Emotional Languages in Donald Trump's Campaign Speeches: A Systemic Functional Linguistics Approach

Erick Firmansyah[1], Slamet Setiawan[2], Suharsono[3]

[1,2,3] Program Studi Pendidikan Bahasa dan Sastra, Pascasarjana Universitas Negeri Surabaya, Jl. Lidah Wetan Surabaya

Email: [1] erickfirmansyah@ymail.com, [2] slametsetiawan@unesa.ac.id, [3] kangharsono@gmail.com

Abstract*: The victory of Donald Trump in 2016 US Presidential Election marks the rise of Post-truth era at which objective truth is less important than the emotional truth. The present study investigates his use of emotional languages during his campaign. The investigated emotions are fear, warmth, and humour. The data on emotions which derives from the transcripted campaign speeches of Donald Trump are detected using prototype scenario theory developed by Wierzbicka (1992). They are, then, analyzed using Halliday and Matthiessen's Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) (2004). The findings show the speaker has four (4) ideational patterns in expressing his emotions. Those are material, relational, mental, and conditional relation. The emotions are communicated mostly in declarative sentences with dominant use of modality will as median value of obligation. His communication style reveals dominant use of repetition varying from lexical item to clausal level. The messages of the emotions contain the problem and its solution. The problem is represented by the exploitation of common noun Hillary Clinton while the solution is represented by the use of pronoun we as the unmarked topical theme. Furthermore, the study modifies Halliday and Matthiessen's SFL theory of emotion.*

Keywords: *Emotional Languages; Systemic Functional Linguistics; Ideational Metafunction; Interpersonal Metafunction; Textual Metafunction*

Abstrak: Kemenangan Donald Trump pada Pemilu Presiden Amerika Serikat Tahun 2016 menandai bangkitnya era paska kebenaran dimana kebenaran obyektif dikalahkan oleh kebenaran emosional. Kajian ini meneliti penggunaan Bahasa – Bahasa emosi saat ia berkampanye. Emosi yang diinvestigasi adalah ketakutan, kehangatan, dan humor. Data kajian yang diperoleh dari transkip pidato Donald Trump saat berkampanye dideteksi menggunakan teori skenario prototipe yang dikembangkan Wierzbicka (1992). Data tersebut dianalisis menggunakan teori Linguistik Sistemik Fungsional milik Halliday dan Matthiessen (2004). Hasilnya, penutur memiliki 4 pola ide dalam mengekspresikan emosi antara lain pola materi, pola hubungan, pola mental, dan pola hubungan pengandaian. Emosi tersebut disampaikan umumnya menggunakan kalimat deklaratif dengan dominasi penggunaan *will* sebagai nilai tengah kewajiban. Gaya komunikasinya menunjukkan seringnya pengulangan yang bervariasi dari kata hingga kalimat. Pesan – pesan dari emosi yang disampaikan berisi masalah dan solusinya. Masalah diwakili banyaknya penggunaan kata benda umum *Hillary Clinton* sedangkan solusi diwakili penggunaan kata ganti benda *we* sebagai topik tema yang tidak ditandai. Lebih lanjut, kajian ini memodifikasi teori emosi yang dikembangkan oleh SFL milik Halliday dan Matthiessen.

Kata kunci: Bahasa-bahasa Emosi; Linguistik Sistemik Fungsional; Metafungsi Ide; Metafungsi Interpersonal; Metafungsi Tekstual

1. INTRODUCTION

The study is encouraged by the victory of Donald Trump in the 2016 US presidential election beating up his rival, Hillary Clinton, against all odds. His victory in the electoral college is claimed by many researchers as the rise of post-truth era, an era where emotional appeal aroused in fabricated truth is more influential than the objective truth itself (Gross,

2017; Rose, 2017; Speed & Mannion, 2017). With the help of the social media in spreading out the emotional truth, he successfully turned most election pollsters predicting his lost to be his glory.

Schrock, Dowd-Arrow, Erichsen, Gentile, and Dignam (2017) argue that his use of emotional discourse is meant to attract the working-class community. By analysing his 44 campaign speech transcripts, they find patterns indicating the working-class as the victim of policy maker, his rival as the villain who produces the policy, and he himself as a hero who saves the victim from the villain by running the candidacy. The feeling of fear and anger is transferred to his audiences and at the same time he comes as the representation of hope.

Seeing its success, this divisive campaign strategy seems to be replicated by other politicians across the world. By examining 4 different political settings, the 2016 Donald Trump's presidential campaign, the 2016 Brexit Referendum, the 2017 Geert Wilders' campaign in Netherlands, and the 2017 Marine Le Pen's campaign in France, Levinger (2017) points out the emotion of love, fear, and anger is exploited. Each of them represents its own theme in shaping the perception of the audience; love for homeland, fear of foreigner, and anger with corrupt political elites.

Putting political debate aside, Donald Trump's rhetorical strategy is proved to employ emotion rather than logical reasoning. Both Liu (2016) and Widyawardani (2016) examined Trump's rhetorical strategies and found something in common although their object of study was different. The object of Widyawardani's investigation was his announcement speech while Liu's was his tweets. The finding suggests that his dominant rhetorical proofs were pathos (emotional appeal) instead of ethos (establishing the authority of speaker) and logos (logical argument). According to Liu, he used three different types of emotion; fear appeal, warm appeal, and humor appeal.

Although the previous studies successfully prevail in showing the utilization of emotion in his speech, many of them stop at the point of listing out linguistic items such as *trouble*, *losing*, *bad shape* as the representation of fear and the use of pronoun *we* as warmth. There is still lack of explanation on how those emotions are construed and communicated.

