Instead, I will make individual deals with individual countries. No longer will we enter into these massive deals, with many countries, that are thousands of pages long – and which no one from our country even reads or understands. We are going to enforce all trade violations, including through the use of taxes and tariffs, any country that cheats. This includes stopping China's outrageous theft of intellectual property, along with their illegal product dumping, and their devastating currency manipulation.

They are the greatest that ever came about. They are the greatest currency manipulators, ever. Our horrible trade agreements with China and many others, will be totally renegotiated. That includes renegotiating NAFTA to get a much better deal for America – and we'll walk away if we don't get that kind of a deal. Our country is going to start building and making things again. Next comes the reform of our tax laws, regulations and energy rules. While Hillary Clinton plans a massive tax increase, I have proposed the largest tax reduction of any candidate who has run for president this year – Democrat or republican. Middle-income Americans and businesses will experience profound relief, and taxes will be simplified for everyone. I mean everyone. America is one of the highest-taxed nations in the world. Reducing taxes will cause new companies and new jobs to come roaring back into our country.

Believe me. It'll happen and it'll happen fast. Then we are going to deal with the issue of regulation, one of the greatest job-killers of them all. Excessive regulation is costing our country as much as \$2 trillion a year, and we will end it very very quickly. We are going to lift the restrictions on the production of American energy. This will produce more than \$20 trillion in job creating economic activity over the next four decades. My opponent, on the other hand, wants to put the great miners and the great steel workers of our country out of work and out of business– that will never happen with Donald J. Trump as President. Our steel workers and our miners are going back to work again. With these new economic policies, trillions of dollars will start flowing into our country.

This new wealth will improve the quality of life for all Americans – We will build the roads, highways, bridges, tunnels, airports, and the railways of tomorrow. This, in turn, will create millions of more jobs. We will rescue kids from failing schools by helping their parents send them to a safe school of their choice. My opponent would rather protect bureaucrats than serve American children and that's what she's doing and that's what she's done. We will repeal and replace disastrous Obama care. You will be able to choose your own doctor again. And we will fix TSA at the airports, which is a total disaster! We going to work with all of our students, who are drowning in debt, to take the pressure off these young people just starting out in their adult lives. Tremendous problem. We will completely rebuild our depleted military, and the countries that we are protecting, at a massive cost to us, will be asked to pay their fair share. We will take care of our great veterans like they have never been taken care of before. My just released 10-point plan has received tremendous veteran support. We will guarantee those who serve this country will be able to visit the doctor or hospital of their choice without waiting 5 days on a line and dying. My opponent dismissed the VA scandal– one more sign of how out of touch she

really is. We are going to ask every Department Head in government to provide a list of wasteful spending projects that we can eliminate in my first 100 days.

The politicians have talked about this for years, but I'm going to do it We are going to appoint justices to the United States Supreme Court who will uphold our laws and our Constitution. The replacement for our beloved Justice Scalia will be a person of similar views and principles and judicial philosophy. Very important This will be one of the most important issues decided by this election. My opponent wants to essentially abolish the 2nd amendment. I, on the other hand, received the early and strong endorsement of the National Rifle Association and will protect the right of all Americans to keep their families safe. At this moment, I would like to thank the evangelical and religious community because I tell you what, the support they have given me and I'm not sure I totally deserve it, has been so amazing and has had such a big reason for me being here tonight. True so true. They have much to contribute to our politics, yet our laws prevent you from speaking your minds from your own pulpits. An amendment, pushed by Lyndon Johnson, many years ago, threatens religious institutions with a loss of their tax-exempt status if they openly advocate their political views. Their voice has been taken away. I am going to work very hard to repeal that language and protect free speech for all Americans. We can accomplish these great things, and so much more – all we need to do is start believing in ourselves and in our country again. Start believing. It is time to show the whole world that America Is Back – bigger, and better and stronger than ever before.

