

APPELLATIVE FUNCTION WITHIN THE POLITICAL DISCOURSE

Diana I. Kasimova

Institute of Foreign Languages
Peoples' Friendship University of Russia
Moscow, Russia
e-mail: kasimova.di@gmail.com

Abstract. The objective of the present study is to analyze the appellative function implementation within the political discourse on the basis of speech transcripts of D. Trump's and H. Clinton's speeches of both election and post-election periods. The selected data is analyzed as a social phenomenon in relation to the discourse analysis; the frames that are resorted to by the politicians are investigated from the perspective of the cognitive analysis, and most regular stylistic devices are considered via the rhetoric analysis. By analyzing the appellative function from different perspectives we consider the tools the politicians use to achieve one main goal; that is getting the people to vote for the speaker.

Research on the appellative function on the basis of the US election 2016 is greatly valuable from the linguistic point of view, as the candidates represent quite contrasting communicative styles and framing models. Thus, implementation of the appellative function contrasts in Clinton's and Trump's rally speeches as they refer to the opposing cognitive models- Nurturant Parent model and Strict Father model respectively.

In order to carry out the research of language means that constitute the appellative function within the post-election period, we undertook the comparative analysis of the personal pronouns, repetition and modality.

It should be also highlighted, despite the simple speech surface, Trump selects the words and frames deliberately to enhance the appellativeness of his speeches. Trump's sentences are shorter and not so sophisticated as Clinton's ones, hence quickness, decisiveness and speed characterize his claims.

The study reaches a conclusion that exercising power and maintaining solidarity with the listeners is correlated to some extent with the ways appellative function is realized in the speeches. The practical significance is that the results of the thesis may be successfully used in the university courses of American Socio-Cultural Linguistics, as well as in the special courses on political studies.

Keywords: appellative function, political discourse, frames

Introduction

Concern of the present paper is the analysis of the appellative function within the political discourse. **The objective** of this research is to analyze the appellative function implementation on the basis of speech transcripts of Hillary Clinton and Donald Trump. For analyzing the material the following **methodologies and methods** are used: a descriptive method, critical discourse analysis, comparative analysis, lexical analysis. Political speeches are examined as a social phenomenon in relation to the discourse analysis; the frames that are resorted to by the politicians are investigated from the perspective of the cognitive analysis, and most regular stylistic devices are considered via the rhetoric analysis. We managed to identify the themes H. Clinton and D. Trump resort to via the Linguistic Inquiry and Word Count (LIWC) program that categorizes words into meaning categories. Various schools of linguistics have defined the many-sided term "discourse" highlighting different shades of its meaning. In the present work we adhere to Fairclough's three-dimensional model of the discourse analysis. From this perspective we investigate the grammar and syntactic levels of the political speeches and analyze their significance placing the text in the sociocultural

context (Fairclough, N., 2004: 46). Political discourse can be defined as a special type of discourse, which is realized in the sphere of politics, has a high communicative and persuasive orientation (Dijk, T.V., 2008: 101). In political speeches appellativeness is represented as a functional semantic category that constitutes grounds for the political texts. Appeal is a distinctive feature of any text within the political discourse.

In the light of the 2016 American presidential election, the present analysis focuses on Clinton's and Trump's election campaign that started in June, 2015.

By analyzing the appellative function from different perspectives we consider the tools the politicians use to achieve one main goal; that is, getting the people to vote for the speaker.

Having studied the theoretical data, we examine the election and post-election period 2016 that highly attracted attention of the world media and international community.

The object of research is the appellative function manifestation within the political discourse.

Findings

Framing in Trump's and Clinton's rally speeches within the election period

The cognitive linguist George Lakoff (Lakoff, R. 1975: 15) writes, "frames are mental structures that shape the way we see the world." He argues that because frames shape the way we see the world, they also shape our goals, our plans, the way we act and how we deem our actions. Framing can also be used in politics, where they influence social policies and the institutions that carry out those policies. Furthermore, framing is an important part of politics, as it shapes the way the public sees the world. According to frame analysis, Hillary Clinton and Donald Trump adhere to the opposite frames models such as the Nurturant Parent model and The Strict Father model correspondingly.