By applying Halliday and Matthiessen's Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) (2004) as an approach and analytical tool, this study focuses on how emotional appeal is reflected throughout Donald Trump's campaign speech. It aims to answer three basic questions such as how those emotions are construed in terms of ideas (ideational), how the speaker communicates them (interpersonal), and what messages lie behind the emotions (textual). The investigated emotions follow Liu's finding on his emotions; fear, warmth, and humor, because the categories represent positive and negative emotion This effort is a means of describing linguistic phenomenon, emotional language, which has been successfully implemented by Donald Trump.

SFL is profoundly recognized for its concept of language metafunction. Matthiessen and Halliday (2009, p. 12) explain that metafunction refers to the different modes of meaning construed by the grammar. The meaning is realized in the form of lexicogrammar. They use the term "metafunction" to differentiate it from the term "function". The term function popularly refers to the purpose of language use. For example, persuasive language, evaluative language, and also emotive language. Metafunction does not refer to that but simply to intrinsic elements within language. It can be used for an analytical tool to understand the language use phenomenon.

There are three types of metafuntion in SFL; ideational, interpersonal, and textual metafunction. **Ideational** refers to language function to construe human experience. Construing means organizing, understanding and expressing one's perception of the world

and of his consciousness. In some cases like the difference between clause and clause complex, Halliday and Matthiessen (2004, p. 29) divides ideational into two, experiential and logical. The later may be found in the logical relation between clauses such as in clause complex. **Interpersonal** derives from the words "interactive" and "personal". It refers to the language function as a mean to communicate with other people by expressing opinion, attitude, and judgment. **Textual** refers to the organization of text or simply how those two previous metafunctions are realized in the construction of text (Bloor & Bloor, 2004, pp. 10-11).

Fontaine (2013, p. 10) argues that metafunction should be seen from two different angles; from language production and from language analysis. The former believes that when the speaker produces language, all three metafunctions are realized in one language unit, a clause, simultaneously and integratedly. However, the later shows different treatment and purpose. In language analysis, they are seen separately to understand and to interpret the meaning of the clause, which is believed to be central processing unit of analysis in SFL.

In the linguistic analysis, three types of metafunctions are interpreted into three lines of meaning. Ideational metafunction views clause **as representation**. It represents the idea of the speaker. Interpersonal perceives clause **as an exchange** because it involves the transaction between the speaker and the listener in verbal text and between the writer and the reader in non-verbal text. At last, textual metafunction shows clause **as a message**, a point of departure of the information (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004, p. 58).

SFL remains a primary option for researchers who want to reveal the speaker's ideology. Number of researchers have investigated Donald Trump's ideology using Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) along with SFL theory (Cherkaoui, 2016; Leth, Grønnebæk, Egholm, Jordahn, & Dyrbye, 2016; Mohammadi, 2017; Rahman & Yunianti, 2017; Rohmah, 2018). Their investigation tends to look at the connection between language and power behind his speech. It resulted terms like Trumpism, nihilism, protectionism, far right-wing populism, and fascism as representation of his ideologies.

There are also researchers who only take interpersonal metafunction of SFL as an approach to investigate the interpersonal style of political figures like Barrack Obama and Nelson Mandela or of literary works (Feng & Liu, 2010; Koussouhon & Dossoumou, 2015; Nur, 2015; Ye, 2010). Their studies argue that most political speeches are meant to encourage, to elicit hope, and to influence the audience's behaviour.

However, this study uses all metafunctions of SFL as linguistic analysis to reveal the production process of emotional language. When the clause contains emotion, it can reflect what is in the mind of the speaker (ideational), how it is delivered to the addressee (interpersonal), and what message it brings (textual). Practically, it is essential for understanding emotional language which grows rapidly together with the rise of post-truth era. Theoretically, it contributes to the modification of emotion theory within SFL framework, which highlights the speaker's inner experience as the place of emotion, to be lying in both inner and outer experience of the speaker.

2. RESEARCH METHOD

This study is a qualitative research which attempts to describe the production process of emotional language in Donald Trump's campaign speeches. The data are in the form of excerpts derived from three selected transcribed campaign speeches.

- Text 1: Remarks at the Summit Sports and Ice Complex in Dimondale, Michigan on August 19, 2016, retrieved february 12th 2018 from

https://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/documents/remarks-the-summit-sports-and-ice-complex-dimondale-michigan

- Text 2: Remarks at a Rally at the Pensacola Bay Center in Pensacola, Florida on September 9, 2016, retrieved february 12th 2018 from https://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/documents/remarks-rally-the-pensacola-bay-center-pensacola-florida

- Text 3: Remarks at a Rally at Sun Center Studios in Center Township, Pennsylvania on September 22, 2016, retrieved february 12th 2018 from https://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/documents/remarks-rally-sun-center-studios-chester-township-pennsylvania

The campaign speeches above are selected with the following considerations:

- Rally speeches at Michigan and Pennsylvania are chosen because those two states belong to Democratic Party in the previous election but in this 2016 election, it belonged to Republican with Donald Trump as the victor. This means that the campaign successfully influenced the voter's decision.

- Rally speech at Florida did not belong to Democratic Party previously. However, it is picked to find the regularity of the phenomenon, the use of emotional language, besides the fact that Florida is included as the big states with many electoral voters. The successful campaign in Florida was proved to support the effectiveness of the campaign speech.

