

**A CRITICAL DISCOURSE ANALYSIS OF DONALD TRUMP'S
ANNOUNCEMENT SPEECH**

BY

OTIENO BENARD OBIERO

**A RESEARCH PROJECT SUBMITTED IN FULFILLMENT OF THE
REQUIREMENT FOR THE AWARD OF DEGREE OF MASTERS IN
LINGUISTICS, UNIVERSITY OF NAIROBI**

NOVEMBER 2017

DECLARATION

This research project is my original work and has not been presented for examination in any other university.

Signature: _____ Date: _____

OTIENO BENARD OBIERO

REG: C50/76559/2014

This research project has been submitted for examination with our approval as supervisors at the University of Nairobi.

Signature: _____ Date: _____

DR. ZIPPORAH OTISO

University of Nairobi

Signature: _____ Date: _____

MR. H.B. MANYORA

University of Nairobi

DEDICATION

To my elder sister; Monica Auma, for the great sacrifice you have made towards my education. To my other siblings: Christine Obiero, Melda Obiero, Beatrice Obiero, Henry Obiero and Jared Obiero, for the selfless support you have offered me over the years. And to my mother; Nerea Odira, you are the source of my strength.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

A study of this nature would not be possible without the support and guidance of several people some of whom I may not mention. I would like to sincerely thank my supervisors: Dr. Zipporah Otiso whose in-depth knowledge in Discourse I have greatly benefited from since I started my post-graduate studies, Mr. Herman Manyora whose incisive guidance helped shape this work.

I am equally indebted to the late Prof. Okoth Okombo and Prof. John Habwe who though not directly my supervisors, have greatly contributed to this study. I am equally grateful to Mr. Fred Attoh who despite not being my supervisor contributed a great deal to this study. I remain indebted to him especially for having provided a number of theoretical texts that were used in the study. I thank Dr. Ayub Mukhwana whose insightful advice helped shape the study at its inception; particularly the research problem.

I thank my colleagues and friends: Lucy Kinoti, Janet Kilonzi and Maryanne Odima, your constant encouragement was a great source of inspiration towards this study. I greatly appreciate the contribution of my family to this study. I specifically thank my mother; Nerea Odira for her patience and understanding. I wonder if I would have made it without a mother who was ever present yet absent at the same time.

To my late father Gilbert Obiero, you taught me the values of hard work and diligence; I am greatly indebted to you. I am grateful to all my siblings to whom this research project is dedicated. May God shower you with blessings. To all my academic role models, thank you.

ABSTRACT

The study sought to investigate how the language used in Donald Trump's Announcement Speech positions various actors. Specific focus was on how language is used to signify, produce and contest unequal power relations. Similarly, the study not only sought to unpack how the language used serves ideology and power but also how it enables a better understanding of the political purpose of the speech. Data for the study was drawn from selected representative excerpts resident in Donald Trump's Announcement Speech. The study was anchored on the theoretic underpinnings of Critical Discourse Analysis. Systemic Functional Linguistics was used as an adjunct theory to provide linguistic tools for analysis. The study made use of qualitative research design. Fairclough's (1989, 2010) three tier model of description, interpretation and explanation was employed by focusing on both micro and macro discourse analysis. On the other hand, linguistic representation of ideology, power and dominance revealed two contending discourses: the discourse of domination by participants such as Mexico, Saudi Arabia and the Islamic Terrorists on the one hand and the discourse of subordination of the American citizenry on the other. In terms of Agency and nominalization, the study revealed that Donald Trump placed himself in the first position of the sentence, the position of greatest emphasis, which in my speculation portrays him as arrogant and divisive.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

DECLARATION.....	ii
DEDICATION.....	iii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT.....	iv
ABSTRACT.....	v
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS.....	ix
CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1 Background to the Study.....	1
1.1.1 Introduction of Donald Trump.....	3
1.2 Statement of the Problem.....	4
1.3 Research Questions.....	5
1.4 Research Objectives.....	5
1.5 Justification of the Study.....	6
1.6 Scope of the Study.....	6
1.7 Operational Definition of Terms.....	7
1.8 Literature Review.....	10
1.8.1 Literature Review on CDA.....	10
1.8.2 Literature Review on Systemic Functional Linguistics.....	15
1.8.3 Political Discourse Analysis.....	19
1.8.4 Review of Recent Related Studies on American Politics.....	21
1.9 Theoretic Framework.....	21
1.9.1 Introduction.....	21
1.9.2 Theoretic Framework on CDA.....	22
1.9.3 Theoretic Framework on SFL.....	25
1.9.4 Modality System as A Framework of Interpersonal Meaning.....	38
1.10 Research Methodology.....	41
1.10.1 Sampling Method.....	42

1.10.2 Research Design.....	42
1.10.3 Data Analysis	43
1.11 Conclusion	43
CHAPTER TWO: IDEOLOGY AND POWER	44
2.1 Introduction to the Notion Ideology and Power	44
2.1.1 The View of Ideology as a Common Sense.....	46
2.1.2 Overt or Opaque Ideologies	47
2.1.3 Ideology of Positive Self or ‘Us’ Representation and Negative ‘Him’ or ‘Them’ Representation.....	48
2.1.4 Ideology as a Weapon of Persuasion	51
2.1.5 Ideology as a weapon of Negotiation.....	52
2.1.6 Ideology of Isolation/ Personality Profiling.....	53
2.2 Power	55
2.2.1 Introduction.....	55
2.2.2 Power Relations and Dominance	55
2.2.3 Power as Manipulation/ Mind control	58
2.3 Conclusion	60
CHAPTER THREE: TRANSITIVITY SYSTEMS REALIZED IN THE RECURRING THEMES.....	61
3.0 Introduction.....	61
3.1 Highlight of the Recurrent Themes Across the Announcement Speech.....	61
3.1.1 Data Description	61
3.2 The Grammar of Transitivity/ Process Types and Participant Roles Realized in the Selected Texts	63
3.2.1 Process Types and Participant Roles in the Theme of Immigration.....	64
3.2.2 Process Types and Participants roles in the Theme of National Security...	72
3.2.3 Conclusion	87

CHAPTER FOUR: MODALITY TYPES REALIZED IN THE RECURRING THEMES	88
4.1 Introduction.....	88
4.1.1 Modality Types in the Selected Texts.....	89
4.1.2 Epistemic Modality/Modalization	91
4.1.3 Deontic Modality/Modulation	92
4.1.4 Conclusion	100
CHAPTER FIVE: SUMMARY OF FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH AND RECOMMENDATIONS	101
5.1 Introduction.....	101
5.2 Summary of Aims and Methods	101
5.3 Key Findings of the Study	102
5.4 Conclusion	104
5.5 Recommendations for Further Research.....	104
REFERENCES.....	106
APPENDICES	111
Appendix I: Donald Trump’s Presidential Announcement Speech.....	111

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

CA	-	Conversational Analysis
CDA	-	Critical Discourse Analysis
Circ	-	Circumstance
ISIS	-	Islamic State in Iraq and Syria
MR	-	Members Resources
PD	-	Political Discourse
PDA	-	Political Discourse Analysis
Pr	-	Process
Rel	-	Relational
SFL	-	Systemic Functional Linguistics
SVO	-	Subject Verb Object
U.S	-	United States

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background to the Study

Discourse has been defined in various ways by different linguists. This view is supported by Van Dijk (1997a, 1997b) who posits that a large portion of his recent publication is an attempt to define discourse. In spite of the enormous difficulty in determining its definition, it is important we get some general sense of what we mean when we use the term ‘discourse’ and other related terms. An attempt is, therefore, made to define discourse and other related terms in the subsequent paragraph of this introduction.

To begin with, Woodilla sees discourse as the general habit of talking and writing while Chalaby (1997) views it as not only resident in a number of texts but as also superseding the texts that give rise to it. To Chalaby, texts can be viewed both as ‘units’ of discourse as well as their material realization. Based on Chalaby’s view it can be concluded that: (a) texts do not their meanings in isolation but rather depend on other texts to generate their meanings. (b) the nature of the production, distribution and consumption of discourse is an important consideration in establishing its definition of. Put differently, it implies that discourse is intertextual. Such a view is supported by Phillips & Brown concur with this view and point out that discourse analysis should investigate how meaning is realized intertextually as well as how such realizations enable the construction of social reality.

Hardy (2001) adopts a similar view and argues that the interest of discourse analyst is in trying to find out its constitutive effects; a process done through well-structured and systematic study of texts. Further, he adds that discursive events do not occur on their own but rather are: shared, social and emanate from interactions involving social groups and complex networks, in which discourse is contained. The same view is held by Sherzer (1987) and Van Dijk (1979) who avers that for a better understanding of discourse and its effects, one needs to understand the context from which it originates.

In this study, we intend to approach the study of discourse along the three dimensions set by Fairclough: Firstly, that discourse connects texts to discourses. Secondly, that discourse is concerned with the link and the relationship between language and society. Thirdly that discourse is concerned with the characteristics of everyday communication.

In other words, a discourse activity entails particular reference to given characters, how they relate to each other and the nature of the situation that surrounds the interaction. Our definition of discourse was modelled along Parker's definition of discourse as a series of texts which are not only related but are also produced, distributed and received.

Discourse Analysis on the other hand, was used to refer to different scientific approaches used to analyze varied texts ranging from written, oral, sign language, or any other semiotically significant event. Such analysis helps one move away from looking at language merely as an abstraction but rather as something meaningful in a given political, social and historical context.

Our view of Critical Discourse Analysis, on the other hand, was anchored on Fairclough's assertion that a CDA analyst seeks to out both the hidden relations between discourse activities and the societal strata. In so doing, an analysis of how discourse text and practice arise as well as how they are ideologically shaped by power relations and power struggles is crucial. A good example can be seen in political campaign speeches and presidential speeches which typically are fields for ideological struggles. This can, thus, be studied under a Critical Discourse Analysis rubric. Fairclough's view is supported by van Dijk who argues that political campaign speeches are characterized by opposing groups holding different ideological persuasions.

Political discourse on the other hand is viewed by Wilson (2001) as either a formal or informal language used by political players in a political arena with political agenda. In other words, political discourse is geared towards maintaining or resisting the status quo. This view is supported by Chilton (2004) who points that a political event oscillates between the forces for or against change.

In this study, we adopted Fairclough's view that political discourses are decision and action oriented. Fairclough added that such decisions are made in the context of uncertainty and disagreement as can be seen in campaign speeches where politicians not only use language to express their ideas and feelings but also to re-shape the opinions of the electorate. Though the idea of political activity can also refer to other genres of political events, such as ministerial statements, parliamentary debates and so forth, the present study looked at a political speech as a written or spoken language

whose purpose is to affect the attitudes and opinions of an audience to aid the covert objective of the speaker.

The study adopted Donald Trump's Announcement Speech as its data. The research intends to contribute towards a better understanding of the issues raised by the speaker two respects: (a) In terms of experiential meaning. (b) In terms of interpersonal meaning. As such, the study employed Systematic Functional Linguistics as an adjunct theory to provide the Linguistic tools for analysis. This was done by investigating the process types, participant roles as well as modality choices used in the Announcement Speech.

1.1.1 Introduction of Donald Trump

Donald Trump was sworn in as the 45th president of the United States of America after defeating Hillary Clinton in the recent USA presidential elections. Donald was born on 14th June 1946 in New York to Fredrick Trump and Mary McLeod. His father, Fredrick, was a real estate developer worth \$ 200 million in the 1970's. Fredrick knew the essence of closely networking with political players whom he funded in their campaigns.

Trump began his early education at Forest School, New York but was later moved to New York Military Academy, which was 60 miles from his home, at the age of 13. He therefore, had to contend with strict discipline regimen that came with life in a Military Academy. At the school, he did well socially and academically. Indeed, by the time of his graduation in 1964, he had not only emerged as a star athlete but also as a student leader.

Trump later enrolled for his higher education at Fordham University, but only studied there for two years before proceeding to the Wharton School of Finance from where he successfully graduated with a degree in economics in 1968.

In 1977, Donald Trump married Ivana Zelnic Kova with whom they had and two children namely: Donald Jr., Ivanka and Eric. However, in 1992 the couple called off their marriage upon Ivana discovering that Trump had a relationship with Maria Maples; an American actress.

Donald Trump then went on to marry Maria Maples, in 1993, with whom they had one child, Tiffany. However, two months to their wedding, in 1997, Donald filed for divorce to the surprise of Maria. The case was eventually settled in 1999 with the two going

their separate ways. Afterwards, Trump married Melania Knauses, with whom they have a son known as Barron William Trump. Besides, his marital life, Trump is a business mogul with a net worth of \$ 10billion.

He majorly anchored his campaign on issues such: unemployment, illegal immigration, Islamic Terrorism, National Security and Obamacare. Additionally, his campaign advocated for the reduction of corporate tax by 15% as well as the replacement of Affordable Care Act (Obamacare) with another free-market plan. To push through his agenda, he built his campaign around the slogan, “Make America Great Again” which resonated well with many Americans, particularly, the young single middle class white Americans without a college education (https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Donald_Trump).

1.2 Statement of the Problem

Political discourses just like any other genre of discourse have their own unique structures of language and an investigation on the particular nature of such a structure is an important academic pursuit. In this study, we attempted to bring out some descriptive and interpretive aspects of Donald Trump’s Announcement Speech.

Since representations in texts are socially, politically and economically motivated and since they are increasingly becoming influential, it is important to try and find out how these hidden meanings should be understood. Fairclough points out the following key ideas that need to be borne in mind when dealing with the idea of representation: (a) whose representations are they? (b) Who gains from them? (c) What social relations do they draw people into? (d) What are their ideological effects? (e) What alternative representations are there?

However, in trying to answer such questions there is the challenge of theory. This discourse contains multiple features in its data which are studied from different theoretic perspectives. For the purposes of the present study, Systemic Functional Linguistics was used to provide analytic tools for data. On the other hand, CDA was used to reveal the hidden meanings embodied in the selected text.

Within the SFL model, the study looked at how the Process Types and Participant’s Roles brought out the experiential meaning in the selected text. Similarly, Modality choices were interrogated to establish how interpersonal meaning was brought out in the selected text. These two aspects of meaning, experiential and interpersonal were

investigated by analyzing the lexicogrammatical resources Trump used to convey his ideas.

An example of a clause is captured as follows: that formed part of our investigation “The U.S. has become a dumping ground for everybody else’s problems.” This clause falls under the attributive relational process which expresses the idea of ‘being’. The above clause can be represented as follows: -

The U.S	has become	a dumping ground for everybody else’s problem
Carrier	relational process	(attribute)
	(attributive)	

Drawing from the traces of textual cues and social aspects of the MR (“Members” Resources) one concludes that Trump portrays America as a carrier of a negative attribute ‘dumping ground’ with the probable intention of demonstrating to the electorate how the present administration has failed them.

1.3 Research Questions

- i) How do the choices of Process Types and Participant Roles made in the Announcement Speech bring out experiential meaning?
- ii) How do the Modality choices made in the Announcement Speech bring out the interpersonal meaning?
- iii) How do some of these features of transitivity and modality bring out the salient issues conveyed by Donald Trump in his Announcement Speech?

1.4 Research Objectives

This study analyzed Donald Trump’s Announcement Speech in order:

- i) To find out how the experiential meaning is realized through participant roles and process types.
- ii) To find out how the interpersonal meaning is realized through modality choices.
- iii) To find out how some of these features of Transitivity and Modality bring out issues conveyed by Donald Trump in his Announcement Speech.

1.5 Justification of the Study

Language serves myriad roles other than communication. In fact, it is central in the reproduction of ideologies, social identities, social relations and power relations. The present study attempts a rigorous linguistic analysis of Donald Trump's Announcement Speech with the view of unlocking the inherent ideological postulations and power relations.

The choice of Trump is informed by a number of reasons. First, he is a known world leader. Secondly, as a head of the most powerful country in the world, his political ideologies, if any, have implications for the rest of the world. Thirdly, speeches have not been widely explored linguistically as evidenced by the available literature which focuses on political speeches of president Barack Obama. These studies include: Nufus (2014); Wang (2014); Ratih (2014); Naz (2012); Saati (2013); Shayegh (2012); Boyadi, (2014); Nartey & Yankson (2014); and Alvin & Albanseer (2011).

These studies largely focused on seemingly well thought out Obama speeches. However, little attention has been given to seemingly banal and incoherent speech such as Donald Trump's Announcement Speech. This study therefore intends to fill this gap by investigating how the experiential and the interpersonal meanings are realized through the systems of transitivity systems and modality choices.

1.6 Scope of the Study

The study adopted Fairclough's (1989, 1995, 2010) tenets of CDA as well as the works of the CDA theorists such as Van Dijk (195, 2001) and Wodak (1997). The study only concerned itself with the principles of CDA in sync with the research questions. The study also employed Systemic Functional Linguistics by Halliday (1985, 1994, 2004) to provide analytic tools. It similarly, made references to other theoretic studies on Systemic Functional Linguistics. Specifically, reference was made to Halliday's model of transitivity and modality patterns. On this, the study analyzed the major process types: Material, Mental and Relational processes. The other process types: behavioural, verbal and existential were only analyzed when their occurrence was salient in the selected text. The study similarly, analyzed modality purely as contextually conceived in modal auxiliary.

Two political speeches were collected: The Announcement Speech and The Inauguration Speech, however, because they largely addressed the same issues, the Announcement Speech was deemed representative. Within the Announcement Speech, the study only concerned itself with the transitivity systems and the modality choices within the themes of Immigration and National Security because they were the most salient. The other themes: Obamacare, Economy, Education and Unemployment were only used to illustrate the concepts: Ideology and Power.

1.7 Operational Definition of Terms

Agency – It has to do with who is construed in a position of power in a given process.

Agent - The doer entity in the material process.

Ancillary Role of Language – Language that accompanies, non-verbal communication.

Attribute - The entity that has something attributed to it.

Behavioural Process – These are processes akin to human physiological and psychological behaviour.

Carrier - The entity which carries the attribute.

Channel – Use of written or spoken Language.

Circumstance - The adverbial group or prepositional phrase in the clause.

Constitutive Role of Language – Events defined by Language.

Context of culture - The cultural factors that influence texts.

Context of situation - The technical term for this is register.

Critical Discourse Analysis - Analysis that aims to bring out both the hidden and opaque relationships between discourse activities, texts and the wider contexts.

Discourse - A series of texts which are not only related but are also produced, received and distributed.

Discourse-Semantics - The interface between discourse and semantics which has three functions namely: ideational function, interpersonal function and the textual function.

Discursive – An instance of language use event.

Dominance – The exercise of special power resulting into social inequality.

Existential Process – Process that suggest something exists

Experiential Meaning - The meaning of clause as it constructs a quantum of change in the flow of events as a figure (Halliday, 2014:212).

Field - provides an indication of topic or what is being talked about.

Genre - Text type based on the intention of the communicator.

Hegemony - A form of control realized through the influence of the minds of the dominated group in such a way that they accept dominance and act in the interest of the powerful out of free will.

Ideational Function- The function of language content that represents the world's experience.

Ideology - Refers to attitudes, set of beliefs, doctrines and values that shape the perception of individuals and which they use to construct and interpret reality.

Interpersonal Meaning -The function of language when it represents the speaker's meaning as an intruder.

Intertextuality - The presence within a text of the features of other texts which suggest the integration of history into a text that contributes to a wider process of power.

Lexico-grammar - Includes both language and grammar in one unit and represents the view of language in both lexis and grammar.

Material Process – This is a process of 'doing' and is denoted by action verbs.

Members Resources(MR)- What people have in their heads and draw upon which they produce or interpret texts.

Mental Process - These are processes of sensing. They are denoted by verbs of cognition, desideration, perception and emotion.

Metafunction - A term Halliday uses to refer to the three functions of the clause.

Modality - The degree with which a particular proposition is endorsed.

Mode - Provides an indication of what part the language is playing in the interaction and what form it takes (written or spoken).

Orthography- Refers to the writing system (Eggins 2004:19)

Participants - Entities (human or non- human) in the clause which are realized through the nominal group.

Phonology - Refers to the sound systems of language (Eggins 2004:19)

Political Discourse - Language of political forums such as campaign speeches, parliamentary debates and so forth.

Power - It is a form of control exercised by individuals, groups or institutions over others.

Power Relations – The social organizations between the speaker and the audience particularly, with regard to authority, social control and economic dominance.

Process - The element in the clause that expresses what is going on in the world.

Process – These are experienced events, actions that cover anything that can be expressed by the verb.

Proposition- The language form used to exchange information.

Relational Process – These are processes of ‘being’ expressed by linking verbs such as: is, was, were, and so forth.

Social Practice - The human behaviours which entail conforming to socially established conventions.

Subject Position - A set of socially recognized roles in which people participate in discourse. For instance, the subject position of a doctor, police, criminal etc.

Tenor -The participants’ role in the interaction.

Text – The spoken or written language produced in a discursive event.

Textual - Concerned with the organizational structure and the significant themes Trump conveys in his Announcement Speeches.

Transitivity - A linguistic system that consists of process types, participants and circumstantial elements, and which relates to the way meaning is encoded in the clause.

Verbal Process – Processes of ‘saying’ which exist in the bounding between relational processes and mental processes.

1.8 Literature Review

This section delves into literature review of Critical Discourse Analysis. Sub-section 1.7.1 provides a general overview of CDA with sections 1.7.1.1, 1.7.2.1 and 1.7.3 respectively offering Fairclough’s, Van Dijk’s and Wodak’s approaches to CDA.

1.8.1 Literature Review on CDA

Critical Discourse Analysis is geared towards establishing out how language constitutes and sustain unequal power relations. Its leading scholars include: Norman Fairclough, Ruth Wodak, Teun Van Dijk and Paul Chilton. The other scholars with significant contribution on CDA include: Margret Wetherel, Michal Billig, Christine Schaffner, Theo Van Leeuwen and Guther Krees.

CDA’s nucleus is anchored on social issues which it seeks to address by focusing on texts, interactions and other semiotic materials linguistically, major social theorists view CDA as the nature and place available for public dialogue.

Key questions that CDA seeks to answer include: (a) the nature of changes that have taken place or are taking place in the form of interaction on political and social fronts; (b) how such changes compare with the manner in which politicians and others in public life represent dialogue, debate or deliberations. As Keenol et al (1997) argues, a CDA research model endeavors to espouse the struggles in such struggles are evidenced by the fore-grounding of some discourse activities while backgrounding others. Keenol adds that CDA is an interdisciplinary approach which creates room for dialogue between linguistic practice and social practice.

Critical Discourse Analysis is not merely analytic. It is critical in the sense that it sets out to discern the relationship between language and other hidden elements in the social strata. These elements include: (a) how language figures social relations of power and dominance; (b) how language works ideologically; (c) how language negotiates personal and social identities.

Similarly, CDA is critical in the sense that it is committed to progressive social change as it possesses emancipatory language. For instance, an analysis of a neo colonial liberal world could entail an evaluation of how language contributes to the opposition of new order by bridging the gap between the rich and the poor.

1.8.1.1 Fairclough's Approach to CDA

The present study is based on Fairclough's (1989, 2000, 2010) approach to CDA, the approach looks at language as a crucial element in constituting, maintaining and changing social relations of power. Its examples are drawn from daily formal and informal settings such as police stations, schools, hospitals or churches. Fairclough's interest is in not only trying to find out how language figures in everyday talk but also in how it constructs identity and portrays ideology and power. This is the notion of discourse as a social practice and suggests that: (a) language is part of the society (b) Language is a social process. (c) Language is conditioned by the society. The implications of these views are explored in the subsequent paragraphs.

First is the view of Language as a part of the society. This implies that there is dialectical relationship between Language and the society. That is, language shapes the society and the society shapes language in the sense that: (a) people communicate in ways that are socially conditioned. (b) People's communication embodies social effects as seen in both conscious and private communicative events. Such private communication, Fairclough adds, are not only conditioned by the social relationship but also by the necessity to keep them.

On the other hand, the society is shaped by language in the sense that language is an integral part of the social process. This can be seen in disagreements arising from divergent views on the meanings of political terms such as nationalization, democracy and so forth. Such disagreements are manifest in language. However, the society and language do not stand in direct symmetric relationship but rather language is simply an aspect of it. This implies that all linguistic elements are social while not all social activities have a linguistic characteristic.

The second implication of discourse as a social practice stems from the difference between discourse and text. Fairclough looks at discourse as the whole process of societal interaction with the text being one of its elements. This view involves identification of linguistic characteristics and instances of factual discourse choices of

vocabulary, grammar, cohesion and textual structure. Social interaction can, thus, be summed up as entailing text production and interpretation; meaning the analyses of texts takes into account productive and interpretive processes.

As such, features of texts are viewed as both clues to the productive and interpretive processes. Such clues entail an interface between characteristics of texts and a sizeable amount of 'Members Resources' (MR). The MR here relates to the knowledge people have in their heads and which they employ in the production and interpretation of texts. Equally it relates to how the world is represented socially in terms of values, assumptions and beliefs. This notion of MR as socially generated suggests that it is based on struggles and social conditions and unequal power relations. This leads us to the third implication of language as a social practice; that language is socially conditioned.

The notion of language as socially conditioned relates to how an individual's productive and interpretive processes are shaped by non-linguistic features. Such social conditions are in sync with the organizational structure of the society. These include: the social situation (the immediate context of discourse occurrence), social institution (the bigger matrix for discourse) and the whole society. In effect, an individual's MR brought to the productive and interpretive phases are shaped by these three conditions. Therefore, the notion of language as a social practice can be viewed as not only entailing the analysis of a text's productive and interpretive processes but also its immediate and remote contexts.

Fairclough, further, adds a three-layered method of doing Critical Discourse Analysis which conforms to the implications mentioned above. These include: description, interpretation and explanation. Firstly, description focuses on the identification of the formal linguistic features resident in a text. Such features are subsequently labeled as per the descriptive framework. In the course of this description, the researcher takes a position similar to that of the participants but uses an explicit interpretive framework.

