



Pragmatic Annotation of Manipulation in Political Discourse: The Case of Trump-Clinton Presidential Debate

Correspondence:

Dr. Meisam Moghad
<moghaddam.m@fasau.ac.ir>

PhD in TEFL, Faculty of Science, Fasa University, Fasa, Iran.

Niloofar Jafarpour
<niloofar.jafarpour@stud.tu-darmstadt.de>

MA, Technical University of Darmstadt, Germany.

Publication details:

Received: September, 15, 2022**Accepted:** December, 20, 2022**Published:** December, 30, 2022

Abstract

Within a pragmatic analysis framework, this research investigates manipulation in the political discourse of the 2016 American Presidential Debate by pragmatically annotating and visualising the text in the CATMA tool. The manipulation types that are used to decide about the tag set and its guidelines are in light of Baron's (2003) and Asya's (2013) categorization of manipulation. The chosen manipulative language tool in the selected manipulative context to be observed are the direct and indirect manipulative speech acts of Ivanova (1981) and Brusenskaya (2005), which are based on Austin's typology of speech act theory. This study concerns itself, first, with the notion of manipulation, manipulative speech acts, and selected manipulation types, and then manifests the practical annotation of manipulation to analyse the top-layer hypothesis, that political debates are manipulative and there are certain manipulative criteria to be observed, and finally, the selected manipulative features are supposed to play an obvious role at the pragmatic level in these debates. This research confirms, manifests, and analyses the existence of manipulative evidence in the selected presidential debates.

Keywords: manipulation, political discourse, speech acts, pragmatic annotation

1. Introduction

"It is quite acceptable to say, "I persuade you to..." but it is very odd to say, "I manipulate you to..." (Blass, 2006). Blass's work in linguistics and pragmatics is acknowledged worldwide and is at most based on McCornack's (1992) "Information Manipulation Theory." This theory was inspiring for many scholars to explain the notion of manipulation within a linguistic framework.

Manipulation is a goal-oriented way of social influencing. According to Webster's Dictionary (1998), to manipulate is to control or play upon something by artful, unfair, or insidious means, especially to one's advantage. In this study, manipulation is observed from a pragmatic perspective. In a pragmatic analysis of manipulation, the main concern is the use of language. According to Blass (2002), this process can be identified through concepts like goals and intentions, but in a broader dimension of pragmatic analysis, the high presence of some features like fallacious arguments, certain pragmatic deixis, some impoliteness strategies, some semantically loaded expressions, some connotative words, breaching conversational maxims, maneuvers, irrelevant information, and direct and indirect speech acts are all the language tools to create the manipulative context and support the speaker to achieve the manipulative goal.

However, as Asya (2013) pointed out, manipulation is more than just using metaphors, a specific syntactic structure, or a specific semantic feature; it is also about making these features play a specific role at the pragmatic level.

Among the aforementioned manipulation language tools mentioned by Blass (2002), the direct and indirect manipulative speech acts of Ivanova (1981) and Brusenskaya (2005), which are based on Austin's typology of speech act theory, are observed on the layer of annotated manipulation types in Baron's (2003) and Asya's (2013) categorization of manipulation. These categorizations of manipulation are the basis of the proposed tag set and the guidelines for the annotation in this study.

1.1 Manipulation and Speech Acts

By manipulating, one cleverly expresses an utterance to get what he wants, sometimes by not telling the truth. The victims do not even recognise or realise that they are being manipulated because the manipulative discourse does not use direct conviction but rather camouflages its real intention. (Arvay, 2004) The speaker tries to indirectly interfere with the decision-making of the target while manipulating. The vagueness of the process of manipulation enables its appearance, often in a variety of strategies and forms (Handelmann, 2009).

In this study, we consider the speech as a tool in a manipulative utterance. The theory of speech manipulation defines the manipulator as a person who sends a message by using certain manipulative speech acts in such a way that the message is not the final aim of the interaction (Zheltuhina, 2004). The manipulator aims to engineer the behaviour through the weak points and affect them. To achieve his aim, the manipulator either uses a direct subject-object interaction or an indirect way. The direct manipulation may be asserted in an open, direct claim or demand. On the other hand, indirect manipulation is directed towards his environment (Leontyev, 1981).

