



Scientific Publishing Unit



Buhūth

**Journal of Humanities,
Social Sciences & Education**

A peer reviewed Academic Journal

Issue 8 August 2021 – Part 3

ISSN 2735-4822 (Online) \ ISSN 2735-4814 (print)



Editor-in-Chief

Prof. Dr. Amira Ahmed Youssef
Professor of Linguistics
Ain Shams University

Co-Editor-in-Chief

Prof. Hanan Mohamed Elshair
Professor of Educational Technology
Faculty of Women, Ain Shams University

Managing Editor

Dr. Sara Mohamed Amin Ismail
Lecturer in Educational Technology
Faculty of Women, Ain Shams University

Assistant Editor

Ms. Heba Mamdouh Mukhtar Mohamed

Website

Ms. Nagwa Azzam Ahmed Fahmy

Ms. Doaa Farag Ghreab

Buhuth is a peer-reviewed academic e-journal published by the Faculty of Women, Ain Shams University. Buhuth encourages submission of original research from a wide range of disciplines such as social sciences, humanities and education



Pragma-Syntactic Manipulative Devices in the 2016 U.S. Presidential Debates

Wael Mohamed Kotb Khedr
PhD Degree- English Department
Faculty of Arts, Suez University
waellanguages@yahoo.com

Dr. Shaker Rizk Taky El-Din
Professor of Linguistics
Faculty of Arts- Suez University
Shaker115@yahoo.com

Dr. Shaymaa Taher Sallam
Assistant professor of Linguistics
Faculty of Arts- Suez University
Shymaa.sallam@hotmail.com

Abstract

This study examines some of the pragma-syntactic manipulative devices in the 2016 U.S. presidential debates between the Democratic candidate Hillary Clinton and the Republican candidate Donald Trump. The pragma-syntactic manipulative devices included in this study are person deixis, modality, and passive constructions. The study aims at answering the following questions: "what are the different pragma-syntactic manipulative devices used in the debates under analysis?" and "what are the most frequently used pragma-syntactic manipulative devices and what are the least used ones?" The two candidates' aim behind using these different manipulative devices is to shape their audiences' minds and gain a huge public following. The study shows how the use of the different pragma-syntactic manipulative devices helps in creating the image of the two candidates' political persona. It sees that spoken English differs from written English in terms of applying the conventions of grammar. The study concluded that Donald Trump used the three pragma-syntactic manipulative devices more than his opponent. The study indicated that while the different forms of person deixis are the most dominant pragma-syntactic manipulative device employed by the two candidates in the three debates under analysis, passive forms are the least commonly used device. It also showed that of the three purposes of modality, modal verbs of predictability are the most heavily used. The study also indicated that the two candidates resorted to using the passive constructions to avoid assuming responsibility.

Keywords: linguistic manipulation, modal verbs, presidential debates, political discourse language, pragma-syntactic.

1-Introduction

There are myriad uses of language. Besides the main purpose of the language as a means of communication, every person uses language to achieve specific goals with every communication. Language is a tool that a presidential candidate uses either to persuade voters or spread his/her ideologies. Language is the tool that religious preachers and community leaders use to gain a public following. One of the important uses of the language is manipulation. Manipulation is defined as "covert influence adopted by a speaker (amanipulator) to intentionally and directly affect someone's beliefs, desires, and/or emotions in ways typically not in his self-interest or, at least, not in his self-interest in the present context" (Goodin, 1980, p. 59). Taking into account the effective roles of manipulative language devices in oral discourse, speakers use these devices for a broad range of purposes.

In their attempts to manipulate their listeners, speakers use a variety of linguistic means, despite the negative impact of using subterfuge and vilification. Some speakers tend to attack their listeners to achieve their goals. Attacking individuals in positions of power is popular among politicians, especially those who aspire to run for office. Some of the main reasons why speakers attempt to manipulate listeners are to shift blame, avoid responsibility, or distract from uncomfortable truths or manage opinions.

This study aims to describe the different ways in which both Donald Trump and Hillary Clinton employed manipulative language structures for political reasons, which was to gain popular support. This study also discusses in detail both the most frequently used and the least used pragma-syntactic manipulative devices in the 2016 U.S. presidential debates.

2. Statement of the Problem

The whole world paid much attention to the 2016 U.S. presidential election, because of the 2008 world economic crisis. The outcome of this election affected not only the United States, but also all the world due to globalization and derivational economic independence.

With the help of the interviewers, the two presidential candidates discussed many controversial issues and topics. One of these topics is dealing with Muslims and allowing them to enter the United States. Before the 2016 elections, Trump called for a total and a complete shutdown of Muslims'

entering the country (Duffy, 2018; Musolff, 2019). During the Democratic Convention, he attacked the Gold Star Khan family (an army Captain who was killed in Iraq in 2004), and prevented Ghazala Khan from speaking due to her Islamic faith (Duffy, 2018; Musolff, 2019). He also accused American Muslims of supporting terrorism (Musolff, 2019). He also attacked, but not to the same degree, other minorities like Latinos and African Americans. Trump attacked women to such an extent that both his wife and his daughter publicly defended him for his unprofessional behavior toward women. He also presented his economic plans which were supposed to create only 3.5 million jobs. His opponent's plans were estimated to offer 10 million job opportunities. The above-mentioned issues were completely presented in the three 2016 presidential debates. There are some reasons for studying the use of manipulative language structures in the three 2016 presidential debates.

The 2016 election provides the prime opportunity to study the different manipulative devices the two candidates used in the three debates under analysis, as they attempt to garner perceived social and political capital. The study considers potential manipulation through discussing the different verbal pragma-syntactic manipulative devices that the two candidates used in their three 2016 presidential debates. Another reason for discussing manipulative language structures in these debates is that verbal pragma-syntactic manipulative devices have not been discussed in these three debates before.

3. Objectives of the Study

This study aims to:

- 1- Examine how the two presidential candidates, Hillary Clinton, and Donald Trump, used some pragma-syntactic manipulative devices in order to attain their goal.
- 2- Discuss how the choice of the inclusive pronouns "we", "us", and "our" can generate and arouse emotions on the part of the audiences.
- 3-Analyze the use of personal deictic pronouns, some functions of modal auxiliaries, and passive structures in the presidential debates.
- 4- Show the role played by pragma-syntactic manipulative devices in shaping the image of the presidential candidates' political persona.

4. Significance of the Study

Presidential debates play an important role in influencing individuals of certain things. They help candidates in directing their audiences to accept their ideas and argument. Using the appropriate persuasive and manipulative techniques, presidential candidates can easily shape the minds of their audiences and gain the votes of the undecided citizens.

The present study shows how the use of the different pragma-syntactic manipulative devices helps in creating the image of the two candidates' political persona. These verbal manipulative devices are important in achieving the different goals aimed at by those who use them. Pragma-syntactic manipulative devices contribute to convincing the audiences of the ideas and argument being discussed.

5. Study Questions

This study aims at answering the following questions:

- 1- What are the different verbal pragma-syntactic manipulative devices used by the presidential candidates in the debates under consideration?
- 2- What are the most frequently used pragma-syntactic manipulative devices and what are the least used ones? And how is verbal manipulation important in winning the presidential elections?

6. Study Hypotheses

This Study is based on the following assumptions:

1. Spoken English is different from written English in terms of the application of the conventions of grammar.
2. The pragmatic nature of manipulation is revealed by studying it through its relation to various pragmatic theories.

7. Review of Literature

Many researchers have studied manipulation in terms of political discourse (Palacios, 2018), legal discourse (Smithson, 2013), and news reporting (Nordlund, 2003). Some researchers have focused on the discourse analysis approach in their analysis of the 2016 U.S. presidential debates. The following review introduces some of the studies that tackle both linguistic manipulation and the 2016 U.S. presidential debates.