In order to describe the formal features in a text, an evaluation of potential choices is established. This is done with the view of finding out the patterns of options in the discourse activity which actual properties of the text emanate from. Key elements of grammar identified, and which are in line with the present study, include: (a) the nature of the experiential values grammatical features process; (b) whether there are important

features of relational modality. To answer the first question, the following must be born in mind:

- 1) What types of processes and participants predominate?
- 2) Is agency clear?
- 3) Are processes what they seem?
- 4) Are nominalizations used?
- 5) Are sentences active or passive?
- 6) Are sentences positive or negative?

On the other hand, to answer the second question one has to consider the following:

- i) The authority of one participant in relation to the other (relational modality).
- ii) The strength with which a particular proposition is endorsed (expressive modality).

At the Interpretive stage, the manner in which participants draw from their ideological, social and cognitive endowments in their bid to better understand discourse is determined. Such endowments are known as 'Members' Resources (MR) and are both cognitive and social. The cognitive aspects of the MR refer to what people have in their heads and which they rely on when producing and interpreting texts. Such awareness enables individuals to identify formal properties of a text such as: phonology, vocabulary, grammar and semantics. The social aspects of the MR, however, relates to values, assumptions, beliefs and awareness of the social world.

The researcher at the interpretive stage therefore, seeks to address three key concerns: (a) the kind of interpretation that participants are giving to intertextual and situational context; (b) the kind of discourse that is being drawn upon and which relates to the systems of phonology, vocabulary, grammar, pragmatics, schemata, frames and scripts; and (c) whether the answers to the concerns raised in (a) and (b) vary based on participants or change as the interaction goes on. However, the present study will only concern itself with transitivity and modality patterns within the grammatical system. The interpretive stage will be used to unpack the hidden meanings and to correct pretenses of independence on the part of discourse subjects. Since interpretation primarily looks at which elements of the MR are relied upon in the production of discourse, there is need to account for the changes in social constitution of the MR which then necessitates the explanatory stage.

The explanation stage aims at portraying discourse as ingrained in social processes which are based on social theory. This helps to bring out covert ideologies invisible to lay interpretation as it avails a broader base upon which individual communicative events can be placed and upon which their meanings can be drawn. These bases relate to: (a) the interplay between social structures and discourse; (b) reproductive effects that discourses have on structures as in whether they change or sustain them. The social structures and effects are however mediated by the MR implies that there is a dialectical relationship between the societal strata; the societal strata; and the MR.

Key issues that the explanation phase addresses include: (a) the power relations at the immediate, institutional and social level, that shape the discourse in question (b) the aspects of MR relied on and which are ideological in nature (c) the position of discourse in relation to contestations at the situational, institution and societal levels. As such, the explanatory phase gives grounds for overcoming the shortcomings of lay consciousness in dealing with the implicit aspects of discourse.

The view of discourse as a social practice can thus be conceived as relating to the ideological and its hegemonic effects. Hegemony relates to the power realized through construction of alliances that ensures the dominant group wins the loyalty of the dominated group through submission rather than coercion. Its existence in discourse is further supported by Forgas who argues that it cuts across all the facets of political, cultural, and social life and that it is ideologically sustained through common assumptions of everyday life.

1.8.1.2 Van Dijk's Approach to CDA

Besides the work of Fairclough, Van Dijk (1995, 2001, 2003) takes a socio cognitive perspective in his analysis of discourse. He looks at what role discourse plays in the (re) production and resistance of dominance. Further, he views dominance as the exercise of institutional social power leading to social, cultural, political, ethnic, class, racial and ethnic inequality. Van Dijk identifies mental control where those in control of discourse dominate the less powerful through mind control, as being used to actualize dominance. This mental control, as Van Dijk points out, does not only involve the censure of information conveyed to the dominated but also the manner in which it is relayed. Van Dijk further adds that it entails the control of discourse context such that: the communicative event, time, place and the participants involved are defined.

This approach primacy to ‘top- down’ relationship of dominance as opposed to ‘bottom- up’ (relationships of compliance and resistance). In terms of participant’s role, Van Dijk observes that it relates to (a) the knowledge and experience they possess, (b) the way they express those opinions; (c) the subject position they occupy. Most CDA work by Van Dijk, therefore, looks at how the issues of gender, ethnic prejudice and racism are produced and reproduced in everyday talk.

The critical approach employed by Van Dijk guides the present study in deciphering how process types constitute discourses that emphasizes dominance. Additionally, reference made to his work in the course of this study.

1.8.1.3 Wodak’s Approach to CDA

Wodak (2001) takes a historical perspective to the study of discourse. Her approach, similarly, sheds more light to the present study because just like Fairclough’s approach, it acknowledges the dialectical relationship between discourse and society. Besides, it views language as possessing the power and ideology which is used by the dominant participants to convey their norms and values.

Further, Wodak’s approach just like Fairclough’s proffers that readers and participant’s interpretation of texts differ not only on the basis of their background knowledge but also on the basis of their position. This notion is used in the present study to account for the varied ideologies and power relations in the selected text.

1.8.2 Literature Review on Systemic Functional Linguistics

The background to Systemic Functional Linguistics and its comparison to other linguistic models are explored in sub sections 1.7.2.1 and 1.7.2.2 respectively.

1.8.2.1 Background to SFL

The SFL view of language was developed by Halliday in the 1960s. It originated from works of Bronislaw Malinowski (1887-1942) who offered a two-tier criterion for conducting any language study that is analysis of both its cultural and situational context. To Malinowski culture and environment had an influence on language. Malinowski’s theory was later used by J.R Firth to develop an approach to phonology known as ‘prosodic phonology’ which enabled phonological features to be shared over successive phonemes rather than individual phonemes having a unique feature (O’ Donnell, 2012:6).

Halliday later developed the work of Firth and used it to describe the structure of Chinese languages at the University of Lingam under the supervision of Wang Li. He then proceeded with the idea to London where he used it to analyze the English Language. Much later, the concept was used to study other European languages

Systemic functional linguistics looks at language from a sociological perspective. It does so by investigating: (a) how language is used in social situations to realize a particular objective; (b) the processes of discourse production; (c) the contexts which give rise to discourse. However, SFL does not concern itself with the way language is represented or processed in the brain. The system has two elements namely: the systemic and functional aspects.

The systemic element relates to the paradigmatic relations which provide alternative properties of language employable in particular contexts. Further, it provides the possible sequence of elements or possible syntagms, individuals can produce in a given communicative event. This approach, therefore, looks at language as entailing choices based on particular contexts. Consequently, the models enable one to focus on meaningful choices available to language users as opposed to structures that give rise to them.

Contrarily, the functional aspects are realized by: (a) the functional analysis of syntactic elements (e.g. agent instead of subject); (b) determining the function of each utterance (e.g. commands, requests, promise); (c) establishing the social function of language; (d) by viewing language as action oriented (a tool that gets things done and not simply conveyor of ideas).

1.8.2.2 Comparison of SFL to Other Linguistic Traditions

Halliday's SFL model differs from Chomsky's Universal Grammar in the sense that while SFL is anchored on meaning, universal grammar is based on form and content (paradigmatic principle). To justify his functional view of language, Halliday argues that it should describe varied functions of sentences and not their deep underlying meaning as Chomsky propounds.

On the other hand, Halliday's functional grammar differs from Bloomfield's structural tradition in that Bloomfield focuses his study on oral texts and argues that language changes over time and so does its meaning while Halliday avers that in Language study, primacy should be given meaning and its potential and not the structure language.

Further, he points out that the meaning of any language is brought out through its form and function. The Hallidayan model, as such, sets out choices available to language users in a particular communicative context.

Functional view of Language Abdul-Aziz argues that SFL is based on functional categories and not classes such as: nouns and verbs. Abdul-Aziz adds that this helps uncover clauses which viewed purely syntactically have similar structure, yet, if analyzed from a semantic syntactic perspective have significant differences. Consider the example below:

	John	saw	Mary
Syntax	subject	verb	object
Semantics	sensor	(process)	phenomenon
	mental		
	John	carried	Mary
Syntax	subject	verb	object
Semantics	actor	(process)	goal
	material		

To Halliday & Matthiessen (2014) SFL modal is identified in four layers namely: phonology, context, lexico-grammar and semantics. The context, one of the most important concerns of SFL is integral to the overall process of meaning making series because it relates one context to a series of contexts. Such contexts include: the context of culture and the context of situation. The present study only concerned itself with the context of situation as it relates to the research questions as such the context of culture was not explored. The context of stimulant is explained in the subsequent paragraphs: The context of situation relates to the elements of the context relevant to the ongoing language event which are modeled into the following three layers: Field, Tenor and Mode.

The field refers to what is being talked about or the topic of the text. This ranges from broad topics like education to more specialized ones like linguistics and so forth while Tenor on the other hand, refers to the nature of the relationship of the participants involved in the communicative process such relationship could include unequal power relations as in teacher-pupil relationship or equal power relations as in pupil – pupil

relationship. It could also refer to formal versus informal discourse or to the degree of closeness of the participants involved in discourse (whether distant, neutral or close).

The mode, on the other hand, refers to the role language plays in the communicative event. This ranges from ancillary to constitutive roles of language. Other aspects of mode include channel, the presence or absence of visual contact and the level of preparedness. On level of preparedness discourse can be categorized as meticulously prepared or hastily prepared. These elements of mode shed light into people's intuitive understanding; that is, how individuals use different resources from the same system of language.

Halliday (1971:332) observes that the level of discourse – semantics is divided into three metafunctions namely: ideational, interpersonal and textual metafunctions. Ideational function embodies both the internal and external experiences of the speaker or writer. Halliday adds that the ideational function plays the following roles: **(a)** enables conveyance of information; **(b)** allows communication of new content; **(c)** captures events subjectively and objectively.

Further, Halliday observes that the ideational function has two components namely: experiential and logical functions. The experiential function he observes construct a version or gives meaning to an individual's experience. The logic function however, defines the relationship between processes and participants. It is mainly brought out through transitivity with the clause as its meaningful grammatical unit.

On interpersonal meaning, Halliday (1971: 333) argues that it refers to the way a speaker intrudes into a speech event through language. Such intrusion ranges from the way a speaker expresses his comments and attitudes to the way he expresses his evaluations. On the contrary, the interpersonal meaning could also include the relationships set up between the speaker and hearer. Such relationships depend on the communicative function the speaker intends to achieve; for example, questioning, persuading, informing and so forth. The interpersonal function is mainly expressed through mood and modality. Modality, which informs part of the present study is discussed in detail elsewhere in this work.

On the other hand, the textual function, refers to the way language makes links between itself and the situation concerned making it possible for the text produced to be recognized by the listener. Since it is a precondition to the use of language, its existence

is subsumed in every text. This is so because it enables the use of language both in a generalized and personal sense.

Fairclough (1992a) adopts the three functions in his social approach and structures text analysis in the following systematic order: (a) analysis of vocabulary (meanings of words, wording and metaphor); (b) analysis of grammar (transitivity and modality); (c) analysis of cohesion (argumentation and connectives); (d) analysis of text structure (interactional control). The present study adopts Halliday's approach but only concerns itself with the analysis of transitivity and modality within the selected text.

1.8.3 Political Discourse Analysis

According to Teun, van Dijk the idea of PDA analysis is ambiguous because one has to decide which discourse is political. To address such a challenge, he proposes that the focus should be on detailing how political discourse is analyzed as opposed to seeking its definition. However, because most PDA interpretations are geared towards analyzing political speeches, PDA can be deemed as referring to critical elements of political discourses. From a CDA perspective, PDA can be viewed as an investigation focusing on how political dominance is enacted, reproduced and abused and varied forms of resistance against such dominance. Such a notion is supported by Fairclough (1995) & Van Dijk (1993b) who argue out that PDA deals with the dominance and the social effects of inequality generated by such dominance.

Political discourse can, therefore, be viewed as discourse aimed at identifying political actors such as politicians. Such view is supported by studies that look at political discourse as text and talk of political institutions including presidential candidates and other or professional politicians.

Teun van Dijk argues that from an analytic perspective, politicians are perceived as people paid for their activities. Such people he adds are either elected or appointed and play a crucial role in the politics of the day. As such, they can be equated to educationists, lawyers or doctors. However, van Dijk avers that in the course of political discourse politicians are not the only players This is so because PDA when or other categories of participants.

Therefore, to him the notion of Political discourse as only defined by its authors is inadequate. He suggests that the meaning of political discourse should be broadened to include all its related participants; whether they are passive or active in the political

communicative event. This idea is supported by Verba, et al (1993) who argues that people are either involved in political events as voters, demonstrators, members of civil society or dissidents. This study adopts this view and holds that PDA takes the entire context into consideration in its analytic focus. The context in question relates to: (a) participants and their actions; (b) the communicative events which includes the place, time and circumstance involved; (c) the functions and political implications of the discourse.

1.8.3.1 The Current Approaches to PDA

The two most established and widely used approaches to PDA are attributed to the works of Chilton, Wodak and Fairclough. Chilton (2004) looks at PDA from a cognitive perspective. He sheds light on the relationship between language and politics by focusing on how participants represent reality through binary distinctions and metaphors. In other words, it is an approach that gives prominence to analysis of representation. Chilton's view differs from Fairclough's assertion that action is superior to representation. Fairclough, however, adopts Chilton's the idea of representation of reality and integrates it within his model of deliberative action. The present study adopts this view.

Wodak on her part adopts a historical approach to the study of PDA. This approach is taxonomic in nature in the sense that it segments the field of politics into a host of fields ranging from political advertising, political opinions to parliamentary debates and so forth. Each of these fields has its own distinct features. However, Fairclough argues that such approach is atomistic in nature because it looks at political discourse as a succession of parts without a clear account of the whole. He adds that this may lead to a large number of categories whose grasp then becomes difficult. Fairclough observes that he is not opposed to such taxonomies as he actually draws from some of them. He, however, points out that representation and taxonomies can be integrated into action and argumentation.

Fairclough's view on PDA is, therefore, based on the notion of politics as action oriented, that is the choices and decisions which lead to argumentation. Such choices rely on speech acts and pragmatic elements to offer a better account of the relationship between language and society.

1.8.4 Review of Recent Related Studies on American Politics

The following studies have been conducted on political discourses of Barack Obama: Shayegh and Nobifar (2012), Wang (2010) and Hovarth (2009).

Firstly, Shayegh and Nobifar (2012) focused their study on ideology and socio-relationships of power in Obama's interviews. Their study revealed that Obama used personal pronouns to bridge the gap between himself and his audience.

Secondly, Wang (2010) adopted a Systemic Functional Grammar approach to the study of Obama's political discourse. The study found out that Obama used colloquial and simple language to reach out to his audience.

On the other hand, Hovarth (2009) looked at the strategies President Obama employed in his public speech. This study revealed that Obama anchored his speech on the ideological prisms of inclusivity, liberalism and pragmatism.

These studies largely focused on political discourses of Obama as manifested in his speeches and interviews. However, there has been very little linguistic research on political discourse of Donald Trump and thus, the study intends to fill this gap.

1.9 Theoretic Framework

1.9.1 Introduction

The present study adopts an eclectic framework that is hinged on both systemic functional grammar and CDA. The two approaches are selected because CDA on its own has no tools of linguistic analysis. Besides, CDA and systemic functional grammar share common grounds in their analytical focuses. The theoretic perspectives shared by both CDA and SFL as Fowler et al (1979) point out include: Firstly, both view language as socially constitutive, that is, language shapes the society and the society shapes language. Secondly, both vouch for a dialectical view of language, that is, the way different discourse activities influence their context and how contexts are influenced by these discourse events. The close relationship between CDA and SFL is further supported by Graham (2003) who observes that both CDA and SFL are interested in the way meaning is embedded in culture and history. The notion of an eclectic approach is further to discourse supported by Ruth Wodak who posits that knowledge of Hallidayan grammar is essential to understanding of CDA. This study adopts those views.

1.9.2 Theoretic Framework on CDA

CDA can be viewed as an analytic approach whose major concern is the way dominance, social power and inequality are enacted, reproduced and resisted in a text, social and political contexts (Van Dijk 2001: 352, 2003: Fairclough: 2010). According to Young and Harrison (2004: 3), CDA focuses on espousing ideologies hidden in language. Such ideologies naturalize the unequal power relations but once they are brought to the fore, they can be contested. The primary concern of CDA, therefore, is to show the relationship between language, power and ideology on the one hand and that of social change and social identity on the other. CDA does this by looking at the role discourse plays in the production and maintenance of unequal power relations and dominance (Weiss and Wodak 2003; Mr. Gregor 2011:4).

These roles are summarized by Wodak and Fairclough into seven principles namely: (a) the role of discourse in social problems; (b) the relationships between power and discourse; (c) how discourse constitutes culture and society; (d) how discourse is ideologically marked; (d) the historical nature of discourse; (e) the mediated relationship that exists between text and society; (f) the interpretive and explanatory orientation of CDA.

Although significant variations exist in CDA's approaches, Haig (2011) argues that two key facets of CDA still remain consistent; the relationship between language and power on the one hand and the way language creates and maintains an unequal power relations on the other. Paltridge, (2006: 179-183), which informs the present study, breaks down these principles into the following tenets.

1.9.2.1 Discourse Social and Political Issues

According to Fairclough (1989, 2010) there exists a dialectical relationship between discourse and the society. This implies that the societal structures shape discourse while discourse embodies the values and beliefs in the society. Simply put, discourse reflects the linguistic choices used to represent and sustain reality. Kress (1979:185) holds the same view and argues that there are aspects of social meaning in language specifically distinguishable in its lexical and syntactic structures and which are articulated when we speak and write. Such aspects he adds are inherent in all discourses.

1.9.2.2 Discourse and Power Relations

In this respect, Critical Discourse Analysis looks at the way elements of both spoken and written texts are organized. It does this with the goal of trying to establish the salient political and ideological features resident in the texts. Joworski & Coupland (2006:474) concerns with such views and observes that, discourse constitute certain power relations which are not easily discernible by the participants involved.

Van Dijk (1993:249; Fairclough 1989; Wodak 2001; Holmes 2005:33) agree with the notion of power in CDA by pointing out that it is an integral part of it. They add that discourse entails manifestations of power imbalances made worse and reinforced by either explicit or implicit references. Similarly, Fowler and Kress (1979:188) posit that language is a consolidation of the structures which shape it and it is not only used to manipulate people but also to establish and maintain the power of state agencies, corporations and institutions.

This is made possible by use of direct and indirect speech acts or by processes in which the ideology of a culture or a group is linguistically marked, articulated and tacitly affirmed. The present study hinges on these assertions because through transitivity choices some power relations are foregrounded while others are backgrounded. An analysis of process types, for instance, may show the participants favoured by the power relations.

1.9.2.3 Discourse and Social Relations

This principle is based on the role discourse plays in the construction of identity. This view is supported by Fairclough (2010) who posits that discourse is a reflection of people's identity. He adds that participants in discourse continuously construct and reconstruct different identities through the discursive choices they make in different contexts. Halliday (1978:2) concurs with this notion by pointing out that:

People act out the social structure, affirming their own statuses and roles and establishing and transmitting the shared systems of value and knowledge.

The present study adopts this view and seeks to find out how linguistic features such as transitivity and modality help bring out both the experiential and interpersonal meaning in Donald Trump's Announcement Speech.

1.9.2.4 Discourse and Ideology

Foucault (1975, 1982) looks at discourse and ideology as formations of ‘orders of discourse’ and power or knowledge while Antonio Gramsci’s (1971) views it as the notion of hegemony. Louis Althusser’s (1971) on the other hand, looks at discourse and ideology as the concepts of ideological state apparatus and interpellation.

Trew (1979) on his part looks at ideology as a pattern of images and systems which aid in the interpretation, perception and understanding of things. To Van Dijk ideology relates to use of language as a vehicle of communication because it determines which issues are elevated and which ones are subordinated.

Fairclough (2010) adopts the view of hegemony. He points out that such a model of analysis examines how language is used in the expression of the interests of the dominant group. He adds that such ideas are packaged as natural and originating from common sense. This he says is an important way of constituting and maintaining unequal power relations.

CDA is used in this study to find out how transitivity patterns and modality choices construct experiential and interpersonal meanings in Donald Trump’s Announcement Speech. These choices will then be subjected to Fairclough’s (1989, 1995, 2010) three tier framework of doing CDA: description, interpretation and explanation.

1.9.2.5 Criticism of CDA

The most vocal critics of CDA involve scholars from Text linguistics and Conversational Analysis. Among the prominent critics of CDA are: Schegloff (1997) quoted in Chouliaraki and Fairclough (1997:7) and Paltridge (2006:195). Firstly, Schegloff points out that CDA makes use of categories that are sociological in nature and as such are alien to formal analysis (Conversational Analysis), Further, he adds that CDA theoretically plants itself on discourse; an imposition that defies the intent of discourse participants.

However, Chouliaraki and Fairclough disagree with Schegloff’s view by pointing out that formal analysis precludes the theoretic preoccupation of the analyst. To them, whereas the interest of Conversational Analysis is in espousing how a conversation by itself makes sense, CDA is concerned with societal hiccups. CDA does this by bringing

out the role discourse plays (conversational analysis inclusive) in manipulation of power.

Fairclough further points out that although CDA and CA differ in their approaches, they are not in conflict. His postulation is supported by some studies in CDA which employ conversation as their data. Such an approach to CDA can be seen in the work of Yieke (2007). Additionally, some studies in CA look at social and political issues, as seen in the work of Remlinger (2005). As such, the two approaches can be blended with one being complimentary to the other.

Secondly, CDA is perceived as overtly political making and as such lacks objectivity' and 'scientificity'. Widdowson (1995) cited in Lazar (2005: 2) point out that a CDA analyst is likely to interpret data based on his or her own linguistic biases. Although this is true, as is the case with both qualitative and quantitative research; a purely objective research hardly exists. This view is supported by Fairclough who argues that research on social matters is largely swayed by people's perceptions, the topic of choice and their societal experience (inclusive of world views, values and political commitments).

However, Lazar (2005:2) disagrees with this view by pointing out that a politically inclined approach to CDA is a foundation to social problems. Similarly, Lazar adds, it is linguistically responsive to issues of social equity. In response, Chouliaraki and Fairclough (1999) point out that neutrality in research fails to acknowledge the social, historical and value based nature of all knowledge.

1.9.3 Theoretic Framework on SFL

This section focuses on theoretical framework based on Halliday's Transitivity and Modality. Sub Sections 1.8.3.1 focuses on the introduction of Transitivity and Modality while section 1.8.3.2 provides a description of Transitivity with examples of process types and participant roles. On the other hand, section 1.8.4 offers an explanation on Modality system.

1.9.3.1 Transitivity and Modality

Transitivity systems and modality are linguistic systems that realize experiential and interpersonal metafunctions. These SFL models have been elaborately explored by Halliday in his SFL model since 1985. It was further developed by Halliday and

Matthiessen in 2004 with the final publication of their book on 'Functional Grammar' coming out in 2014.

Modality and Transitivity systems have also been explored by other Linguists such as Eggins (1994, 2004), Thompson (1990, 2004, 2014), and Fontaine (2013). The works of these linguists closely mirror Halliday's work. As such, references will be made to these works to aid better understanding of the study.

The SFL model is anchored on the idea that language is a system of meaning which affords a speaker a number of grammatical choices in the course of a communicative event. The meaning of language, therefore, is configured through these choices which are also embodied in the structure of the clause. As Bloor & Bloor (2013:3) point out, 'SFL involves the idea that a language consists of a set of systems which offer speakers or writers unlimited choices and ways of creating meaning.' Halliday (as cited in Fontaine, 2013:22) agree with this view by pointing out that 'the clause is a multifunctional unit of language.' This implies that the clause is an embodiment of different meanings at the same time.

The three meanings of the clause pointed out by Halliday (1985) as working together include (a) the experiential metafunction (which represents the human experience and corresponds to the view of the clause as representation); (b) the interpersonal metafunction (enacts personal and social relationship and corresponds to the view of clause as exchange); (c) the textual metafunction (which relates to the discursive flow of the text and corresponds to the view of the clause as a message) (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2014).

It can, thus, be seen that each metafunction is a distinct in its functions. However, the present study focuses only on the experiential and interpersonal metafunctions. Two systems are employed to realize them; Transitivity as an element to bring out the experiential meaning in the Announcement speech and Modality as a tool to reveal the relationship between Donald Trump as a speaker and his audience. Sections 1.8.2 and 1.8.3 present the systems of Transitivity and Modality respectively.

1.9.3.2 Transitivity Systems as a Framework of Experiential Meaning

Transitivity system according to Halliday (1985:101-102) refers to the experiences of language structures as semantic arrangements comprising process types, participants and circumstantial elements. Transitivity, thus, relates to how meanings are expressed in the clause and how processes are manifested in language (Simpson, 2004:22).

These experiences relate to the ‘goings’ on/or the flow of events, the happenings, doing, saying, sensing, being or having (Halliday 1985: 101). The above events involve the processes, the participants (directly involved in the process) and the circumstantial elements (relate to elements of space, time, and manner and so on).

The clause, based on these three elements, is not only capable of being used to impose linguistic communicative events but can also be used as a mode of interaction. (Halliday and Matthiesen, 2014:213). Further, transitivity system provides lexicogrammatical tools used for interpreting the elements of change that characterize these flows of events.

Typically, the processes, which are realized through the verbal group, are reduced into a sub-set of process types which constitute distinct and varied domains of experience. On the other hand, participants realized in the clause structure by the noun phrase refer to animate or inanimate entities which are associated with the clause. While the circumstantial elements realized through the adverbial or prepositional phrases, only provide subsidiary information in the clause. A summary of Process Types and Participants is provided below.

Process Types and Participants

Process type/ Category	Meaning	Participants
Material:	‘doing’	Actor, Goal
Action	‘doing’	
Event	‘happening’	
Behavioral	‘behaving’	Behaver
Mental:	‘Sensing’	Senser, Phenomenon

Perception	‘seeing’	
Emotion	‘feeling’	
Cognition	‘thinking’	
Desideration	‘wanting’	
Verbal	‘saying’	Sayer, Target
Relational:	‘being’	Token, Value
Attributive	‘attributing’	Carrier, Token
Identifying	‘identifying’	Identified, Identifier
Existential	‘Existing’	Existent

(Halliday, 1985:131)

The processes constitute the most crucial element in the clause while the participants, though directly involved in the process, are either used to bring out the experience or are themselves affected by the process in a particular way. This suggests that the elements of process and participants constitute the experiential center of the clause.