According to Lakoff, the basic idea is that authority is justified by morality (the Strict father model), and that, in a well-ordered world, there should be (and traditionally has been) a moral hi-

erarchy in which those who have traditionally dominated should dominate. The hierarchy is: God above Man, Man above Nature, The Rich above the Poor, Employers above Employees, Western culture above other cultures, Our Country above other countries (Lakoff G., 2002: 69).

Strict father model, designed by Lacoff, is represented in the following Trump's quotation that was delivered in Phoenix after meeting with Mexican President Enrique Peña Nieto in Mexico City:

Trump: *“For instance, we have to listen to the concerns that working people, our forgotten working people, have over the record pace of immigration and it's impact on their jobs, wages, housing, schools, tax bills and general living conditions. These are valid concerns expressed by decent and patriotic citizens from all backgrounds, all over”* (The New York Times, 2016).

Trump opposes “forgotten working people”, “patriotic citizens” and “immigrants” labeling the latter ones as people destroying America and making it weak. Framing is an inherent segment in appellative function as it enhances the influence over the message addressee.

The linguistic means such as epithets ‘forgotten’, ‘valid’, and ‘patriotic’ are used by the speaker in order to intensify the message and enhance the appellative function as well.

Clinton, on the contrary, opposes to Trump's framing model of a Strict father and acts within Nurturant parent model. The Nurturant parent model sees morality from a more social perspective compared to the view of the Strict father model. Clinton uses a range of different frames, where some of the strongest are the family frame and the personal frame. By evoking the family frame, she becomes closer to her listeners, as she is implicitly saying ‘I am one of you. You are my family’, but she is also making sure that when she talks about family, everyone knows exactly what kind of values she is referring to.

The following extract is on the issue of gender inequality, where Clinton makes the case that gender inequality in regards to une-

qual pay is an overdue problem. The presidential candidate argues that this is in fact not an issue specific to the female gender, she says,

Clinton: *“This isn’t a women’s issue. It’s a family issue. Just like raising the minimum wage is a family issue. Expanding childcare is a family issue. Declining marriage rates is a family issue. The unequal rates of incarceration is a family issue. Helping more people with an addiction or a mental health problem get help is a family issue”* (Hillary for America, 2016).

In the above expression Clinton frequently uses repetitions that refer to the stylistic devices. The word group ‘family issue’ is repeated five times in the single paragraph. Clinton uses the repetition in order to stress and highlight the message delivered to the audience.

When Clinton states that unequal pay between men and women is a family issue, the specific meaning can be interpreted in different ways. On one level, the locutionary value of the utterance is quite simple that it is an issue, which affects families on a general level across America. However, when Clinton further places the issue in alignment with other issues, such as, unequal incarceration rates, addictions and mental health problems, she creates a link with other social taboos that are not at all gender specific. It is highly interesting as it is now arguable that the illocutionary value is that problems relating to minority groups ought to be problems for the entire society and not specific to the individual minority alone.

Language means of the appellativeness within the post-election period

As we consider both victory and concession speeches as the most prominent and vivid starting-up point of the post-election period, the means of appellative function implementation are studied on the basis of these two speeches delivered by H. Clinton and D. Trump.

Comparative analysis of the personal pronouns

Studies in political discourse have tried to shed light on the politicians’ strategic use of personal pronoun expressions for varied

purpose implementation such as appellative function (El-Falaky, 2015: 45). Therefore, we consider both inclusive and exclusive personal pronouns in Trump’s victory speech and Clinton’s concession speech as a tool for appellative function implementation. Using different personal pronouns the speaker pursues different goals. Thus, resorting to the 1st person pronouns, the speaker becomes fully accountable for what is said and done. Furthermore, by excluding others and only referring to oneself, the speaker is in a power position; hence the speaker is the doer talking to the addressee(s) and has the authority in the communicative situation. In addition to that, the pronouns ‘we’, ‘us’ and ‘our’ can both function as including and excluding ones. The pronouns ‘we’ and ‘us’ also demonstrate who has the authority, because the spokesman is speaking on behalf of others, hence he or she has the authority to speak for others. ‘They’, ‘their’ and ‘them’ are used by the speaker when referring to people outside the ‘in-group’, they can be used as words for Othering. Appellative function of the 3rd plural personal pronouns is realized in creating solidarity between the in-group members and distancing the in-group from the out-group, namely ‘they’ and ‘them’.

We examined the victory and concession speeches and produced statistics of the pronouns usage that is presented below.