The speech act theory, which is speaker-centered (Austin, 1962; Searle, 1969), is one of the major focuses in any kind of pragmatic annotation. The goal is to identify and mark up the speech acts, which may indicate the manipulative intentions and interaction strategies of a person taking part in a conversation. According to Searle (1969), the speech acts consist of five general classifications to classify the functions or illocutionary of speech acts. These are declarations, representatives, expressive, directives, and commissive.



1.2 Objectives of the study

The impetus for the present study comes from the astonishing presence of Donald Trump in the 2016 presidential campaign, with a unique speech rhetoric that was not similar to other politicians' literature. Adding to this particularity were the stunning results of the election as the last ballots were counted, as mentioned by McClay (2017). This perception was due to the fact that Donald Trump had not possessed any significant political role till then. In an article published in "The Guardian," Lakoff and Duran (2018) believed that Trump, with an instinctive ability to manipulate, weaponized the words by framing them first, repeating them often, and leading others to repeat them by getting people to attack him within his own frame.

Moreover, Oliver and Rahn (2016) considered Trump's presidential linguistic style as highly distinctive because of its simplicity, anti-elitism, and collectivism. As McClay (2017) believed, Trump's language throughout the campaign had changed the norms of acceptable political discourse. According to Quionez (2018), Trump made use of "brazen, inflammatory, and hyperbolic language" while representing his ideas throughout the presidential debates, specifically when he denoted his opinions about immigrants (p. 4).

Considering the points mentioned above, the goal of the present study is to investigate manipulation in the political discourse of the 2016 American Presidential Debate by pragmatically annotating and visualising the debate between Trump and Clinton in the CATMA tool. The reason for this selection is that it is hypothesised here that the selected manipulative features play an obvious role at the pragmatic level in these debates. Finally, it is interesting to observe which of these two candidates talked more manipulatively. Based on the mentioned objective, the following research questions are posed:

1.3 Research Questions

1. How are the manipulative speech acts (if any) represented in the Trump and Clinton Presidential Debates in 2016?
2. How do the nominees' speeches differ in terms of the frequency and types of manipulative speech acts?

2. Literature Review

Realizing the importance of Donald Trump's linguistic presidential style, a bulk of studies have been done focusing on the debate strategies, discursive models and the linguistic features of Trump-Clinton presidential debate.

Vaz de Oliveira (2020) analyzed the Appraisal's social evaluation as an ideological and persuasive device in Clinton-Trump nomination speeches in 2016. It was concluded that they employed different strategies to persuade electors by "constructing negative (Trump) and positive (Clinton) ideological discursive approaches by applying social evaluation as a pivotal rhetorical strategy in those speeches" (p. 210).

Nguyen and Sawalmeh (2020) focused on Trump's linguistic style, specifically the presidential debate's strategies in 2016. Based on the debate's strategies mentioned by Fairclough (1993), Halliday (1971), and Goffman (1967), Nguyen and Sawalmeh (2020) revealed that Trump combined four strategies of presidential debates, including (1) self-acclamation, (2) describing opposing candidates through the verbal attack, (3) self-rectification or image enhancement through the defence against opposing candidates' blaming arguments, and (4) extra-vocalization (p. 68).

Beeman (2018) employed an empirical and pragmatic study using qualitative data compiled from speeches given during the campaign to illustrate the overarching ideological themes of populism, a business-like approach to politics, and an anti-establishment attitude. The bulk of the speeches selected for this investigation comprised all the speeches presented by President Trump, from the time he announced his campaign on June 16, 2015, until his Inaugural Address on January 20, 2017.

Demeter (2017) made a control-character analysis of the 2016 US presidential debate, showing the strongest parts and the weakest parts of the speeches between Donald Trump and Hillary Clinton. It was concluded that people want to be controlled in an easy but still total way. "To make people think that there is a man who is able to do this was Donald Trump's greatest asset" (p. 40). He could present up to 37% more assertions than Hillary by emphasising the boundaries between "us" and "them," therefore depicting more integrative complexity and objective control.

Palacios (2018) analyzed the political discourse through the examination of seven representative linguistic features including, personal pronouns, three-part list, contrastive pairs, fillers, conceptual metaphors, equivocation, interruptions, employed by the two candidates in the 2016 United States presidential debates. It was found that conceptual metaphors and fillers, are used by Trump and Clinton with almost the same frequency in their political exchanges; however, they employed the rest of linguistic features quite distinctively to persuade the majority of voters. Trump employed more personal pronouns with the aim of directly attacking his rival and promoting his position. While, Clinton preferred using personal pronouns in order to defend her viewpoint by avoid taking the whole responsibility or sharing it with a group such as the government or the citizens. Clinton shows a more polite style and stresses the importance of improving the life of American citizens which reflect to the audience that she is a refined and empathetic person.