In this journey, I'm so lucky to have at my side my wife Melania and my wonderful children, Don, Ivanka, Eric, Tiffany, and Barron: you will always be my greatest source of pride and joy. And by the way and Melania and Ivanka, did they do a job? My Dad, Fred Trump, was the smartest and hardest working man I ever knew. I wonder sometimes what he'd say if he were here to see this and to see me tonight. It's because of him that I learned, from my youngest age, to respect the dignity of work and the dignity of working people. He was a guy most comfortable in the company of bricklayers, and carpenters, and electricians and I have a lot of that in me also. I love those people. Then there's my mother, Mary. She was strong, but also warm and fair-minded. She was a truly great mother. She was also one of the most honest and charitable people I have ever known, and a great great judge of character. She could pick 'em out from anywhere. To my sisters Mary Anne and Elizabeth, my brother Robert and my late brother Fred, I will always give you my love. You are most special to me. I have had a truly great life in business. But now, my sole and exclusive mission is to go to work for our country – to go to work for all of you. It's time to deliver a victory for the American people. We don't win anymore, but we are going to start winning again. But to do that, we must break free from the petty politics of the past.

America is a nation of believers, dreamers, and strivers that is being led by a group of censors, critics, and cynics. Remember : all of the people telling you that you can't have the country you want, are the same people that wouldn't stand, I mean they said Trump doesn't have a chance of being here tonight, not a chance. The same people... ah we love defeating those people, don't we? We love it. No longer can we rely on those same people in the media, and politics, who will say anything to keep our rigged system in place. Instead, we must choose to believe in America. History is watching us now. We don't have much time, but history is watching. It's waiting to see if we will rise to the occasion, and if we will show the whole world that America is still free and independent and strong. I am asking for your support tonight so that I can be your champion in the White House and I will be your champion.

My opponent asks her supporters to recite a three-word loyalty pledge. It reads: "I'm With Her". I choose to recite a different pledge. My pledge reads: "I'M WITH you – THE

AMERICAN PEOPLE.” 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 am With you, and I will fight for you, and I will win for you. To all Americans tonight, in all our cities and in all of our towns, I make this promise: 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. God bless you and good night. I love you. 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 am With you, and I will fight for you, and I will win for you. To all Americans tonight, in all our cities and in all of our towns, I make this promise: 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. God bless you and good night.

I love you

## **Appendix 2: Inaugural Address Transcript, January 20th 2017**

Chief Justice Roberts, President Carter, President Clinton, President Bush, President Obama, fellow Americans, and people of the world: Thank you. We, the citizens of America, are now joined in a great national effort to rebuild our country and to restore its promise for all of our people. Together, we will determine the course of America and the world for years to come. We will face challenges. We will confront hardships. But we will get the job done. Every four years, we gather on these steps to carry out the orderly and peaceful transfer of power, and we are grateful to President Obama and First Lady Michelle Obama for their gracious aid throughout this transition. They have been magnificent. Today's ceremony, however, has very special meaning. Because today we are not merely transferring power from one administration to another, or from one party to another – but we are transferring power from Washington, D.C. and giving it back to you, the People. For too long, a small group in our nation's Capital has reaped the rewards of government while the people have borne the cost. Washington flourished but the people did not share in its wealth. Politicians prospered but the jobs left, and the factories closed. The establishment protected itself, but not the citizens of our country. Their victories have not been your victories; their triumphs have not been your triumphs; and while they celebrated in our nation's capital, there was little to celebrate for struggling families all across our land. That all changes – starting right here, and right now, because this moment is your moment: it belongs to you. It belongs to everyone gathered here today and everyone watching all across America. This is your day. This is your celebration. And this, the United States of America, is your country. What truly matters is not which party controls our government, but whether our government is controlled by the people. January 20th 2017, will be remembered as the day the people became the rulers of this nation again. The forgotten men and women of our country will be forgotten no longer. Everyone is listening to you now. You came by the tens of millions to become part of a historic movement the likes of which the world has never seen before. At the center of this movement is a crucial conviction: that a nation exists to serve its citizens. Americans great schools for their children, safe neighborhoods for their families, and good jobs for themselves. These are just and reasonable demands of righteous people and a righteous public. But for too many of our citizens, a different reality exists: Mothers and children trapped in poverty in our inner cities; rusted-out factories scattered like tombstones across the landscape of our nation; an education system flush with cash, but which leaves our young and beautiful students deprived of all knowledge; and the

crime and the gangs and the drugs that have stolen too many lives and robbed our country of so much unrealized potential.