The emotional languages of fear, warmth, and humour in selected speeches are detected using prototype scenario developed by Wierzbicka (1992) because applying SFL alone is believed to be inadequate to detect the current trends of emotional language. In Halliday and Matthiessen's SFL, the emotion can be found in the speaker's inner experience which is expressed in mental process of ideational, for example, the sentence *I feel afraid of chaos happening on the street* expresses the speaker's fear. However, in the contemporary use of language, emotion may derive from speaker's inner as well as outer experience. Ströbel (2015, p. 227) studies the concept of fear and argues that it may come naturally from the speaker's intuition and from outside where something forced or manipulated upon him. The sentence *The country is in chaos* may reflect the same fear although, in SFL, it does not belong to mental process but relational one.

Wierzbicka (1992, p. 539) suggests that emotion can be detected using prototype scenario in terms of thought, want, and feeling. The prototype is formed using the semantic primitives. The emotion of fear is about something bad happening. Different with the feeling of *anger* or *sadness* which has the same concept, the bad thing is predicted or probably happens in the future. This misfortune is accompanied by the feeling of one's weaknesses. Thus, the basic concept of fear covers three criteria, 1) something bad will/can happen (to me), 2) I don't want this, and 3) I can't prevent it (Wierzbicka, 1990, p. 363). The prototype scenario of fear emotion can be described as follow,

> **Fear**
> X feels something (when X thinks of Y)
> sometimes a person thinks something like this:
>> I don't know what will happen
>> something very bad can happen
>> I don't want this
>> because of this, I would want to do something
>> I don't know if I can do anything
> because of this, this person feels something bad

X feels like this

Liu defines warm appeal to be a call for the sympathy of the audience to agree with speaker's message. This will be contradictory since warm emotion is basically expressing something good whereas sympathy, according to Wierzbicka (1999, p. 284), means that a person wants to do something good to other person because he has something bad happen to him. Warmth is an emotion which involve people interpersonally. It is basically the feeling of good thing towards someone else. In this context, the interpersonal warmth emotion involves the speaker and the audience for the setting is during the campaign speech. The concept of warmth is a genuinely flowing from the heart of the speaker to express good feeling towards person or people who are not close the speaker. Expressing love is part of this type. Therefore, the prototype scenario of warmth can be seen below.

> **Warm**
> [people think:]
> It is good
> If a person says/does something
> because this person feels something good towards another person

The concept of humor emotion is related to the feeling of amusement. Different from the emotional state of amusement, it is created from the amusement of incongruity where one might enjoy the violation on the way things are supposed to be (Morreall, 1983). It is also influenced by causal, spatial, and temporal factor. For example, a kid may perceive humor differently than the way adult may do. The following prototype will give the detail scenario of humor setting.

> **Humour**
> X feels amused
> Sometimes a person thinks like this:
>> Something violates my picture of the way it is supposed to be
>> I enjoy the violation
> Because of that, I feel amused
> X feels like this

The derived emotional languages are then analyzed in three analysis stages under Halliday and Matthiessen's SFL theory (2004). It is firstly analyzed using transitivity analysis of ideational metafunction to identify patterns of ideas in the mind of the speaker. Second analysis is conducted through examining Mood, Modality, and Appraisal Technique to see the attitude of the speaker and his interpersonal style. The last stage of analysis is theme-rheme analysis of textual metafunction to determine the messages behind them.

3. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

3.1. *The Speaker's Patterns of Ideas in the Emotional languages*

The three investigated speeches in the study show there are 158 collected clauses containing emotional languages. The first stage of analysis is transitivity analysis to reveal the idea behind those languages. There are six (6) ideational processes which are investigated in the analysis; material, mental, relational, behavioural, verbal, and existential. It is figured out that not all ideational processes can be found in the speaker's speeches. Among those processes, only material, relational, and mental process are found. However, there can be found another type of process outside the previous six which is labelled as conditional relation process (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004, p. 373). Thus, there are four (4) ideational processes in total. What makes the last type different from the previous three is that the previous processes may be found under a clause, single clause, whereas the last one may be

found above the clauses, more than one clause. The following section elaborates the four (4) aforementioned ideational processes used by the speaker.

3.1.1. Material Process

The data shows that the speaker uses this process to articulate fear and humour emotion. Those emotions are embedded in various elements in the clause including the actor, the process, the goal or the scope.

- Emotion in an actor

The actor in SFL does not always mean a person who takes an action but it is a logical subject which the speaker believes as the doer of the deed (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004, p. 59). In this ideational pattern, it represents the speaker's emotion of an event. It is also a source of information that draws out his emotion.

(1). <u>Her failed decisions as secretary of State</u> unleashed ISIS onto the world. (excerpt no. 59)

The sentence expresses fear emotion of the speaker. He conveys a message to his audiences that his opponent, Hillary Clinton, has failed her duty as The Secretary of the State. He proves her failure by showing the fact that ISIS was unleashed to the world during her regime. He convinces them how she has no right to be chosen again because of her failure.

- Emotion in a process

This ideational pattern highlights how the speaker embeds his emotion in the process of the clause by using verbs such as *lose, empty out, leave*, or *end up*. Those verbs describe the process into fearful condition.

(2). You're <u>losing</u> your businesses. (excerpt no. 36)

The above sentence is used by the speaker to describe the economic situation in the country which is not in a good shape. He created his audiences' fear by telling them that their business and their country's business is declining. Losing business is something most people are afraid of because it means to lose money, to lose job, and to lose wealth.

- Emotion in a goal

Another way the speaker articulates his emotion is by putting nominal group representing it in the goal of the clause. The goal is passive participant in the clause which is affected by the deed of the actor.