The current study attempted to investigate how the processes types, participants roles and modality choices bring out the ideologies of Donald Trump in his Announcement Speech. As such, the research will not concern itself with the circumstantial elements. Prototypical examples of clauses that inform the present study are discussed below: (a) *Munene took Gakii to the market.* (b) *Gakii went to the market with Munene.* Despite the fact that Gakii is a logical subject (Actor in SFL) in sentences, the use of the process types ‘took’ and ‘went’ varies the meanings of the two sentences. The first sentence involves the use of material process ‘took’ which gives the sentence a goal, Gakii. And under the CDA rubric Munene, thus, is construed as having the power to affect the actions of Gakii. However, ‘went’ in the second sentence grammatically and ideationally constructs Munene as less powerful as he has no direct control over the actions of Gakii. This can be viewed as a case of equal power relations.

1.9.3.2.1 The Role of Transitivity

Writers or speakers normally make decisions on the types of processes based on the kind of reality they intend to portray. This can be exemplified as follows: (a) *Kioko educated Nkirote*, (b) *Kioko loves Nkirote*, (c) *Kioko bought Nkirote a pen*. The first sentence conceives Kioko as the Actor with Nkirote as the Goal. From a CDA perspective, Kioko is experientially constructed as possessing material ability to finance Nkirote's education. Notice the inscription of Nkirote in the object position which suggests she is less powerful Kioko. In the second sentence, Kioko is the sensor while Nkirote is the phenomena. The use of the internalized mental process loves portrays Kioko as lacking the power to dictate the activities of Nkirote which he poses as an actor in the first sentence. In the last sentence however, Nkirote is a beneficiary of Kioko's actions while the pen is being the goal. This sentence just like the first, therefore, exemplifies unequal power relations.

From the above observations, it can be deduced that the grammar of the clause apportions varied levels of agency to participants as well as objects depending on their location in the clause. This variance in agency is crucial in the analysis of power relations because under a CDA rubric, a powerful participant is able to influence or control a less powerful participant to act in a particular way as he pursues his own interest (Fairclough 1955, Van Dijk, 1995, 1998, 2001). Therefore, under the CDA rubric the participants brought out by the grammar of the clause as ideationally having great agency.

1.9.3.2.2 Types of Transitivity: Processes and Participants Elements as A Framework for Experiential Analysis in The Data

The concept process, participants and circumstances only explain generally the phenomena of the world's experience and cannot be used to interpret the grammar of the clause because they do not reveal much. This calls for recognition of processes and participants that are more particular. In the sections below, the study explores the different process types (material process, the mental process, the relational process, the verbal process, the behavioral process and the existential process) and the participant roles associated with them.

1.9.3.2.3 Material Process and Participants

Material processes are clauses of ‘doing and happening’ (Halliday and Matthiessen, 2014:224). The Material process conceives a chain of change in the course of events as occurring through an input of some energy. This energy originates from the participants. Typically, material processes entail two participants i.e. the Actor or the Agent (Simpson, 2004:77). This can be illustrated as follows:

The boy kicked the ball

Actor Process Goal

The Actor refers to the object or person who brings about the change (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2014: 224-245). The Goal on the other hand, relates to animate or inanimate entity that gets affected by the process (Faweet, 2008). The role of the Goal, though, can be taken by the Beneficiary in the clause. This can be exemplified as follows: *John bought a book for Maria*. In this sentence, *John* is the Actor or Agent, *a book* is the Goal while and *Maria* is the Beneficiary. For this study, the Beneficiary encapsulates Halliday’s (1985) Patient or Abdulaziz’s (1996: 116) Maleficiary Participant. This can be exemplified as follows:

The government brought down Okero’s Kiosk; where Okero is the Maleficiary participant.

An investigation of material process is essential to the present study because in terms of transitivity, the doer of the action is conceived to be more powerful than the one who merely perceives or carries an attribute. Material processes are analyzed to help find out: whether America is brought out an Actor; whether the immigrants are pushed to the position of Beneficiary or maleficient beneficiary; whether the material processes in which America is brought out as Actors have an effect on their independence, status, authority, confidence, and power over the other participants; whether the material processes in which immigrants and other nations are cast construe them as less confident, less independent or incapable of having an influence on the actions of others.

1.9.3.2.4 Mental Process and Participants

Mental clauses refer to our inner experience of the world, our consciousness, our states of being, and our reflection on or ‘our relation to outer experience. (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2014:245). Mental processes are brought out through verbs that relate to

cognition (e.g. remember, think, suppose, expect, believe, consider and so forth), **emotion** (e.g. hate, like, detest, loathe, dislike, love, fancy and so forth), **perception** (e.g. seeing, notice, sense, hear, smell, taste and so forth) and **desideration** (e.g. hope, wish, want and so on) (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004:246).

There are two participants involved in the process: the *senser or experiencer* according to Butler (1987) and *the phenomenon*. The senser refers to the entity capable of sensing, feeling, thinking or perceiving. For instance, Okoth in *Okoth liked the present*. In other words, the senser is human-like and has consciousness, (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2014:249). In grammatical terms, the senser is the pronominal he or she, not it.

The nature of creatures endowed with consciousness varies depending on our individuality, the task at hand or our feeling. For instance, in various registers domestic animals such as cats and pets are viewed as conscious. This can be seen in a situation where the owner of the cat says: *she does not like the food*. Yet someone who does not like the cat or has been annoyed by the specimen may refer to *the animal as it*.

Therefore, any entity (animate or inanimate) can be viewed as conscious, though, someone has to possess the element of feeling, thinking, hearing perceiving to turn them into conscious being. For instance, in the sentence: *Empty classroom was longing for the pupils*, the nominal group the empty classroom is a senser because by placing as an entity that felt longing, we conceive it as embodied with consciousness.

As such, though, the conscious being particularly refer to a person or persons, it can also be used to refer to a human collective as in the American in the sentence: *the American people dislike dishonesty*. Further, the senser could also refer to a product of our conscious. For instance, in the sentence: *The video clip imagines that the C.I.D brought in mercenaries to silence government critics*. The senser additionally could entail representation of an aspect of a person as seen in the sentence: *the brain thinks in a logically structured manner*. A mental clause can be represented as follows:

John	loves	you
Senser	process: emotion	phenomenon

Further, the mental process entails the phenomenon which refers to what is felt, thought, seen wanted or perceived (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2014:251). A typical example of a

mental process with the phenomenon can be seen in the sentence: *The woman knew the man's soft spot*. In the above sentence, 'the woman' is the senser; 'knew' is the mental process of cognition and 'the soft spot' is the phenomenon.

Mental clauses typically focus on the feeling and thinking of the senser (Halliday, 2004). They are mostly used to portray the opinion or perception of one individual as more important than others. This implies that the individual in question elevates his status and casts himself in a positive light.

1.9.3.2.5 Relational Process and Participants

Relational processes are processes of 'being' (Halliday, 1994:119). They are used to bring out attributes or identities. Attributive clauses relate to the qualities, objects or things possess or simply categorize things fit into. For instance, in the relational clause: *Kiptoo is intelligent* the quality Kiptoo possesses is brought out through the attribute 'intelligent'. On the other hand, identifying clauses, refer to uniformity between entities as in the sentence *Barrack Obama was the president of the United States of America* where the position Obama held is identified.

As such, relational processes, create connections between entities (Simpson, 2004:24). Halliday (2004:21) posit that relational clauses have two basic participants conceived as one element in a relationship of 'being'. The two participants relate to the carrier and the attribute which can be typified as follows: *Rose is a winner*; where Rose is the Carrier, *is* the relational process and winner the attribute.

The idea of experience being modeled as 'being' relates to: (a) how 'being' is construed as unfolding through time. And (b) how 'being' is construed as a configuration involving the process and the participants (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2014:266). Further, Relational processes conceive change as taking place without being induced by a particular energy. This implies that it takes place uninterrupted unlike the material process where there is the initial and the final phase of the unfolding. As such, static location in space is construed relationally as in the sentence: *she is in the classroom* while dynamic motion through space is construed materially as in the sentence: *she is walking into the classroom*.

Similarly, static possession as in the sentence: *Amara has an expensive watch* is construed relationally while dynamic transfer of possession as in *Amara is being given an expensive watch* is construed materially. In addition, static quality as in the sentence *the guard is empty* is conceived relationally while dynamic change in quality as in the sentence *the guard is emptying* is construed relationally.

According to Halliday (1985, 1994, 2004) there are three sub sets of relational processes namely: the intensive relational process, the possessive relational process and the circumstantial relational process. The intensive relational process refers to a relationship of equivalence or sameness (Simpson, 2004) while the circumstantial relational process refers to the location of a particular entity. Possessive relational process on the other hand, relates to a possessive carrier. This can be exemplified as follows:

Type	Example
Intensive:	The man's chest is broad.
Circumstantial:	Jakes is in class.
Possessive:	Kioko has sharp eyes.

Each of these sub categories of relational process are further divided into 'attributive' and 'identifying' modes. The two are set out as two concurrent systems in the system network which intersect to define six categories of 'relational' process. This can be seen in the example below:

Type/Mode	attributive	identifying
Intensive	John is intelligent	Donald Trump is the President of U.S.A
Circumstantial	The exam is on Third	Today is the third; the third is today
Possessive	Peter has two phones	The two phones are Peter's

Halliday (1985, 1994, and 2004) argues that the attributive mode constructs the participant as a Carrier of some quality or class as in the sentence *Seth is wise*. The identifying mode, however, conceives the participant involved as the Token or the identified element and that which identifies the participant as the identifier or value.

For example, an analysis of the sentence *Henry is the chairman* would reveal Henry as the *Token* and chairman as the *Value*.

The ‘attributive’ mode differs from the ‘identifying’ mode in the following respects: (a) the identifying mode is reversible as in the sentence *John is the chairman; the chairman is John*. The attributive mode, however, is not reversible. For instance, there is no form: *Clever is John* which is related systematically (agnate) to *John is clever*. (b) The nominal group functioning as an attribute, which is mainly indefinite with either a common noun or an adjective as head, construes a class of things. This implies proper nouns are not used as attributes because they do not construct classes. (c) The lexical verb realizing the attributive relational process is one of the ascriptive classes. The attribute is normally brought out like a circumstance if it is realized by a nominal group which has a common noun as a head but has no pre-modifying adjectives as in the sentence *He grew old* but he grew into a man. Further illustrations of relational process types and modes are given below:

Illustration of Attributive clauses

Attribute of:

quality (intensive)	Jared	is	handsome
circumstance (circumstantial)	Mueni	was	in the library
Possession (possessive)	Seth	has	a watch
	Carrier	process	attribute

Illustration of Identifying Clause

Identification by:

Token-Value (intensive)	Mary	is	the treasurer
Circumstance (circumstantial)	yesterday	was	the seventeenth
Possession (possessive)	the book	is	Nkatha’s
	Identified	Process	Identifier

Relational processes are important in attempting to analyze identity and power relations because as Halliday (2004:214) posits, relational processes are a crucial way of assigning roles, class membership and identity. As such, they are key parameters for making assessment and evaluation (*ibid*: 219). Similarly, the choice of relational processes over mental or material process is significant to a CDA analyst. This is so because a CDA analyst is interested in the ideational representation of participants.

Halliday (1994, 2004) argues that the Carrier is basically assigned roles or identities or possessions that seem given and unchangeable. He adds that relational processes do not bring out participants capable of undertaking activities geared towards change but rather brings out participants who are not only passive but also merely carry out identities and roles assigned to them.

Relational processes can, thus be employed by those in power, Donald Trump inclusive to positively or negatively represent and evaluate participants. The present study attempted to find out how transitivity patterns foregrounds or backgrounds certain participants by assigning them given attributes which creates certain stereotypes about them.

1.9.3.2.6 Behavioural Process and Participants

Behavioural processes are processes akin to (human) psychological and physiological behavior. The psychological processes could include, glaring, dreaming and sleeping while the physiological processes entail actions like smiling, crying, and breathing. They are the least distinct of the process types because they lack a definite feature unique to them. They stand in the border line between material and mental processes implying that they are partly like the material clause and partly like the mental clause (Halliday & Mattienhessen, 2014: 301; Simpson, 2004:23).

The participant (who is behaving) in the process is the Behavior. (Halliday & Mattienhessen, 2014:301; Simpson 2004: 24). The behavioural process is similar to ‘doing’ and its unmarked ‘present in present’ is similar to that of the material process as in the sentence: *He is dreaming*. However, the unmarked form can also be the present simple (not suggesting a habitual action) as in the sentence: *why do you cry?* which hardly has any significant difference with the sentence *Why are you crying?*

In terms of Transitivity, the Behavior is conceived as holding more power than the carrier or the sener because he or she is brought out as acting. For example, in the sentence: *The boys watched the game*. Although watching is construed materially, the Behavior, the boys, is cast as doing something while ‘the game’ is portrayed as a target or goal of the boys. The behavioural process is normally realized by an intransitive verb with a single participant; the behavior, and an action verb which has an inseparable element of mental and material processes. Illustration of the Behavioural Process and Participants is shown below.

Behavior Behavioural Process

Faith neither smiles nor laughs.

1.9.3.2.7 Verbal Process and Participants

Verbal processes are processes of saying which exist in the boundary between relational processes and mental processes as in *what did you say? I said it is cold in here* (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2014:302; Halliday 2004:252-253).

The process involves the sayer (the participant speaking), receiver (the one the verbiage is directed at) and the verbiage (verbalization or what is said). For instance, in the sentence: *she asked him a lot of questions*: ‘she’ is the *sayer*, ‘asked’ the *verbal process*, him *the receiver* and ‘a lot of questions’ the *verbiage*. This process may also entail a sayer verbally acting on a direct participant through the use of verbs such as slander, insult, praise, flatter, congratulate, censure and rebuke (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2014:302). This other participant is known as the target and can be exemplified as follows: *I am always praising her to my mother* where ‘I’ is the *Sayer*, ‘am always praising’, the *verbal process*, ‘her’, the *target* and ‘to my mother’ the *recipient* (Halliday & Matthiessen 2014; Halliday, 1985).

The sayer, in terms of agency, is portrayed as more powerful because his verbiage has a potential impact on the life of the Target or the Receiver; viewed as the Goal or the victim of the Sayer’s verbiage. For instance, in the sentence: *The professor says you should not cheat*; ‘the professor’ is the *Sayer*, ‘You’, the *Receiver* and ‘should not cheat’ the *Verbiage*. Ideationally, the above sentence brings out the professor as more authoritative, the source of information and the entity that regulates behavior while the

Receiver is portrayed as under obligation to abide by what the Sayer says. Illustration of Verbal Process and Participants are shown below.

Verbal process and Participants

Sayer	pr: Verbal	Target	Verbiage
I	am congratulating	him	for the good work.

1.9.8.3.2.8 Existential Process and Participants

These processes suggest that something exists or happens as in the sentence: *There was wailing and breaking of the furniture*. It is referred to as existential because it represents phenomenon of existence. The process stands in the border line between Material and Relational processes (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2014:307).

The existential clauses include the use of dummy subject; *There* as in the sentence: *There were prayers*. The word '*there*', though, is neither a participant nor a circumstance because it has no functional representation in the transitivity structure of the clause. Rather, it serves to bring out the feature of existence interpersonally as a subject. This process, is characterized by a single participant, *the existent*, an animate or inanimate entity, that is said to exist. For instance, 'Prayers' are the *existent* in the sentence above.

Existential processes similarly are characterized by the verb 'be' or a verb that expresses existence such as: remain, come about and arise followed by a nominal group that functions as Existent. The entity said to exist can be a thing, person, abstraction, person or any other phenomenon (Fontaine, 2013:78). The illustration of existential process and the participants involved is shown below.

Existential process and Participants

Subject	Process	Existent
There	is	rainfall.

The present study posits that what is essential to a CDA analyst on Transitivity is the way participants are assigned varied levels of agency or power based on the process type chosen. The type of process used can also help the analyst determine how each participant is represented.

The study mainly focuses on the three major process types namely: the material process, the mental process and the relational process. The other process types will only be analyzed when they are salient in the recurring themes.

1.9.4 Modality System as A Framework of Interpersonal Meaning

Modality can be expressed through the mood of sentences, auxiliary verbs, modal adjuncts and tense (Kress and Fowler 1979; Halliday 1985; Fawcett 2008:68-83). Its analysis is used in the present study to attempt to bring out the interpersonal meaning and to express social roles between the speaker and the hearer. Fowler and Kress (1979:200) define modality thus:

Linguistic constructions which express speaker's and writer's attitudes towards themselves, towards their interlocutors, towards their subject matter, their social and economic relationships with the people they address; and the actions which are performed via language (ordering, accusing, promising and leading).

It can thus, be inferred that the use of modality in the clause to establish the judgment and the opinion of the speaker towards his topic and hearers. Modality, therefore, relates to the validity of what is being predicated, stated, questioned, commanded or offered. It may also refer to social relationship within the clause. (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2014:177). Further, it relates to the intermediate between the positive and negative poles (the gap between the choices of 'yes' and 'no' that allows speakers to attach expressions of attitude, belief and obligation to what they say (Simpson, 2004:123). This intermediacy varies in propositions and proposals. In proposition, in between certainties of 'it is' and 'it isn't lie the relative probability of 'it must be,' 'it will be,' and 'it may be.' Whereas in proposals, in between the definitive 'do' and 'don't' lie the discretionary options 'you must do.' 'You should do' and 'you may do.' Modals can help unpack the writer's standpoint to the reader by bringing out tentativeness or other aspects of interpersonal meaning. Similarly, as Simpson (2004:23) posit, it can also be a significant part of establishing personal identity.

1.9.4.1 Types of Modality

The different types of Modality are explored in the sub-sections below:

1.9.4.1.1 Modalization

When people exchange information in the form of statements and questions, the semantic form of the clause is known as the proposition (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2014). The term proposition can be defined as the thing which ‘can be argued about, affirmed or denied,’ (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2014:249). The space between ‘yes’ and ‘no’, used to assert or deny, varies in its significance in proposition. In between these poles lie two intermediate possibilities: degrees of probability and degrees of usuality.

The degrees of probability have different levels of ‘judgments of likelihood’ attached to them (possibly, probably and certainly) while the degrees of usuality (frequencies of what happens, happened or will happen) have varied levels of ‘judgments of oftenness’ attached to them. It is captured by words such as ‘sometimes’, ‘usually’ and ‘always’. Halliday and Matthiessen (2014) refer to these scales of probability and usuality as modalization.

Probability and usuality can be expressed in three ways namely: (a) By a finite modal operator in the verbal group as in *That will be Mary; she sits there all day long* (b) by a modal adjunct of probability or usuality as in *that is probably Mary; she usually sits there all day*. (c) By both the above (together forming a prosody of modalization) as in *that’ll probably be Mary, she’ll usually sit there all day*. In a statement, it is an expression of the speaker’s opinion. For instance, *that will be Mary* ‘that is Mary, I thought’. Whereas in a question, it is a request for the listener’s opinion. For example, ‘*will that be Mary?*’ Is that Mary do you think?

Examples of Modalization (Probability)

“She **might** arrive tomorrow.”

“Perhaps I **will** go.” “She **will** arrive tomorrow.” “I **will** certainly go.” “He **could** take my watch.” “He is **probably** taking my watch.”

(Fontaine, 2013:128)

Examples of Modalization (Usuality)

‘She **usually** sits there all-day long.’

‘**Usually** they don’t open before ten.’

‘They **always** don’t open.’ ‘It **seldom** works that day.’ ‘He will sit there **all day**.’

(Halliday and Matthiessen, 2014: 177-187)

Modality, therefore, is grounded in the initiating role of exchange. However, modality inclusive of high modals such as **certainly**, **always** and so forth, are less determinate than the polar form as in *That is certainly Muriuki* is less certain than *that is Muriuki*. Similarly, it always rains in the summer is less invariable than it rains in the summer. This implies that you only say you are certain when you are not.

1.9.4.1.2 Modulation

Proposals refer to the form of clause which functions to exchange goods and services. In a proposal, the positive and negative poles are cast as prescribing and proscribing as in positive ‘do it’ negative ‘don’t do it.’ Within these are two intermediate possibilities depending on the speech functions (whether commands or offers) (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2014:303).

In a command, the intermediate point represents degrees of obligation for instance, allowed to, supposed to or required to. On the other hand, in an offer the intermediate represents degrees of inclination as in willing to, anxious to, determined to and so forth. This scale of obligation and inclination are known as modulation and is expressed in two ways: (a) by a finite modal operator as in *you should know that I’ll help them*. (b) By an expansion of the predicator through a complex verbal group (typically by a passive verb) as in *you are supposed to know that* or by an adjective as in *I am anxious to help them*.

Examples of Modulation found in the works of Halliday and Matthiessen (2014) and Eggins (2004) respectively:

Examples of Modulation (Obligation)

‘You **should** remember that.’

‘You’re **supposed to** remember that.’

‘You **should be** singing.’ ‘You **ought to be** singing.’

‘Mary **will** help.’

(Halliday & Matthiessen, 2014:178).

Examples of Modulation (Inclination)

I **want** to lend you ‘the Bostonians.’ “**I’d like** to lend you the Bostonians.”

“I **am willing** to lend you the Bostonians.” “I **am happy** to lend you the Bostonians.”

“**I’m determined** to lend you the Bostonians.”

(Eggins, 2004:18)

Modalization therefore, refers to the speaker’s judgments in propositions while modulation shows the speaker’s attitude in proposals. Based on the explanations above, two types of modality pointed out by Fairclough (1989:126) inform the present study. That is relational modality and expressive modality. Relational modality shows authority of one participant in relation to the other while expressive modality is with the strength with which a particular proposition is endorsed.

The present study attempted to find out how the Modality patterns reveal Donald Trump’s presuppositions, opinions, views and judgments about the issues he raises. Further to find out how particular roles are emphasized or de-emphasized. The other aspects of Mood will not be explored since they are not concerned with the speaker’s opinion but rather contribute to an understanding of the speech roles.

1.10 Research Methodology

The study adopted qualitative research model. It was anchored on Kombo and Tromp’s (2016):18) observation that qualitative research is on the qualitative research is on meaning. Qualitative research was therefore applied because in analyzing the research applied because in analyzing the research questions a lot of explanation and interpretation of the text, its discursive practice and social practice was required.

1.10.1 Sampling Method

Purposive sampling method was adopted to select the data. The data for the study are in the form of clauses selected from the Announcement Speech. The speech was made at Trump Towers, New York on June 16th 2015. It addressed different issues affecting America. The speech is in the form of written texts collected from the website (<http://time.com/3923128/donald-trump-announcement-speech/>) (See Appendix)

A comparison was made between the speech and the original video of Donald Trump speech to make sure that the texts selected are the same as spoken texts. However, not all the clauses were analyzed rather only the clauses relating to the objection of the study were analyzed. This implies that the investigation only applied to the sections where the clauses expressing the issues of immigration, Islamic Terrorism and National Security were manifested. In other words, the selection of the clauses took two stages. The first stage involved determination of the recurring themes across the Announcement Speech. The second stage involved collecting the clauses within the recurring themes. Therefore, the contents of the selected themes informed the study data.

1.10.2 Research Design

The research involved the following stages. First, the transcripts of the announcement speech were downloaded from the internet. The researcher ascertained the accuracy of the speech by listening to its audio version and comparing it to the transcribed speech. Secondly, the speech was coded into clauses. The clauses were then analyzed to help highlight the recurring themes. Then the most salient themes were identified. This was also to allow the researcher reduce the themes to a manageable number and to create hierarchies.

Afterwards, representative clauses were selected in order to identify the process types, participants and the circumstantial elements. Further, the clauses were analyzed for modality as they form part of interpersonal meaning. The data was subsequently tabulated to capture the frequency of the transitivity systems and modality choices inherent in the clauses shown. The data was narrowed down to percentages for ease of analysis. Once this was done, the data was interpreted and a discussion on how transitivity patterns and modality choices brought out the identified themes established.

1.10.3 Data Analysis

The study employed Fairclough's (1989, 1995, 2010) CDA as theoretic framework. Halliday's (1985, 1994, 2004) framework of SFL was used as an adjunct theory to provide linguistic tools for analysis at the micro-linguistic level. Specifically, transitivity patterns and modality choices were investigated. The two were chosen because they were suitable for the present study whose objectives are to find out how the experiential and interpersonal meanings are brought out through discourse of the recurring themes.

A qualitative approach based on Fairclough's three tier model of description, interpretation and explanation was adopted. This implies the study was descriptive as it focused on both micro and macro discourse analysis. At the micro-level, analysis was based on the description of the linguistic choices resident in the selected excerpts. Similarly, it also involved interpretation of the identified linguistic choices. At the macro-level, the explanation and assessment of how the transitivity systems and modality choices in the selected text brought out the experiential and interpersonal meanings was established.

1.11 Conclusion

The chapter has dealt with the background of the study which gives a brief over-view of the notions Discourse, Critical Discourse Analysis and Political Discourse. Similarly, it offers brief interview of Donald Trump. It has also highlighted the statement of the problem, the objectives of the study, the research questions as well as the scope of the study. Additionally, it encapsulates literature review on Critical Discourse Analysis, Systemic Functional Linguistics and Political Discourse Analysis. Besides, it also entails the theory that informs the study. Finally, the methodology employed in the study, which includes: sampling method, research design and data analysis, has also been shown. As such, it serves as the backbone of what is to be addressed in the subsequent chapters.

CHAPTER TWO

IDEOLOGY AND POWER

2.1 Introduction to the Notion Ideology and Power

Ideology has been a central area of investigation in Critical Discourse Analysis (Kress and Hodge, 1979; Fairclough, 1989, 1992; Wodak 1989; Van Dijk, 1989). This is so because discourse or any other semiotic behaviour has been identified by major linguistic scholars as a location of ideology. However, one major problem immediately noticeable to anyone attempting to study Ideology is the difficulty in trying to establish its specific definition. From a historic perspective, Ideology can be traced to thinkers such as Destutt de Tracy, Napoleon Bonaparte, Karl Marx, Karl Mannheim and the other members of the Frankfurt Institute of Social Research. The views of such scholars would require a separate study to elaborate on their details.