In her 2018 study *The 2016 U.S. Presidential Debates: A Discourse Analysis Approach*, Lucía Palacios presented seven linguistic features in her

analysis of the three presidential debates. These seven markers are personal pronouns, fillers, conceptual metaphors, equivocations, interruptions, contrastive pairs, and the three-part lists. Palacios concluded that both Trump and Clinton used conceptual metaphors and fillers with almost the same frequency in political exchanges (Palacios, 2018). Hillary Clinton prefers to use the personal pronouns in order to defend her viewpoint by avoiding assuming the whole responsibility (Palacios, 2018). Palacios also concluded that Trump used many personal pronouns in order to directly attack his opponent. Trump also makes use of many three-part lists, interruptions, contrastive pairs, and equivocations in the three presidential debates (Palacios, 2018).

The current study is different from Palacios' study in that it concentrates on the intention behind the two candidates using each of these pragma-syntactic manipulative devices. Palacios' study was meant "to analyze the style adopted by the two candidates through the examination of seven particular features used in the context of a formal political interview" (Palacios, 2018, p.4). When studying conceptual metaphors and personal pronouns, the present study concentrates on how these markers help in generating and arousing emotions on the part of the audiences, and therefore, achieving the two candidates' goals. While Palacios' study concentrated mainly on persuasion, the current study focuses on manipulation. Unlike this study which concentrates on all the different types of personal pronouns (18 pronouns), Palacios refers only to five pronouns (She does not even exclude the exclusive "we"). She does not exclude the pronouns that the two candidates use when quoting others. She also does not present specific examples to show how and why the two candidates use the different markers. Instead, she analyzes the debates in general.

In a research paper entitled *Rhetoric and Psychopathy: Linguistic Manipulation and Deceit in the Final Interview of Ted Bundy*, Rebcca Smithson (2013) analyzed the last interview with Ted Bundy, an American rapist and serial killer who eventually confessed to being responsible for the deaths of at least thirty women (Smithson, 2013). Smithson concluded that some of Aristotle's modes of persuasion like ethos and pathos are connected with potentially manipulative aspects of Bundy's language, such as the use of the plural first pronoun, the conceptual metaphors, and the application of modal auxiliaries (Smithson, 2013). Through the use of the above-mentioned manipulative devices, Bundy tried to persuade both the audience and the

interviewer that he was not a criminal. Instead, as he claimed, he was a victim of sexual violence.

In a study entitled *Analyzing the (Ab)use of Language in Politics: The Case of Donald Trump*, Ana Curbelo (2017) studied fifteen speeches during Donald Trump's 2016 U.S. presidential election campaign. These speeches were given between June 16th and November 8th of the year 2016. The main purpose of this research paper is to show how Trump used both the political discourse and language to attract different audiences. Two different types of analyses are presented in this paper: analysis of similarities and descending hierarchical analysis. Curbelo states that "Donald Trump's language and political discourse were instrumental in his pursuit of symbolic power and legitimization reflected in his electoral success in 12 out of the 15 states analyzed, three of which were historically Democratic states" (Curbelo, (2017, p. 19). She also stresses on the fact that language cannot be studied in isolation. The contextuality and intertextuality of words should be taken into account (Curbelo, 2017).

In their study *Persuasion in Hillary Clinton and Donald Trump's presidential debates: A critical discourse analysis*, Al- Tarawneh and Rabab'ah (2019) focuses on how Clinton and Trump made use of passive voice, modality, reported speech, evidentiality, and pronouns to persuade their audiences. In terms of the use of modality, Al- Tarawneh and Rabab'ah concluded that both candidates utilized a great deal of epistemic and obligational modalities with the aim of constituting a strong persuasive identity. The study also indicated that the two candidates shift from using the active to the use passive to "obscure the agent and augment the action" (Al- Tarawneh & Rabab'ah, 2019, p.37).

In his 2018 study *A Contrastive Analysis of Modality Markers in U.S. Presidential Election Debates by Hillary Clinton and Donald Trump*, Nguyen Phuoc extensively analyzed the semantic, syntactic and pragmatic features of modality markers in the three 2016 presidential debates between Hillary Clinton and Donald Trump. He states that modality plays an effective role in clarifying the interpersonal meaning when speakers make their strategy of certain purposes (Phuoc, 2018). He also stresses on the significant role played by the tenses in expressing and presenting the speaker's messages (Phuoc, 2018).

Jacques Savoy (2018) analyzes the rhetorical and stylistic aspects adopted by Hillary Clinton and Donald Trump in a study entitled *Trump's and Clinton's Style and Rhetoric during the 2016 Presidential Election*. The study analyzes

both the oral communication form which is based on interviews and T.V debates transcripts and the written form based on the speeches. The study concluded that the stylistic and rhetorical factors adopted by Donald Trump are sufficient in making him appear as a strong masculine figure (Savoy, 2018). It also indicates that while the pronoun "I" is commonly used in the oral form by the two candidates, the plural pronoun "we" appears more frequently in the written form. In terms of sentence style, Trump prefers to use a direct communication style. He presents simple sentences characterized by verb phrases. Clinton seems to be more descriptive. She concentrates on using nouns and prepositions (Savoy, 2018).

To show how newspapers with different political beliefs can display different attitudes when they report news, Marie Nordlund (2003) concluded that some newspapers can shape the mind of their readers and allow them to accept or deny certain argument. With the help of some syntactic elements such as modal verbs, transitivity, normalization, and agentless passive constructions, writers can direct the attention of their readers (Nordlund, 2003).

From the above-mentioned previous research studies, we can conclude that there is no- to my knowledge- research that tackled the influence of the pragma-syntactic manipulative devices in shaping the minds of listeners and allow them to either accept an idea or change their mind regarding another. There seems to be a dire need for some new studies to discuss such influence. Therefore, the present study is intended to investigate how the two presidential candidates skillfully employed the different pragma-syntactic manipulative devices to shape their audiences' minds. This is greatly noticed in how more than one device can be used at the same time.

8. Methodology

The study quantitatively and qualitatively analyzes the three debates pragma-syntactically in the light of three devices. These devices are person deixis, modality, and passive constructions. In terms of the person deixis, the study quantitatively and qualitatively presents how the two candidates use the different personal pronouns and the reasons behind their use. As for modality, the study also presents both a quantitative and a qualitative analysis of the occurrence of the modal auxiliaries by the two presidential candidates in order to show how they were able to manipulate their audiences. It also analyzes these modal auxiliaries in accordance with the three deontic purposes of modality:

possibility, predictability, and obligation. In counting both person deixis and modal verbs, the Antconc computer software was used. As for the passive constructions, the study discusses quantitatively and qualitatively the two candidates' goals behind using this indirect form of expressing thoughts.

8.1 Data of the Study

The data of the study includes the three U.S. presidential debates that were held in 2016. The two candidates were the Republican candidate Donald Trump and the Democratic candidate Hillary Clinton. The **first** debate was held on September 26, 2016, at New York's Hofstra University. This debate was chaired by Lester Holt of National Broadcasting Company (NBC). It lasted for ninety-five minutes. Donald Trump spoke for forty-five minutes and three seconds, while Hillary Clinton spoke for forty-one minutes and fifty seconds. The interviewer asked questions which focused on nuclear weapons, economy improvement, cyber-attacks, and race. An estimated 84 million people watched this debate (The Nielsen Company, 2008).