(3). Their policies have produced only <u>poverty, joblessness, failing schools, and broken homes</u>. (excerpt no. 11)

The nominal group in (3) represents his view on social condition in the country which he believes as something bad happening. It is a condition most people are afraid of. Most people do not want to live in poverty. They want a job not joblessness. They do not want the failing schools because anyone wants good schools at which their kids can study successfully. They absolutely do not want broken homes. These conditions represent his fear emotion which he thinks as a result of the actor's deed. The actor of the clause is *Their policies* which refers to the Government's policies that his opponent is part of the system issuing them.

- Emotion in a scope

Scope is another role of participant in the clause beside the Goal. The difference between them is that the Goal is affected by the process of the clause but Scope is not. Halliday and Matthiessen (2004, p. 192) explains that it functions to construe domain where the process happens or to construe the process in general or specific terms.

(4). Why then are 70 million American women and children living in <u>poverty, or on the brink of poverty</u>? (excerpt no. 108)

In (4), he uses *poverty, or on the brink of poverty* to describe the scope of bad condition where American women and children are living in. The uniqueness is that the fear is uttered in interrogative form.

3.1.2. Relational Process

The most dominant ideational process employed by the speaker after material process is relational one. It is labelled this way because it discusses the relation among participants in the clause. The data shows that he uses both modes to express fear emotion by characterizing or identifying something bad is happening.

- Emotion in Attributive

In attributive mode, the speaker expresses his emotion by describing or characterizing the participant with something scary in his perception. The sentence (5) is meant to create fear of the audience. The speaker utilizes the attributive *disaster* to describe how bad the economy condition in Michigan (carrier), the place where he delivers his speech in. It is known for years that Michigan is filled with automotive and manufacturing industry. By the emerging free trade agreement, NAFTA, going around, he speaks to his audiences that industries in Michigan are badly affected. The word disaster itself means a great harm or loss. It means that people of Michigan will be in a great danger if this keeps going on.

> (5). *Now, you have to understand, the Michigan manufacturing sector <u>is a disaster</u>. Is <u>a disaster</u>. (excerpt no. 35)*

- Emotion in Identifier

Besides using attributive relation, the speaker employs identifying relation in expressing his fear emotion. In this type of the clause, he embeds it in the identifier rather than identified. It can be seen from the sentences (6) that the identified element, which is often labelled as **token**, is the common noun Hillary Clinton, which is the name of his rival in the election. However, the identifier element, **a value**, is put after the linking verb. It can be stated that he identifies his opponent as legacy of death, destruction, and terrorism. Those identifications are commonly against logical description of a leader. Nonetheless, he still uses them that way because he is scared that presidential candidate with such identifications wins the election.

> (6). *Hillary Clinton is <u>a legacy of death, destruction, and terrorism</u>. (excerpt no. 66)*

3.1.3. Mental Process

Besides material and relational process, this study finds the speaker utilizes mental process to articulate his emotion. He employs it to express his fear and warm emotion.

> (7). *It's the mother who feels like <u>a refugee</u> in her own country. (excerpt no. 107)*
> (8). *I <u>love</u> Michigan. (excerpt no. 129)*

The speaker uses the perception process feels like in (7) to describe how dangerous the area she is living in. He speaks about it in respond to the chaos in Chicago in which 65 people got shot. He tries to frame his opponent, Hillary Clinton, that she has not done enough for the country's security at which she serves as the Secretary of State.

On the other hand, he is so warm to his audience as in (8). His excitement is represented by the use of mental verb *love*. By saying that, he wants to engage with his audiences as if he is not stranger who does not know who he is talking to. He utters those expression in the beginning of his speech to open his narrative that he does not want to do any harm to the people. It is the reason the verb *love* is selected.

3.1.4. Conditional Relation

The final model of ideational is labelled as conditional relation. What makes it different from the previous three is that they lie within a clause meanwhile it lies above the clause meaning that it relates more than one clause under one logical function. He embeds his fear emotion in the dominant or independent clause as in (9). It expresses his fear of losing job at which he is afraid that Michigan industry is collapsing. It is enhanced by the dependent

clauses which serve as causes. The dependant clause indicates the way out of the problem mentioned in the dominant one.

> (9).   *And Michigan is going to end up with lots of empty buildings all over the place unless you elect Donald Trump president. (excerpt no. 51)*

To sum up all presented ideational patterns, there are four (4) different types employed by the speaker. The first dominant pattern is material process by which he describes his inner and outer experience of the world. The next one is relational process by which he embeds his emotion in characterizing or identifying the participant of the clause. The third pattern is mental process where he expresses his perception and emotion (the term emotion here as one of the types of mental process other than cognition and perception). And the last pattern is conditional relation which lie on the complex sentence.

This finding enlarges the interpretation of process evoking emotion which Halliday and Matthiessen and their followers such as Butt, Fahey, Feez, Spinks, and Yallop (2000) and Fontaine (2013) claim that it is part of inner experience as mental process. Halliday and Matthiessen themselves open to the multi-interpretation of emotion (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004, p. 173). The development of appraisal theory from SFL by Martin and White (2005) is undeniable proof that emotion can also be used to evaluate the language by the speaker. The sentence *These are hard times for many in this country* is a form of emotional reaction at which they label it as affective attitude in their theory. However, in transitivity analysis, it is classified as relational clause because it relates attributive *hard* and carrier *these*.

Thus, this study argues that, besides exposing inner experience explicitly in warmth, emotion can be expressed by both inner and outer experience of the speaker, agreeing with Ströbel (2015). It modifies Halliday and Matthiessen's view on emotion by claiming that the speaker's outer experience may evoke it. The fear language like *You're losing your business* (material), expose the speaker's outer experience. And at the same time, it implies his inner experience of fear with omitted phrase *I am afraid that*.