The notion of power is quite problematic. This is so because of the divergent views by scholars on its exact location, its constituents and its mode of analysis. Power is an abstract and complex idea that significantly influences our lives. It is closely linked to politics whose objectives include: (a) Having the power to make decisions (b) Having the power to control resources (c) Having the power to control other people's behaviour. (d) Having the power to control other people's values It is 'The ability to control people or things,' 'political control of a country or an area' (Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary, 2005:1136).

To enable us proceed with the present study, two approaches to the definition Ideology are explored in section 2.1 while the notion of power is further discussed in section 2.2.

First is the view of Ideology as a 'specific set of symbolic representations (Blommaert, 2005:158). These include: discourses, images, arguments and so forth. Such symbolic representations Blommaert adds are operated by particular groups or actors who are identifiable by their use of such ideologies. This view as Blommaert posits out, is characterized by the well-known – 'isms' (Blommaert, 2005:158) as in fascism, socialism, liberalism or individualized Ideologies such as Marxism, Maoism or schools and doctrines such as the Monroe Doctrine, the Chicago School and so forth.

This view could also involve reference to particular positions within a political system (factionalism) such as progressivism, conservatism, reactivism and so forth. These Ideologies characterize participants who subscribe to them as seen, for instance, in actors who exhibit socialist symbolic representations because they subscribe to the Ideology of Socialism. Such Ideologies Blommaert points out, are normally coded in the sense that: (a) they have a clear origin (through the seminal writing of an author); (b) they have a clear pattern of development; through political parties, Institutions or movements (Blommaert, 2006:158).

The conception of Ideology in the first sense, therefore, represents particular biases of specific social formations which have specific interests. Such biases, Blommaert (2006:158) observes lead to the colloquial usage of Ideology as ‘counterfactual, biased and partisan.

The second approach to the definition of Ideology relates to its view as a general phenomenon that characterizes the totality of a particular social or political system. Such Systems are practiced by every member of the group that subscribes to it. This view emphasizes that Ideology represents the ‘cultural,’ Ideational aspects of a particular socio-political system. This sense of Ideology is linked to the works of Antonio Gramsci (1971). According to J. Blommaert (2006:159) authors in this category emphasize that:

Ideology cannot be attributed to a particular actor, is not located in one particular site but that it penetrates the whole fabric of societies or communities and results in normalized and naturalized patterns of thought and behaviour.

To such scholars, therefore, Ideology is common sense. This implies that Ideology relates to both the normal perceptions individuals have of the world as a system as well as natural activities involved in it. Such activities sustain social relations, power structures and the patterns of thought which serve to reinforce the common sense. The present study adopts this latter view and proceeds to further explore the definition of Ideology within this prism in the subsequent paragraphs and sub sections.

2.1.1 The View of Ideology as a Common Sense

According to Eagleton (1991:1), Ideology relates to the body of ideas or belief systems that characterize a particular social group, class or society. Such ideas are shared and serve to legitimize the dominant political power. Fairclough (2001:20) on his part looks at Ideology as the implicit assumptions which exhibit power relations. Within such assumptions, he observes, are ideologies which sustain unequal power relations thereby enhancing particular political objectives.

However, Raymond Geuss looks at Ideology in three senses namely: (a) descriptive sense; (b) pejorative sense; (c) positive sense. The descriptive sense assumes that all individuals are endowed with an Ideology. Further it suggests that ideology is a coherent world view of groups of individuals as opposed to random collection of beliefs. Such a view, Geuss avers, is modeled along the following characteristics:

- 1) The agents of the group widely share the elements of the subset.
- 2) The elements in the subset are systematically connected.
- 3) The elements are integral to the agent's conceptual frame and cannot easily be given them up.
- 4) The elements in the subset greatly influence the behaviour and action of the agents.
- 5) The beliefs in the subset elements are central in dealing with issues of human life such as: interpretation of death, sexuality and so forth.

Secondly, Geuss's pejorative sense of Ideology relates to criticism of the beliefs, wants and attitudes of the agents in a particular society with the aim of espousing their delusion to the ideals they hold. Such exposures free the agents of their delusions. Hence the use of Ideology in the second sense is pejorative or critical. To Geuss, adds that a form of consciousness can be false Ideologically in three ways namely: (a) by virtue of its functional properties; (b) by virtue of its genetic properties; (c) by virtue of some of its epistemic properties.

On the other hand, Geuss's positive sense of Ideology relates to the determination of the socio-cultural systems or the world-views most appropriate for a particular group or simply the most applicable Ideology that would enable a given group to actualize their needs, wants and interests. Though Geuss's concept of Ideology is detailed, it fails to recognize the central role of the social theorist, who as an evaluator, pays attention

to the aspects of Ideology he is interested in before drifting to the contradictory and dysfunctional elements of Ideology. Critical Discourse Analysis being the domain of social theorists as Fairclough and Van Dijk argue, analyzes, criticizes and offers alternatives to social situations. The present study adopts the view of Ideology as a common sense and defines it as a form of influence or manipulation in order to win acceptance.

2.1.2 Overt or Opaque Ideologies

In texts, Ideological postulations can be overt or covert. Overt Ideologies usually come in the form of skewed representation or in the form of offensive and insensitive language to the institutional subjects such the use of the word ‘rapists’ in reference to Mexican Immigrants by Donald Trump. It can also entail the use of ingroup or outgroup delineation to derogatorily refer to different participants in the selected text.

Similarly, it can also involve the use of language that portrays ‘self’ in a positive light while painting the ‘other’ in a negative light. Such a view is supported by van Dijk who posits that such otherization emphasizes the speaker’s good things but de-emphasizes the other participant’s good things or backgrounds the speaker’s bad things but foregrounds the bad things of the other actors.

On the other hand, opaque ideologies take the form of propaganda. This can be demonstrated by the following example drawn from Donald Trump’s Announcement Speech: *I would build a wall and have Mexico pay for it.* The other forms opaque Ideologies could take include: (a) evasion of responsibility, (b) Gate keeping of what gets to be represented, (c) backgrounding of less privileged Ideologies, (d) use of hegemony to win or manufacture consent. Scholars of Critical Discourse Analysis concur that dominant Ideologies are characterized by the following features:

- They are stabilized and legitimized by discourse such a manner that obscures the effects of power and Ideology.
- They have the ability to naturalize discourse by making it appear ‘normal’ or ‘common sense.’
- They flourish and are sustained by hegemony.
- They may be sustained by the dominated individuals albeit unawares. Such dominated groups even if aware of the dominant Ideologies, may find it difficult to wriggle their way out.

The present study employs the context of use to study how linguistic features bring out both covert and overt Ideologies in the selected text. Consider the following examples in the sub-sections below

2.1.3 Ideology of Positive Self or ‘Us’ Representation and Negative ‘Him’ or ‘Them’ Representation

Political aspirants normally present themselves or their group in positive light while painting the other participant or group in negative light. This they do by employing socially shared mental models with negative connotations to bring out different Ideological postulations. The excerpts below exemplify this notion:

Excerpt 1

Our country is in serious trouble. We don't have victories anymore.
We used to have victories, but we don't have them. When was the
last time anybody saw us beating, let's say China in a trade deal?
They kill us. I beat China all the time. All the time.
(Excerpt from Appendix 1 line 10 - 13)

The Ideology of positive representation of ‘self’ and negative ‘other’ representation is captured in the above excerpts. This can be seen in the way Donald Trump projects himself in positive light as in *I beat China all the time* while implicitly painting the current American administration in negative light. The expressions ‘serious trouble,’ ‘killing us’ and ‘no victories anymore,’ are meant to demean the government of the day and thus paint it in negative light. Another way of positive ‘self’ representation and negative ‘other’ representation is brought out in excerpt 2 below:

Excerpt 2

And remember the \$ 5 billion website? \$ 5 billion we spent on a
website and to this day it doesn't work. A \$ 5 billion website. I have
so many Websites, I have them all over the place. I hire people, they
do a website. It costs me \$3. \$ 5 billion website.
(Excerpt from Appendix 1 line 77 - 80)

The excerpt above espouses self-glorification. The speaker elevates his personal image by attacking the current administration in a subtle way. The repetition of the expression *a \$5 billion website* is an exaggeration meant to project the negative image of the

Obama administration. The clause *I have so many websites, I have them all over the place* is an implicit way of enacting power that is not in sync with reality. Donald Trump, perhaps, uses this statement to demonstrate to the electorate how prudent he is in terms of financial management. Such Opaque Ideologies are normally used by politicians to deceive unsuspecting electorate.

Further example of Ideological enactment can be seen in excerpt 3 below:

Excerpt 3

Ask Boeing. They wanted Boeing's secrets. They wanted their patents and all their secrets before they agreed to buy planes from Boeing. Hey I'm not saying they are stupid. I like China. I sell apartments for- I just sold an apartment for \$15 million to China. Am I supposed to dislike them? I own a big chunk of the bank of America Building at 1290 Avenue of Americas that I got from China in a war. Very valuable.

(Excerpt from Appendix 1 line 210 - 215)

The excerpt above is a case of Ideological projection in which opponents are attacked and cast in negative light. The reason for this information giving is to subtly influence the listener to reject any candidate associated with the Obama administration and to accept the speaker. The background information on China, for example, is a biased platform Donald Trump uses to project his Ideology. He implicitly suggests that the present administration is powerless and incapable of dealing with China and that he is the only one capable of sorting out the 'detrimental' influence of China to the benefit of the American citizenry. However, his dalliance with China as captured in the clause: *I like China...Am I supposed to dislike them* points to a likelihood of this promise coming to naught as the speaker says he is in business with China.

Negative 'other' representation is further brought out in the excerpt below:

Excerpt 4

Wow. Whoa. That is some group of people. Thousands. So nice, thank you very much. That's really nice. Thank you. It's great to be at Trump Tower. It's great to be at a wonderful city, New York. And it's an honor to have everybody here. This is beyond anybody's expectations. There has been no

crowd like this. And I can tell, some of the candidates, they went in. They didn't know the air-conditioner didn't work. They sweated like dogs. They didn't know the room was too big, because they didn't have anybody there. How are they going to beat ISIS? I don't think it's gonna happen.

(Excerpt from Appendix 1 line 1 - 9)

The speaker represents the other candidates in bad light while projecting a positive image of himself. he uses clauses laden with lexical items of negative expressive values such as 'sweated like dogs,' 'didn't have anybody there' to emphasize particular meanings. This perhaps is geared towards influencing the opinions and attitudes of his audience. On the other hand, lexical items such as 'thousands,' 'no crowd like this' project Donald Trump in positive light; a biased and polarizing Ideological representation between 'us'(in-group) and 'them' (out-group). The employment of 'us' and 'them' points to a difference in Ideological perspective between the two participants something that is reinforced in the excerpt below:

Excerpt 5

We have people that aren't working. We have people who have no incentive to work. But they're going to have incentive to work, because the greatest social program is a job. And they'll be proud, and they'll love it, and they'll make much more than they would they would've ever made, and they'll be- they'll be doing so well, and we're going to be thriving as a country, thriving. It can happen. I will be the greatest jobs president God ever created. I tell you that.

(Excerpt from Appendix 1 line 154 - 159)

The speaker implicitly represents the present administration led by the Democratic Party as incapable of solving the issue of unemployment but represents himself as the solution to the problem. This is perhaps meant to paint himself in a positive way in the eyes of the electorate. For instance, the clause *I will be the greatest jobs president God ever created* is meant to positively project the image of the speaker and to blur any possibility of a positive conceptualization of his opponents.

2.1.4 Ideology as a Weapon of Persuasion

In the excerpts below, the participant studied employed Ideology as a weapon of persuasion to win favour with his audience and to ensure rejection of his opponent. Consider excerpt 6 below:

Excerpt 6

But Obamacare kicks in in 2016. Really big league. It is going to be amazingly destructive. Doctors are quitting. I have a friend who's a doctor, and he said to me the other day, 'Donald, I never saw anything like it. I have more accountants than I have nurses. They have no plan now.'" We have to repeal Obamacare and it can be—and it can be replaced with something much better for everybody. Let it be for everybody. But much better and much less expensive for people and the government. And we can do it.

(Excerpt from Appendix 1 line 107 - 114)

In the excerpt above, the clause *let it be for everybody* shows that the speaker is persuading his audience to buy his line of thought. The speaker projects himself as being very concerned about the inability of a vast majority of Americans to access quality healthcare due to the Obamacare. He similarly appeals to the conscience of his audience in the following declarative clause: *We have to repeal Obamacare*. In this clause, the speaker re-enacts the power of the electorate. This emanates from the assumption that the electorate may be hoodwinked into mortgaging their votes necessitating the need for them to be wise while casting their votes. In addition, the repetition of the phrase 'much better' is meant to heighten emotion and to prick the conscience of the citizenry. Such structures are meant help build a positive image of the speaker in the minds of his audience.

In excerpt 7 below, the speaker attempts to draw the listeners into his team by bridging the power gap between them in a bid to win their support.

Excerpt 7

They are ripping us. We are rebuilding China. We're rebuilding many countries. China, you go there now, roads, bridges, schools, you never saw anything like that. They have bridges that make the

George Washington Bridge look like small potatoes. And they're all over the place. We have all the cards, but we don't know how to use them. We don't even know that we have the cards, because our leaders don't understand the game. We could turn off that spigot by charging them tax until they behave properly.

(Excerpt from Appendix 1 line 223 - 229)

The excerpt begins with the speaker painting a picture of a naive American citizenry taken advantage of by China and many other countries. In terms of power relations, the clause: *They are ripping us places*. China in an agentive position that casts it as impinging on the interests of the American citizens; something that demonstrates asymmetrical power relations. However, the speaker calls for a joint effort to redress this situation as captured in the following clause: *We could turn off that spigot by charging them tax until they behave properly*. The use of the inclusive pronominal 'we,' is significant relationally because it casts the speaker and the audience as one and the same. This implies that it is ideologically positioned.

2.1.5 Ideology as a weapon of Negotiation

Ideology as a vehicle of negotiation has been used by Donald Trump in the following excerpt:

Excerpt 8

Take a look at the deal he's making with Iran. He makes that deal, Israel maybe won't exist very long. It's a disaster, and we have to protect. But... so we need people- I'm a free trader. But the problem with free trade is you need really talented people to negotiate for you. If you don't have talented people, if you don't have great leadership, if you don't have people that know business, not just a political hack that got the job because he made a contribution to a campaign, which is the way all jobs, just about, are gotten, free trade is terrible.

(Excerpt from Appendix 1 line 176 - 183)

The above excerpt exemplifies a scenario where the 'truth' of the dominant Actor is elevated while that of the dominated participants backgrounded. This is so because the speaker projects himself solely as the one capable of sorting out the issue of free trade.

That the speaker will fix the issue of trade, emanates his Members Resources knowledge of the stiff competition China poses to America in terms of trade. The speaker, therefore, suggests that American citizens will have to wait until he is elected into power before the issue is addressed.

Another example of Ideology as a weapon of negotiation is captured in the excerpt below:

Excerpt 9

We've got nothing. We've got Social Security that's going to be destroyed if somebody like me doesn't bring money into the country. All these other people want to cut the hell out of it. I'm not going to cut it at all; I'm going to bring money in and we're going to save it.

(Excerpt from Appendix 1 line 297 - 300)

From the first clause, the speaker paints a picture of sorry state of affairs in America. He makes reference to Social Security because of the common-sense assumption among the electorate that it is an essential source of livelihood to a vast majority of Americans. The speaker goes on to negotiate with the electorate as seen in the declarative clause *I'm going to bring money in* which points to a personal commitment to deal with the issue at hand. However, to bridge the distance between him and his audience, he uses 'we' as in *We're going to save it*. The speaker does this to demonstrate to the audience that they are joined together in a common destiny. Similarly, the fact that the statement is not modulated indicates an assurance to the electorate that the social security problem will be sorted once the speaker is elected into office.

2.1.6 Ideology of Isolation/ Personality Profiling

The Ideology of personality profiling relates to the idea that personality takes precedence over the political affiliation. The Ideology of Isolation/ Personality Profiling is manifest in Donald Trump's Announcement Speech. This can be seen in the excerpt below:

Excerpt 10

I'll bring back our jobs from China, from Mexico, from Japan, from so many places, I'll bring back our jobs, and I'll bring back our money. Right now, think of this: We owe China \$1.3. We owe Japan more than that. So, they come in, they take our jobs, they take our money, and they loan us back the money, and we pay them in interest, and the dollar goes up so their deal's even better. How stupid are our leaders? How stupid are these politicians to allow this to happen? How stupid are they?

(Excerpt from Appendix 1 line 160 - 167)

The excerpt above portrays Donald Trump as the right person for the position and the opponents as ill-suited for the same. The speaker projects his personality probably to enable the electorate judge his potential to deliver without necessarily considering the political party he belongs to. This he does by isolating his political party and foregrounding his personality to the electorate. His sense of commitment and determination is reinforced further by the repetition of the phrase: 'I'll bring back' which shows the seriousness of the speaker towards addressing the issue of unemployment.

Another example of use of ideology of Personality Profiling is captured in the excerpt below:

Excerpt 11

...One of the early things I would do, probably before I even got in – and I wouldn't even use – you know, I have – I know the smartest negotiators in the world. I know the good ones. I know the bad ones. I know the overrated ones.

(Excerpt from Appendix 1 line 252 - 254)

In this excerpt Donald Trump projects his personality to the electorate through the pronominal 'I'. He alludes to the fact that Ford, a car manufacturing company, is in the processes of relocating to Mexico because of the poor negotiators Americas has. His projection of himself as one who is able to easily handle the situation is

heightened by the clause:- “I have the smartest negotiators in the world.” Notice the agentive position he occupies in the clause.

2.2 Power

2.2.1 Introduction

Fairclough (2001: 38) views power as having to do with the powerful participants inhibiting and controlling the less powerful participants. This is so because discursive practice may contain major ideological effects which may lead to production and reproduction of unequal power relations between participants involved. Such power may involve the powerful individual not only controlling the freedom of the less powerful individual to act but may also involve control of their minds.

Further, Fairclough points out that power may be distinguished based on different resources used to exercise it. These include use of force and use of ideology. Firstly, the exercise of power through force or coercion involves the use of: threats, the police, the military and operational laws in order to secure social control and dominance. Such exercise of power is, however, expensive because it entails recruitment and training of personnel to help in law enforcement. The present study does not concern itself with this type of power.

The second type of power involves the use of Ideology to shape the conscious of dominated groups. This is done through persuasion and manipulation which is mediated by discourse. Consequently, the dominated groups accept the beliefs, ideas and values of the dominant group as the ‘truth’ that everyone should emulate. It is the easiest means of social control. The present study is anchored on this mode of power. As such, the power relations manifest in the Announcement Speech by Donald Trump are exemplified in the sub- sections below:

2.2.2 Power Relations and Dominance

To enable an understanding of how power works as a constraint in discourse, the study explored the different social roles of the speakers. For instance, the social role that exists between a political figure such as a presidential candidate and his audience is that of the dominant and the dominated type. A president has power due the authority vested in him and hence his authority is perceived as ‘natural’; implying that even if he uses such power to manipulate, dominate or unfairly influence the electorate, it is not visible to them because it is naturalized. The analysis brings out discourse structures that have

implications for power in a general sense as well as those used for dominance. It focuses on the use of power as a strategy for domination and mind control/ manipulation.

Political aspirants normally use power and dominance to demonstrate authority and supremacy over particular beliefs or views. As the dominant group, such politicians control what should be projected to the audience. Consider the following excerpts:

Excerpt 1

...Rebuild the country's infrastructure. Nobody can do that like me Believe me. It can be done on time, on budget. way below the cost way below anyone ever thought. I look at the roads being built all over the country, and I say I can build those things for one-third. What they do is unbelievable, how bad.

(Excerpt from Appendix 1 line 482 - 486)

In the excerpt above, the dominance and supremacy of the speaker is captured in the clause: *Nobody can do that like me* and the clause *I can build those things for one-third*. In the two clauses, the speaker draws attention to himself as the only individual capable of fixing the American road infrastructure at a third the cost. The power asymmetry between the speaker and his audience is brought out through the lexical item 'build' which suggests that the speaker would want the dominated group to look at things from his point of view. Similarly, in the excerpt the speaker draws attention to himself as opposed to his party; a personal profiling kind of Ideology. Another example of power and dominance is captured in the excerpt below:

Excerpt 2

...After I'm called by 30 friends of mine who contributed to different campaigns, after I'm called by all the special interests and by the--- the donors and the lobbyists--- and they have zero chance at convincing me, zero--- I'll get a call the next day from the head of Ford. He'll say, 'Please reconsider,' I'll say no. He'll say, 'Mr. President, we've decided to move the plant back to the United States, and we're not going to build it in Mexico.' That's it. They have no choice. They have no choice.

(Excerpt from Appendix 1 line 302 - 309)

The excerpt above shows some lexical items replete with power and dominance. This can be seen in the lexical items ‘called’ and ‘me’ respectively. The gap between the powerful and the less powerful is revealed in the imperative clause ‘Please reconsider.’ Such usage portrays the speaker as sure of what he is saying. Further, the use of the imperative mood signifies the dominance the speaker has over the head of Ford. The speaker exercises such authority by placing obligation on Ford through its head.

Another instance of power and dominance is captured in the excerpt below:

Excerpt 3

Our country is in serious trouble. We don’t have victories anymore. We used to have victories, but we don’t have them. When was the last time anybody saw us beating, let’s say China in a trade deal? They kill us. I beat China all the time. All the time.

(Excerpt from Appendix 1 line 10 - 13)

In the excerpt above, the authority or power of the speaker is captured in the clause *I beat China all the time*. The pronominal ‘I’ which functions as the subject of the clause is assertive as the speaker uses it to give an assurance to the electorate that he is more than capable of dealing with ‘unfair’ trade deal between United States and America. The commitment and ability of the speaker, as a leader capable of guaranteeing America victory is captured in the repetition of the phrase ‘all the time.’ Implicitly, the speaker appears to portray the present regime as inferior and incapable of accomplishing any tangible victory on behalf of American citizenry. This is illuminated by the clause: “When was the last time anybody saw us beating, let’s say China in a trade deal?”

An instance of unequal power relations is captured in the excerpt below:

Excerpt 4

... Obama is going to be out playing golf. He might be on one of my courses. I have the best courses in the world, so I’d say, you what, if he wants to--- I have one right next to the White House right on the Potomac. If he’d like to play, that’s fine. In fact, I’d love him to leave early and play, that would be a very good thing.

(Excerpt from Appendix 1 line 101 - 106)

The excerpt typifies a case of unequal power relations. The speaker casts himself as powerful and superior than everyone else. Supremacy is reflected in clauses such as ‘I have the best courses in the world,’ and ‘If he’d like to play, that’s fine.’ The speaker chooses such clauses perhaps to promote a positive image of himself before the electorate. Similarly, the speaker employs the declarative mood in the clause ‘I’d love him to leave early and play, that would be a very good thing,’: The use of ‘play’ suggests a pass-time and so the speaker implies that Obama needs to engage in pastime activities and not a serious leadership role.

2.2.3 Power as Manipulation/ Mind control

Critical Discourse Analysis entails an analysis of the interface between discourse structures and mental representation. This is so because other than control of discourse as a form of power, another key way of reproducing dominance is through control of people’s minds. Manipulation entails skewing the processes of understanding as well as formation of unbalanced mental models. Discursively, manipulation is ideologically embedded in discourse that emphasizes the speaker’s good things while de-emphasizing the other participant’s good things.

One feature of manipulation is that it involves power and dominance. These are analyzed by accounting for the nature of control that some participants exercise over others. It is made possible by the fact that:

- 1) The participants may lack the knowledge to contest the discourse they are offered.
- 2) There may be no alternative information from which new beliefs may be derived.
- 3) The participants may be recipients of the discourse in some instances.
- 4) Recipients are likely to accept opinions, beliefs and knowledge from sources they perceive as credible, trustworthy, authoritative and reliable.

This, therefore, suggests that discursive mind control is imbued with power and dominance. Similarly, it suggests that people are not only influenced by the textual properties of discourse but also by the perceived credibility, power and authority of the speaker. As such, the same discourse may be manipulative or not in different contexts. The focus of the study, thus, is based on context of use. In the excerpts analyzed below,

the speaker tries to influence his audience through biased social representations and mental models:

Excerpt 5

Our labour participation rate was the worst since 1978. But think of it, GDP below zero, horrible labor participation rate. And our real unemployment is anywhere from 18 to 20 percent. Don't believe the 5.6. Don't believe it.

(Excerpt from Appendix 1 line 56 - 59)

In this excerpt, the speaker attempts to influence his audience. The speaker, through the pronominal 'our'; identifies with audience perhaps to gain their acceptance. The expressions 'horrible labor participation' and 'worst since 1978' serve to paint a sad state of affairs that can only be remedied upon the speaker being elected into office. Through linkage of events the speaker intends to provoke feeling of anger and revolt in his audience. Consequently, the audience then view the speaker as the most suitable candidate for the position as opposed to all the others.

Another example of mental control is resident in the excerpt below:

Excerpt 6

I will be the greatest jobs president that God ever created. I tell you that. I'll bring back our jobs from China, from Mexico from Japan, from so many places. I'll bring back our jobs, and I'll bring back our money.

(Excerpt from Appendix 1 line 159 - 161)

In this excerpt, the speaker does not only employ the ideology of personality profiling but uses it as a means of controlling the minds of his audience into believing his assertions. This is aptly captured in the clauses: *I will be the greatest jobs president that God ever created* and *I'll bring back our jobs from so many places*. Such exaggerated statements serve to influence the electorate into approving the candidature of the speaker.

In the excerpt below, the speaker makes use of deictic expression as a tool of mind control:

Excerpt 7

I watch the speeches of these people, and they say the sun will rise, the moon will set, and all sorts of wonderful things will happen. And people are saying, what's going on? I just want a job. I don't need the rhetoric. I want a job. And that's what is happening. And it's going to get worse...