The **second** debate was held on October 9, 2016, at Washington University. The debate was moderated by Anderson Cooper of Cable News Network (CNN) and Martha Raddatz of American Broadcasting Company (ABC). The debate lasted for ninety minutes. Donald Trump spoke for forty minutes and ten seconds, while Hillary Clinton spoke for thirty- nine minutes and five seconds. Unlike the other two debates, the audience and people through the different social networking websites asked the questions. The questions revolved around the war in Syria, Islamophobia, the economy, and healthcare. An estimated 66 million people viewed this debate (The Nielsen Company, 2008).

The **third** debate took place on October 19, 2016, at the University of Nevada, in Las Vegas. The debate was chaired by Chris Wallace of Fox News. It lasted for ninety-three minutes. Trump spoke for thirty -five minutes and forty-one seconds, while Clinton spoke for forty- one minutes and forty -six seconds. The final debate discussed the topics of immigration, abortion, the war in Syria, economy, and cyber-attack. Approximately 71.6 million people saw this televised debate (The Nielsen Company, 2008).

The data of this research were collected from two different websites with different form of data. The first one was the video of the three of the United States of America presidential debate 2016 downloaded from youtube.com. The

username of the channel of the video is NBC News, this YouTube channel is belong to NBS TV. The second one was the transcript of those three presidential debates, downloaded from presidential website called The American Presidency Project (www.presidency.ucsb.edu).

9. Theoretical Background

This section aims at presenting a brief account on the three pragma-syntactic manipulative devices known as person deixis, modality, and passive constructions.

9.1 Deictic Expressions

Deixis is an important factor in the process of manipulation, especially in political discourse. Deixis is a Greek word meaning "pointing to" or "picking up". It is used for manipulating persons and making alliances. Deixis is an important field studied in pragmatics, semantics and linguistics. Deixis "refers to the phenomenon wherein understanding the meaning of certain words and phrases in an utterance requires contextual information. Words or phrases that require contextual information to convey meaning are deictic" (Levinson, 1983, p. 54). Deixis is described as a way of "pointing through language" (Yule, 1996, p. 9). Dr. Lyons (1977) defined deixis as:

By deixis is meant the location and identification of persons, objects, events, processes and activities talked about, or referred to, in relation to the spatio-temporal context created and sustained by the act of utterance and the participation in it, typically, of a single speaker and a least one addressee. (p. 377)

Deixis is divided into five main parts: place, time, discourse, social, and person. Place or spatial deixis helps in clarifying the spatial locations relevant to an utterance. Spatial deixis also plays a major role in determining whether something is near the speaker or not. Some of the common place deixis are this, that, these, those, here, and there. Time or temporal deixis has to do with the various times involved in and referred to in an utterance. Yesterday, tonight, tomorrow, last week, next month, before, after, now, then, and soon are some examples of time deixis. Discourse deixis refers to the use of expressions and phrases within an utterance whether it is spoken or written. Some common examples of discourse deixis are: later, earlier, in the following paragraphs, in the preceding paragraphs, during next week, and in the previous chapter. Social

deixis refers to the relation between the speaker and the addressee and third party referents (Fillmore, 1977).

Of all the five types of deictic expressions, person deixis is the only type used for the analysis of the debates under study. Using the different types and forms of person deixis skillfully, speakers can express commitment and obligation, assume responsibility, generate emotions and feelings on the part of their listeners and/or attack their addressees. All the aforementioned purposes play an important role in attaining both persuasion and manipulation. Person deixis has to do with the expressions that refer to the speaker or the addressee of the utterance. Person deixis is of three types: first person deixis, second person deixis, and third person deixis. While the first person deixis encodes the speaker's reference to him/herself, the second person deixis includes the speaker's reference to the hearer (Frawley, 2013; Jungbluth, 2015). Third person deixis indicates reference to someone (or some animals or things like cats, dogs, and ships) that is not present (the narrated participant) (Frawley, 2013).

9.2 Modality

Modality has attracted the attention of many disciplines such as philosophy, discourse analysis, and linguistics. In terms of linguistics, modality can be studied as a part of morphology, syntax, and semantics (Sulkunen & Torronen, 1997). Lyons defines modality as "the expression of the speaker's attitude or opinion regarding the proposition that sentence expresses" (Lyons, 1977, p. 452). Modality can be expressed through certain verbs, adjectives, adverbs, and nominalization. In this regard, Fowler (1985) introduces the following brief list:

Modality is signified in a range of linguistic forms: centrally, the modal auxiliary verbs may, shall, must, need, and others; sentence adverbs such as probably, certainly, regrettably; adjectives such as necessary, unfortunate, certain. Some verbs, and many nominalizations, are essentially modal: permit, predict, prove; obligation, likelihood, desirability, authority. (p. 73)

Linguists act differently in their classification of modality. It is divided into two types: one that has "will", and the one that does not have "will" (Jespersen, 1924). Alethic, epistemic, deontic, and existential are the different types of modality (Wright, 1951). Epistemic and deontic modalities are the two

kinds that need to be taken into account when studying modality (Palmer, 1986). By epistemic modality we indicate the knowledge the speakers has about what they are talking about. Deontic modality, on the other hand, is the act of the speakers' engagement and participation in the speech event (Palmer, 1986). Fowler presents five categories of modality. These five categories are validity, predictability, desirability, obligation, and permission (Fowler, 1985).

Modal auxiliary verbs help in giving basic information about the functions of the main verbs that follow them. There are some facts that must be taken into account when using modal auxiliary verbs. They must be followed by the base form of the verb. They have no third person singular present forms (Cain, 2012). It is possible to say "she cooks food every day", but it is not possible to say "she cans study", or "he musts go". Modals can be used to express different communicative functions such as possibility, ability, permission, obligation, and necessity. Modal auxiliary verbs may have more than one meaning depending on the context they are used in. In the sentence "I can lift this box", the auxiliary verb "can" is used to express physical ability. In the sentence "can I leave now?", "can" is used to express permission. The following are some of the most important modal auxiliaries and quasi-modals: can, could, may, might, shall, should, will, would, must, have to, and ought to, have got to.

9.3 Active and Passive Voice

Each sentence in English is expressed either in active or in passive. The speakers' or the writers' choice of which type to be used is determined by their communicative goal. Active voice is usually chosen when the focus is upon the subject that does the action (Crystal, 1991). Speakers tend to use active constructions when they are sure about the agent of the action in the sentence. Their main concentration at that time is only on who does the action.

Passive constructions are commonly used when the speaker's or the writer's concern is on the action. Formed only with transitive verbs, passive voice has different forms. While "be" is the common form of passive, "get" and "have" are possible forms (Cain, 2012). When forming passive constructions, the "by phrases" are not necessary unless they contain essential information, such as the agent adding important or surprising information and/ or it is an inanimate (Cain, 2012).

Using passive constructions is considered one of the desired techniques that speakers, especially presidential candidates, use, when trying to manipulate their listeners. Speakers tend to hide the doer or the agent to avoid their responsibility for something. They also hide the agent to protect someone, or deceive the listeners into thinking another person is responsible for the action. The passive construction is syntactically derived from the canonical active-voice, and is formed as a result of a series of transformations that are triggered by case and thematic-role requirements (Chomsky, 1998).

10. Data analysis

The two presidential candidates employ the three verbal pragma-syntactic manipulative devices in their attempt to manipulate their audiences as the following table shows:

Table 1. *The occurrences of the three pragma-syntactic manipulative devices*

Pragma-syntactic manipulative device	Hillary Clinton			Total	Donald Trump			Total
	1 st Debate	2 nd Debate	3 rd Debate		1 st Debate	2 nd Debate	3 rd Debate	
Person deixis	535	524	568	1627	763	682	615	2060
modality	168	126	137	431	218	153	157	528
Passive voice	30	24	41	95	54	30	44	128
Grand Total	733	674	746	2153	1035	865	816	2716

As table 1 shows, the two candidates employ the three verbal pragma-syntactic manipulative devices (4869) times: (2153) times (44.2%) by Hillary Clinton, and (2716) times (55.8%) by Trump. The first debate, on the one hand, has the highest number of these devices (36.3%), because the two candidates want to establish a solid ground before their audiences from the beginning. The second debate, on the other hand, has the lowest number (31.6%). Of the three pragma-syntactic manipulative devices, person deixis is the most used device (75.7%), while passive constructions are the least used (4.5%). The following section discusses in brief how the three pragma-syntactic manipulative devices are quantitatively and qualitatively used in the three debates under analysis.