After all, there may appear curiosity on why fear emotions are very dominant in the speeches. It is related to what has been clearly explained by many theorists that Trumps victory, followed by the upcoming Brexit, marks the rise of post-truth era. The term post-truth itself was nominated as the word of the year in 2016 by Oxford Dictionary in regard to Donald Trump's winning declaration against all odds (McComiskey, 2017).

In post-truth era, the fact truth or objective truth is considered less important than the expected truth. People do not seek "what is true" but "what I believe is true". In this sense, Donald Trump is proven successful in branding himself to be more "truthful" than his rival, Hillary Clinton. In fact, it was found out later on that 70% of his statement during candidacy were false according the independent factchecker (Lewandowsky, Ecker, & Cook, 2017). This study takes the position not to discuss whether what he speaks are true or not, which is clear that most of them were untrue, rather it takes the responsibility for explaining how some untrue fact were construed and delivered in effective and convincing manner.

Going back to why the speaker prefers employing fear dominantly, one logical reasoning is that it is the simplest way to attract other's attention and to influence their behaviour. McComiskey (2017) suggests

> "Bullshit and fake news, regardless of truth-value or reasoning, reinforce and intensify current beliefs, so if rhetors can control those current beliefs through emotional appeals (prior to the strategic use of bullshit and fake news), then the persuasive effect of bullshit and fake news is also reinforced and intensified. In other words, if rhetors can control the emotional foundations of their audiences' beliefs, then they can feed their audiences any line of bullshit or fake news whatsoever, and these audiences will accept it without question" (2017, p. 27).

The way Donald Trump control his audiences in his speeches is through the issues which are closest to them, economy and security. In economy issue, he describes it badly by pointing out the high poverty rate, many joblessness, losing manufacturing industries since NAFTA, economic disaster. At the same time, he describes the security condition in the country are unsafe, high crime, threats from immigrant and radical Islamic terrorists, and depleted military condition. These two issues definitely attract his audiences because nobody wants to die in hunger and to feel insecure. To make matter worse, he puts all the blame on his rival, Hillary Clinton, as many of his thematic selection puts her name or pronoun referring to her (more elaboration on the discussion of the speaker's message). And unfortunately, those issues and the statements are always repeated by the speaker whenever he speaks in the rally. It will be presented in the following subsection that repetition, as one of his communication strategies, may impact on one's belief slowly but sure although one does not believe at the very first time.

3.2. The Speaker's Interpersonal Style

After construing the speaker's experience in articulating his emotions, the next question to answer is how he communicates them to his audience. To reveal that, Mood, Modality, and Appraisal Technique are investigated throughout the collected data. Mood analysis shows his language preference either indicative or imperative and their functional use in the speech. Modality evaluates his attitude towards them. And Appraisal technique will expose his style in using them.

3.2.1. The Speaker's Mood

Mood as system network of interpersonal style may not just explain the speaker's statement but also reveal its purpose in the text. Ye (2010) has found that Obama uses declarative sentences to change his audiences' attitude and to arouse their passion. On the other hand, Nelson Mandela uses imperative sentences not just to command his audiences but to elicit hope and to arouse them to dream (Nur, 2015). Thus, this study does the same thing by investigating the Mood utilized by Donald Trump in expressing his emotion.

The Mood analysis indicates that the speaker frequently utters declarative sentences followed by imperative and interrogative sentences. This finding is in line with many investigations of Mood analysis of political figures in his speech (Feng & Liu, 2010; Nur, 2015; Ye, 2010). Most of them says that the frequent use of declarative is meant to give information from speaker to audience. Although the speaker, Donald Trump in this context, has something in common with aforementioned figures in terms of the use of declarative sentences as info-giver, he has a broader variation in its purpose as follows.

- First, it serves as explanation and description of what is happening to world.
- Second, it aims to encourage his audience to hope.
- At last, his objective is to convince his audience to agree with his opinion by confirming what he speaks is true.

The first function of declarative sentences in Trump's speeches is to explain and to describe state of affairs in the material world. The sentence (10) is uttered to explain how his opponent does not fit to be elected anymore because she has failed in her duty. As a result of her failure, he explains that the community affected by her failure is law-abiding African-Americans.

(10). *Hillary Clinton has failed in every single country where she has ever gotten involved, and at a very high price for the world. (excerpt no. 93)*

The second function is to encourage his audience to hope. The speaker's most popular slogan in his campaign is Make America Great Again abbreviated as MAGA. This study finds that he gets used to uttering it in the closing speech of his campaign. However, he expresses it not in the form of imperative like in the slogan but in declarative one as in (11). It aims to arouse the audiences' courage to dream, the dream to be Great Nation again. In saying so, he uses pronoun *we* instead of *I* with the message that to make America great again cannot be achieved by him alone as the presidential candidate. Nur (2015) argues that pronoun *we* can be used to create more intimate relation between the addresser and the addressee. The pronoun also reveals the warm emotion evoked by the speaker because it also means he has the same feeling with them.

(11). *Friends and fellow citizens, We Will Make America Great Again. (excerpt no. 146)*

The last function of declarative sentence is to convince his audience. Trump's speech like any other political speeches is designed to influence the audience's perception to agree with him. One of his style in convincing them is by employing conditional sentence as logico-semantic relation as in (12). What is referred by the results here are none other than poverty, joblessness, or unemployment. *The same people* refers to his opponent, Hillary Clinton, because she is the secretary of the State in the incumbent regime. It means that the available options for the people are two; first, voting his opponent and statuesque of suffering will continue, or second, voting him and they get a better future. It sounds more convincing.