With respect to manipulative discourse, Greenhill (2018) believed that Donald Trump had shown himself to be a master practitioner of psychological manipulation, especially when it comes to the subject of immigration and refugee policy. Trump has systematically used distraction and the repetition of misleading information to manipulate the addressees on the notion of immigration.

Díaz-Valdés (2017) investigated the general linguistic patterns of macro-level discursive manipulation in two samples of political discourse belonging to different periods of time and cultural backgrounds, comparing Hitler and Trump's speeches based on Van Dijk's approach to critical discourse analysis. To this end, the samples were analysed in terms of discursive notions such as polarization, modality, and metaphors. It was concluded that both Hitler and Trump used the same devices to create polarization, making clear the distinction between "us" and "them" by utilising nice allusions when referring to the former and negative ones for the latter. Moreover, in both political speeches, the different degrees of modality employed and the preferred use of the epistemic modal "will" to reflect strong promises and certainty and the deontic modal "must" to get the audience involved in the speaker's decisions consolidate the group's ideas through the sharing of one common vision (epistemic modality) and one common need (deontic modality).

Then, considering the usage of conceptual metaphors, it was revealed that in both speeches the negative portrait of the out-group and the positive portrait of the in-group were depicted. Other rhetorical devices, such as repetition and hyperbole, have also been discovered in both texts, adding to their overall persuasive power.

With respect to the application of software and coding in doing discourse or pragmatic research, Zhang, Afzaal, and Liu (2020) examined Donald Trump's electoral tweets through the lens of critical discourse analysis. The required data was collected using Python web-crawling to identify the possible pattern. Based on the results of the study, they revealed that Trump's strategy of "manipulation" remains classical populism, through which Trump attempted to promote "himself as an extraordinary and right leader, attack rivals as part of the political establishment, propose overly simplified solutions to problems, and promote alternative truth to enhance his creditability as well as political influence" (p. 1273).

Based upon the theories and methods of critical discourse analysis and corpus linguistics, Quiñonez (2018) analysed a selection of transcriptions of 100 speeches, addresses, and remarks delivered by Donald Trump both before and after the 2016 U.S. Presidential Elections, as well as ten news stories on the topic of immigration gleaned from FoxNews.com, Breitbart.com, and Bill O'Reilly.com. To quantify and model the discursive pattern, Concordancing software was implemented. Quiñonez concluded that the use of “demagogic and dehumanising language along with more subtle discursive strategies, such as positive representation of ‘us’, negative representation of ‘them,’ and metaphorical constructions” were among the characteristics of Trump’s speech (p. 3).

As it was mentioned, the rhetorical, pragmatic, and discursive features of speeches presented by Donald Trump were extraordinarily unique in the realm of political discourse and the source of “outrage, controversy, and enthusiasm” all over America and throughout the world (p. 1). Based on this point, analysing his speech is worthy of scrutiny and informative in political discourse research. However, most of the studies, as mentioned, focused on the speech strategies through the lens of critical discourse analysis, while there is a dearth of research focusing on the manipulative speech acts implicit in the presidential debate. Moreover, the present study implemented CATMA annotation tools to systematically detect the traces of manipulation, which adds to the novelty of the present study.

3. Methodology

3.1 Description of the corpus

The corpus of the present study consists of the first presidential debate of the United States presidential election of 2016, represented by the candidates of the two major political parties, Donald Trump, the Republican, and Hillary Clinton, the Democratic. The debate was held on September 26th, 2016 at New York’s Hofstra University. The interviewer was Lester Halt of the National Broadcasting Company (NBC). The debate lasted 95 minutes, with Trump speaking for 45 minutes and 3 seconds and Clinton speaking for 41 minutes and 50 seconds (Hellman, 2016). The main topics discussed by the candidates include controversial issues such as improvement of the economy, race, ISIS, cyber-attacks, nuclear weapons, and politicians’ opinions about the possible outcome of the elections. The interviewer asked the questions and posed the issues, and the audience was not allowed to applaud or talk.