10.1 Person Deixis

“Person deixis concerns the encoding of the role of participants in a speech event in which the utterance in question is delivered” (Levinson, 1983,

p. 62). One reason for using person deixis is to avoid repetition which, in turn, leads to redundancy. In the debates under study, both Hillary Clinton and Donald Trump utilize personal deixis for many reasons such as insulting, attacking, and denigrating. The following table shows the distribution of the person deixis adopted by the two candidates in the debates under consideration. It is worth noting that the two candidates' use of pronouns when quoting what others said or referring to other persons (rather than the other opponent) are excluded.

Table 2. *Person Deixis Distribution*

pronoun	Hillary Clinton			Total	Donald Trump			Total	
	1 st Debate	2 nd Debate	3 rd Debate		1 st Debate	2 nd Debate	3 rd Debate		
I	158	227	199	584	296	212	171	679	
We	inclusive	154	108	121	383	144	106	178	428
	exclusive	15	9	11	35	18	14	5	37
He/she	58	55	99	212	42	130	85	257	
US	inclusive	19	14	14	47	15	6	7	28
	exclusive	3	2	1	6	-	1	-	1
Our	inclusive	40	53	55	148	62	52	40	154
	exclusive	2	-	3	5	-	-	-	-
You	30	4	13	47	89	72	57	218	
Your	15	1	1	17	16	8	4	28	
Me	7	16	12	35	38	28	26	92	
Mine	1	-	-	1	3	1	-	4	
His/ Her (possessive adj)	18	14	16	48	14	20	17	51	
My	11	13	13	37	19	17	13	49	
Him /Her (object)	1	8	7	16	3	10	11	24	
Yours	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	
Yourself	1	-	-	1	1	2	1	4	
Himself /Herself	-	-	2	2	-	1	-	1	
Hers	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	
Myself	1	-	1	2	3	1	-	4	
Grand Total	535	524	568	1627	763	682	615	2060	

As table 2 shows, the different forms of the person deixis are used (1627) times by Hillary Clinton, while Donald Trump uses the different forms (2060) times. Of all the personal deictical forms, the first-person plural pronoun “we”, whether it is inclusive or exclusive, is paid much attention to a great deal by the two candidates. Its usage does not differ significantly: (418) times by Clinton and (465) times by Trump. The reason behind this massive use of the pronoun “we” is the two candidates’ desire to arouse their audiences’ emotions. In terms of the pronouns “us” and “our”, Clinton uses them (206) times, whereas Trump utilizes them (183) times. Using the inclusive pronouns "we" "our", and "us", the two candidates want to express that they share the same beliefs and opinions with their audiences. The least frequently used pronouns are the possessive pronouns “yours” and “hers” and the reflexive pronoun “herself”. In order to attack his rival, Trump uses the pronoun “she” (257) times and the pronoun “you” (218) times. On her part, Clinton makes use of the pronouns “you” and “he” (47) times and (212) times respectively. In the following lines the three types of the person deixis: first-person, second-person, and third-person will be discussed in detail.

10.1.1 First Person Deixis

First person deixis is the set of pronouns used when the speaker is referring to him/herself. The first person deixis is of two types: singular and plural. While “I” and “me” are examples of singular pronouns, “we” and “our” are their plural equivalents. The following table shows how Clinton and Trump employ the first person deixis:

Table 3. The Occurrence of the First Person Deixis

Type	pronoun	Hillary Clinton			Total	Donald Trump			Total
		1 st Debate	2 nd Debate	3 rd Debate		1 st Debate	2 nd Debate	3 rd Debate	
singular	I	158	227	199	584	296	212	171	679
	Me	7	16	12	35	38	28	26	92
	My	11	13	13	37	19	17	13	49
	Mine	1	-	-	1	3	1	-	4
	Myself	1	-	1	2	3	1	-	4
	Sub-total	178	256	225	659	359	259	210	828
plural	Inclusive “we”	154	108	121	383	144	106	178	428

	Exclusive "we"	15	9	11	35	18	14	5	37
	Inclusive "us"	19	14	14	47	15	6	7	28
	Exclusive "us"	3	2	1	6	-	1	-	1
	Inclusive "our"	40	53	55	148	62	52	40	154
	Exclusive "our"	2	-	3	5	-	-	-	-
	Sub-total	233	186	205	624	239	179	230	648
Grand Total		411	442	430	1283	598	438	440	1476

As table 3 shows, both Hillary Clinton and Donald Trump use the first person deixis (2759) times. Clinton refers to these personal deictical terms (1283) times, whereas Trump mentions these pronouns (1476) times. Talking about her plans and future vision, Clinton uses the singular pronoun "I" (584) times, while Trump makes use of it (679) times. In their attempt to arouse their audiences' emotions and feelings, both Hillary Clinton and Donald Trump pay much attention to the plural inclusive pronoun "we". Clinton, on the one hand, uses it (383) times. On the other hand, Trump employs this inclusive pronoun (428) times. The possessive adjective "my" is used by Clinton and Trump (37) times and (49) times respectively. Since the plural possessive pronoun "ours" and the plural reflexive pronoun "ourselves" are not used at all, there is no need to include them in the above mentioned table. In order to attract the attention of their audiences, the two candidates profoundly use the inclusive plural object pronoun "us" and the inclusive plural possessive adjective "our". In this regard, Clinton makes use of them (195) times. Trump, on his part, uses them (182) times. The following examples show how the two candidates use the different forms of the first person deixis:

- 1- "I voted for every sanction against Iran when I was in the Senate, but it was not enough. So I spent a year-and-a-half putting together a coalition that included Russia and China to impose the toughest sanctions on Iran" (Clinton, first debate).

- 2- "I will bring -- excuse me. I will bring back jobs. You cannot bring back jobs" (Trump, first debate).
- 3- "I have worked with Latinos — one of *my* first jobs in politics was down in south Texas registering Latino citizens to be able to vote" (Clinton, second debate).
- 4- "I pay hundreds of millions of dollars in taxes. But — but as soon as *my* routine audit is finished, I will release my returns" (Trump, second debate).
- 5- "I think it is very important for **us** to make clear to **our** children that **our** country really is great because **we**'re good. And **we** are going to respect one another, lift each other up. **We** are going to be looking for ways to celebrate **our** diversity, and **we** are going to try to reach out to every boy and girl, as well as every adult, to bring them in to working on behalf of **our** country" (Clinton, second debate).
- 6- "**We**'re going to have borders in **our** country, which **we** do not have now. People are pouring into **our** country, and they're coming in from the Middle East and other places. **We**'re going to make America safe again" (Trump, second debate).

In example 1, Clinton uses the pronouns "I" to share and present her experience when she was Secretary of State. The Iranian file is one of the hottest files discussed during these elections. Clinton wants to persuade her audiences that she was, and still is, against Iran's policies and intentions to possess nuclear weapons. In example 2, Donald Trump presupposes that a lot of jobs have been taken away from the country. Donald Trump makes use of the personal pronoun "I" to show his commitment to bring these jobs that were, according to his belief, both lost and fled to some countries during Obama's two terms in power. He is implicitly attacking Clinton who was a part of Obama's administration. Demonstrating such commitment, Trump wants to direct the attention of his audiences to look at his plan that will bring these jobs back.