(Excerpt from Appendix 1 line 97 - 99)

The speaker uses the deictic expression 'these' to refer to politicians generally. Such deictic expressions are important as they draw the attention of the audience to the circumstance of the utterance. In the above case, the speaker exploits the issue of unemployment as seen in the repetition of clause: *I want a job*. However, this is just an avenue for the speaker to influence his audience to accept him. The excerpt further provides the audience with two sets of leaders to choose from, that is, leadership full of rhetoric on the one hand and the other which is action oriented. The speaker in effect represents himself in positive light while painting the other in negative light; something that can be considered a tool of influence and manipulation.

2.3 Conclusion

This chapter explored the twin issues of Ideology and Power. The analysis reveals that even banal political speeches such as Donald Trump's Announcement Speech is crafted in such a manner that brings out Ideology dominance and manipulation. Such tools are meant to influence the electorate to vote for the speaker. However, whether the promises politicians get fulfilled is a different matter. This is so because politicians in most cases make high sounding promises to the electorate with the sole purposes of securing their vote and not necessarily making any meaningful contribution.

CHAPTER THREE

TRANSITIVITY SYSTEMS REALIZED IN THE RECURRING THEMES

3.0 Introduction

This chapter provides further analyses of the process types and participant roles in the selected data. The analysis of the data is based on the tenets of SFL and relies on the theoretic foundations of CDA to describe the Transitivity Systems (Material processes, Mental processes and Relational processes) within the recurring themes with. This is done with view of interpreting what they reveal about the experiential meaning.

Section 3.1 highlights the recurring themes found in the Announcement Speech while section 3.2 offers a description of the process types alongside their participant roles.

3.1 Highlight of the Recurrent Themes Across the Announcement Speech

This sub section is geared towards answering the third question of the study: ‘What are the recurring themes in the Announcement Speech and which American issues do they address?’ As earlier indicated, the data for the study are in the form of selected paragraphs which address some issues within the American context.

The criterion for the selection of the themes is, thus, based on their recurrence across the Announcement speech. In the study, the term recurring themes relates to the common issues found in the Announcement Speech. The analysis of the Process Types and Participant roles is to be conceived within a consistent frame of the recurring themes. The data from the Announcement Speech is described in Sub-section 3.1.1 below.

3.1.1 Data Description

Donald Trump in his Announcement speech explored relationship between America and the rest of the world and outlined how such relations would be under his presidency. Majorly, he focused on the issues of National Security, Immigration, Islamic Terrorism, Unemployment, Obamacare and Education. For the purposes of the present study, we shall focus on the issues of Immigration and National Security and subsume the issue of Islamic Terrorism as falling within the realm of National Security. Its analysis therefore is done within the ambit of National Security.

In terms of organizational structure, the Announcement Speech begins with Donald Trump thanking his audience for turning up in large numbers to listen to him. He then proceeds to point out the ills bedeviling America ranging from its inability to provide jobs for its citizens to its poor handling of the issues of Immigration and National Security. Further, he points out that immigrants have been allowed unfettered access to the U.S. He blames this situation on the current Obama administration and vows to remedy the situation.

Trump then goes on to talk about the issue of Islamic Terrorism pointing out how rich they had become courtesy of the American weakness. He, partly, blames the upsurge of Terrorism in the Middle East on the decision of America to attack Iraq. To him, it is that attack that resulted into the instability of the Middle East leading to emergence of dangerous terrorist groups such as ISIS. Similarly, he points out that China is building a military island in the middle of the South China sea. Something America cannot do because of the restrictive environmental laws.

On the issue of Affordable Obamacare, he christens it ‘a lie’ and a ‘disaster’. He promises to repeal it because of its cost implications and the fact that it had led to job losses for doctors. Politicians are not able to address such issues because they are fully controlled by lobbyists. As a remedy, Donald Trump emphasizes that what America needs is a leader who wrote “The Art of the Deal” and that he happens to be that leader. He justifies this position by pointing out that the Republican politicians, for instance, are merely full of rhetoric devoid of any tangible plan of addressing the issues of unemployment.

To capture how disillusioned American citizens have become, he says most of them have no incentive to work, however, he does not clearly provide the reasons for this but goes ahead to promise to reverse this attitude by “bringing back American jobs from China, Mexico, Japan and so many places.’

Further he adds that America has had poor negotiators compared to China. He singles out Obama whom he describes as clueless. He justifies his assessment of him by pointing out that he was the one who “did Bergdah”, an agreement that led to the discharge of killer terrorists now trying to attack America.

On the issue of economy, he promises to ensure that Ford (a car manufacturing company) does not relocate to Mexico. He insists that he would force the company to reverse its decision by imposing punitive taxes which would leave the company with no option but to build its plant in America.

From the observations above, it can be concluded that the recurring themes in Donald Trump's Announcement Speech include: Immigration, National Security, Islamic Terrorism, Obamacare and Economy. The study focused on the themes of Immigration, Islamic Terrorism and National Security. The study analyzed the Process Types and Participant's roles resident in the selected text. In order to avoid repetition or redundancy, repeated clauses will be analyzed once. The analysis of Process Types and Participants roles used in the data is explored in sections 3.2 below.

3.2 The Grammar of Transitivity/ Process Types and Participant Roles Realized in the Selected Texts

As earlier noted transitivity system is the grammatical element used to capture experience (Simpson, 2004:22). Its analysis, therefore, is significant in answering the first research question which is: How is experiential meaning realized through the process types and participant roles within the recurring themes in the Announcement Speech?

Since the grammar of transitivity enables realization of different models used in the presentation of events and in the identification of roles of individuals in their interaction with others (Kress and Fowler 1970:199 & Sahragad and Davatgarzadeh, 2010:74), it can thus, be used to Donald Trump's perception on the issues of Immigration and National Security. Of significance in this study is how Trump manipulates transitivity systems to project particular meanings about the topics, events and people, he discusses or simply put how, who, what and whom are realized as part of the identified themes.

Process types are, investigated to find out what kind of attributes are assigned to different participants, which participant is portrayed as having the capacity to act upon the other, and which participant is cast as lacking the ability or capacity to perform certain duties or tasks. Such representations help bring out covert power imbalance among the participants involved.

3.2.1 Process Types and Participant Roles in the Theme of Immigration

The issue of Immigration is characterized by the use of five process types which are explored in the section below:

3.2.1.1 Material Process

Material processes as earlier noted in section 2.1.1 are processes of “doing” and “happening”. In this type of clause, the actor is able to perform an action and to occasion change through what Halliday (2004:179) refers to as input of energy. Similarly, the actor is able to affect the flow of events of another participant in the clause known as the Goal or Beneficiary. Material processes are employed to bring out different views as evidenced in the following excerpts:

Excerpt 1

When Mexico sends its people, they are not sending their best. They are not sending you. They are sending people that have lots of problems. They are bringing drugs. They are bringing crimes.

(Excerpt from Appendix 1 line 21 - 25)

Trump describes Mexico using material processes thereby giving prominence to the action it performs. ‘Sending’ for example, is a concrete and directional action. Similarly, ‘bringing’ is a transitive material process in which Mexico is portrayed as an agent impinging on the right of Americans. This casts Mexico as an entity that not only takes control of what is happening, but also affects the physical phenomena around it. The excerpt above brings out the ideology of negative ‘other’ representation. These are captured in material process below:

Example 1

They	are sending	people	that have lots of problems
Actor	Pr: Mat	Goal	circumstantial

Example 2

They	are bringing	drugs
Actor	Pr: Mat	Goal

Example 3

They are bringing crime

Actor Pr: Mat Goal

The circumstantial element (that have lots of problems) in example 1, ideationally constructs an unfair scenario in which Mexico occupies an agentive position presumably as a fraudulent and unfair actor that sets out to offload its suffering citizens to the U.S. Therefore, Mexico as an actor is portrayed as negatively affecting the lives of Americans. Donald Trump represents Mexican Immigrants in bed light while subtly projecting the image of America in positive light as can be seen in examples 2 and 3 where Mexican Immigrants are cast as agents impinging on the interests of America offering ‘drugs’ and ‘crimes’ as their goal.

Excerpt 2

But I speak to the border guards and they tell us what we’re getting. And it only makes common sense. It only makes common sense. They’re sending us not the right people.

(Excerpt from Appendix 1 line 26 - 27)

Analyzing identity, Paltridge (2006:42), quoting Wenger (1998:49) posits that identity is a ‘negotiated experience’ in which we define who we are by the way we experience ourselves... as well as by the ways we and others reify ourselves. In the above excerpt, Trump constitutes his identity and that of the American people through self-evaluation. This evaluation is coded through the use of the material process speak and send. This evaluation, can be captured as in examples 4 and 5 below:

Example 4

I speak to the border guards and they tell us what we are getting

Actor Pr: Mat Goal

Example 5

They are sending us not the right people

Actor Pr: Mat Goal

In terms of transitivity, Trump is depicted in agentive position in example 4 while the immigrants are cast as a target or victim of his actions. This is a typical example of power relations and dominance. In the clause, the speaker draws attention to himself as a leader capable of ascertaining the truth from the border guards. The asymmetrical power relations between the speaker and his audience is brought out through the agentive position he occupies which suggests he wants them to work at the issue from his point of view. In example 5 above, Mexico is cast as the Actor, the ‘wrong’ people they send to America as the Goal while America is brought out as the maleficiary Beneficiary. This portrayal of Mexico further develops the ideology of negative ‘other’ representation. More importantly is the fact that it implicitly suggests to the electorate the failure of the present regime to contain this situation.

Excerpt 3

When do we beat Mexico at the border? They are laughing at us, at our stupidity.

(Excerpt from Appendix 1 line 14)

The use of material process can be captured as in example 6.

Example 6

When do we beat Mexico at the border?

Actor: Pr Material Goal

In this example, the pronominal ‘we’ represent American citizens which in this case is the Actor. The process ‘beat’, on the other hand, entails the physical act of being out beaten by Mexico. The circumstantial element ‘at the border’ is the scope of the material process ‘beat’ because it reflects the locality of the action. In terms of transitivity, America is cast in the agentive position implying that it should be more powerful than the other participant; Mexico. However, according to Trump this seems not to be the case pointing towards asymmetrical power relations between the two countries. In terms of ideology, example 6 above types ideology of negative ‘other’ representation. Trump perhaps aware that the present administration is led by a Democrat, President Obama, foregrounds its failures to the electorate while backgrounding any of its successes to the electorate. This he does, perhaps to win favour with the electorate.

3.2.1.2 Relational Processes

Relational processes are key grammatical tools for classifying, assessing, identifying and evaluating people, concepts or objects (Halliday, 2004:214; Simpson, 2004:25-26). In this section, relational processes are investigated to try and find out for instance, how immigrants are classified based on the types of attributes attached to them and the meanings ascribed to those attributes. Further, the analysis seeks to find out whether there are particular negative attributes associated with immigrants and what identity they construct of those immigrants. As Fairclough (1989) posits, and which this section adopts, relational processes are part of classification schemes. Fairclough asserts this by pointing out that:

Classification scheme constitutes a particular way of dividing up some aspect of reality which is built upon a particular ideological representation of that reality (p.115).

This can be seen in the following examples drawn from the issue of immigration.

Excerpt 4

They are sending people that have lots of problems, and they're bringing those problems with us. They are bringing crime. They are rapists and some, I assume, are good people.

(Excerpt from Appendix 1 line 23 - 25)

The relational process in this excerpt which serves to further develop the ideology of positive 'us' representation and negative 'other' representation is captured in example 7 below:

Example 7

They are rapists

Carrier Pr; Relational Attributes

The employment of the relational clause of the attributive type, which is brought out interpersonally as a declarative clause, has the overall effect of overtly representing the moral decadence of the immigrants as a general truth which traverses the past, the present and possibly the future (Harrison and Young, 2004:239) thus making it natural. This clause represents an 'otherizing' discourse in which the immigrants are portrayed

as carriers of the negative attribute ‘rapists’. Covertly, such a description is meant to demean the government of the day and subsequently paint it as unable to safeguard American interests. However, Donald Trump implicitly appears to portray America in positive light through the declarative clause: *They are bringing those problems with us.*

The verbiage presupposes an objective discourse and thus defocusing the reader’s assessment of the initial utterance as a subjective proposition on the problems associated with immigrants which then presents Donald Trump’s proposition as an undeniable fact, an idea that is reinforced by the portrayal of the Mexican Immigrants as rapists.

The ideology of negative ‘other’ representation is further captured in the excerpt below:-

Excerpt 5

The U.S has become a dumping ground for other people’s problems.

(Excerpt from Appendix 1 line 20)

This can be exemplified relationally as follows:

Example 8

The U.S. has become a dumping ground for other people’s problems.

Carrier Pr; Rel – Attributes circumstantial element

Here Trump assigns the U.S. a negative attribute; dumping ground. This constructs the U.S. as having accommodated way too much of other people’s problems to an extent that the same people are now taking advantage of the U.S. The use of the present perfect as opposed to other forms of tense implies that the impact of other people’s problems is still found at the moment. He appears to implicitly ridicule the present state of affairs, thus, painting it in negative light in the eyes of the electorate. Through these attributive clauses, Trump conveys a critical message. He emphasizes the need for this state of affairs to change.

3.2.1.3 Mental Processes

Mental process entails consciousness which include cognition, emotion or perception (Halliday 1985; Abdulaziz, 1996). They allow language users to espouse thoughts, opinions, emotions and tastes that help to bring out their definitions of reality (Halliday,

2004;174; Simpson, 2004:23). An analysis of the mental process in addressing the issue of immigration is important because it is through the way characters think that they may be conceived as having a particular ideology or identity.

Further, mental clauses mostly construct an individual's opinion or perception of others as being more significant than their actions and as such are essential in establishing Donald Trump's evaluation of issues.

Consider excerpt 6 on the ideology of negative 'other' representation:

Excerpt 6

It's coming from more than Mexico. It's coming from all over South and Latin America, and its coming probably __probably __ from the Middle East. But we don't know. We have no protection and we have no competence. We don't know what's happening. And it's got to stop and it's got to stop fast.

(Excerpt from Appendix 1 line 29 – 32)

Two mental clauses in this excerpt are significant in relation to the ideology of negative 'other' representation. This can be seen in examples 9 and 10.

Example 9

We don't know

Sensor Pr: Cognition

Example 10

We don't know what's happening

Sensor Pr: Cognition Phenomenon

Donald Trump uses the cognitive process 'know' to underscore the frustrations and hopelessness of the American citizens at the turn of events. According to Halliday and Matthiessen (2014) the mental verb 'know' relates to the cognition of the senser. The senser 'we' and the phenomenon in the dependent clause "what's happening" captures the personal feeling of the speaker on the issue of immigration as a major threat to American citizens. Notice that the speaker implicitly portrays the present administration led by the Democratic Party as incapable of dealing with the issue of immigration leading to the state of despair he paints among the American citizens. He subtly appears

to be on a mission of ensuring no positive perception of his opponents in the run up to the presidential elections.

3.2.1.4 Verbal Processes

These are clauses of ‘saying’ (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2014:252). In the theme immigration, verbal processes involve the sayer, the verbiage and the target. Donald Trump makes use of one verbal clause ‘tell’ as in the following example drawn from excerpt 2:

Example 11

They tell us what we’re getting

Sayer Pr Verbal Verbiage

In this example, the speaker employs the verbiage:- “what we’re getting”, as a weapon of persuasion to enable him win favour with his audience. The speaker projects himself as very concerned with the issue of illegal immigration. This is a way of appealing to the conscience and hence secure their support.

3.2.1.5 Existential Process

As earlier indicated, existential processes suggest that something exists (Simpson 2004:25). They are processes of existence and happening. In the theme of immigration, the following existential processes drawn from excerpts 2 and 6 respectively can be seen:

Example 12

It only makes common sense

Pr: Exis Existent

In the above example, though the existent is not explicitly mentioned, we get it from the context of excerpt 6 which revolves around the idea that the U.S. is getting dangerous and poor immigrants. Such portrayals of the U.S, further illustrates the ideology of negative ‘other’ representation as it casts the government of the day in bad light in the eyes of the electorate. Further examples are analyzed below:

Example 13

It's coming from Mexico

Pr: Exis Existent

Example 14

It's coming from all over south and Latin America

Pr: Exis Existent

Example 15

It's coming probably – probably – from the Middle East.

Pr: Exis Existent

These clauses show how the illegal immigrants get into the U.S. The speaker uses these Existential clauses to blur any possible positive conceptualization of the present administration in the eyes of the electorate. Once he achieves this, it will minimize competition from any candidate associated with the government in power.

3.2.1.6 Behavioral Process

These processes entail physiological and psychological behavior. They represent not only activities of doing but also those of sensing (ibid, 1994:139; Simpson, 2004:230). The participant in the process is the Behavior that is construed as more powerful compared to the senser or the carrier because he or she is brought out as actually acting. Consider the following examples drawn from excerpt 3 which further serves to illustrate the use of ideology as a weapon of persuasion.

Example 16

They are laughing at us

Behavior: Pr: Behavioural Target

Example 17

They are laughing at our stupidity

Behavior: Pr: behavioural Target

In the above examples, Mexico is inscribed as the Behaver with the U.S. as the Target of that behavior. The clause reveals that the speaker is subtly appealing to his audience to do something to remedy the current state of affairs. The placement of the U.S as the Target in the phrase “our stupidity”, serves to buttress the speaker’s appeal to the conscience of his audience.

The use of Transitivity in the theme Immigration reflects the way Trump persuades his audience to reflect on the effect of Illegal Immigration on the American society. He does this by making use of material, mental, relational, existential, verbal and behavioural processes. His aim is to make the audience buy into his observations, ideas and suggestions.

3.2.2 Process Types and Participants roles in the Theme of National Security

The theme of National Security is characterized by all the process types. However, for the purposes of the present study, we shall focus on the major process types most prevalent in the selected text. These include: Material Processes, Mental Processes and Relational Processes.

3.2.2.1 Material Processes

Material processes are the most used in the portrayal of the state of security in America. Their manifestation in the theme of National Security is explored in a two-pronged approach. First, the study focuses on the issue of Islamic Terrorism then proceeds to look at other aspects of National Security. The issue of Islamic Terrorism is resident in the excerpts below:

Excerpt 7

Islamic terrorism is eating up large portions of the Middle East. And it has got to stop fast.

(Excerpt from Appendix 1 line 33)

From the above excerpt, one material clause is significant in the evaluation of the spread and effect of Islamic Terrorism in the Middle East. This can be exemplified as follows:

Example 18

Islamic terrorism is eating up large portions of the Middle East

Actor

Pr: Mat

Goal

The use of material process ‘eating up’ elevates the concrete action ‘eating’. Notice also that Islamic Terrorists are inscribed in the agentive position thereby casting them as actors intentionally impinging on the entity Middle East. This is another example of the use of ideology as a weapon of persuasion. The speaker implicitly appeals to the conscience of the electorate by hoodwinking them into voting for them. In addition, use of the circumstantial element ‘large portions’, serves to heighten emotion of the electorate and thereby root for change. The use of ideology as a tool for manipulation is captured in the excerpt below:

Excerpt 8

They just built a hotel in Syria. Can you believe this? They built a hotel. When I have to build a hotel, I pay interest. They don’t have to pay interest, because they took the oil which I said we should have taken.

(Excerpt from Appendix 1 line 35 - 37)

The material processes in this excerpt are shown in examples 19 – 22 below:

Example 19

They just	built	a hotel in Syria
Actor	Pr: Material	Goal

Example 20

I	pay	interest
Actor	Pr: Material	Goal

Example 21

They	took	the oil
Actor	Pr: Material	Goal

Example 22

We	left	Iraq
Actor	Pr: Material	Goal

In example 21, the Islamic Terrorists are cast in the agentive position and are acting upon inanimate entity: oil. This portrays them as not only taking control of the situation but as also affecting what is going on; an indication of their power. On the other hand, America is brought out as weak and seemingly dumb. The use of the material process 'built' preceded by the adverb 'just' is meant to prick the minds of the speaker's and make them heed his clarion call for change.

In example 19 and 22, Donald Trump constructs the Power Relations and Dominance between America and the Islamic Terrorists by evaluating the two entities against each other. He makes use of concrete lexis such as 'took' and 'left' which brings out the Islamic terrorists and the America differently as it assigns them varied levels of power. The use of material process 'took' in the first sentence construes the Islamic terrorists as having the power and the ability to gain access to oil. On the other hand, the material process 'left' does not embody the kind of power envisaged in example 21 thereby casting the U.S. as weaker compared to the Islamic terrorists.

On the other hand, in clause 20, Trump through the pronominal 'I' occupies the agentive position which portrays him as action oriented. He appears to confirm and to reassure his audience that as a responsible and law abiding American citizen he pays interest as the law stipulates. He foregrounds his interest payment credentials to assure the electorate that he will abide by all the laws as laid down in the American Constitution. This therefore, is an attempt by the speaker to portray himself in positive light in the eyes of the electorate as he projects the present administration as incapable of dealing with the issue of Islamic Terrorism.

In the excerpt below, the Ideology of personality profiling is brought out:

Excerpt 9

But I said, "Don't hit Iraq," because you're going to totally destabilize the Middle East. Iran is going to take over the Middle East, Iran and somebody else will get the oil, and it turned out that Iran is now taking over Iraq. Think of it. Iran is taking over Iraq, and they're taking it over big league.

(Excerpt from Appendix 1 line 41 - 43)

Analyses of the material processes in the excerpt are captured below:

Example 23

Iran is taking over the Middle East

Actor Pr: Material Goal

Example 24

Iran is now taking over Iraq

Actor: Pr: Material Goal

The excerpt above portrays the speaker as best suited for the position he is vying for. The speaker projects his personality as captured in the verbal process; But I said, “Don’t hit Iraq.” He isolates his political party and foregrounds his personal judgement as sound and well thought out. He justifies the folly of ignoring his advice as captured in examples 23 and 24 by pointing out the outcome of such a move by the present administration. On the other hand, the Ideology of negative ‘other’ representation is further captured in the excerpt below;

Excerpt 10

We spent \$2 trillion in Iraq, \$2 trillion. We lost thousands of lives, thousands in Iraq. We have wounded soldiers who I love...they’re great...thousands and thousands of wounded soldiers.

(Excerpt from Appendix 1 line 45 - 47)

From the above excerpt two material processes can be seen:

Example 25

We spent \$2 trillion in Iraq, \$2 trillion.

Actor Pr: Material Goal

Example 26

We lost thousands of lives, thousands in Iraq.

Actor Pr: Material Goal

Example 29

They leave it

Actor Pr: Material Goal

In example 27, the Americans are inscribed as the Actors who through the directional Material process go are unable to access Iraq despite having spent \$ 2trillion on it. In example 28, though Iraq is cast as a beneficiary of America's action, America did not get any counter benefit from that gesture. In example 29, Iraq is portrayed as being unable to defend or safeguard American security interests even after receiving military aid from the U.S. Indeed, the use of the inverted clause: 'The first time a bullet goes off in the air, they leave it,' underscores this point.

The issue of the U.S military having left sophisticated vehicles in the hands of the enemy is captured in the following excerpt.

Excerpt 12

Last week, I read 2,300 Humvees – these are big vehicles ---were left behind for the enemy. 2,000? You would say maybe two, maybe four? 2,300 sophisticated vehicles, they ran, and the enemy took them.

(Excerpt from Appendix 1 line 50 - 52)

The following examples of material processes can be seen in the above excerpt.

Example 29

The enemy took them

Actor Pr: Material Goal

Example 30

They ran

Actor Pr: Material

In this excerpt, the speaker projects his personality to the audience as he provides them with information concerning the sophisticated military vehicles left in the hands of the enemy. This is captured in the clause "I read 2,300 Humvees were left for the enemy." The speaker in example 29 construes the enemy as the agent which is intentionally

acting on the entity: Humvees. In, example 30, he highlights the way American military was overwhelmed by the enemy and thus, had to flee. The intentionality of the American military actions to flee is captured by the agentive position assigned to them. Notice also that he uses the passive clause: 2,300 Humvees were left behind for the enemy in Excerpt 14. Although, passivization weakens the link between the Actor and the Humvees left behind, it emphasizes the issue of the 2,300 Humvees left behind to the enemy and de-emphasizes the Actor. The speaker, therefore, shifts the focus from the military to the 2,300 Humvees left for the enemy. The U.S military culpability is thus, defocused while the huge sums of money the government lost foregrounded. Implicitly, the speaker appears to project himself as the right candidate for the job. He seems keen to ensure that the electorate judge his personality and contribution as opposed to his political party.

In the excerpt below, the use of ideology as a weapon of persuasion is brought out:

Excerpt 13

And believe me; you look at the border with Yemen. You remember Obama a year ago, Yemen was a great victory. Two weeks later the place was blown up. Everybody got out – and they kept our equipment.

(Excerpt from Appendix 1 line 317 - 319)

From the excerpt, the following material processes can be identified.

Example 31

Everybody got out

Actor Pr: Material

Example 32

They kept our equipment

Actor Pr: Material Goal

In this excerpt, the speaker persuades the audience to buy his line of thought and to reject others. In example 31, he heightens his argument by placing the Islamic Terrorists in agentive position of power. This signals that they have the liberty to do as they please to the detriment of America. The speaker, similarly, attempts to integrate his audience

into his team in an attempt to bridge the power imbalance between them and thereby win their support. Notice that the speaker is part of the Goal in example 32.

The clause in example 32 assigns Yemen an agentive position with the U.S occupying the weaker position of the Goal. The speaker, thus, appears to suggest to his audience that he suffers just like they do but is prepared and ready to remedy the situation.

Further Trump outlines the measures he would take to remedy the security situation. First, on the issue of the American border with Mexico, he promises to deal with it as captured in the following excerpt.

The excerpt below captures the ideology of personality profiling.

Excerpt 14

I would build a great wall, and nobody builds walls better than me, believe me, and I'll build them very inexpensively, I will build a great, great wall on our southern border. And I still have Mexico pay for that wall.