Table - Usage of personal pronouns

First-person singular	I	my	me
D. Trump	40	11	7
H. Clinton	31	6	4
First-person plural	we	our	us
D. Trump	32	26	4
H. Clinton	32	28	—
Third-person plural (exclusive)	they	their	them
D. Trump	1	—	—
H. Clinton	—	—	—

(Developed by the author)

As we may see from the table presented above, Trump’s victory speech is more personal and subjective. Trump, as an elected

president, demonstrates his power and authority to the audience more often than Clinton does. Appellative function realized in Trump's victory speech is represented more explicitly and his speech sounds more persuasive in comparison with Clinton's one.

Moreover, the opponents Trump and Clinton almost equally use the first-person plural pronoun 'we', 'our' and 'us'. However the pronouns analysis shows that Trump's speech is more inclusive in comparison with Clinton's concession speech. The appellative function of the victory speech is determined by the main ground-the speaker represents the power as a newly-elected president and his message addressee is the entire nation. Saying 'we' Trump more apparently identifies the audience as a united group of people that is only contrasted with the other nations.

But it should be also emphasized that Clinton keeps on calling primarily upon her supporters that are opposed to the Trump's electorate. According to the usage of exclusive first-person pronoun in her speech, we may conclude she is not willing to gain the sympathy of the broader audience and is committed to her loyal supporters as it is shown in the following example:

*Clinton: "Last night, I congratulated Donald Trump and offered to work with him on behalf of **our** country.(...) This is not the outcome **we** wanted or **we** worked so hard for and I'm sorry that **we** did not win this election for the values **we** share and the vision **we** hold for **our** country"* (Cable News Network, 2016).

Clinton phrases the combination of exclusion and inclusion simultaneously, naming 'our country' as the country of all the Americans, though implicitly distancing those who are opposed to the values she shares and the vision she holds for the country. In this sentence 'we' is referred to 'Clinton+ Clinton's supporters' that contrasts with 'Others'.

Repetition in political discourse

Repetition is an essential tool of the appellative function implementation as repetition is aimed at highlighting and emphasizing the stimulus for the intended action (Komleva, E. V. 2008: 27)

Almost all politicians exploit the strategy of repetition effectively for ideological and functional reasons even in the post-election period. Though, one change is obvious that key words highlighted after elections are different.

Trump quite frequently resorts to the repetitive constructions in order to add the emphasis to what is being repeated.

*Trump: "That is now what I want to do for our country. **Tremendous potential.** I've gotten to know our country so well. **Tremendous potential.** It is going to be a beautiful thing. Every single American will have the opportunity to realize his or her fullest **potential.**"* [Cable News Network. Donald Trump's victory speech, 2016]

Trump repeats twice the whole elliptical construction "Tremendous potential" and one repetitive word "potential" putting it into the last complete sentence of the paragraph. One more rhetorical tool in the studied paragraph is using the repetition in the next but one sentence. First two repetitive elliptical constructions seem incoherent at a glance as do not have any logical connection with the surrounding sentences. Though, Trump makes the audience anticipate the key idea that is so explicitly expressed in the repetitive construction. Trump's repetition looks like the 25th frame that is not so obvious for the audience but affects the listener.

Clinton, in her turn, does not exploit the repetitive constructions as frequently as Trump does. The extract of her concession speech November 9, 2016 is examined below.

*Clinton: "Now, **I -I know - I know** we have still not shattered that highest and hardest glass ceiling, but some day someone will and hopefully sooner than we might think right now"* (Cable News Network, 2016a).

In this sentence Clinton, on one hand, emphasizes her confidence in the equal-right future where women will not be limited in anything because of the gender. But, on the other hand, phrasing this claim she is trying to excuse herself for the loss in election as some patriarchal society is not ready to accept the equality of

women and still advocates the female bias. The appellative function of repetition is expressed in this extract dually.

Modality in political discourse

It is one of the common tools that help appellative function to realize within the political discourse. Due to the modality the mood is indicated. A modal (also known as a modal auxiliary) expresses necessity, uncertainty, ability, or permission.

We should also mention that in the post-election period politicians resort to less authoritarian tone of obligation in comparison with the election period. Modality is commonly expressed in verbs, nouns, adverbs and adjectives. In the next example Trump facilitates the high level modality combining verb ‘will’ and adverb ‘no longer’.