In example 3, Clinton uses the possessive adjective "my" to show that she is more experienced in public work than her opponent is. Unlike her opponent who repeatedly attacked Latinos and wanted to exclude them from the society, Clinton helped them to get their constitutional right to vote. Defending himself against Clinton's accusation of not releasing his federal income tax returns because he has not paid federal taxes, Trump uses the possessive adjective "my" in example 4 to refute this claim.

In examples 5 and 6, both Clinton and Trump use the different inclusive pronouns to arouse and stir their audiences' emotions and feelings. If we closely look at these two examples, we can consider how the greatness of the country is differently seen by the two candidates. Clinton, as seen in example 5, sees that the United States is great now, and she wants to enhance such greatness in the future through different ways such as working together, bringing people to work, and respecting the actual existing diversity. On his part, Donald Trump sees that greatness is not existing now (example 6), and he is trying, with the help of Americans, to make America great again (this was his campaign's slogan).

10.1.2 Second Person Deixis

Words used to refer to the listeners/readers are called second person deixis. "You" and "your" are two examples of this set of deixis. The referent of the pronoun "you" is only established by the persons who utter it during the moment of discourse (Benveniste, 1971). Apart from the plural "you" and the generic "you", the singular "you" is commonly used by presidential candidates to express their disagreement with their opponents regarding certain issues. It can also be used to avoid answering a question, and, instead, attacking the other opponents (Benveniste, 1971). The presidential candidate can use this pronoun to co-involve the other candidate. Like the first-person reflexive pronoun "myself", "yourself" is used when the subject is the same as the object. "Yours" is used to indicate possession. The following table shows the occurrence of the second person deixis in the three debates:

Table 4. *The Occurrence of the Second Person Deixis*

pronoun	Hillary Clinton			Total	Donald Trump			Total
	1 st Debate	2 nd Debate	3 rd Debate		1 st Debate	2 nd Debate	3 rd Debate	
You	30	4	13	47	89	72	57	218
Your	15	1	1	17	16	8	4	28
Yours	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-
Yourself	1	-	-	1	1	2	1	4
Total	47	5	14	66	106	82	62	250

As table 4 shows, the different forms of the second person deixis are used (316) times by the two candidates: (66) times (20.8%) by Clinton and (250)

times (79.2%) by Trump. Due to its fundamental use either to refer to the other candidate or to attack him/her, the pronoun “you” is the most commonly second person pronoun used by the two candidates (265) times (83.8%). The pronoun “you” is excluded in this study when it is used generically (i.e. to refer to others rather than the two candidates, like when is it used to refer to the interviewers, President Putin, some judges, etc.). While the possessive pronoun “yours” is used only once by Clinton, it is never used at all by Trump. Clinton uses the pronoun “yourself” once in her first debate, while Trump uses it four times. The following are some of Clinton’s and Trump’s use of the second person pronouns:

7-“I could, especially kids and families get ahead and stay ahead, with *your* 30 years, and I will let the American people make that decision” (Clinton, third debate).

8-“I sat there watching ad after ad after ad, false ad. All paid for by *your* friends on Wall Street that gave so much money because they know *you*'re going to protect them” (Trump, third debate).

When comparing what she has done during the last thirty years to what has been done by her opponent, Clinton uses the possessive adjective pronoun “your” in example 7 to underestimate his efforts in helping and supporting his nation. While she was calling for the right of African American kids of not being discriminated in schools, as she claimed, Trump was getting sued by the Justice Department for racial discrimination in his apartment buildings. She also said that Trump was hosting his program "Celebrity Apprentice" while she was monitoring the raid that brought Osama Bin Laden to justice. As clearly seen in example 8, Trump uses the pronoun “your” to attack Clinton for not enacting laws to force people to pay their federal tax income while she was in power. He claimed that Clinton did not issue such laws to protect some of her friends who are supporting her with everything including what he called the false campaign advertisements.

10.1.3 Third Person Deixis

Unlike the first person deixis which refers to the speakers and the second person deixis which addresses the listeners/readers, the third person deixis refers to things, entities, and/or things other than the speakers or listeners (Cain,

2012). Some of the third person deictic expressions are used to refer to males like the subject pronoun “he”, the object pronoun “him”, the possessive adjective and pronoun “his”, and the reflexive pronoun “himself”. “She”, “her”, “hers”, and “herself” are some of the deictic expressions used to refer to females. Presidential candidates usually tend to use this set of person deixis with the aim of attacking their opponents (Benveniste, 1971). The following table shows the distribution of the third person deixis in the debates under scrutiny:

Table 5. *The Occurrence of the Third Person Deixis*

pronoun	Hillary Clinton			Total	pronoun	Donald Trump			Total
	1 st Debate	2 nd Debate	3 rd Debate			1 st Debate	2 nd Debate	3 rd Debate	
He	58	55	99	212	She	42	130	85	257
His	18	14	16	48	Her object	3	10	11	24
Him	1	8	7	16	Her possessive	14	20	17	51
Himself	-	-	2	2	Herself	-	1	-	1
					Hers	-	1	-	1
Grand Total	77	77	124	278	Grand Total	59	162	113	334

As table 5 shows, the third person deixis is used (612) times by the two candidates : (278) times by Clinton (45.4%) and (334) times by Trump (54.6%). Being used (469) times (76.6%), “he” and “she” are the most frequently third-person pronouns used by the two candidates. The possessive pronoun “hers” and the reflexive pronoun “herself” are less frequently used by Trump. He uses them only one time each. The following examples clarify how any why the third person deixis is paid much attention to by the two candidates in the three debates under consideration:

9-“So *he* has a long record of engaging in racist behavior. And the birther lie was a very hurtful one. You know, Barack Obama is a man of great dignity” (Clinton, first debate).

10- “*She*’s done a terrible job for the African-Americans. *She* wants their vote and *she* does nothing, and then *she* comes back four years later” (Trump, second debate).

11- "He was criticizing President Reagan. This is the way Donald thinks about *himself*, puts *himself* into, you know, the middle and says, "You know, I alone can fix it," as he said on the convention stage" (Clinton, third debate).

12- "Warren Buffett took a massive deduction. Soros, who's a friend of *hers*, took a massive deduction" (Trump, second debate).

In example 9 the anaphoric referent "he" is used by Clinton to attack Trump for being a racist. Using this pronoun, Clinton presupposes that Trump has his own record of prejudice. As he continuously attacked women, Latinos, and Muslims, according to what she says in the course of the three debates, he also raises serious doubts about the birthplace of Barrack Obama. Hillary Clinton completely disagrees with what he has said, describing that as "a hurtful lie". Trump makes use of the pronoun "she" in example 10 to criticize what Clinton has done for the African-Americans pretending that to be done only for electoral purposes. When quoting what Trump has said on the convention stage, Clinton uses the reflexive pronoun "himself" in example 11 to show how he criticized former president Reagan. Trump sees himself as the superhero who can fix all the economic problems that governments were not able to solve for decades.

Accusing Clinton of corruption, Trump uses the possessive pronoun "hers" in example 12 to create a negative image of Clinton before the audiences. To support this idea, he claims that Clinton's friends, who financially support her, received massive tax deductions. Although Trump did not tell the reason behind these tax deductions, he indirectly pretends that Clinton's friends help her to be the president in order to get more benefits and more deductions.

10.2 Modality

Modal auxiliaries are verbs that are used with other verbs to express a tense or mood and provide specific and additional meanings of the main verbs (Cain, 2012). They are formed in both present and past. Modals in the present time frame have the following two main forms: modal+ base form of the verb and modal +be + the present participle. Modal+ have+ past participle and modal+ have+ been+ present participle are the two forms of the past modals.