(Excerpt from Appendix 1 line 448 - 450)

From this excerpt, the use of the concrete material process 'build' is quiet notable. This can be signified as follows:

Example 33

I will build a great, great wall on our southern border.

Actor Pr: Material Goal

As earlier indicated, material processes are concerned with the "doing" and are usually characterized by a verb expressing an action which can either be concrete or abstract. From the above example one can notice that the Actor is 'I' (Trump in this case), who makes use of the concrete material clause build to project himself as having concrete plans to remedy the issue of immigration upon assumption of office.

This assertion is meant to raise his approval ratings among the electorate as a leader who is committed and serious in his resolve to bring the issue of illegal immigration to a close. The ideology of personality profiling is further developed in the excerpt below:

Excerpt 15

I will find, within our military, I will find the General Patton or I will find General MacArthur, I will find the right guy. I will find the guy that's going to take that military and make it work. Nobody will be pushing us around.

(Excerpt from Appendix 1 line 453 - 456)

The following material process can be drawn from the above excerpt.

Example 34

I will	find	General Patton
Actor	Pr: Material	Goal

In example 34 above, Donald Trump projects himself in an agentive position thereby drawing attention to his personality. The speaker's sense of seriousness in addressing the issue of National Security is reinforced by his choice of the Goal: 'General Patton? The Speaker draws from his member's resources the idea that General Patton and General MacArthur are highly regarded in the eyes of the public. He uses this idea to project his personality to the electorate as the candidate capable of getting someone with similar traits to fix the issue of National Security in America. Notice the repetition of the material clause:- 'I will find' in the excerpt above.

3.2.2.3 Mental Processes

Mental process types are the second most used in the theme of National Security. Mental processes, as earlier mentioned, are processes of thinking, seeing, feeling and desideration which represent our inner experience. Additionally, they can be indicated by the verbs of cognition, affection, desideration and affection. The process is marked by two participants: the senser and the phenomenon. From the theme of National security, all the four types of mental processes can be found. However, it is the mental process of cognition which is predominant. The examples of the use of mental processes to signify power as manipulation or mind control are captured below:

Example 35

Can you believe this?

Senser Pr: Mental Phenomenon

(Cognitive)

(From Appendix 1 excerpt 8)

Here the speaker (Donald Trump) asks his audience to reflect on how rich the Islamic terrorists had become. This is intended to prick their conscience and to make understand the urgency of the need to elect the ‘right’ leadership to fix the problem. This happens to be the speaker.

Further examples of power as mind control or manipulation are captured in the mental processes below:

Example 36

They don’t know if it worked

Senser Pr: Mental Phenomenon

(From Appendix 1 line 67)

Example 37

I thought that was horrible when it was broadcast on television.

Senser Pr: Mental Phenomenon

(From Appendix 1 line 68)

Example 38

They don’t know what they’re doing

Senser Pr: Mental Phenomenon

(From Appendix 1 line 71)

In these examples, the speaker makes use of the Mental Processes ‘know’ and ‘thought’ to draw the attention of the audience to the phenomenon of the utterance. This is probably a platform to influence the electorate to accept his candidature.

According to Halliday and Matthiessen (2014:257), the four different types of sensing shade into one another, for example, perception shades into cognition with *I see* coming to mean *I understand*. This can be seen from excerpt 15 and more precisely from the example below:

Example 39

You look at the border with Yemen

Sensor Pr: Mental Phenomenon

(From Appendix 1 line 317)

The speaker, thus, uses the Mental Processes ‘look at’ to provoke his audience to pause and reflect on how the mishandling of the issue of border with Yemen had allowed the Islamic Terrorists to flourish. The speaker presumably hopes that this approach would help sway the electorate to his side. Similarly, example 39 presupposes some inherent weaknesses in the character of the present leadership that only the speaker can fix. This is reinforced by examples 36 and 37 where the speaker inscribes the U.S military as Sensor that does not have control of the phenomenon.

The speaker’s attempt to influence his audience is further heightened in the example below:

Example 40

I love the military

Sensor Pr: Mental Phenomenon

(From Appendix 1 line 39)

Although love is a mental process of affection, the phenomenon (the military) that Donald Trump loves has got nothing to do with feelings. As a sensor, the speaker is detached from Intimacy and is more concerned with other issues of the American military which in the long run will improve its standing in the world. Such projection of himself is meant to win support for his candidature. This is evidenced by the use of desiderative mental process as shown in example 41 below:

Example 41

I want to have the strongest military that we've ever had.

Senser Pr: Mental Phenomenon

(desiderative)

(From Appendix 1 line 40)

Example 42

We need it more than ever

Senser Pr: Mental Phenomenon

(desiderative)

(From Appendix 1 line 40)

However, to co-opt his audience into his team, he uses the pronominal 'we' as the senser as exemplified in example 42. This helps to assure the audience that the speaker is part of them and hence elect him into office.

A further example of a cognitive mental process that supports the same notion is resident in the example below:

Example 43

Do you think these people are interested in Yemen?

Senser Pr: Mental Phenomenon

(From Appendix 1 line 324 -325)

3.2.2.4 Relational Processes

Relational process is the third type of Transitivity process used by Donald Trump in the theme of National Security by Donald Trump in his Announcement speech. According to Halliday (1985), the process is used to express being. This being can be expressed through attributive or identifying processes (Eggins, 2004: 239). Consider the following examples.

Example 44

They	have become	rich
Carrier	Pr: Relational	Attributive
	Descriptive	
	Intensive: Attributive	

(From Appendix 1 line 33)

Example 45

So now	ISIS	has	the oil
	Carrier	Pr: Relational	Attributive/Possessed
		Attributive: Possession	

(From Appendix 1 line 38)

Example 46

And we	have	nothing
Carrier	Pr: Relational	Attributive/Possessed
		Attributive: Possession

(From Appendix 1 line 48)

Example 47

They	have	equipment that is 30 years old
Carrier	Pr: Relational	Attributive/Possessed
		Attributive: Possession

(From Appendix 1 line 67)

Example 48

Secretary Kerry	has completely	no concept of negotiation
Carrier	Pr: Relational	Attributive/Possessed
	Descriptive	
	Intensive: Attributive	
	(Circ: degree)	

(From Appendix 1 line 458)

The examples above provide different types of Relational processes found in the theme National Security by Donald Trump in his Announcement Speech. They show that the clauses are either intensive attributive or descriptive intensive attributive with all of them joined by a linking verb. This is because they link one individual to another. However, the clauses play different roles in the theme National Security. For instance, Trump uses the intensive attributive relational clause to classify the Islamic Terrorists as rich in example 44 notice the use of the perfection tense 'have become' which implicitly suggests that this is a recent development. The speaker therefore subtly appears to be painting the present administration in negative light with the hope of being elected into office.

Though the intensive possessive attributive clauses, conceived through transitive verbs that conform to the SVO structure, are normally used to encode the meaning of ownership or possession, the speaker uses the ones in examples 45 and 56 differently.

In example 45, the speaker portrays ISIS as the carrier of the attribute 'oi' as a mind control to appeal to the conscience of the electorate who he hopes will react in his favour. This is heightened by the portrayal of America as a carrier of emptiness in example 46.

In example 47 and 48, Donald Trump uses the intensive attributive clauses to advance the Ideology of negative other representation. For instance, example 47 portrays American military as a carrier of obsolete military something the government of the day is to blame. The speaker implicitly suggests to the electorate that he would redress this situation. As a result, he comes out as best suited for the job in the eyes of his audience.

Similarly, in example 48, Trump constructs secretary Kerry ideationally through a dissenting discourse which portrays him as lacking the ability to negotiate. This presupposes the speaker as more qualified to undertake such a task.

To assess American military priorities, Donald Trump uses relational processes as captured in the excerpt below:

Excerpt 16

Saudi Arabia, they make \$1billion a day; \$ 1 billion a day. I Love the Saudis. Many are in this building. Whenever they have problems, we send over ships. We say “we’re gonna protect.” What are we doing? They’ve got nothing but money.

(Excerpt from Appendix 1 line 311 - 314)

The excerpt has two attributive processes as shown below:

Example 49

Many (Saudis) are in this building

Carrier Pr: Relational Attribute

Example 50

They have got nothing but money

Carrier Pr: Relational Attribute/Possession

Attributive: Possession

In the examples above, the speaker uses these relational processes to describe Saudi Arabia as a main Carrier Positive of the attribute; an indication of their power and influence. Secondly, Trump uses these relational processes to offer explanation on the state of affairs in America. In so doing, he assigns himself the role of an interpreter with the power to apportion attributes to the other participants. With that power, he chooses attributes of negative value for some participants to create a bad impression of them perhaps to bolster his chances of clinching the presidency.

Further, it can be observed that the circumstantial elements in the above relational processes are linked by the verb ‘be’ and the stative verb ‘become’ which are not action oriented but rather show the state or condition of being. They serve to link the Carriers to their attributes and make their relationship clear. Consequently, the ideologies resident in the Carriers are made manifest through these relational processes. This can be considered a means of negative reflection of the other while projecting a positive image of self.

3.2.3 Conclusion

This chapter has explored the role of Process Types and Participants in bringing out experiential meaning in the themes of Immigration and National Security. In terms of participant role prescription, the highlighted excerpts reveal an asymmetric relationship. Two Participants' Power relations are dominant. First is the masculine portrayal of other participants who are seen as impinging on the interests of the United States of America and the second is that of an insecure and fragile nation whose resources are the phenomenon for other nations exploitation.

Transitivity processes investigated portray America's vast resources as being impinged by Mexico, Saudi Arabia, Iran and Iraq. This positions the U.S as the object of exploitation by other participants further, something that the present administration is to blame for. Similarly, Mexico, Saudi Arabia, Iran and Iraq are also discursively represented as evil, manipulative and exploitative. On the other hand, Transitivity patterns analyzed portray the U.S in material clauses that cast it as subordinate, weak and lacking in the ability to protect its citizens; a subservient position.

Further, the interrogation of Transitivity depicts the present American administration as inept and seemingly outmuscled by Mexico and ISIS. As such, it is unable to effectively deal with the issues of Immigration and National Security. This kind of Ideological representation is perhaps meant to shape the views of the American citizenry with the goal of securing the presidency for Donald Trump.

On the other hand, the selected text uses discourse that signifies and perpetuates the ideology of nativism or self-preservation. This can be seen in the portrayal of the other participants in transitivity processes that cast them as 'masculine' and 'aggressive', This is particularly so when they are cast engaging in activities that infringe on the interests of America. For instance, Mexico and Saudi Arabia are represented in processes that foreground their ability to act while the U.S is represented in clauses that portray it as weak and clueless. Since individuals can define themselves in consistency with the socially ascribed roles, the roles Donald Trump ascribes to America accentuates the notion of dominant ideology. This constrains how American citizens come to define themselves in relation to other social actors.

CHAPTER FOUR

MODALITY TYPES REALIZED IN THE RECURRING THEMES

4.1 Introduction

This chapter investigates the use of interpersonal metafunction within the selected text.

As Halliday points out:

A speaker uses language as a means of intrusion into the speech event: the expression of his comments, attitudes and evaluations, and also of the relationship he sets up between himself and the listener; in particular, the communication role that he adopts of informing, questioning, persuading and the like (Halliday, 1971:333).

The present study is premised on these assertions and uses them to attempt to find out how interpersonal meaning is brought out within the discourse of Immigration and National Security in Donald Trump's Announcement Speech. Interpersonal meaning as earlier stated can be expressed through Mood and Modality. Mood espouses the role the writer or speaker selects in a speech event and the roles he assigns the addressee. For instance, if the speaker selects the interrogative mood, he assumes the role of one asking questions and puts the addressee in the role of one expected to answer the questions.

On the other hand, Modality relates to the intermediate between 'yes' and 'no' which expresses either the speaker's objective judgement towards the topic or shows the social relationship, power relationship and scales of formality. An investigation of modality is important in this study because it establishes what people commit to when they make statements or demands or when they ask questions or give offers. This commitment in turn helps in the construction and negotiation of relationships between the addresser and the addressee (Fairclough 1989, 2010; Francis And Kramer Dahl 1992:78). The interrogation of modality therefore, is not only useful in finding out which ideas are emphasized or de-emphasized in a given discourse but also in demonstrating how people identify and position themselves in a particular discourse.

Modality can manifest itself in different ways in the clause, for instance, through verbs, adjectives and certain nominalizations. Fowler (1985: 73) offers a list to elaborate on these categories. To him, modality is captured in the clause through a number of linguistic forms such as: -

- Modal auxiliary verbs: - e.g. shall, will, may etc.
- Sentence adverbs: - e.g. probably, certainly, regrettably.
- Adjectives e.g. necessary, unfortunate, certain.
- Some verbs and nominalizations e.g. permit, predict, prove obligation, likelihood, desirability, authority etc.

However, under the Critical Discourse Analysis rubric modality entails more than just the above modal auxiliaries. This is so because it is used to bring out the speaker's attitudes or confidence towards his proposition. Fowler (1985: 72) offers five parameters within which modality can be used to indicate a speaker's or writer's attitude towards the proposition they are making. These include; -

- Validity – the speaker shows greater or lesser confidence in the truth proposition.
- Predictability – reference to future events which are less likely to happen.
- Desirability – relates to moral, practical or aesthetic judgments.
- Obligation – obligation to another person to perform an action.
- Permission – speaker permits addressee to undertake some action.

These five categories somehow correspond to modalization (epistemic modality) and modulation (deontic modals) that is epistemic modality corresponds to predictability and probability whereas deontic modality corresponds to permission, obligation and desirability (volition).

4.1.1 Modality Types in the Selected Texts

The study began by reviewing and instantiating the modal auxiliaries within the selected text based on Fowler's five categories. However, as Lillian (2008: 5) point out classifying the modals is by no means unproblematic because individual modals may function in more than one category. This can be demonstrated with examples drawn from Palmer (2001: 10) where 'can' expresses permission in the sentence *Mary can come in now*; but expresses ability in the sentence, *Mary can speak German*. As such,

the context in which the individual modal appear was taken into account in trying the possible meanings they convey. However, because interpretation and judgments are involved, the classifications arrived at was regarded as being open to some differences of opinion should another researcher examine similar data.

After classification of the modals into either epistemic or deontic categories, the latter is further classified into the categories such as: desirability, obligation, permission and possibility.

The present study looked at modality purely as conceived in modal auxiliary and analyzed the modals by focusing on their overt occurrence in the selected text. A frequency count of the modal occurrence in the selected texts is given in the table below:

Table 1: - Frequency of modals in the selected text

Modal	Immigration. Frequency of Count	National Security. Frequency of Count	Frequency of Count In Both Themes.
will	3	11	14
would	1	4	5
can	0	3	3
could	0	0	0
should	0	1	1
ought	0	3	3
have	3	3	6
has	3	1	4
may	0	2	2

Table 1 indicates that the modal “will” is the most frequently used followed by the modal auxiliary ‘have to’, while the modal “would” comes in third. On the other hand, the modal auxiliary ‘has to’ has a frequency count of four while the modals “can” and “ought” both have frequency counts of three. The modals “may” and “should” have a frequency count of two and one respectively.

4.1.2 Epistemic Modality/Modalization

Epistemic modality also known as modalization in Systemic Functional Linguistics refers to the kind of connotative meaning relating to the degree of Certainty the speaker conveys about his message or the estimation of probability associated with the message being conveyed through the discourse, Fontaine (2013:121). Downing and Locke (1992: 332) hold similar view and point out that the knowledge the speaker has about what he is saying; his knowledge of the world or simply his assessment of the truthfulness of the proposition in terms of possibility, probability and certainty The present study looks at Epistemic Modality along the same line.

4.1.2.1 The Ideological Use of the Modals in the Selected Text

The modal ‘will’ according to Fairclough (2010) is a high affinity modal used to mark futurity. It involves the addresser making a high level of commitment to the proposition he is making.

4.1.2.2 ‘Will’ as a Tool for Personality Profiling

For the purposes of the present study, the modal ‘will’ has been used 8 times as shown in the extracts below:

- a. ‘I will build a great wall.’
- b. ‘I will have Mexico pay for the wall’
- c. ‘I will find, within our military, I will find the General Patton.’
- d. ‘I will find the General MacArthur.’
- e. ‘I will find the right guy.’
- f. ‘I will find the guy that’s going to take the military and make it really work.’
- g. ‘Nobody, nobody will be pushing us around.’
- h. ‘I will never be in a bicycle race.’

(Excerpt from Appendix 1 line 449 - 460)

The examples given above show the use of the Modal verbs in the selected text. Significantly, ‘will’ has been used by Donald Trump to demonstrate his political will and commitment. He uses the modal ‘will’, which signals a relatively higher degree of certainty about the validity of the proposition, to successfully show his strong desire and determination to address the twin issues of Immigration and National Security and to introduce a catalogue of dividends he is set to deliver to the American citizens. As

such, his assertions enhance his personality in the eyes of the electorate as a leader who is committed and ready right all the wrongs facing America.

The modal 'will' in (a) indicates his personal commitment to getting a permanent solution to the issue of illegal immigrants. This exemplifies an instance of Ideology of personality profiling, that is, the speaker portrays himself as very committed to sorting out the issue of Mexican immigrants. However, the fact that the statement is modalized shows the speaker is not fully committed to the proposition. This could therefore be considered a way he uses to persuade and manipulate the electorate to vote for him. In (b-f) the modal 'will' is followed by the lexical verb 'find' which reinforces Donald Trump's determination to fix the issue of Security by appointing the right person at the helm. In (g) the modal 'will' has been used with the adverb 'never' to reiterate Donald Trump's political commitment to pertinent issues affecting the state.

However, his choice of the modal 'will' instead of the modal 'shall' can be interpreted as a strategic move to distinguish himself from the ordinary politician. According to Quirk & Greenbaun (1973:48-53) shall foregrounds certainty and not probability of the promises enumerated and, as such, politicians not only use it to assure the electorate of the certainty of their promises but also to indirectly persuade and cajole them into voting for them. His choice of 'will' instead of 'shall' can, therefore, be viewed as strategy to help Trump to across as more diplomatic and reliable in the eyes of the electorate while at the same enable him escape scrutiny in case his pledges do not come into fruition.

4.1.3 Deontic Modality/Modulation

Deontic Modality also known as Modulation in Systemic Functional Linguistics, is also connotative in meaning. Unlike Epistemic Modality, it entails obligation, permission, willingness, ability or appeal. In other words, deontic or modulation relates to the varied ways used by a speaker to introduce his message as he expresses different levels of attitude and judgement (Eggins, 2004:172). More specifically, it implies that the speaker or writer 'intervenes' in the speech event by laying obligations or giving permission (Downing and Locke 1992: 332). This can be seen in the following examples drawn from Downing and Locke (1992: 332).

- i. One must look into this matter in detail.
- ii. Shall we negotiate peace now?
- iii. This experiment should be repeated.

The view of speaker involvement in deontic modality is supported by Halliday (1970: 335) who posits that it is “a form of participation of the speaker in the speech event” which serves a crucial role in negotiating interpersonal meaning through language. Halliday adds that it expresses wants, desires, commands, obligations, permission and undertakings. This can be exemplified as captured below:

Deontic modal of	Example
Permission	may, can, may
Obligation/ necessity	must, should, ought to, have to
Expectations	ought to
Advisability	ought to
Volitions – desirability	should, would
Prohibition	must, must not

4.1.3.1 Analysis of the Deontic Modals

This section analyzes the following modal auxiliaries: would, can, should, May and the quasi modal auxiliaries’ ‘have to’ and’ has to.’ These modals are mostly associated with the modality cline of strong to medium deontic meanings (Huddleston & Pellum 2002: 177).

For ease of analysis, the modals are further classified into various categories as shown in table two below: -

Table 2: Deontic modals by sub-category in the texts.

Modal	Totals in themes Immigration and National Security.
Desirability	9
Obligation	20
Permission	5

An aggregate of the three deontic categories in the table shows a total of 34 deontic modals. These categories are further explored as follows: -

4.1.3.2 Desirability

The modal auxiliary typically associated with desirability is “should” though sometimes it can also be expressed through the modals “would” and “ought”. Consider the use of the modal ‘would’ in the clause below which espouses the Ideology of personality profiling.

I **would** build a great wall and nobody builds walls better than me.

(Excerpt from Appendix 1 line 448)

In the clause above Donald Trump uses the modal ‘would’ to affirm his desire to bring the issue of Mexican immigrants to a close. He occupies the agentive position in the above clause signaling that he possesses the power to address the matter once elected into office. However, placed in its context, the clause reveals that he subordinates Mexico when he promises to have it pay for the wall he is to build at the border of the two countries. The speaker had earlier pointed at cross roads on how to deal with the issue of Mexican immigrants. In the above clause, though the speaker projects himself as the solution to the problem as opposed to his opponents. However, his use of the low modal ‘would’ can also be interpreted as lessening his power and authority over the matter at hand. This enables him to escape responsibility in future in case the promise does not materialize.

Further, Donald Trump uses the modal of desirability as a tool of mind control. Consider the following example:

They took the oil that when we left Iraq; I said we **should** have taken.

(Excerpt from Appendix 1 line 37)

In the above example, the speaker uses the modal ‘should’ to point the conscience of his audience. He paints the present administration in bold light by pointing out that it failed in its obligation to take the oil as it left Iraq; something that would have benefitted America. Implicitly, therefore, the speaker hopes this would influence the electorate to reject any candidate associated with the present administration. Notice that the verbal clause possessing the modal ‘would’ is preceded by the material process ‘took’ with the terrorists occupying an agentive position which implies they have the power to act on a goal; in this case oil whereas the U.S is portrayed in the verbal clause signaling that it has no capacity to act and is therefore less aggressive and less powerful.

Another variant of the modal ‘should’ found to characterize the theme of National Security is ‘ought to’ which is used as a tool of Ideological persuasion. This is resident in the excerpt below:

They always keep our equipment. We **ought** to send used equipment, right?

They always keep our equipment. We **ought** to send real junk, because, frankly,

it would be – we **ought** to send our surplus. We're always losing this gorgeous brand-new stuff.

(Excerpt from Appendix 1 line 320 – 323)

In the excerpt above, the speaker uses the modal 'ought to' repeatedly. Notice that the modal 'ought to' occurs in the Material Processes where the U.S occupies agentive position with the power to send Iraq military equipment. However, the speaker through the modal 'ought to' constructs Iraq as deserving 'used equipment' or 'junk' for that matter; a clear indication of unequal social and power relations between the two countries. Donald Trump heightens his bid to convince his audience by using the adverb with 'frankly' which presupposes concurrence with or approval of what he is saying.

In the excerpt below, the speaker uses the modal 'would' to enhance the Ideology of personality profiling.

Consider excerpt below;

Last week, I read 2,300 Humvees- these are big vehicles – were left behind for the enemy. 2,000? You **would** say maybe two, maybe four? 2,300 sophisticated vehicles, they ran and the enemy took them.

(Excerpt from Appendix 1 line 50 - 52)

In this excerpt, Donald Trump uses the modal 'would' to question the wisdom of the government, through its military, leaving behind expensive vehicles to the enemy. Notice that the clause bearing the modal is followed by the intransitive material clause: *they ran* and the transitive material clause: *the enemy took them*. In the former, the speaker portrays the U.S military resort to fleeing while in the latter the enemy is portrayed as having the physical power to withhold American sophisticated vehicles. The modal 'would', therefore, amplifies the state of power imbalance between Islamic Terrorists and the U.S; with the Terrorists and the U.S subordinated. The speaker projects himself as very concerned with number of expensive vehicles America lost and seems to suggest that under his leadership this would not happen. An example of the use of modal 'would' as a tool of negative 'other' representation is captured in the excerpt below:

Saudi Arabia, they make \$ 1 billion a day; \$ 1 billion a day. I love the Saudis. Many are in this building. They make a billion dollars a day. Whenever they have problems, we send over the ships. We

say, “We’re gonna protect.” What are we doing? They’ve got nothing but money. If the right person asked them, they **would** pay a fortune. They **would not** be there except for us.

(Excerpt from Appendix 1 line 311 - 316)

In the excerpt above, the speaker uses the modal ‘would’ and negative variant ‘would not’ to demonstrate to his audience that Saudi Arabia would not be as wealthy as they are, were they not getting the support of U.S government. The negative variant of the modal ‘would’ in the clause: ‘they would not be there except for us, constructs Saudi Arabia as impinging on the resources of America courtesy of the present administration. This paints the government in bad light in the eyes of the electorate. On the other hand, the speaker uses the modal ‘would’ in the conditional clause; ‘If the right person asked them, they would pay a fortune’, this implies the situation is not likely to change unless the right person is elected into office.

This is a subtle way the speaker uses to portray himself as the only hope for the country. An example of ‘would’ for personality profiling is captured in the example below:

Nobody **would** be tougher on ISIS than Donald Trump. Nobody.

(Excerpt from Appendix 1 line 452)

In this example, the speaker uses the modal ‘would’ with the lexical adjective ‘tough’ to demonstrate his commitment and seriousness to the electorate. He projects his personality to the electorate through expressions; ‘Nobody’, ‘tougher’, ‘on ISIS’, and so forth. Notice also that instead of using an anaphor to refer back to himself, he uses the proper noun; ‘Donald Trump’ to foreground his personality as the best suited for the presidency.

Table 3: Frequency of Counts of Modals of Desirability

Modals of desirability	Immigration	National security
Should	0	1
Ought	0	3
Would	1	4
Total	1	8

Table 3 shows that Donald Trump uses more modals of desirability (8) in the theme National Security compared to the theme of Immigration (1 count). This could be attributed to his desire to demonstrate the power imbalance between America and other Actors.

4.1.3.2.1 Obligation

The models of obligation are used by speakers to convey authority, supremacy or decisiveness in dealing with issues at hand. This is illustrated in the sections below;

4.1.3.2.1.1 ‘Has to’ and ‘Have to’ as Tools for Mind Control and Manipulation

The use of power as mind control and manipulation is manifest in the selected text. This can be seen in the following excerpt drawn from Donald Trump’s Announcement Speech:

We have no protection and we have no competence we don’t know what’s happening. And it has got to stop and it has got to stop fast.