The second presidential debate took place on October, 9th, 2016 at Washington University in St. Louis. The debate lasted for 90 minutes in which Trump represented his ideas for 40 minutes and 10 seconds and Clinton spoke 39 minutes and 5 seconds. In contrast to the other two debates, the questions were not only posed by the interviewers but also by the audience and people through social networks. Therefore, many points and issues were addressed such as islamophobia, refugees, the economy, the war in Syria, mistakes committed by Trump and Clinton in the past, and reasons for their aspiration to be the next president of the US.

The third presidential debate was held on October 19th, 2016 at the University of Nevada, in Las Vegas. The duration of the debate was around 93 minutes, of which Trump spoke for 35 minutes and 41 seconds and Clinton spoke for 41 minutes and 46 seconds (Hellman, 2016). In this debate, the main topics that were discussed were abortion, immigration, the economy, cyberattack, the war in Syria, and the reason to be elected president in the elections.

This text was considered the main instrument of the study because, as denoted in the literature, it is worthy in terms of its communicative strength and the linguistic devices it employs to persuade its addressees.

3.2 Data Analysis

The manipulative context of the selected corpus is manually distinguished and annotated in the practical part of this research by applying the two classifications of manipulation types of Baron's (2003) and Asya's categorization of manipulation (2013). Based on these two categorizations, a unit tag set and guideline are formed.

Afterwards, the manipulative speech acts are recognized in a separate layer as a tool in the manipulative utterances. The direct and indirect speech acts that are taken into consideration are the direct and indirect manipulative speech acts of Ivanova (1981) and Brusenskaya (2005). After the manual detection of manipulative speech acts, which is done based on close reading design, a supplementary quantitative procedure is followed. In the second stage, the computerised annotation of the selected corpus was done using the CATMA tools, and the visualisation and tabulation of the frequencies of each element are illustrated.

In the following section, the comprehensive descriptions of the types of manipulative speech acts are explained according to Ivanova’s classification of manipulative direct speech acts (1981), along with the related examples from the corpus, to gain a more vivid view on each element of manipulative speech.

3.3 Manipulative Direct Speech Acts

According to Leontyev (1981), the direct method of manipulation includes the following formats, which have a definite meaning in the language system and directly express corresponding illocution:

- Manipulators express their words by using lexical verbs in the imperative form; for instance, the imperative speech act, which is directly expressed in a sense of order (e.g., Just think... just imagine...).

Example:

TRUMP: “And look at her website. You know what? It's no difference than this. She's telling us how to fight ISIS. Just go to her website.” (Trump in first presidential debate, September 16, 2016. POLITICO Online magazine)

CLINTON: “That's a -- that's -- go to the -- please, fact checkers, get to work.” (Clinton in first presidential debate, September 16, 2016. POLITICO Online magazine)

- Manipulators express their words by using the verb "get" in the imperative form. For instance, they talk about an obligatory action that should be taken by every individual (e.g., There has got to be...).

Example:

Clinton: “So you've got to ask yourself, why won't he release his tax returns?” Clinton in the first presidential debate, September 16, 2016. POLITICO Online magazine)

- Manipulators express their words by using the verb "to be" in the imperative form (e.g. we should all be).

Example:

TRUMP: “They do not pay us what they should be paying us, because we are providing ...”, and “... you should be apologizing for are the 33,000 e-mails that you deleted service and we’re losing a fortune, that’s why we’re losing.” (Trump in first presidential debate, September 16, 2016. POLITICO Online magazine)

- Manipulators express their words with the verb "let" and a pronoun in the first-person plural, indicating the involvement of the speaker and the hearer in the same issue to assure their cooperative situation.

Example:

CLINTON: “Yeah, well, let's start the clock again, Lester. We've looked at your tax proposals.” (Clinton in first presidential debate, September 16, 2016. POLITICO Online magazine)

The summary of the manipulative speech act described earlier is tabulated in table 1.

Table 1: The summary of Manipulative Direct Speech Acts Classification by Ivanova, 1981

Element	Attribute
Direct Imperative	Imperative lexical verb
Direct Imperative	Imperative (get)
Direct Imperative	Imperative (to be)
Direct Involvement Inducement	verb (let) and a pronoun in the first-person plural

Source: *The Author*

3.4 The Indirect Manipulative Speech Acts

Inducement can be expressed through utterances that are non-imperative in form but express the meaning of inducement. The meaning of inducement can be associated with these forms in the language system (Akimova, 1992). The most relevant elements of indirect manipulative speech act categorization in this study are those offered by Brusenskaya et al. (2005):