(12). *If you keep voting for the same people you will keep getting the same, exactly the same, results. (excerpt no. 25)*

3.2.2. The Speaker's Use of Modality

Exposing the Mood preferences is just the beginning of investigation on how the speaker communicates with his audiences. The next step to be carried out is to examine the modality in emotional languages because it evaluates his attitude in utilizing them. It deals with the intermediate degree of proposition between two opposing system of polarity, positive yes and negative no. This intermediate degree is an available medium at which the speaker expresses his attitude towards the proposition he is going to utter. The data shows there are 51 (32%) out of 158 emotional languages containing modality. It means that the dominant 68% are expressed using positive or negative polarity system with no modality. It is argued that the speaker has a firm position either yes or no towards his proposition he delivers to his audiences.

Among the 51 modality expressions, it is found that the speaker prefers modulation than modalization. Modulation talks about obligation or inclination meanwhile modalization is about probability or usuality (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004, p. 620). The most used modal items found in the excerpts are *will*-modulation, *will*-modalization, and *can*. The use of *will* is very dominant since it is campaign speeches which enables the speaker saying something he is going to achieve in the future when he is elected. It is also typical like any other speeches delivered by political figures such as Obama and Nelson Mandela (Nur, 2015; Ye, 2010). However, the different use of *will* carry its own value so that they should be treated accordingly.

Will in modalization type carry the median value of probability. It means that the action may probably happen in the future. The sentence (13) indicates that if Hillary wins the election, she will approve Trans Pacific Partnership. The partnership will bring bad impact in automobile business in the country which makes it get out of it. When the business is moving away, the job will of course go away. However, the speaker cannot be certain that the

partnership will bring bad result, in his calculation it will, that is why the modality probability is selected. Referring to other studies, Nur (2015) and Ye (2010) argue this function as the predictor of the future.

Both studies explain there is another function of *will* besides predicting the future. It also functions as strong wish of determination. In Halliday and Matthiessen's SFL, it belongs to modulation type of *will*. In (14), *will* carry the median value of obligation. The speaker's popular slogan Make America Great Again (MAGA), which is basically imperative in nature, is modulated as indicative when he delivers it in the speech. This is why *will* in the sentence serves as his determination or obligation in the future to make America great and safe again. It is very different with *will* in (13).

> (13). *Just imagine how many more automobile jobs will be lost if Hillary gets her wish and approves TPP. (excerpt no. 53)*
> (14). *We Will Make America Safe Again. (excerpt no. 145)*

3.2.3. The Speaker's Appraisal Technique

The last investigation to reveal the speaker's interpersonal style is by examining his appraisal technique. It is a technique which is part of language evaluation that has been developed by Martin and White still with SFL as the basis. Even though previous modality analysis does so, it has not fully described his interpersonal style in terms of uniqueness of language use. It aims to expose his style in expressing his emotions.

The speaker utilizes appraisal technique in 93 out of 158 sentences. The 93 sentences consist of 70 sentences of graduation, 21 sentences of attitude, and 2 sentences of engagement. The last technique can be found from the sentences (13) when discussing about the function of imperative sentences. It is the proof that he uses it to engage with his audience, in this case, to feel their fear. The discussion should focus on the dominant one, graduation.

The 70 sentences using graduation technique employs both force (50 sentences) and focus (20 sentences). This study figures out that the type of force which dominantly appears is intensification rather than quantification (see Martin and White (2005, p. 140) to understand the differences). And the modes of intensification which is frequently utilized is repetition. Although there have been studies stressing the use of repetition in Trump's language such as Sclafani (2018) who proves that he frequently repeats the phrases "believe me" and Flores-Ferrán (2017) who claims he utters multiple repetition of first singular pronoun, the finding shows to what extent he uses it.

First, it is realized in the lexical item, for example the repeatedly use of the word *disaster* as in (5) above. It is meant to emphasize how bad the economy is in Michigan. The word disaster alone embeds his fear moreover when it is repeated, it influences the resonance of fear towards his audiences.

Secondly, there can be found related terms above the clause meaning that the same message is repeated in more than one clause or sentence as in (15), (16), (17), and (18). Those clauses may be shortened as *We Will Make America Wealthy, Strong, Safe, and Great Again*. The words wealthy, strong, safe, and great are closely related items indicating good condition. To sound more convincing and to amplify the messages, he articulates them not under a clause but different clauses repeatedly.

> (15). *We Will Make America Wealthy Again. (excerpt no. 150)*
> (16). *We Will Make America Strong Again. (excerpt no. 151)*
> (17). *We Will Make America Safe Again. (excerpt no. 152)*
> (18). *And We Will Make America Great Again. (excerpt no. 153)*

To conclude his communication strategies in delivering his emotional expressions, the speaker expresses his emotion in the form of declarative sentences. The most dominant modality is median value of obligation with *will* as modal item. And the dominant appraisal technique is repetition. However, those three components, Mood, Modality, and Appraisal Technique, do not stand in one line at a time. Declarative sentences is often implemented to express his fear emotion. But the fear emotion does not go in line with the dominant use of *will* as median value of obligation. It is usually accompanied by negative use of *can* as low value of ability. On the other hand, the dominant use of *will* is in line with the expression of warm emotion. It turns out that the repetition is in line with all emotional expressions. It can be inferred that, in one speech, he delivers his fear to his audiences using declarative sentences articulated with repetition. Then, he follows it with the strong determination of hope and warmth to overcome it. It is strongly resonanced, again, by the repetition technique.

The speaker seems quite confident with all information he brings in the speech. It is supported by the fact that the use of modality in the emotions is minimum. In other words, he seldom uses intermediate degree to carry his proposition or proposal instead his utterances are mostly positive declarative. However, his abundant use of *will* represents both obligation and probability.