Although modality can be expressed through modal auxiliaries, semi-modals, adjectives, adverbs, nominalization, and conditionals (Fowler, 1985), the study discusses only modal auxiliaries and some-quasi-modals in terms of Fowler's three deontic purposes: possibility, predictability, and obligation. The

following table shows the distribution of the modal auxiliaries in the debates under consideration:

Table 6. *Modal Auxiliaries Distribution*

Modal Auxiliary	Hillary Clinton			Total	Donald Trump			Total
	1 st Debate	2 nd Debate	3 rd Debate		1 st Debate	2 nd Debate	3 rd Debate	
Will	27	25	43	95	50	45	46	141
Might	1	2	2	5	2	1	2	5
Cannot	5	4	3	12	25	11	12	48
Can	29	27	16	72	9	12	14	35
Have to/ Has to	21	11	7	39	44	26	25	95
Won't	1	1	8	10	2	10	3	15
Could	4	3	7	14	15	9	5	29
Would	39	22	23	84	25	20	16	61
May	8	9	1	18	10	3	1	14
Should	12	8	11	31	23	6	16	45
Must	1	1	3	5	1	-	1	2
Couldn't	-	2	2	4	1	-	-	1
Wouldn't	4	4	2	10	4	2	2	8
Have got to	9	5	5	19	-	-	-	-
Had to	2	-	-	2	-	2	2	4
Shouldn't	3	1	3	7	7	5	12	24
Ought to	1	-	-	1	-	1	-	1
May not	-	1	1	2	-	-	-	-
Might not	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-
Grand Total	168	126	137	431	218	153	157	528

As table 6 shows, the two candidates mention the modal auxiliaries (959) times: (431) times (44.9%) by Hillary Clinton and (528) times (55.1%) by Donald Trump. Being used (236) times (24.6%) to express commitment and obligation, "will" is the most frequently used modal verb in the debates under analysis. While Hillary Clinton utilizes the modal auxiliaries "may not", "might not", and "have got to" (22) times (2.2%), Trump never mentions any of them. The two candidates use the negative auxiliary verbs (142) times (14.8%) to attack each other, give advice, and/or express ability. "Could not" and "ought to" are the least frequently used modal auxiliaries by Trump (once for each), whereas Clinton uses these modals (3) times and once respectively. Only being used to express past obligations, "had to" is mentioned only (6) times (0.6%).

Of all the different functions of modality, obligation, predictability, and possibility are the three main functions that politicians, especially presidential candidates, tend to use to manipulate their audiences. These functions are commonly present in presidential debates due to their great impact on the audiences. The following two tables show the occurrences of these three modality functions by the two presidential candidates in the debates under analysis:

Table 7. *The Use of Obligation, Predictability, and Possibility by Hillary Clinton*

Modal Auxiliary	1 st Debate			2 nd Debate			3 rd Debate		
	possibility	predictability	obligation	possibility	predictability	obligation	possibility	predictability	obligation
will-won't	7	20	1	5	19	2	7	33	11
might-might not	2	-	-	2	1	-	2	2	-
can-cannot	30	1	3	29	-	2	19	-	-
have got to	-	-	9	-	-	4			5
have to/ has to	-	-	21	-	-	11	-	-	6
Must	1				1	1	2	1	2
Should/should n't/ought to	-	-	16	-	-	9	-	-	14
could- couldn't	3	1	-	4	1	-	9	5	-
would- wouldn't	4	38	1	-	26	-	-	25	-
may-may not	7	3	-	10	1	-	2	-	-
had to	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	54	63	53	50	49	29	41	66	38

Table 8. *The Use of Obligation, Predictability, and Possibility by Donald Trump*

Modal Auxiliary	1 st Debate			2 nd Debate			3 rd Debate		
	possibility	predictability	obligation	possibility	predictability	obligation	possibility	predictability	obligation
will-won't	2	51	-	-	54	1	1	49	-
might-might not	2	1	-	1	-	-	2	1	-
can-cannot	31		3	24	-	-	19	4	3
have got to	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
have to/ has to	1	-	45	-	-	25	-	-	25
must			1	-	-	-	-	-	1
Should/should n't/ought to	-	-	30	-	-	12	-	-	28
could-couldn't	15	3	-	8	2	-	4	-	-
would-wouldn't	3	26	-	-	21	-	-	18	-
may-may not	10	1	-	3	1	-	1	1	-
had to	-	-	-	-	-	3	-	-	2
Total	64	82	79	36	78	41	27	73	57

As the two tables show, both Clinton and Trump use obligation, predictability, and possibility (980) times. While Clinton mentions these three functions (443) times (45.2%), Trump mentions them (537) times (54.8%). The two candidates express possibility (272) times: (145) times (53.3%) by Clinton and (127) times by Trump (46.7%). Having been used (411) times, predictability is the function most frequently used by the two candidates to predict the outcomes of their future plans and criticize their opponent's. In order to show their commitment on some issues and the urgent need for others to be changed, the two candidates use the modal verbs and the quasi-modals of obligation (297) times. While Clinton utilizes these modal verbs of obligation (120) times (40.4%), Trump mentions them (177) times (59.6%). It is worth noting that whenever a modal auxiliary expresses two functions, it is counted twice. The following lines discuss in detail the use of obligation, predictability, and possibility in the 2016 U.S. presidential debates.

10.2.1 Modal Verbs of Obligation

There are many modal verbs and quasi-modals that express obligation in English such as “must”, “have to”, “ought to”, and “should”. Some of these verbs express a firm necessity or obligation (strong obligation) like “have to”, “have got to”, and “must”. Other verbs, like “should” and “ought to”, are used to express recommendations or a moral obligation (weak obligation) (Hacquard, 2005). The following examples clarify the usage of the modal verbs of obligation in the three debates under consideration:

13- “I feel strongly that we **have to** have an education system that starts with preschool and goes through college” (Clinton, third debate).

14-“But we **have to** stop our jobs from being stolen from us. We **have to** stop our companies from leaving the United States and, with it, firing all of their people” (Trump, first debate).

15-“I represented upstate New York. I understand and respect the tradition of gun ownership. It goes back to the founding of our country. But I also believe that there can be and **must be** reasonable regulation” (Clinton, third debate).

16- “If we do not repeal and replace -- now, it's probably going to die of its own weight. But Obamacare **has to** go” (Trump, third debate).

When talking about the educational system in the United States, Hillary Clinton uses the strong modal verb of obligation “have to” in example 13 to express her intention to address this issue. She stresses the fact that getting a good education is the pillar of getting good job; therefore, building a strong economy. Trump utilizes “have to” in example 14 to express the commitment of all the people to immediately stop companies from leaving the country and firing their employees. As clearly apparent in the previous two examples, the effect of “have to” is strong when used with the inclusive pronoun “we”.

The strong modal verb of obligation “must” is used in example 15 to stress on the need to regulate the rules governing the bearing of arms. Unlike Trump’s claim, Clinton has no intention to abolish the second amendment. Expressing his strong refusal of Obamacare, Trump uses the auxiliary verb “has to” in example 16. He is wholly against Obamacare, describing it as “disaster”

that destroys the country. He announces that it has no place in his plans if he becomes the president.

10.2.2 Modal Verbs of Possibility

Presidential candidates tend to use modal verbs of possibility for many purposes. They make use of these auxiliary verbs of possibility to express their ability to make sweeping changes when they are nominated for the office. They also utilize this set of auxiliary verbs to attack their opponents for failing to achieve certain goals. Three kinds of possibility are present in every type of communication, especially in presidential debates: present, past, and future. The following examples show how the modal verbs of possibility are used by the two presidential candidates in the three debates under study:

17-We **cannot** take four more years of Barack Obama, and that's what you get when you get her” (Trump, third debate).