This American carnage stops right here and stops right now. We are one nation and their pain is our pain. Their dreams are our dreams; and their success will be our success. We share one heart, one home, and one glorious destiny. The oath of office I take today is an oath of allegiance to all Americans. For many decades, we've enriched foreign industry at the expense of American industry; subsidized the armies of other countries while allowing for the very sad depletion of our military;

We've defended other nation's borders while refusing to defend our own; and spent trillions of dollars overseas while America's infrastructure has fallen into disrepair and decay. We've made other countries rich while the wealth, strength, and confidence of our country has disappeared over the horizon. One by one, the factories shuttered and left our shores, with not even a thought about the millions upon millions of American workers that were left behind. The wealth of our middle class has been ripped from their homes and then redistributed across the world. But that is the past. And now we are looking only to the future. We assembled here today are issuing a new decree to be heard in every city, in every foreign capital, and in every hall of power.

From this day forward, a new vision will govern our land. From this day forward, it's going to be only America First. America First. Every decision on trade, on taxes, on immigration, on foreign affairs, will be made to benefit American workers and American families. We must protect our borders from the ravages of other countries making our products, stealing our companies, and destroying our jobs. Protection will lead to great prosperity and strength. I will fight for you with every breath in my body and I will never, ever let you down. America will start winning again winning like never before. We will bring back our jobs. We will bring back our borders. We will bring back our wealth. And we will bring back our dreams. We will build new roads, and highways, and bridges, and airports, and tunnels, and railways all across our wonderful nation. We will get our people off of welfare and back to work -- rebuilding our country with American hands and American labor. We will follow two simple rules: Buy American and hire American.

We will seek friendship and good will with the nations of the world - but we do so with the understanding that it is the right of all nations to put their own interests first. We do not seek to impose our way of life on anyone, but rather to let it shine as an example, we will shine, for everyone to follow. We will reinforce old alliances and form new ones -- and unite the civilized world against radical Islamic terrorism, which we will eradicate completely from the face of the Earth. At the bedrock of our politics will be a total allegiance to the United States of America, and through our loyalty to our country, we will rediscover our loyalty to each other. When you open your heart to patriotism, there is no room for prejudice. The Bible tells us "How good and pleasant it is when God's people live together in unity." we must speak our minds openly, debate our disagreements honestly, but always pursue solidarity. When America is united, America is totally unstoppable. There should be no fear - we are protected, and we will always be protected. We will be protected by the great men and women of our military and law enforcement and, most importantly, we will be protected by God.

Finally, we must think big and dream even bigger. In America, we understand that a nation is only living as long as it is striving. We will no longer accept politicians who

are all talk and no action constantly complaining but never doing anything about it. The time for empty talk is over. Now arrives the hour of action. Do not let anyone tell you it cannot be done. No challenge can match the heart and fight and spirit of America. We will not fail. Our country will thrive and prosper again. We stand at the birth of a new millennium, ready to unlock the mysteries of space, to free the Earth from the miseries of disease, and to harness the energies, industries and technologies of tomorrow. A new national pride will stir our souls, lift our sights, and heal our divisions. It's time to remember that old wisdom our soldiers will never forget: that whether we are black or brown or white, we all bleed the same red blood of patriots, we all enjoy the same glorious freedoms, and we all salute the same great American Flag. And whether a child is born in the urban sprawl of Detroit or the windswept plains of Nebraska, they look up at the same night sky, they fill their heart with the same dreams, and they are infused with the breath of life by the same almighty Creator. So to all Americans, every city near and far, small and large, from mountain to mountain, from ocean to ocean, hear these words: you will never be ignored again. Your voice, your hopes, and your dreams will define our American destiny. And your courage and goodness and love will forever guide us along the way.

Together, we will make America strong again. We will make America wealthy again. We will make America proud again. We will make America safe again. And yes, together, we will make America great again.

Thank you. God bless you. And God bless America. Thank you.

God bless America.



Strategic Research Academy ©

---

© Copyright of Journal of Current Researches on Social Science is the property of Strategic Research Academy and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.