What is interesting to find from his communication strategies is his language style in intensifying the message in which he uses repetition technique. It varies from lexical item to clausal level. The various lexicons such as *disaster*, *lost*, and *poverty* are found several times. At clausal level, the sentence like *We will make America Great Again* is repeated with slight modification of related item such as *We will make America Safe Again* or *We will make America Strong Again*. It does mark his language style.

SFL theorists argue that repetition is meant to create cohesiveness in the text (Bloor & Bloor, 2004; Butt et al., 2000; Eggins, 2004; Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004). Fundell (2008) in her thesis on ideational function and lexical repetition found it functioning as rhetorical device in political speech. However, this study suggests more than those. It confirms Johnstone's theory in which she explains that it is a persuasive device (Johnstone, 1996, p. 175). It is normal for politicians to influence their audiences in speech because they want their vote. They are going to try any communication strategies to look as attractive as they want to be.

Johnstone's theory on repetition is firstly confirmed by Sclafani in her book Talking Donald Trump published in 2018 at which she examines his language in the process of candidacy including debates, interviews, and speeches. She found two discourse markers which he uses them very often; *by the way* and *believe me*. The former is uttered mostly during interview or debate to steer the topic shifting in his interest. The later functions as involvement strategy to encourage the audience participation in monologic situation as well as self-branding(Sclafani, 2018, pp. 32-39).Although those discourse markers are not found repeatedly in the exploitation of emotional language, this study firmly supports her argumentation that repetition is a means of persuasive strategy.

The persuasiveness is achieved through the message intensification which in appraisal theory classified as mode of intensification in force graduation technique. The repetition of the adjective *same* in the sentence *If you keep voting for the same people you will keep getting the same, exactly the same, results* intensifies the modified noun *results*. This example shows how the speaker amplifies his message that his audiences must vote him if they do not want the same results. The same results here represents bad results of economic condition and security which are associated with fear. Sclafani (2018, p. 3) quoting linguist George Lakoff states that this kind of repetition can strengthen hearer's neural circuitry and beliefs. This

explains why a hearer sometimes does not believe a message at the first time, but slowly change his or her mind later when it is repeated again and again.

The study has drawn conclusion that repetition is not only effective in intensifying fear emotion but also warm emotion. It is proven by the repeated utterance of his slogan Make America Great Again (MAGA) which is modulated in declarative sentence in all his speeches. It serves as involvement strategy which effectively arouses his audience to hope in him.

3.2.4. The Speaker's Messages of Emotion

The last challenge in the study is to expose the speaker's message in his emotional languages. It can be done through investigation on their thematic structure. Using theme-rheme analysis provided by Halliday and Matthiessen's SFL, his messages are clearly unveiled. The analysis covers the theme selection and range. The former differentiates simple and multiple theme under the clause. The later shows the markedness under the topical theme. Markedness means different role of subject as theme either psychological, grammatical, or logical (see Fontaine, 2013, p. 141; Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004, p. 56 for more elaboration).

The data shows that the dominant thematic selection is simple theme represented by topical theme which reaches up to 82% of all expressions. The rest 18% belongs to multiple theme which consists of configurations such as textual and topical theme (13%), interpersonal and topical theme (4%), and textual, interpersonal, and topical (1%). The combination of textual and topical theme can be seen from the use of conjunction *and* as in (9), and of conditional *if* as in (12). The example of interpersonal and topical theme combination is shown in interrogative sentence where wh-element serves as theme as in (4).

On the other hand, the thematic range is dominated by the unmarked topical themes rather than the marked one. It, in fact, takes high portion of all themes. It is figured out that the dominant themes under this type are first plural pronoun *we* and the common noun *Hillary Clinton*. The theme *we* is mostly used to convey warm emotion rather than fear. The aforementioned sentences like (15), (16), (17), (18), represents the warmth whereas sentences. As a theme, it creates intimate relation between the addresser and the addressee as if he speaks on their behalf.

After the use of first plural noun, the noun *Hillary Clinton* marks the next dominant unmarked topical theme. Its use is always attached to fear emotion as presented in (6) and (10). In some other clauses, the speaker utters the pronoun *her* in the sentence (1). As a theme, it implies that Hillary Clinton who is none other than his rival is the actor who causes fear for she is part of the governing regime.

The analysis has done its job by exposing his most dominant theme in the emotions. They are pronoun *we* and common noun *Hillary Clinton* which serves as unmarked topical theme. When these themes are associated with the type of emotional languages, *we* mostly goes with warm emotion but *Hillary Clinton* certainly goes with fear emotion. They somehow represent solution and problem. *Hillary Clinton* is the problem and *we* is the solution.

This problem-solution distinction is quite similar with the *us-them* distinction found by McClay (2017) in his dissertation. He argues that Trump applies us and them distinction to raise the fear of his audiences. *Them* here represents *the establishment* and *the foreigners* who grows stronger and wealthier compared to *us* who suffers. By the distinction, he describes how Trump classifies his allies and his enemy. This classification surely emphasizes the far distance between the groups.

4. CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

Although the present study has fulfilled its job in describing the production process of emotional languages from what are in the mind of the speaker until how they are received by his audiences, the finding will still represent one case, Donald Trump's language. It cannot guarantee that the patterns of emotional languages are limited to only what are found in this study. Another limitation is on the types of emotion whose focuses are only in fear, warmth, and humor. There should be a further research on emotional languages in broader case and emotion types to be able to claim as the genre of emotional languages in political speech. However, the ideational pattern found here can be a foundation to understand the growth of fear language spreading out fast together with the spread of post-truth strategy used by politicians around the world. The study finally suggests the use of repetition technique in amplifying the messages of positive emotion for its impact is effective in the hearer's or viewer's neural circuitry.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bloor, T., & Bloor, M. (2004). *The Functional Analysis of English: A Hallidayan Approach* (Second Edition ed.). London: Arnold Publication.