18-“We've been around for 240 years. We've had free and fair elections. We've accepted the outcomes when we **may not have** liked them” (Clinton, third debate).

19-“So you **can** regulate if you are doing so with the life and the health of the mother taken into account” (Clinton, third debate).

In example 17, Trump uses the negative modal verb of possibility “cannot” to express his total disagreement with the political and economic policies established by president Barrack Obama. He announces that such policies can remain for another four years in case Clinton wins the elections, because she was a member of that administration. When asked if she would accept the outcomes of the elections, Clinton uses the negative past possibility “may not have” in example 18 to express her great respect for the fair and free electoral system in the United States. When talking about abortion, Clinton mentions the modal verb of possibility “can” in example 19 to state that some regulations can be enacted to legalize abortion in the final month of pregnancy when there is a real danger to mothers.

10.2.3 Modal Verbs of Prediction

Another set of auxiliary verbs that presidential candidates use in their attempt to manipulate their audience is the modal verbs of prediction. This important function of modality is quite noticeable when presidential candidates predict the good future outcomes of their plans, and the bad ones of their opponents'. By using the modal verbs of prediction that are based on strong evidence, presidential candidates shape the opinion of their audiences regarding certain issues. Like obligation and possibility, prediction can be represented in some modal auxiliaries such as "will", "might", "would", and others. The following are some of the examples that show how the two presidential candidates express prediction in the debates under consideration:

20- "And so what I believe is the more we can do for the middle class, the more we can invest in you, your education, your skills, your future, the better we **will** be off and the better we **will** grow" (Clinton, first debate).

21- "Under my plan, I **will** be reducing taxes tremendously" (Trump, first debate).

22- "I am going to renegotiate NAFTA. And if I **cannot** make a great deal -- then we're going to terminate NAFTA" (Trump, third debate).

23- "I've taken on Putin and others, and I **would** do that as president. I think wherever we can cooperate with Russia, that's fine" (Clinton, second debate).

Clinton uses "will" in example 20 to express an optimistic prediction of a prosperous future of the country. She believes that this can easily be achieved if complete support is given to the middle class. Supporting the middle class will, in turn, provide an excellent all-round education and grow the economy. Trump mentions the modal verb of prediction "will" in example 21 to praise his economic plan, which is supposed to greatly reduce taxes.

In example 22, Trump mentions the negative modal of prediction "cannot" to unveil his plan for terminating NAFTA with the help of the American people in case he fails to renegotiate it. Clinton utilizes the modal verb of prediction "would" in example 23 to announce her intentions of working

with all persons no matter who they are when she becomes the president. She sees no problems to deal with all the countries including Russia.

10.3 Passive Constructions

Another pragma-syntactic manipulative device that presidential candidates employ to manipulate their audiences is the use of passive constructions. While there is a need for a subject or doer in active voice sentences, there is no demand for a sentence in passive constructions to have a doer (beard, 2000). Knowing how and when to perfectly use the passive constructions, politicians have their own motivations behind paying special attention to this pragma-syntactic manipulative device. The following table shows the number of times in which both Clinton and Trump utilize this manipulative device.

Table 9. *Passive Voice Distribution*

	First debate	Second debate	Third debate	Total
Hillary Clinton	30	24	41	95
Donald Trump	54	30	44	128

As table 9 shows, the total number of passive constructions is (223) times: (95) times by Clinton (42.6%), and (128) times by Trump (75.4%). The third debate has the highest number of the voice constructions (38.1%), while the second debate has the lowest number (24.2%). The following examples show the different reasons behind the two candidates' use of the passive construction forms:

24- "Just like when you ran the State Department, \$6 billion was missing. How do you miss \$6 billion? You ran the State Department; \$6 billion **was either stolen**" (Trump, third debate).

25- "That is a plan that **has been analyzed** by independent experts which said that it could produce 10 million new jobs. By contrast, Donald's plan **has been analyzed** to conclude it might lose 3.5 million jobs" (Clinton, third debate).

26-“Third, we do not know all of his business dealings, but **we have been told** through investigative reporting that he owes about \$650 million to Wall Street and foreign banks” (Clinton, first debate).

27-“I will release my tax returns -- against my lawyer's wishes -- when she releases her 33,000 e-mails that **have been deleted**. As soon as she releases them, I will release” (Trump, first debate).

Trump speaks in the passive voice in example 24, because he is not sure what happened to the 6 billion dollars. Since he does not have any accurate information, he claims that this amount of money “was stolen”. Unable to name any of the independent experts who have analyzed her plan, or who have analyzed Trump’s plan, Clinton uses the passive constructions in example 25. By using the passive voice, Clinton’s main purpose is to avoid assuming responsibility.

The reason why Clinton uses the passive voice in example 26 is she is not certain about the reports that have talked about Trump’s business dealings. She does not have the precise information to present. Her main purpose is to attack and denigrate Trump. Trump utilizes the passive construction in example 27 to imply that Clinton’s deletion of the 33,000 e-mails was an intentional and deceptive act. He wants to tell his audience how irresponsible and unreliable Clinton is. He sees that Clinton does not deserve the trust of the American citizens to represent them either in the government or as a future president.

11-Conclusion

In order to manipulate their audiences pragma-syntactically, the two candidates pay much attention to three devices: person deixis, modality, and passive voice. Both Hillary Clinton and Donald Trump utilize the three different types of person deixis: first person deixis, second person deixis, and third person deixis to attack their opponents and arouse emotions on part of their audiences. The two candidates also concentrate on three deontic functions of modality known as obligation, predictability, and possibility with the aim of manipulating their audiences. Being used when there is a lack of information, passive voice is the third syntactic manipulative device the two candidates employ in the debates under analysis.

The study was able to answer the research questions. As for the question “What are the different verbal pragma-syntactic manipulative devices used by the presidential candidates in the debates under consideration?”, the analysis revealed that there are three pragma-syntactic manipulative devices that are greatly paid much attention to by the two presidential candidates. These three devices are person deixis, modality, and passive voice.

In its answer to the question “What are the most frequently used pragma-syntactic manipulative devices and what are the least used ones?”, the study concluded that pragma-syntactic manipulative devices are used (4869) times: (2153) times (44.2%) by Hillary Clinton, and (2716) times (55.8%) by Trump. With a total number of (3687) times, person deixis is the most dominant used device. The three functions of modality come in the second place, with total number of (959) occurrences. Being used only (223) times, passive voice is the least used device. Of the three types of person deixis, first person deixis is the most used type (74.8%). Among the tree functions of modality, modal verbs of predictability are the most heavily used function.

As for the question “How is verbal manipulation important in winning the presidential debates?”, the study indicated that it is clear that manipulation works better in arousing and evoking the emotions and feelings of audiences. Manipulation is also beneficial when there is a lack of evidence or no evidence at all. One of the outcomes that the two candidates’ manipulative linguistic practices accomplish is confusion. They distract and deflect from facts in a clear effort to side-step truths that conflict with their narrative about various issues.

It is clear that the two candidates in general, and Trump in particular, did not follow some of the conventions of grammar due to the spoken form nature of the three debates. An example of the not following of these conventions can be seen in the case of register-shift. By shifting register, the two candidates easily and frequently adapted their level of formality and adherence to conventions through both verbal and non-verbal cues like word choice, use of slang, colloquial language, polite language, swearing, tone of voice, posture, facial expression, and physical gestures. When using passive voice, the two candidates used what is called “illogical shift” in voice, which means the speaker’s or the writer’s shift from passive to active, or from active to passive. This is one of the characteristics of using passive constructions in spoken English.