- The indirect manipulative speech acts can be represented by verbs expressing a must, necessity, advise, order, command, and request; the latest is often marked by please and kindly. This categorization seems to apply to what Searle (1969) introduces as the "directive speech act," when the speaker intends to make the hearers perform some form of action:

Example:

TRUMP: “We need the wall. The border patrol, I.C.E., they all want the wall. We stop the drugs; we shore up the border.” (Trump in the third presidential debate, October 14, 2016. POLITICO Online magazine)

TRUMP: “But I will tell you the is all talk and it doesn't get done. All you have to do is take a look at her senate run, take a look at upstate New York.” (Trump in the second presidential debate, October 4, 2016. POLITICO Online magazine)

- Speech acts as an interrogation and is represented by modal verbs such as "can," "could," "will," and "would" to express request. The requests with “could” and “would” are more polite than the requests with “can” and "will."

Example:

TRUMP: “Thank you, Hillary. Could I just respond?” (Trump in the third presidential debate, October 14, 2016. POLITICO Online magazine)

Or as in the example:

CLINTON. “And I would be happy to compare what we do with the Trump Foundation which took money from other people and bought a six-foot portrait of Donald” (Trump in the third presidential debate, October 14, 2016. POLITICO Online magazine)

- Speech acts of interrogation include a rhetorical question which expresses prohibition, which attempts to stop something being done or used.

Example:

“These are people that kill women and treat women horribly and yet you take their money. So, I'd like to ask you right now why don't you give back the money that you've taken from certain countries that treat certain groups of people so horribly. Why don't you give back the money?” (Donald Trump, American Presidential Debate, 20/10/2016)

This interrogative utterance of Trump is a rhetorical question that functions as prohibition.

- Interrogation expressed by a special utterance with the word “why” has the meaning of advice used in order to induce the target to do the correct action. For example:

Example:

“That's why I want to have an intelligence surge that protects us here at home, why we have to go after them from the air, on the ground, online, why we have to make sure here at home we don't let terrorists buy weapons.” (Hillary Clinton, American Presidential Debate, 20/10/2016)

- Indirect questions which include the form, I + wonder. For example:

“I wonder when he thought America was great. And before he rushes in and says, "You know, before you and President Obama were there, I think it's important to recognise that he has been criticising our government for decades.”

- Declarative sentences with conditional clauses indicate positive and negative consequences of an action's completion. For example, in the utterances of Trump and Clinton in their presidential debate, talking about Social Security and Medicare.

"It's destroying our businesses—our small businesses and our big businesses." We have to repeal and replace Obamacare. You take a look at the kind of numbers that that will cost us in the year 2017. "It is a disaster if we don't repeal and replace."

or as Clinton uses the same structure: "If he repeals it, our Medicare problem gets worse."

TRUMP. "I believe, if my opponent should win this race, which I truly don't think will happen, we will have a second amendment which will be a very, very small replica of what it is right now."

The aforementioned manipulative speech acts are summarized in table 2.

Table 2. The summary of the indirect manipulative speech acts offered by Brusenskaya (2005)

Attribute	Definition
must, necessity, advise, order, command, request	make the hearers perform some action
can/could, will/would express request	Polite request
rhetorical question	stop something being done or used
Why	advice to do the correct action
I + wonder...	
Conditional clauses	conditional clauses + positive /negative consequences of action completion

Source: The Author

3.5 Manipulation Types

In this study, Baron's classification of manipulation and one criterion of Asya's classification (2013) are supposed to lead us into the right distinctness of manipulation types. First, a brief definition of each element is presented, and afterwards, for each type, some examples are offered from the text. Secondly, based on the findings of the annotation part, which is a close reading approach to the text, a complementary quantitative analysis is applied to support the distant reading approach in our study.

The quantitative operation includes investigating the concordance of each tag and comparing it to the total results through performing queries on the annotation data. Totally 748 tags are assigned according to the selected tag set of manipulation types. In the accompanying tables, the visualisation of concordance for each manipulation tag is presented.

The elements of Asya's classification (2013) include deceptive, emotional, rational, social, submissive, and volitional, each of which is explained and exemplified.

- Deceptive: including outright lying, false promises, fake assumption, misleading by encouraging false assumption, getting the target to view things differently, interpreting the situation in the light of a favorable mood to the manipulator purpose.

An example from Clinton:

TRUMP: "You called it the gold standard of trade deals. You said it's the finest deal you've ever seen."

CLINTON: "No."

This is an outright lie from Clinton. It turns out she really did call the NAFTA "the gold standard of trade deals."