Butt, D., Fahey, R., Feez, S., Spinks, S., & Yallop, C. (2000). *Using Functional Grammar: An Explorer's Guide*. Sydney: National Centre for English Language Teaching and Research Macquarie University.

Cherkaoui, M. (2016). Donald Trump: The Rise of Right-wing Politics in America: Al Jazeera Centre for Studies.

Eggins, S. (2004). *An Introduction to Systemic Functional Linguistics* (2nd ed.). London: Continuum International Publishing Group.

Feng, H., & Liu, Y. (2010). An Analysis of Interpersonal Meaning in Public Speeches - A Case Study of Obama's Speech. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research, 1*(6), 825-829.

Flores-Ferrán, N. (2017). "I'm very Good at and maybe that's Why I'm Center Stage…": Pronominal Deixis and Trump. *English Linguistics Research, 6*(1), 74.

Fontaine, L. (2013). *Analysing English Grammar: A Systemic Functional Introduction*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Fundell, T. (2008). *Ideational Function and Lexical Repetition in Three American Presidential Speeches*. Högskölan Skovde, Sweden.

Gross, M. (2017). The dangers of a post-truth world: Elsevier.

Halliday, M. A. K., & Matthiessen, C. (2004). *An Introduction to Functional Grammar* (Third Edition ed.). New York: Oxford University Press Inc.

Johnstone, B. (1996). *The Linguistic Individual: Self-Expression in Language and Linguistics*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Koussouhon, L. A., & Dossoumou, A. M. (2015). Analyzing Interpersonal Metafunction through Mood and Modality in Kaine Agary's Yellow-Yellow from Critical Discourse and Womanist Perspective. *International Journal of English Linguistics, 5*(6), 20.

Leth, A. N., Grønnebæk, L. L., Egholm, M., Jordahn, S., & Dyrbye, Z. R. (2016). Making

America Great Again? *HIB-Communication*(Spring 2016).

Levinger, M. (2017). Love, Fear, Anger: The Emotional Arc of Populist Rhetoric. *Narrative and Conflict: Explorations of Theory and Practice, 6*(1), 1-21.

Lewandowsky, S., Ecker, U. K., & Cook, J. (2017). Beyond misinformation: Understanding and coping with the "post-truth" era. *Journal of Applied Research in Memory and Cognition, 6*(4), 353-369.

Liu, C. (2016). *Reviewing the Rhetoric of Donald Trump's Twitter of the 2016 Presidential Election.* Jonkoping University, Sweden.

Martin, J. R., & White, P. R. R. (2005). *The Language of Evaluation: Appraisal in English*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Matthiessen, C. M., & Halliday, M. A. K. (2009). Systemic functional grammar: a first step into the theory: Higher Education Press Beijing.

McClay, R. (2017). *Us and Them: A Descriptive Analysis of Donald Trump's Campaign Speeches.* Master, University of Birmingham, Birmingham.

McComiskey, B. (2017). *Post-Truth Rhetoric and Composition*. Colorado: Utah State University Press.

Mohammadi, M. (2017). A Critical Discourse Analysis of Donald Trump's Language Use in US Presidential Campaign, 2016. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics & English Literature, 6*(5).

Morreall, J. (1983). Humor and Emotion. *American Philosophical Quarterly, 20*(3), 297-304.

Nur, S. (2015). An Analysis of Interpersonal Metafunction in Public Speeches: A Case Study of Nelson Mandela's Presidential Inauguration Speech. *The International Journal of Social Sciences, 30*(1), 52-63.

Rahman, A., & Yunianti, S. (2017). Critical Discourse Analysis in Donald Trump Presidential Campaign to Win American's Heart. *TELL Journal, 5*(2), 8-17.

Rohmah, S. N. (2018). *Critical Discourse Analysis of Donald Trump's Speeches.* Bachelor, Sunan Ampel State Islamic University, Surabaya.

Rose, J. (2017). Brexit, trump, and post-truth politics: Taylor & Francis.

Schrock, D., Dowd-Arrow, B., Erichsen, K., Gentile, H., & Dignam, P. (2017). The emotional politics of making America great again: Trump's working class appeals. *Journal of Working-Class Studies, 2*(1), 5-22.

Sclafani, J. (2018). *Talking Donald Trump A Sociolinguistic Study of Style, Metadiscourse, and Pollitical Identity*. New York: Routledge.

Speed, E., & Mannion, R. (2017). The rise of post-truth populism in pluralist liberal democracies: challenges for health policy. *International journal of health policy and management, 6*(5), 249.

Ströbel, L. (Ed.). (2015). *Linguistics Realization of the Concept of Fear*. Düsseldorf: dup.

Widyawardani, Y. I. (2016). *Rhetorical Analysis of Donald Trump's Presidential Candidacy Announcement Speech.* Undergraduate Program, Sanata Dharma University, Yogyakarta.

Wierzbicka, A. (1990). The Semantics of Emotions: Fear and its relatives in English. *Australian Journal of Linguistics, 10*(2), 359-375.

Wierzbicka, A. (1992). Defining Emotion Concepts. *Cognitive Science, 16*, 539-581.

Wierzbicka, A. (1999). *Emotions Across Languages and Cultures: Diversity and Universals.* Paris: Cambridge University Press.

Ye, R. (2010). The Interpersonal Metafunction Analysis of Barrack Obama's Victory Speech. *English Language Teaching, 3*(2), 146-151.