As a result of the skillful use of the different pragma-syntactic manipulative devices, the two candidates were able to attain their goal, which was to gain a huge public following, control their audiences, and shape their minds and opinions. In doing so, the two candidates tried to arouse their audiences' emotions and feeling by employing the inclusive pronouns "we", "us", and "our". These pragma-syntactic manipulative devices were helpful in shaping the image of the presidential candidates' political persona.

It would be interesting to analyze manipulation in terms of the extra linguistic factors such as tone of voice, eye contact, gesture, pauses, pace, volume, pitch and intensity. These paralinguistic factors help the listeners to know if the speakers are trying to manipulate. It would also be helpful to study both face-threatening acts and face-saving acts as manipulative techniques. Studying manipulation in light of the other functions of modality such as desirability, lack of necessity, ability, and prohibition can be a good area of future research.

References

- Al-Tarawneh, M & Rabab'ah, G. (2019). Persuasion in Hillary Clinton and Donald Trump's presidential debates: A critical discourse analysis. *Jordanian Educational Journal*: Vol. 4:No. 1 Article15.
- Beard, A. (2000). *Language of politics*. London: Routledge.
- Benveniste, E. (1971). *Problems in general linguistics*. Coral Gables, Florida: University of Miami Press.
- Cain, J. (2012). *Grammar for writing 3: An editing guide to writing*. (2nd ed.). White Plains: NY: Pearson ELT.
- Chomsky, N. (1981). *Lectures on government and binding*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Crystal, J. (1991). *A dictionary of linguistics and phonetics*. Oxford: Blackwell Publisher LTD.
- Curbelo, A. (2017). *Analyzing the (Ab)use of language in politics: The case of Donald Trump*. Retrieved May15, 2019 from https://www.bristol.ac.uk/media-library/sites/spais/documents/Working%20Paper%2002_17_AAC.pdf
- Duffy, M. (2018). *Detention of terrorism suspects: Political discourse and fragmented practices*. United Kingdom: Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Fillmore, C. J. (1997). *Lectures on deixis*. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.
- Fowler, R. (1985). Power. In T. A. van Dijk (ed.), *Handbook of Discourse Analysis*, Vol. 4. London: Academic Press, Inc. pp.61-82.
- Frawley, W. (2013). *Linguistic semantics*. (n.p.): Taylor & Francis.
- Goodin, R.E. (1980). *Manipulatory politics*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press.
- Hacquard, V. (2005). Aspects of too and enough constructions. In: Efthymia Georgala & Jonathan Howell (eds.): *Proceeding of SALT XV*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University, 80-97.
- Jespersen, O. (1924). *The philosophy of grammar*. London: Allen & Unwin.
- Jungbluth, K. (2015). *Manual of deixis in Romance languages*. Germany: De Gruyter.

- Levinson, S. C. (1983). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lyons, J. (1977). *Semantics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Musolff, A. (2019). *Language aggression in public debates on immigration*. Netherlands: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Palacios, L. (2018). *The 2016 U.S. presidential debates: A discourse analysis approach*. Retrieved June 13, 2019 from https://rodin.uca.es/xmlui/bitstream/handle/10498/20674/Luc%C3%ADaRamos_TFG_EEII_FINAL.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y
- Palmer, F. (1986). *Mood and modality*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Phuoc, N. (2018). *A contrastive analysis of modality markers in U.S. presidential Election debates by Hillary Clinton and Donald Trump* [Master's thesis, The University of Da Nang]. The Information Resources Center. http://tailieuso.udn.vn/bitstream/TTHL_125/8317/1/NguyenThiKieuPhuoc.TT.pdf
- Savoy, J. (2018). Trump's and Clinton's Style and Rhetoric during the 2016 Presidential Election, *Journal of Quantitative Linguistics*, 25(2), 168-189, DOI: [10.1080/09296174.2017.1349358](https://doi.org/10.1080/09296174.2017.1349358)
- Smithson, R. (2013). Rhetoric and psychopathy: Linguistic manipulation and deceit in the final interview of Ted Bundy. *Journal of Undergraduate Research* Volume 6, Issue 2.
- Sulkunen, P. & Torronen, J. (1997). The production of values: The concept of modality in textual discourse analysis. *Semiotica* 113(1/2): 43-69.
- The Nielsen Company. (2008). *Highest rated presidential debates 1960 to present*. Retrieved June 26, 2020, from <https://www.nielsen.com/us/en/insights/article/2008/top-ten-presidential-debates-1960-to-present/>
- von Wright, G.H. (1951). *An essay in modal logic*. Amsterdam: North-Holland Publishing Co.
- Yule, G. (1996). *Pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

أدوات التلاعب النحوي التداولي في المناظرات الرئاسية الأمريكية عام 2016

وائل محمد قطب خضر

باحث دكتوراه بقسم اللغة الإنجليزية

كلية الآداب-جامعة السويس

waellanguages@yahoo.com

د. شيماء طاهر سلام
مدرس اللغويات
كلية الآداب جامعة السويس

أ.د شاکر رزق تقي الدين
أستاذ اللغويات
كلية الآداب-جامعة السويس

المستخلص

تهدف هذه الدراسة إلى دراسة بعض من أدوات التلاعب النحوي التداولي في المناظرات الرئاسية الأمريكية والتي جرت عام 2016 بين المرشح الديمقراطي هيلاري كلينتون والمرشح الجمهوري دونالد ترامب. وتشمل أدوات التلاعب النحوي التداولي التي تمت مناقشتها في هذه الدراسة كلا من الضمائر الشخصية، والأفعال الناقصة، وأساليب المبنى للمجهول. وتهدف هذه الدراسة إلى الإجابة عن الأسئلة الأتية: "ما هي أدوات التلاعب النحوي التداولي المستخدمة في المناظرات قيد التحليل؟" و "ما هي أكثر أدوات التلاعب النحوي التداولي استخداماً؟ وما هي أقلها استخداماً؟" ويهدف المرشحان من وراء استخدام أدوات التلاعب المختلفة إلى تشكيل عقول جمهورهما واكتساب حشد كبير من الجمهور. وتظهر الدراسة كيف أن استخدام أدوات التلاعب النحوي التداولي يساعد في تشكيل الصورة الشخصية السياسية للمرشحين الرئاسيين. وترى الدراسة أن اللغة الإنجليزية المنطوقة تختلف عن اللغة المكتوبة فيما يخص تطبيق استخدامات القواعد النحوية. وقد خلصت الدراسة إلى أن دونالد ترامب استخدم أدوات التلاعب النحوي التداولي أكثر من خصمه. وأشارت الدراسة إلى أن الأنواع الثلاثة من الضمائر الشخصية كانت أكثر أدوات التلاعب النحوي التداولي استخداماً في المناظرات الرئاسية الثلاثة قيد الدراسة، بينما كان أسلوب المبنى للمجهول الأقل استخداماً. وأوضحت الدراسة إلى أنه من بين الأغراض الثلاثة للأفعال الناقصة، فإن الأفعال الناقصة الدالة على التنبؤ هي الأكثر استخداماً. وقد أشارت الدراسة إلى إن المرشحين الرئاسيين لجأوا إلى استخدام أساليب المبنى للمجهول وذلك حتى ينتهي لهما تجنب تحمل المسؤولية. وأوضحت الرسالة الدور الهام الذي تلعبه الضمائر الشاملة في إثارة المشاعر والعواطف المختلفة للجمهور.

الكلمات المفتاحية: التلاعب اللغوي، الأفعال الناقصة، المناظرات الرئاسية، لغة الخطاب السياسي، التلاعب النحوي التداولي.