Another example from Trump is "I don't know Putin."

This is an outright lie. According to his series of tweets with particular regard to Putin in 2014 (two years prior to this debate), he clearly knew who Putin was.

The results of the analysis of the quantitative annotation are reported in Table 3.

Table 3: The frequencies of deceptive speeches

Tag Path	Frequency	Percentage
Trump's speech	185	90.2
Clinton's speech	20	9.7
Total detection of the tag	205	100

Source: The Author

- Emotional: The emotional speech acts include the formation of a general emotional mood by denoting emotionally effective expressions such as fear, sympathy, and gratitude. An example of Clinton's writing that indicates a strong feeling of sadness and sympathy is provided below.

Example:

"... think of that picture we all saw of that 4-year-old boy with the blood on his forehead because he'd been bombed by the Russian and Syrian air forces."

An example of Trump in which he expresses disappointment.

"I am so disappointed in congressmen."

The quantitative frequencies of the emotional speech acts are represented in table 4.

Table 4: The frequencies of emotional speeches

Tag Path	Frequency	Percentage
Trump's speech	117	71.7
Clinton's speech	46	28.2
Total detection of the tag	163	100

Source: The Author

- Rational: It involves the reconstruction of the categorical structure of individual conscience, affording undisputed convincing facts and a logical argument.

An example of Clinton:

“That does not solve our internal challenges with ISIS and our need to stop radicalization to work with American Muslim communities who are on the front lines to identify and prevent attacks. In fact, the killer of the dozens of people at the nightclub in Orlando, the Pulse Night Club, was born in Queens, the same place Donald was born. So, let's be clear about what the threat is and how we are best going to be able to meet it.”

This statement by Clinton makes sense since she claims that not all killers are foreigners or refugees, supporting her claim by mentioning that the killer in an instance of American history happened to be an all-American citizen. Based on this claim, she states that radicalization needs to stop, and America cannot put all the blame on non-Americans or people of different religions or races.

An example of Trump:

“Right now, it's getting tougher and tougher to defeat them, because they're in more and more places, more and more states, more and more nations.”

This statement is about ISIS, and it makes sense that when ISIS has covered more ground, it does become harder to defeat them. Hence, this statement is logical. The frequencies of the rational speech acts are illustrated in the following table:

Table 5: The frequencies of rational speeches

Tag Path	Frequency	Percentage
Trump's speech	1	2.9
Clinton's speech	33	97.05
Total detection of the tag	34	100

Source: The Author

- Social: It includes non-informational speech acts in the form of greetings, oaths, and prayers.

An example of Clinton:

“How are you, Donald?” which is a simple form of greeting.

An example of Trump:

“Well, first of all, it's so great to be with you and thank you, everybody.”

This is said as a form of greeting at the start of the third segment. In the following table, the frequencies of the social speech acts of the two candidates are reported.

Table 6: The frequencies of social speeches

Tag Path	Frequency	Percentage
Trump's speech	4	44.4
Clinton's speech	5	55.5
Total detection of the tag	9	100

Source: The Author

- Submissive: The submissive element includes the pressure to acquiesce, camouflage, browbeating, threatening, wearing down the other's resistance, and making someone agree to something to avoid further discomfort or embarrassment.

An example of Clinton:

“And he said you are the most dangerous person to run for president in the modern history of America. I think he's right.”

In the above example, Clinton browbeats Trump by dramatically referring to him as ‘dangerous’.

An example of Trump:

“No, you're the one that's unfit. You know, Wikileaks just actually came out. John Podesta said some horrible things about you, and boy was he right. He said some beauties. And you know Bernie Sanders, he said you have bad judgment. You do. And if you think going into Mosul after we let the world know we're going in and all of the people we really wanted, the leaders are all gone, if you think that was good, then you do. Now John Podesta said you have terrible instincts. Bernie Sanders said you have bad judgment. I agree with both.”

As it can be seen in the above example, Trump browbeats Clinton by associating her with abusive statements, namely "unfit," "having bad judgment," and "having terrible instincts," and claims that he agrees with the people who call her those things. The statistics on frequencies are depicted below.

Table 7: The frequency of submissive speech act

Tag Path	Frequency	Percentage
Trump's speech	194	67.8
Clinton's speech	92	32.16
Total detection of the tag	286	100

Source: The Author

- Volitional: It involves the speech acts of following the will of the speaker in the form of order, request, refusal, or advice.