(Excerpt from Appendix 1 line 31 - 32)

In the excerpt, the speaker enlists his audience into his team. This is meant to portray him as also a victim of the insecurity affecting America. The speaker’s use of the pronominal ‘we’ in Relational clause: ‘we have no protection’, captures this. The speaker, as such, attempts to influence the voters to perceive him as one of them. However, the contexts in which the quasi modal ‘has to’ has been used in the excerpt above signals an infinite obligation whose bearer is not provided. This is perhaps an evasion of future responsibility by Donald Trump in case the issue of illegal immigration is not addressed by his prospective administration. Further, the quasi modal ‘has to’ is preceded by the cognitive lexical ‘know’ which perhaps is meant to provoke his audience to reflect on how bad the issue of illegal immigrants had been handled by the current administration. This, a subtle way the speaker uses to win the loyalty of his audience.

Another example of ‘have to’ as a tool for mind control is resident in the excerpt below:

When I have to build a hotel, I pay interest. They don’t have to pay interest.

(Excerpt from Appendix 1 line 35 - 36)

In the above excerpt, the speaker portrays himself through the clause: ‘I pay interest’, as a responsible and law-abiding citizen because he pays interest whenever he wants to build a hotel. This assertion is meant to win the trust of his audience. However, the speaker implicitly paints the present government in bad light by pointing out that due to its failure to handle the war on Iraq well, the same had resulted into asymmetrical power imbalance between the Islamic Terrorists and the U.S. This is so because the terrorists are under no obligation to pay interest as captured in the modal ‘have to’, drawn from the clause: ‘they don’t have to pay interest.’

The modals of obligation across the two themes are summarized in the table below:

Table 4: Frequency count of modals of obligation in the selected data.

Modal	Theme of immigration	Theme of national security
Has to	2	1
Have to	0	3

4.1.3.2.2 ‘Can’ as a Tool for Persuasion

The modal ‘can’ has been used in the excerpt below to persuade and appeal to the audience:

We spent \$ 2 trillion in Iraq, \$ 2 trillion. We lost thousands of lives thousands in Iraq. We have wounded soldiers who I love, I love, I love, they are great, all over the place, thousands and thousands of wounded soldiers. And we have nothing. We can’t even go there.

(Excerpt from Appendix 1 line 44 - 48)

In this excerpt, the speaker paints the government of the day in bad light and portrays himself in good light. He uses the negative variant of the modal ‘can’ in the clause: ‘we can’t even go there,’ to provoke anger in his audience at the fact that America citizens are not able to access Iraq even after their government had spent \$2 trillion on it. This is meant to influence the voters to reject any candidate fronted by the present administration. In terms of power relations, the speaker uses the modal ‘can’t’ to point to an asymmetrical power balance where the U.S is subordinated while the ability of

Iraq to impede the access of its borders to Americans is foregrounded. The speaker uses this to reinforce his attempt to sway the electorate to side with him.

Another instance of the use of ‘can’ as a tool for persuasion is captured in the example below:

They just built a hotel in Syria. Can you believe this?

(Excerpt from Appendix 1 line 35)

In the above clause, Donald Trump uses the modal ‘can’ of possibility followed by cognitive verb ‘believe’ to promote his audience to reflect on how the Islamic Terrorists had begun gaining economic power under the watch of the present administration. This, according to him, would make the terrorists even more dangerous and difficult to handle. Considering that the clause is preceded by a material clause in which the Terrorists are cast in agentive position, it can thus be concluded that it signals a potential imbalance of power between the terrorists and America. Such an imbalance, the speaker says, would result into America losing control of the terrorists. The speaker hopes that once his audience realizes what is at stake, they would vote for him.

On the other hand, an instance of the use of ‘can’ to express political promise the ideology of positive ‘self’ representation and negative ‘other’ representation is resident in the example below;

I will never be in a bicycle race. That I can tell you

(Excerpt from Appendix 1 line 461 - 462)

The use of the modal ‘can’ in the clause above presupposes alternative discourse meant to influence the audience’s construction of the identity of Donald Trump and John Kerry’s being cast in bad light. On the other hand, Donald Trump projects his personal commitment to taking his work seriously through the modal ‘can’ as seen in the clause: ‘that I can tell you?’ This clause further positions American citizens as receivers of information whose sayer is identified thereby building their trust in the sayer. Similarly, it constructs the speaker’s evaluation of the proposition as desirable and needing no contestation thus, portraying him in positive light in the eyes of the electorate.

4.1.4 Conclusion

Interrogation of modality has revealed a relationship between language, ideology, and power. For instance, the social role Donald Trump assigns himself allows him to employ both epistemic and deontic modals to shape the behaviour of his audience.

Further the analysis of modality patterns used emphasizes dominant discourses which foregrounds the supremacy of some participants and de-emphasizes others. For example, Donald Trump uses the quasi modal 'has to' signal that illegal immigrants would not access America. This kind of discourse foregrounds the power of America while backgrounding that of the immigrants.

Similarly, the analysis has revealed that modality structures are employed in positive representation of 'self' and negative representation of the 'other'. For example, Donald Trump represents himself interpersonally in agentive positions show he has the ability to positively affect the lives of Americans that affect the lives of the other but portrays the Obama administration as clueless. This interpersonally positions his views as authoritative as seen in his promise to construct a wall at the Mexican border and have Mexico pay for it. However, since the validity of such a statement has not been empirically ascertained it can perhaps be considered tentative.

Donald Trump uses more modals of obligation in the theme of National Security resulting into the text communicating scolding tone. Instead of inviting his audience to make their own minds, he appears inclined to telling them what they should think. In this regard, he can perhaps be said to be engaging in the construction of something Jowett and O'Donnell (2007:7) might classify as propaganda or what Van Dijk (2006) might classify as manipulation.

CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Introduction

This chapter reviews the major findings of the study, makes conclusions and presents the implications from the findings of the study. It begins by exploring the summary of aims and the method adopted in the study then delves into the key findings of the research. Then it goes ahead to present the conclusions of the study and the implications for further research. The chapter draws to a close with recommendations for further research.

5.2 Summary of Aims and Methods

The major aim of the study was to interrogate how Transitivity systems and Modality choices help realize both experiential and interpersonal meaning in relation to socio-political environment of the target text. This was done by interrogating ideologies and power relations brought out through the mentioned linguistic choices. The study was guided by four key postulations. First that our words, written or spoken, express a broad sense of meaning which can be identified based on interlocutors social, political and historical backgrounds.

Secondly, that a speaker's words are never neutral but rather are carriers of ideology that reflects and supports the interests of the speaker. Thirdly, that those who occupy institutional leadership play a significant role in shaping and legitimizing discourses and social relations since the words of those in power are often taken as unmitigated truth. Fourthly, while discourses can be used for assertion of power and control, they can also be used to critique, contest and even subvert the same power relations. In line with the above arguments, the study sought to answer the following questions:

- i) How do the choices of process types and participant roles made in the target text bring out the experiential meaning?
- ii) How do the modality choices made in the target text bring out the interpersonal meaning?
- iii) How do some of these features of Transitivity and modality bring out the salient issues conveyed by Donald Trump in the Target text?

The study adopted qualitative research method. Data was obtained from Donald Trump's Announcement Speech. The study was informed by the theoretic tenets of Fairclough's (2014, 2003, 1992 & 1981) Critical Discourse Analysis which view language as a central tool in the reflection, reinforcement and sustenance of asymmetrical power relations. The study used Halliday & Matthysen's (2014) Systemic Functional Grammar as an adjunct theory to provide the linguistic tools for analysis. Two notions of Systemic Functional Grammar formed the basis of linguistic analysis: the transitivity patterns and the modality structures.

In order to unmask the ideologies and power relations, Fairclough's three tier model of analysis was adopted to describe, interpret and explain the lexicogrammatical choices and discourse strategies used in the target text. This implies that the study was descriptive in nature focusing on both micro and macro discourse analysis. At the micro level, the analysis was based on the investigation of transitivity patterns through the choices of process types and participant roles. The modality choices were interrogated at this level to find out the interpersonal representation of participants,' particularly to establish whose views were interpersonally represented as more authoritative and whose was mitigated by the modal markers.

At the macro- level, the study interrogated the types of ideologies and power relations brought out in the selected text as well as how the ideologies acted as sanctions to specific participant linguistic and non-linguistic behaviour.

5.3 Key Findings of the Study

- The study has shown a number of instances where contentious and ideologically contestable ideas are represented as factual. This type of factual inexactitude, though not necessarily lies, may be construed by many as unethical.
- Investigation of the linguistic representation of identity revealed two contending discourses: the discourse of domination by participants such as Mexico, Saudi Arabia and Iran on the one hand and that of subordination of the American citizenry on the other.
- The issue of Agency and nominalization was of particular interest as the study found out that Donald Trump placed himself in certain initial positions of the sentence, the position of greatest emphasis, which in my speculation portrays him as arrogant and divisive.

- The Obama administration is overtly and covertly portrayed in negative light. For instance, the speaker used negative collocates and Transitivity systems that place America in agentive positions depicting it as weak and unauthoritative. Similarly, America is brought out in sensors of Phenomena which deals with little or no accomplishment of feats while participants such as ISIS and Islamic Terrorists are ideationally linked with ownership.
- ISIS and Saudi Arabia are positively portrayed. For instance, they are not only inscribed as carriers of attributes of accomplishment of feats but also in material and mental clauses of physical action and cognitive ability implying that they have control of their environment. This is courtesy of the weak administration in power.
- On the other hand, Mexico is ideationally portrayed as manipulative and evil. For example, it is cast in agentive positions which portray it as intentionally impinging on the interests of America by sending the “wrong” people to it. America in this case is cast as the victim of Mexico’s actions. The speaker implicitly blames the present government for this.
- In terms of power relations, the study found out that it is not just possessed; it is ununiformly enacted in the selected text. For instance, different participants are characterized by varied levels of power. A case in point is the U.S which is brought out in material clauses portraying it as weak and subordinate to other participants. This kind of representation reproduces the ideology of negative ‘other’ representation where the present administration is portrayed as incompetent.
- Modality choices used in the selected text shed more light on the Ideologies and power relations in the selected text; the end purpose of which is to represent the speaker in positive light while foregrounding the failures of his opponents.

5.4 Conclusion

The study has demonstrated that through the use of Fairclough's (1989) CDA framework it is possible to pin-point features which influence in some way the perceptions and actions of the electorate without them being conscious of this influence. Even from a discourse that seems incoherent such as Donald Trump's Announcement Speech, contains features that may perpetuate and reinforce control of power by those who have it. As van Dijk (1997:4) points out, discourse control of people's minds seems an effective "way to reproduce dominance and hegemony." This is definitely an area of concern for the ordinary voter as well as political players.

Based on these observations, the framework drew the following conclusions. Transitivity patterns and modality structures can be used to bring out social actors who on the face of it appear common and natural when in essence they perpetuate inequality and injustice as can be seen in the analysis of the recurrent themes in which the speaker's linguistic choices communicate specific world views preferred by him. These perceptions might have hidden meanings unless the readers are able to unpack them through Critical Discourse Analysis. If left undeciphered, they can influence the audience to accept the dominant view as the unchallenged truth.

Furthermore, transitivity systems have proven very crucial in uncovering the participants involved by showing their relationship to each other; whether they are actively or passively involved in the process. The analysis has further discovered the relationship between meanings and wordings that account for the organization of linguistic features in the Announcement Speech. Finally, the transitivity systems have shown how speakers not only encode in language their mental reflection of the world but also how they account for their experiences of the world around them.

5.5 Recommendations for Further Research

- i. The present study has investigated Donald Trump's Announcement Speech with the view of unpacking the hidden ideologies and power relations. However due to the scope of the present study, the analysis was only limited to the major process types and participants roles within the selected texts. Little focus was given to other process types such as; behavioural, verbal and the existential clauses despite the fact that each of them ascribes varying degree of agency to participants.

- ii. Secondly a similar study can be conducted on the Announcement Speeches of other political parties in the U.S to find out the extent to which the research findings of the present study can be generalized.
- iii. Thirdly other studies could adopt a comparative approach to investigate whether the use of Transitivity Systems and Modality choices in the Announcement Speeches of the other U.S Presidential candidates are conditioned by party specific tendencies.
- iv. Finally, since a lot of work in Critical Discourse Analysis focuses on the unfair treatment of the dominated groups, it may be fascinating to study how the language of the dominated groups themselves enact and perpetuates oppression. This would not only provide results that the dominated groups could act upon but also demonstrate the level of tolerance among the dominated group.

REFERENCES

- Abdulaziz, M. (1996). *Transitivity in Swahili*. Köln: Köppe: East African Languages and Dialects: Vol. 5.
- Althusser, L. (1971). "Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses". *Lenin and Philosophy, and Other Essays*. Trans. Ben Brewster. London: New Left Books (p.127-188).
- Blommaert, J. (2006). *Discourse: A Critical Introduction*. United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.
- Bloor, M & Bloor, T. (2007). *The Practice of Critical Discourse Analysis: An Introduction*. Great Britain: Holder Education.
- Bloor, T., & Bloor, M. (2007). *The Functional Analysis of English* (2nded). London: Edward Arnold.
- Chalaby, J.K. (1997). Beyond the Prison-House of Language: Discourse as a Sociological Concept. *British Journal of Sociology*, 47(4), 684-698.
- Chilton, Paul (2004). *Analyzing Political Discourse: Theory and Practice*. Routledge (Taylor and Francis)
- Chouliaraki, L. & Fairclough, N. (1999). *Discourse in Late Modernity: Rethinking Critical Discourse Analysis*. Great Britain: Edinburg University Press.
- Eggins, S. (2004). *An introduction to systemic functional linguistics* (2nded). London: Bloomsbury Academic
- Fairclough, N. (1991). *Language and Power*. London: Longman.
- _____ (1995). *Discourse and Social Change*. UK: Blackwell.
- _____ (2003). *Critical Discourse Analysis: The Critical Study of Language and Power*. New York: Longman.
- _____ (2014). *Critical Discourse Analysis: The Critical Study of Language. (2nd Edition)*. U.K: Longman.
- Fawcet, F. (2008). *Invitation to Systemic Functional Linguistics: The Cardiff Grammar and An Extension and Simplification of Halliday Systemic Functional Grammar*

- (2nd Edition). UK: Centre For Language and Communication Research: Cardiff University.
- Foucault, M. (1982). *The Subject and Power*. (trans A. Sheridan Smith). Tavistock Publications.
- Fowler, r. (1985). *Power in T.A. Van Dijk* (ed). *Handbook of Discourse Analysis*, Vol. 4. London: Academic Press, Inc. pp.61-82
- Fowler, R. Hodge, B., Kress, G., Trew, T. (1979). *Language and Control*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Gilbert Weiss & Ruth Wodak (Eds.) (2003). *Critical Discourse Analysis. Theory and Interdisciplinarity*. (pp. 85-109). Houndsmills, UK: Palgrave-MacMillan
- Graham, P. (2003). “*Critical Discourse Analysis and Evaluative meaning: Interdisciplinarity as a Critical Turn.*” In, Weiss & Wodak (Eds): *Critical Discourse Analysis: Theory and Interdisciplinarity*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Gramsci, Antonio. (1971). *Selections from Prison Notebooks*. London: Lawrence and Wishart.
- Haig, E. (2011). “*A Critical Discourse Analysis and Systemic Linguistic Approach to Measuring Participant Power in Radio Bulletin About Youth Crime*”. In, *Studies in Media and Society*, 3pp, 45-70.
- Halliday, M.A.K. (1978). *Language as a Social Semiotic*. London: University Park Press.
- Halliday, M. A.K. (1994). *An Introduction to Functional Grammar (2nd edition)*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Halliday, M.A.K, (2004). *An Introduction to Functional Grammar (3rd Edition)*. Rev. Mat Liessen C. London: Edward Arnold.
- Halliday, M.A.K. (1970). Functional Diversity in Language as Seen from a Consideration of Modality and Mood in English.” *Functions of Language*, 6 pp.322-361.

- Halliday, M.A.K. (1985). *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Halliday, M.A.K. and Malthiessen, M.I.M. (2014). *Halliday's Introduction to Functional Grammar*, 4th Edition. New York: Routledge.
- Hardy, C. (2009). Discourse as a Strategic Resource. *Human Relations*, 53(9), 1227-1247.
- Jan Blommaert (2005). *Discourse: A Critical Introduction*. Cambridge University Press,
- Jaworski, A. & Couplend, N. (2006). *The Discourse Reader (2nd edition)*. USA: Routledge.
- Jowett, G.S. and O'Donnell, V. (2006). *Propaganda and Persuasion (4th ed.)* London: Sage.
- Keenoy, T. (1997). Organizational Discourses: Text and Context. *Organization*, 2, 147-58.
- Kombo, K. K. & Tromp, D.L.A. (2006). *Proposal and Thesis Writing: An Introduction*. Nairobi: Paulines Publications Africa.
- Lilian, D.L. (2008). Modality, Persuasion and Manipulation in Canadian Conservative Discourse." *Critical Approaches to Discourse Analysis Across Disciplines. Vol.2 (1): 1-16*.
- O'Donnell, M. (2012). Introduction to Systematic Functional Linguistic for Discourse Analysis. *Language, Function and Cognition*, pp.1-8.
- Palmer, F.R. (2001). *Mood and Modality*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Paltridge, B. (2006). *Discourse Analysis*. London: HT, Ltd.
- Philips, N. (2002). *Discourse Analysis: Investigating Processes of Social Construction*. London: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Remlinger, K. A. (2005). "Negotiating Classroom Floor; Negotiating Ideologies of Gender and Sexuality." in, Lazar, M (Ed) *Feminist Critical Discourse Analysis. Gender, Power Ideology in Discourse: Pp.114-137*.

- Sahragard, R. & Davatgarzadeh G. (2010). "The Representation of Social Actors In, *Interchange (Third Edition)*" In, *The Journal of Teaching Language Skills (JTLS)* Vol. 2 No. 1, Spring 2010, Ser. 5914. Pp. 67-89.
- Schouliaraki, L. & Fairclough, M. (1999). *Discourse in Late Modernity. Rethinking Critical Discourse Analysis*. Great Britain: Edinburg University Press.
- Sherzer, J.A. (1987). Discourse-Centred Approach to Language and Culture. *American Anthropologist*, 89, 295-309.
- Simpson, P. (2004). *Stylistics: A Resource Book for Students*. London & New York: Routledge.
- Thompson, J. B. (1990). *Ideology and Modern Culture*. Stanford: University Press.
- Trew, T. (1979). "Theory and Ideology at Work." In, *Fowler, R. et al: Language and Control*. London: Routledge & Kigan Paul Ltd.
- Van Dijk, T. (2001). *Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics*. Universitat Pompeu: Fabra, Barcelona
- _____ (1998). *Ideology: A Multidisciplinary Approach*. London: Sage
- _____ (1993). Principals of Critical Discourse Analysis. In *Discourse and Society*. 4(2), 249 – 283.
- _____ (1998). *Critical Discourse Analysis in Discourse and Society*, pp.352 – 406.
- _____ (2006). Discourse and Manipulation. *Discourse & Society* 17(3): 359-383.
- _____ (1997). *Discourse Studies. A Multidisciplinary Introduction*, 2 vols. London: Sage.
- Wang, J. (2010). A Critical Discourse Analysis of Barrack Obama's Speeches. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*. Vol. 1 (13): 254 – 261
- Wilson, J. (2001). *Political Discourse*. In D. Schiffrin, D. Tannen, & E. Hamilton (Eds.). *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis*, (pp.398-416). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers Inc.

- Wodak, R. & Meyer, M. (2001). (Eds). *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*. London: Sage Publications Ltd.
- Wodak, R. (2001). The Discourse Historical Approach.” In Wodak, R & Meyer, M. (Eds) *Methods of Discourse Analysis*. London: Sage Publications Ltd, Pp. 63 – 94.
- Yieke, F. (2007). “*Gender and Topic Management in Discourse: The Glass Ceiling as Reality for Women in Corporate Kenya.*” In, Stichproben, Wiener Zeitschrift für Kritischem Afrikastudien Nr. 13/2007, 7.jg.
- Young, L. and Claire H. (2004) (eds). *Systemic Functional Linguistics and Critical Discourse Analysis: Studies in Social Change*. London and New York: Continuum.

APPENDICES

Appendix I: Donald Trump's Presidential Announcement Speech

Wow. Whoa. That is some group of people. Thousands.line 1

So nice, thank you very much. That's really nice. Thank you. It's great to be atline 2
Trump Tower. It's great to be in a wonderful city, New York. And it's an honorline 3
to have everybody here. This is beyond anybody's expectations. There's been noline 4
crowd like this.....line 5

And, I can tell, some of the candidates, they went in. They didn't know the air-line 6
conditioner didn't work. They sweated like dogs.....line 7

They didn't know the room was too big, because they didn't have anybody there.....line 8
How are they going to beat ISIS? I don't think it's gonna happen.....line 9

Our country is in serious trouble. We don't have victories anymore. We used to.....line 10
have victories, but we don't have them. When was the last time anybody saw usline 11
beating, let's say, China in a trade deal? They kill us. I beat China all the time.... ..line 12
All the time.line 13

When did we beat Japan at anything? They send their cars over by the millions,. ...line 14
and what do we do? When was the last time you saw a Chevrolet in Tokyo?line 15
It doesn't exist, folks. They beat us all the time.line 16

When do we beat Mexico at the border? They're laughing at us, at our stupidity. ...line 17
And now they are beating us economically. They are not our friend, believe me.line 18
But they're killing us economically.line 19

The U.S. has become a dumping ground for everybody else's problems.line 20

Thank you. It's true, and these are the best and the finest. When Mexico sendsline 21
its people, they're not sending their best. They're not sending you. They're notline 22
sending you. They're sending people that have lots of problems, and they'reline 23
bringing those problems with us. They're bringing drugs. They're bringing crime. ...line 24
They're rapists. And some, I assume, are good people.line 25

But I speak to border guards and they tell us what we're getting. And it only makes .line 26
common sense. It only makes common sense. They're sending us not the rightline 27
people.line 28

It's coming from more than Mexico. It's coming from all over South and Latin ...line 29
America, and it's coming probably— probably— from the Middle East. But we ...line 30
don't know. Because we have no protection and we have no competence, weline 31
don't know what's happening. And it's got to stop and it's got to stop fast.line 32

Islamic terrorism is eating up large portions of the Middle East. They've become ..line 33
rich. I'm in competition with them.line 34

They just built a hotel in Syria. Can you believe this? They built a hotel. Whenline 35

I have to build a hotel, I pay interest. They don't have to pay interest, because they...line 36
took the oil that, when we left Iraq, I said we should've taken.line 37

So now ISIS has the oil, and what they don't have, Iran has. And in 19— and I will .line 38
tell you this, and I said it very strongly, years ago, I said— and I love the military ..line 39
and I want to have the strongest military that we've ever had, and we need it more ..line 40

now than ever. But I said, "Don't hit Iraq," because you're going to totallyline 41
destabilize the Middle East. Iran is going to take over the Middle East, Iran and ... line 42
somebody else will get the oil, and it turned out that Iran is now taking over Iraq. ..line 43

Think of it. Iran is taking over Iraq, and they're taking it over big league.line 44
We spent \$2 trillion in Iraq, \$2 trillion. We lost thousands of lives, thousands inline 45

Iraq. We have wounded soldiers, who I love, I love -- they're great -- all overline 46
the place, thousands and thousands of wounded soldiers.line 47

And we have nothing. We can't even go there. We have nothing. And every time ...line 48
we give Iraq equipment, the first time a bullet goes off in the air, they leave it.line 49

Last week, I read 2,300 Humvees— these are big vehicles— were left behindline 50
for the enemy. 2,000? You would say maybe two, maybe four? 2,300line 51
sophisticated vehicles, they ran, and the enemy took them.line 52

Last quarter, it was just announced our gross domestic product— a sign ofline 53
strength, right? But not for us. It was below zero. Whoever heard of this? It'sline 54
never below zero.line 55

Our labor participation rate was the worst since 1978. But think of it, GDPline 56
below zero, horrible labor participation rate.line 57

And our real unemployment is anywhere from 18 to 20 percent. Don't believeline 58
the 5.6. Don't believe it.line 59

That's right. A lot of people up there can't get jobs. They can't get jobs, because ...line 60
there are no jobs, because China has our jobs and Mexico has our jobs. They all ...line 61
have jobs.line 62

But the real number, the real number is anywhere from 18 to 19 and maybe even...line 63
21 percent, and nobody talks about it, because it's a statistic that's full of nonsense ..line 64

Our enemies are getting stronger and stronger by the way, and we as a countryline 65
are getting weaker. Even our nuclear arsenal doesn't work.line 66

It came out recently they have equipment that is 30 years old. They don't know if ...line 67
it worked. And I thought it was horrible when it was broadcast on television, line 68
because boy, does that send signals to Putin and all of the other people that lookline 69
at us and they say, "That is a group of people, and that is a nation that truly hasline 70

no clue. They don't know what they're doing. They don't know what they're doing."..line 71

We have a disaster called the big lie: Obamacare. Obamacare.line 72

Yesterday, it came out that costs are going for people up 29, 39, 49, and evenline 73
55 percent, and deductibles are through the roof. You have to be hit by a tractor, ...line 74
literally, a tractor, to use it, because the deductibles are so high, it's virtuallyline 75
useless. It's virtually useless. It is a disaster.line 76

And remember the \$5 billion website? \$5 billion we spent on a website, andline 77
to this day it doesn't work. A \$5 billion website.line 78

I have so many websites, I have them all over the place. I hire people, they do a ...line 79
website. It costs me \$3. \$5 billion website. ..line 80

Well, you need somebody, because politicians are all talk, no action. Nothing'sline 81
gonna get done. They will not bring us— believe me— to the promised land.....line 82
They will not.line 83

As an example, I've been on the circuit making speeches, and I hear my fellowline 84
Republicans. And they're wonderful people. I like them. They all want me to line 85
support them. They don't know how to bring it about. They come up to myline 87
office. I'm meeting with three of them in the next week. And they don't know—line 88
"Are you running? Are you not running? Could we have your support? What do.....line 89
we do? How do we do it?"line 90

I like them. And I hear their speeches. And they don't talk jobs and they don'tline 91
talk China. When was the last time you heard China is killing us? They're.....line 92
devaluing their currency to a level that you wouldn't believe. It makes itline 93
impossible for our companies to compete, impossible. They're killing us.line 94

But you don't hear that from anybody else. You don't hear it from anybodyline 95
else. And I watch the speeches.line 96

I watch the speeches of these people, and they say the sun will rise, the moonline 97
will set, all sorts of wonderful things will happen. And people are saying,line 98
"What's going on? I just want a job. Just get me a job. I don't need the rhetoric.line 99
I want a job."