*Trump: “The forgotten men and women of our country **will** be forgotten **no longer**”* (Cable News Network, 2016a).

Clinton in her concession speech resorts twice to the modal verb ‘must’ that expresses high degree of commitment:

*Clinton: “But I still believe in America and I always will. And if you do, then we **must** accept this result and then look to the future. Donald Trump is going to be our president”* (Cable News Network, 2016b).

The phrase is addressed to the in-group Clinton’s supporters via exclusive ‘we’ that contrasts to Trump’s supporters and labels them as ‘others’. Clinton also frames the extreme loyalty of her supporters, which can hardly accept Trump as the US president.

We also compared and contrasted the expressions of high modality in speeches of the both opponents, and may conclude that Clinton’s speech is perceived as a more authoritarian one as she uses ‘must’ for two times (Trump says once ‘must’), ‘I want you to...’ for four times (Trump avoids this construction), and she says for three times ‘never’ referring to the action of her supports (Trump avoids this phrase). In Trump’s victory speech medium modality is primarily used.

In link with El-Falaky (El-Falaky 2015: 65), we may conclude that the most skillful candidate is the one who balances the ma-

nipulation of modalities. According to “A Corpus Linguistic Analysis of American Presidential Debates” those who are unelected overuse the expressions of high modality in comparison with the elected presidential candidates.

Conclusion

Analysis of the appellative function on the basis of the US election 2016 is greatly valuable from the linguistic point of view, as the candidates represent quite contrasting communicative styles.

Basing on G. Lakoff’s cognitive theory, we may conclude that H. Clinton refreshes the Nurturant Parent Model during her speeches while D. Trump adheres to the Strict Father Model. Keeping the particular model of framing the speaker intends to gain the support and sympathy of the specific group of people. Society with traditional values would apparently vote for the candidate who represents the Strict Father model.

It should be also highlighted that despite the simple speech surface, Trump constructs the frames deliberately that enhances the speech appellativeness. Trump’s sentences are easy-comprehended and not so sophisticated as Clinton’s ones. Quickness, decisiveness and speed identify his claims.

According to the personal pronouns analysis, Trump’s victory speech sounds more personal and subjective than Clinton’s concession speech. In addition to that, via inclusive pronouns Trump identifies the audience that he addresses to as a united group of people that is only contrasted with the other nations. Clinton’s speech, on the other hand, is defined as more exclusive as she is not willing to gain the sympathy of the broader audience and is committed to her loyal supporters. In this respect, appellative function is more successfully realized in Trump’s victory speech. All of the above findings point to the most common ways and tools of appellative function implementation within the political discourse. Having analyzed Clinton’s and Trump’s speeches we may state that the politician’s popularity with the voters is defined to some extent by the ways appellative function is realized in the speeches.

References

- Dijk, T.V. 2008. *Discourse and Power*. Palgrave Macmillan, New York, 308 pp.
- Fairclough, N., Graham, Wodak, R. 2004. Introduction. *Critical Discourse Studies*. Longman, London, 223 pp.
- Lakoff, R. 1975. Language and woman's place. *Language in Society* 2(1): 45–80.
- Lakoff, G. 2002. *Moral Politics: How Liberals and Conservative think*. The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 471 pp.
- El-Falaky. 2015. Vote for Me! A Corpus Linguistic Analysis of American Presidential debates. *Arts and Social Sciences Journal* 6(4): 1-13.
- Komleva, E. V. 2008. Appeal in language and speech (based on the materials of the modern German language). *Vestnik LGU named A.S. Pushkin* 19: 25-37.
- Cable News Network. 2016a. Here's the full text of Donald Trump's victory speech. URL: www.edition.cnn.com/2016/11/09/politics/donald-trump-victory-speech [Accessed March 10, 2019].
- Cable News Network. 2016b. Hillary Clinton's concession speech (full text). URL: www.edition.cnn.com/2016/11/09/politics/hillary-clinton-concession-speech [Accessed March 08, 2019].
- Hillary for America. 2019. Official campaign launch speech on New York City's Roosevelt Island. URL: <https://time.com/3920332/transcript-full-text-hillary-clinton-campaign-launch> [Accessed March 09, 2019].
- The New York Times. 2016. Transcript of Donald Trump's Immigration Speech. URL: www.nytimes.com/2016/09/02/us/politics/transcript-trump-immigration-speech [Accessed March 09, 2019].