And that's what's happening. And it's going to get worse, because remember,line 100
Obamacare really kicks in in '16, 2016. Obama is going to be out playing golf.line101
He might be on one of my courses. I would invite him, I actually would say. Iline 102
have the best courses in the world, so I'd say, you what, if he wants to— I have....line 103
one right next to the White House, right on the Potomac. If he'd like to play,line 104
that's fine.line 105

In fact, I'd love him to leave early and play, that would be a very good thing.line 106

But Obamacare kicks in in 2016. Really big league. It is going to be amazingly ...line 107
destructive. Doctors are quitting. I have a friend who's a doctor, and he said toline 108
methe other day, "Donald, I never saw anything like it. I have more accountants ...line 109
than I have nurses. It's a disaster. My patients are beside themselves. They had a ...line 110
plan that was good. They have no plan now."line 111

We have to repeal Obamacare, and it can be— and— and it can be replaced with ..line 112
something much better for everybody. Let it be for everybody. But much betterline 113
and much less expensive for people and for the government. And we can do it.line 114

So I've watched the politicians. I've dealt with them all my life. If you can'tline 115
make a good deal with a politician, then there's something wrong with you.line 116
You're certainly not very good. And that's what we have representing us. Theyline 117
will never make America great again. They don't even have a chance. They're ...line 118
controlled fully— they're controlled fully by the lobbyists, by the donors, and by ..line 119
the special interests, fully.line 120

Yes, they control them. Hey, I have lobbyists. I have to tell you. I have lobbyists ...line 121
that can produce anything for me. They're great. But you know what? it won'tline 122
happen. It won't happen. Because we have to stop doing things for someline 123
people, but for this country, it's destroying our country. We have to stop, and it ...line 124
has to stop now.line 125

Now, our country needs— our country needs a truly great leader, and we need aline 126
truly great leader now. We need a leader that wrote "The Art of the Deal."line 127

We need a leader that can bring back our jobs, can bring back our manufacturing, ..line 128
can bring back our military, can take care of our vets. Our vets have beenline 129
abandoned.line 130

And we also need a cheerleader.line 131

You know, when President Obama was elected, I said, "Well, the one thing,line 132
I think he'll do well. I think he'll be a great cheerleader for the country. I thinkline 133
he'd be a great spirit."line 134

He was vibrant. He was young. I really thought that he would be a greatline 135
cheerleader.line 136

He's not a leader. That's true. You're right about that.line 137

But he wasn't a cheerleader. He's actually a negative force. He's been a negative ..line 138
force. He wasn't a cheerleader; he was the opposite.line 139

We need somebody that can take the brand of the United States and make itline 140
great again. It's not great again.line 141

We need— we need somebody— we need somebody that literally will takeline 142
this country and make it great again. We can do that.line 143

And, I will tell you, I love my life. I have a wonderful family. They're saying, ...line 144
"Dad, you're going to do something that's going to be so tough."line 145

You know, all of my life, I've heard that a truly successful person, a really, really ..line 146
successful person and even modestly successful cannot run for public office.line 147
Just can't happen. And yet that's the kind of mindset that you need to makeline 148
this country great again.line 149

So ladies and gentlemen...I am officially running... for president of the United ...line 150
States, and we are going to make our country great again.line 151

It can happen. Our country has tremendous potential. We have tremendousline 152
people.line 153

We have people that aren't working. We have people that have no incentive to ...line 154
work. But they're going to have incentive to work, because the greatest socialline 155
program is a job. And they'll be proud, and they'll love it, and they'll makeline 156
much line 156 more than they would've ever made, and they'll be— they'll be ..line 157
doing so well, and we're going to be thriving as a country, thriving. It can happen ..line 158

I will be the greatest jobs president that God ever created. I tell you that.line 159

I'll bring back our jobs from China, from Mexico, from Japan, from so manyline 160
places. I'll bring back our jobs, and I'll bring back our money. line 161

Right now, think of this: We owe China \$1.3 trillion. We owe Japan more than .line 162
that. So they come in, they take our jobs, they take our money, and then they loan .line 163
us back the money, and we pay them in interest, and then the dollar goes up soline 164
their deal's even better.line 165

How stupid are our leaders? How stupid are these politicians to allow this toline 166
happen? How stupid are they?line 167

I'm going to tell you— thank you. I'm going to tell you a couple of storiesline 168
about trade, because I'm totally against the trade bill for a number of reasons.....line 169

Number one, the people negotiating don't have a clue. Our president doesn'tline 170
have a clue. He's a bad negotiator.line 171

He's the one that did Bergdahl. We get Bergdahl, they get five killerline 172
terrorists that everybody wanted over there.

We get Bergdahl. We get a traitor. We get a no-good traitor, and they get theline 173
five people that they wanted for years, and those people are now back on theline 174
battlefield trying to kill us. That's the negotiator we have.line 175

Take a look at the deal he's making with Iran. He makes that deal, Israel maybe ...line 176
won't exist very long. It's a disaster, and we have to protect Israel. But...line 177

So we need people— I'm a free trader. But the problem with free trade is youline 178
need really talented people to negotiate for you. If you don't have talentedline 179
people, if you don't have great leadership, if you don't have people that knowline 180
business, not just a political hack that got the job because he made aline 181
contribution to a campaign, which is the way all jobs, just about, are gotten,line 182
free trade terrible.line 183

Free trade can be wonderful if you have smart people, but we have people that ...line 184
are stupid. We have people that aren't smart. And we have people that areline 185
controlled by special interests. And it's just not going to work.line 186

So, here's a couple of stories happened recently. A friend of mine is a greatline 187
manufacturer. And, you know, China comes over and they dump all their stuff, ..line 188
and I buy it. I buy it, because, frankly, I have an obligation to buy it, becauseline 189
they devalue their currency so brilliantly, they just did it recently, and nobody ...line 190
thought they could do it again.line 191

But with all our problems with Russia, with all our problems with everything— ...line 192
everything, they got away with it again. And it's impossible for our people hereline 193
to compete.line 194

So I want to tell you this story. A friend of mine who's a great manufacturer,line 195
calls me up a few weeks ago. He's very upset. I said, "What's your problem?"line 196
He said, "You know, I make great product."line 197

And I said, "I know. I know that because I buy the product."line 198

He said, "I can't get it into China. They won't accept it. I sent a boat over andline 199
they actually sent it back. They talked about environmental, they talked aboutline 201
all sorts of crap that had nothing to do with it."line 202

I said, "Oh, wait a minute, that's terrible. Does anyone know this?"line 203

He said, "Yeah, they do it all the time with other people."line 204

I said, "They send it back?"line 205

"Yeah. So I finally got it over there and they charged me a big tariff. They'reline 206
not supposed to be doing that. I told them."line 207

Now, they do charge you tariff on trucks, when we send trucks and other things ...line 208
over there.line 209

Ask Boeing. They wanted Boeing's secrets. They wanted their patents and all ...line 210
their secrets before they agreed to buy planes from Boeing.line 211

Hey, I'm not saying they're stupid. I like China. I sell apartments for— I justline 212
sold an apartment for \$15 million to somebody from China. Am I supposed toline 213
dislike them? I own a big chunk of the Bank of America Building at 1290line 214
Avenue of the Americas, that I got from China in a war. Very valuable.line 215

I love China. The biggest bank in the world is from China. You know whereline 216
their United States headquarters is located? In this building, in Trump Tower.line 217
I love China. People say, "Oh, you don't like China?"line 218

No, I love them. But their leaders are much smarter than our leaders, and weline 219
can't sustain ourself with that. There's too much— it's like— it's like take theline 220

New England Patriots and Tom Brady and have them play your high schoolline 221
football team. That's the difference between China's leaders and our leaders.line 222

They are ripping us. We are rebuilding China. We're rebuilding manyline 223
countries. China, you go there now, roads, bridges, schools, you never sawline 224
anything like it. They have bridges that make the George Washington Bridgeline 225
look like small potatoes. And they're all over the place.line 226

We have all the cards, but we don't know how to use them. We don't evenline 227
know that we have the cards, because our leaders don't understand the game.line 228
We could turn off that spigot by charging them tax until they behave properly.....line 229

Now they're going militarily. They're building a military island in the middleline 230
of the South China sea. A military island. Now, our country could never doline 231
that because we'd have to get environmental clearance, and the environmentalist ..line 232
wouldn't let our country— we would never build in an ocean. They built it inline 233
about one year, this massive military port.line 234

They're building up their military to a point that is very scary. You have aline 235
problem with ISIS. You have a bigger problem with China.line 236

And, in my opinion, the new China, believe it or not, in terms of trade, is Mexico...line 237

So this man tells me about the manufacturing. I say, "That's a terrible story.line 238
I hate to hear it."line 239

But I have another one, Ford.line 240

So Mexico takes a company, a car company that was going to build inline 241
Tennessee, rips it out. Everybody thought the deal was dead. Reported it in the ..line 242
Wall Street Journal recently. Everybody thought it was a done deal. It's going in ...line 243
and that's going to be it, going into Tennessee. Great state, great people.line 244

All of a sudden, at the last moment, this big car manufacturer, foreign,line 245
announces they're not going to Tennessee. They're gonna spend their \$1 billionline 246
in Mexico instead. Not good.line 247

Now, Ford announces a few weeks ago that Ford is going to build a \$2.5line 248
billion car and truck and parts manufacturing plant in Mexico. \$2.5 billion, it'sline 249
going to be one of the largest in the world. Ford. Good company.line 250

So I announced that I'm running for president. I would...line 251

... one of the early things I would do, probably before I even got in— and Iline 252
wouldn't even use— you know, I have— I know the smartest negotiators inline 253
the world. I know the good ones. I know the bad ones. I know the overrated ones...line 254

You get a lot of them that are overrated. They're not good. They think they are. ..line 255
They get good stories, because the newspapers get buffaloed. But they're notline 256
goodline 257

But I know the negotiators in the world, and I put them one for each country.line 258
Believe me, folks. We will do very, very well, very, very well.line 259

But I wouldn't even waste my time with this one. I would call up the head ofline 260
Ford, who I know. If I was president, I'd say, "Congratulations. I understandline 261
that you're building a nice \$2.5 billion car factory in Mexico and that you'reline 262
going to take your cars and sell them to the United States zero tax, just flowline 263
them across the border."line 264

And you say to yourself, "How does that help us," right? "How does that helpline 265
us? Where is that good"? It's not.line 266

So I would say, "Congratulations. That's the good news. Let me give you theline 267
bad news. Every car and every truck and every part manufactured in this plantline 268
that comes across the border, we're going to charge you a 35-percent tax, andline 269
that tax is going to be paid simultaneously with the transaction, and that's it.line 270

Now, here's what is going to happen. If it's not me in the position, it's oneline 271
of these politicians that we're running against, you know, the 400 peopleline 272
that we're (inaudible). And here's what's going to happen. They're not so stupid.line 273
They know it's not a good thing, and they may even be upset by it. But thenline 274
they're going to get a call from the donors or probably from the lobbyist for Ford .line 275
and say, "You can't do that to Ford, because Ford takes care of me and I takeline 276
care of you, and you can't do that to Ford."line 277

And guess what? No problem. They're going to build in Mexico. They'reline 278
going to take away thousands of jobs. It's very bad for us.line 279

So under President Trump, here's what would happen:line 280

The head of Ford will call me back, I would say within an hour after I toldline 281
them the bad news. But it could be he'd want to be cool, and he'll wait until theline 282
next day. You know, they want to be a little cool.line 283

And he'll say, "Please, please, please." He'll beg for a little while, and I'll say,line 284
"No interest." Then he'll call all sorts of political people, and I'll say, "Sorry,line 285
fellas. No interest," because I don't need anybody's money. It's nice. I don't need ...line 286
anybody's money.line 287

I'm using my own money. I'm not using the lobbyists. I'm not using donors.line 288
I don't care. I'm really rich. I (inaudible).line 289

And by the way, I'm not even saying that's the kind of mindset, that's the kindline 290
of thinking you need for this country.line 291

So— because we got to make the country rich.line 292

It sounds crass. Somebody said, "Oh, that's crass." It's not crass.line 293

We got \$18 trillion in debt. We got nothing but problems.line 294

We got a military that needs equipment all over the place. We got nuclearline 295
weapons that are obsolete.line 296

We've got nothing. We've got Social Security that's going to be destroyed ifline 297
somebody like me doesn't bring money into the country. All these other people ...line 298
want to cut the hell out of it. I'm not going to cut it at all; I'm going to bringline 299
money in, and we're going to save it.line 300

But here's what's going to happen:line 301

After I'm called by 30 friends of mine who contributed to differentline 302
campaigns, after I'm called by all of the special interests and by the—line 303
the donors and by the lobbyists— and they have zero chance at convincingline 304
me, zero— I'll get a call the next day from the head of Ford. He'll say.line 305
"Please reconsider," I'll say no.line 306

He'll say, "Mr. President, we've decided to move the plant back to theline 307
United States, and we're not going to build it in Mexico." That's it. Theyline 308
have no choice. They have no choice.line 309

There are hundreds of things like that. I'll give you another example.line 310

Saudi Arabia, they make \$1 billion a day. \$1 billion a day. I love the Saudis.line 311
Many are in this building. They make a billion dollars a day. Whenever theyline 312
have problems, we send over the ships. We say "we're gonna protect." Whatline 313
are we doing? They've got nothing but money.line 314

If the right person asked them, they'd pay a fortune. They wouldn't be thereline 315
except for us.line 316

And believe me, you look at the border with Yemen. You rememberline 317
Obama a year ago, Yemen was a great victory. Two weeks later, the placeline 318
was blown up. Everybody got out— and they kept our equipment.line 319

They always keep our equipment. We ought to send used equipment, right?line 320
they always keep our equipment. We ought to send some real junk, because, ...line 321
frankly, it would be— we ought to send our surplus. We're always losing this ..line 322
gorgeous brand-new stuff.line 323

But look at that border with Saudi Arabia. Do you really think thatline 324
these people are interested in Yemen? Saudi Arabia without us is gone.line 325
They're gone.line 326

And I'm the one that made all of the right predictions about Iraq. Youline 327
know, all of these politicians that I'm running against now— it's so nice to say ...line 328
I'm running as opposed to if I run, if I run. I'm running.line 329

But all of these politicians that I'm running against now, they're trying toline 330
disassociate. I mean, you looked at Bush, it took him five days to answer the ...line 331
question on Iraq. He couldn't answer the question. He didn't know. Iline 332
said, "Is he intelligent?"line 333

Then I looked at Rubio. He was unable to answer the question, is Iraq a good ...line 334
thing or bad thing? He didn't know. He couldn't answer the question.line 335

How are these people gonna lead us? How are we gonna— how are we gonna.....line 336
go back and make it great again? We can't. They don't have a clue. Theyline 337
can't lead us. They can't. They can't even answer simple questions. Itline 338
was terrible.line 339

But Saudi Arabia is in big, big trouble. Now, thanks to fracking and other things, ..line 340
the oil is all over the place. And I used to say it, there are ships at sea, and this ...line 341
was during the worst crisis, that were loaded up with oil, and the cartel kept the ..line 342
price up, because, again, they were smarter than our leaders. They were smarter ...line 343
than our leaders.line 344

There is so much wealth out there that can make our country so rich again, and ...line 345
therefore make it great again. Because we need money. We're dying. We're dying. .line 346
We need money. We have to do it. And we need the right people. ...line 347

So Ford will come back. They'll all come back. And I will say this, this is going ..line 348
to be an election, in my opinion, that's based on competence.line 349

Somebody said -- thank you, darlin'.line 350

Somebody said to me the other day, a reporter, a very nice reporter, "But,line 351
Mr. Trump, you're not a nice person."line 352

That's true. But actually I am. I think I am a nice person. People that knowline 353
me, like me. Does my family like me? I think so, right. Look at my family.line 354
I'm proud of my family.line 355

By the way, speaking of my family, Melania, Barron, Kai, Donnie, Don, Vanessa, .line 356
Tiffany, Evanka did a great job. Did she do a great job?line 357

Great. Jared, Laura and Eric, I'm very proud of my family. They're a greatline 358
family.line 359

So the reporter said to me the other day, "But, Mr. Trump, you're not a nice ...line 360
person. How can you get people to vote for you?"line 361

I said, "I don't know." I said, "I think that number one, I am a nice person. Iline 362
give a lot of money away to charities and other things. I think I'm actually aline 363
very nice person."line 364

But, I said, "This is going to be an election that's based on competence, because ...line 365
people are tired of these nice people. And they're tired of being ripped off byline 366
everybody in the world. And they're tired of spending more money online 367
education than any nation in the world per capita, than any nation in theline 368
world, and we are 26th in the world, 25 countries are better than us in education. .line 369
And some of them are like third world countries. But we're becoming aline 370
third world country, because of our infrastructure, our airports, our roads,line 371
everything. So one of the things I did, and I said, you know what I'll do.line 372

I'll do it. Because a lot of people said, "He'll never run. Number one, he won'tline 373
want to give up his lifestyle."line 374

They're right about that, but I'm doing it.line 375

Number two, I'm a private company, so nobody knows what I'm worth. Andline 376
the one thing is that when you run, you have to announce and certify toline 377
all sorts of governmental authorities your net worth.line 378

So I said, "That's OK." I'm proud of my net worth. I've done an amazing job.....line 379

I started off— thank you— I started off in a small office with my father inline 380
Brooklyn and Queens, and my father said -- and I love my father. I learned soline 381
much. He was a great negotiator. I learned so much just sitting at his feetline 382
playing with blocks listening to him negotiate with subcontractors. But Iline 373
learned a lot.line 384

But he used to say, "Donald, don't go into Manhattan. That's the bigline 385
leagues. We don't know anything about that. Don't do it."line 386

I said, "I gotta go into Manhattan. I gotta build those big buildings. I gottaline 387
do it, Dad. I've gotta do it."line 388

And after four or five years in Brooklyn, I ventured into Manhattan andline 389
did a lot of great deals— the Grand Hyatt Hotel. I was responsible for theline 390
convention center on the west side. I did a lot of great deals, and I didline 391
them early and young. And now I'm building all over the world, and I loveline 392
what I'm doing.line 393

But they all said, a lot of the pundits on television, "Well, Donald will neverline 394
run, and one of the main reasons is he's private and he's probably not asline 395
successful as everybody thinks."line 396

So I said to myself, you know, nobody's ever going to know unless I run,line 397
because I'm really proud of my success. I really am.line 398

I've employed— I've employed tens of thousands of people over my lifetime. ...line 399
That means medical. That means education. That means everything.line 400

So a large accounting firm and my accountants have been working for months,line 401
because it's big and complex, and they've put together a statement, a financialline 402
statement, just a summary. But everything will be filed eventually with theline 403
government, and we don't [use] extensions or anything. We'll be filing it rightline 404
on time. We don't need anything.line 405

And it was even reported incorrectly yesterday, because they said, "He hadline 406
assets of \$9 billion." So I said, "No, that's the wrong number. That's the wrong .line 407
number. Not assets."line 408

So they put together this. And before I say it, I have to say this. I made it theline 409
old-fashioned way. It's real estate. You know, it's real estate.line 410

It's labor, and it's unions good and some bad and lots of people that aren't inline 411
unions, and it's all over the place and building all over the world.line 412

And I have assets— big accounting firm, one of the most highly respected—line 413
9 billion 240 million dollars.line 415

And I have liabilities of about \$500 million. That's long-term debt, very low ...line 416
interest rates.line 417

In fact, one of the big banks came to me and said, "Donald, you don'tline 418
have enough borrowings. Could we loan you \$4 billion"? I said, "I don't needline 419
it. I don't want it. And I've been there. I don't want it."line 420

But in two seconds, they give me whatever I wanted. So I have a total net worth, .line 421
and now with the increase, it'll be well-over \$10 billion. But here, a total netline 422
worth of—net worth, not assets, not— a net worth, after all debt, after allline 423
expenses, the greatest assets— Trump Tower, 1290 Avenue of the Americas, ..line 424
Bank of America building in San Francisco, 40 Wall Street, sometimes referred ...line 425
to as the Trump building right opposite the New York— many other places all ..line 426
over the world.line 427

So the total is \$8,737,540,00.line 428

Now I'm not doing that...line 429

I'm not doing that to brag, because you know what? I don't have to brag.line 430
I don't have to, believe it or not.line 431

I'm doing that to say that that's the kind of thinking our country needs.line 432
We need that thinking. We have the opposite thinking.line 433

We have losers. We have losers. We have people that don't have it. We have line 434
people that are morally corrupt. We have people that are selling this country ..line 435
down the drain.line 436

So I put together this statement, and the only reason I'm telling you about it today .line 437
is because we really do have to get going, because if we have another three or ...line 438
four years— you know, we're at \$8 trillion now. We're soon going to be atline 439
\$20 trillion.line 440

According to the economists— who I'm not big believers in, but, nevertheless, ...line 441
this is what they're saying— that \$24 trillion— we're very close— that's theline 442
point of no return. \$24 trillion. We will be there soon. That's when weline 443
become Greece. That's when we become a country that's unsalvageable. And ...line 444
we're gonna be there very soon. We're gonna be there very soon.line 445

So, just to sum up, I would do various things very quickly. I would repeal and ..line 446
replace the big lie, Obamacare.line 447

I would build a great wall, and nobody builds walls better than me, believeline 448
me, and I'll build them very inexpensively, I will build a great, great wall on ...line 449
our southern border. And I will have Mexico pay for that wall.line 450

Mark my words.line 451
Nobody would be tougher on ISIS than Donald Trump. Nobody.line 452
I will find -- within our military, I will find the General Patton or I will find General MacArthur, I will find the right guy. I will find the guy that's going to take that military and make it really work. Nobody, nobody will be pushing us around.line 453line 454line 455line 456
I will stop Iran from getting nuclear weapons. And we won't be using a man like Secretary Kerry that has absolutely no concept of negotiation, who's making a horrible and laughable deal, who's just being tapped along as they make weapons right now, and then goes into a bicycle race at 72 years old, and falls and breaks his leg. I won't be doing that. And I promise I will never be in a bicycle race. That I can tell you.	..line 457line 458line 459line 460line 461line 462
I will immediately terminate President Obama's illegal executive order on immigration, immediately.line 463line 464
Fully support and back up the Second Amendment.line 465
Now, it's very interesting. Today I heard it. Through stupidity, in a very, very hard core prison, interestingly named Clinton, two vicious murderers, two vicious people escaped, and nobody knows where they are. And a woman was on television this morning, and she said, "You know, Mr. Trump," and she was telling other people, and I actually called her, and she said, "You know, Mr. Trump, I always was against guns. I didn't want guns. And now since this happened"— it's up in the prison area— "my husband and I are finally in agreement, because he wanted the guns. We now have a gun on every table. We're ready to start shooting."line 466line 467 ..line 468line 469 ..line 470line 471line 472line 473line 474
I said, "Very interesting."line 475
So protect the Second Amendment.line 476
End— end Common Core. Common Core should— it is a disaster. Bush is totally in favor of Common Core. I don't see how he can possibly get the nomination. He's weak on immigration. He's in favor of Common Core. How the hell can you vote for this guy? You just can't do it. We have to end education has to be local.	..line 477line 478line 479line 480line 481
Rebuild the country's infrastructure.line 482
Nobody can do that like me. Believe me. It will be done on time, on budget, way below cost, way below what anyone ever thought.line 483line 484
I look at the roads being built all over the country, and I say I can build those things for one-third. What they do is unbelievable, how bad.line 485line 486

Washington. The Obama administration. We got it. It was the most highly ...line 490
sought after— or one of them, but I think the most highly sought after project in ...line 491
the history of General Services. We got it. People were shocked, Trump got it.line 492

Well, I got it for two reasons. Number one, we're really good. Number two, weline 493
had a really good plan. And I'll add in the third, we had a great financial statement. Line494
Because the General Services, who are terrific people, by the way, andline 495
talented people, they wanted to do a great job. And they wanted to make sure itline 496
got built.line 497

So we have to rebuild our infrastructure, our bridges, our roadways, our airports. ..line 498
You come into La Guardia Airport, it's like we're in a third world country. You ..line 499
look at the patches and the 40-year-old floor. They throw down asphalt, andline 500
they throw.line 501

You look at these airports, we are like a third world country. And I come inline 502
from China and I come in from Qatar and I come in from different places, andline 503
they have the most incredible airports in the world. You come to back to this ...line 504
country and you have LAX, disaster. You have all of these disastrous airports.line 505
We have to rebuild our infrastructure.line 506

Save Medicare, Medicaid and Social Security without cuts. Have to do it.line 507

Get rid of the fraud. Get rid of the waste and abuse, but save it. People haveline 508
been paying it for years. And now many of these candidates want to cut it.line 509
You save it by making the United States, by making us rich again, by taking back ..line 510
all of the money that's being lost.line 511

Renegotiate our foreign trade deals.line 512

Reduce our \$18 trillion in debt, because, believe me, we're in a bubble. We have ...line 513
artificially low interest rates. We have a stock market that, frankly, has beenline 514
good to me, but I still hate to see what's happening. We have a stock marketline 515
that is so bloated.line 516

Be careful of a bubble because what you've seen in the past might be small ..line 517
potatoes compared to what happens. So be very, very careful.line 518

And strengthen our military and take care of our vets. So, so important.line 519

Sadly, the American dream is dead.line 520

But if I get elected president I will bring it back bigger and better and stronger ..line 521
than ever before, and we will make America great again.line 522

Thank you. Thank you very much.line 523