An example of Clinton:

“So, if you want to see in real-time what the facts are, please go and take a look.” This is a polite form of order to check out Clinton’s website: <http://hillaryclinton.com/>

An example of Trump:

“Let me just tell you.” This is in the form of a light order.

The results of quantitative annotation are reported in the following table.

Table 8: The frequency of volitional speech act

Tag Path	Frequency	Percentage
American presidential debate 2016 - Trump	25	49
American presidential debate 2016 - Clinton	26	50,9
Total detection of the tag	51	100

Source: The Author

4. Discussion

Based on the results of this investigation, we can assume that the presence of a different type of manipulation confirms our hypothesis that the 2016 American Presidential Debates are manipulative. Also, the fact that manipulative types show up in different ways shows that each politician may use different types of manipulation in different situations.

The results imported from CATMA Query Builder manifest that during the three presidential debates of 2016, Trump talked more manipulatively according to the manipulation types tag query results. Furthermore, Trump's general usage of manipulative types is 70%, while Clinton's debates include 30% of the assigned manipulative type.

The comparison of the concordance of each tag also reveals that while the manipulative language of Trump is more deceptive, emotional, and submissive, that of Clinton is more rational and rationalised. The social manipulative type was rarely observed (1%) from both politicians. Both politicians used the volitional manipulative type to the same degree.

Going back to the original idea, the chosen manipulative features should play a clear role in these debates from a practical point of view. Even though the politicians have a manipulative tone, there isn't strong evidence that the manipulative speech acts they use have a clear role to play at the pragmatic level in these debates. The manipulation-type tags are found 526 times in the text of the Trump debate. The occurrence of direct manipulative speech acts is only 48 times among the 526, which includes 9% of all. However, the occurrence of indirect manipulative speech acts occurs only 59 times among the 526, equal to 11% of all features.

Concerning the Clinton debates, it was seen that the manipulation-type tags were detected 222 times in the related corpus, but the occurrence of direct manipulative speech acts was only 17 times, equal to 7.6% of all detected tags. Moreover, the indirect manipulative speech acts occurred only 54 times, which is 24% of all the detected manipulation-type tags.

These results support the notion that these categorizations are not the only categories of speech acts, and they are neither perfect nor exclusive. They are not the only manipulative language tool to be investigated in a manipulative part of the text; as Malmkjaer (2010) mentioned, there are many marginal cases and many instances of overlap. The results of the present study seem significant since, as Weisser (2014) suggests, applying the automatized approaches to the manual processes of pragmatic studies is important because factors beyond the textual units play important roles in a pragmatic annotation.

5. Conclusions and Implications

Based on the results of the study, it can be concluded that the hypotheses proposed in this study were confirmed in the way that the selected manipulative features play an obvious role at the pragmatic level in these debates and that there are traces of manipulative speech throughout the presidential debates. Moreover, it was observed that Donald Trump's debates were more manipulative than the speeches presented by Hillary Clinton. However, the frequency and types of manipulative speech acts that occurred in the speeches of both candidates are distinctive and various. Regarding the selection of the CATMA tool, it should be noted that, in this study, the selected corpus of the presidential debate contains 48780 words and the annotation process took 20 hours for these three debates. In the current study, due to the user technical complexity of the INCEPTION tool in comparison with CATMA and the amount of required time, the CATMA tool is chosen to be applied in this project. However, for a complementary attempt on further study, annotating processes supported by machine learning algorithms and the INCEPTION tool is recommended which may improve the quality of the results. Moreover, the results are gleaned from the tag sets detected based on the mentioned manipulation classifications and frameworks; while, for a more intensive and multidimensional study of manipulative language, other tools and classifications are highly recommended.

Funding: This study was not funded in any shape or form by any party.

Conflict of Interest: The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

Bio notes:

Dr. Meisam Moghadam has earned his Ph.D. in TEFL from Shiraz University and is currently the assistant professor at Fasa University, Iran. His areas of interest include language teaching and testing, teacher education, and computational linguistics.

Niloofer Jafarpour is graduated from Technical University of Darmstadt, Germany. Her main area of interest is computational linguistics and political discourse analysis.

References

- Akimova, T. (1992). *Imperative Mood in the English Language, Typology of Imperative Constructions*. Saint Petersburg.
- Kamil, S. I., & Al-Hindawi, F. H. (2017). *The Pragmatics of Manipulation in British and American Political Debates*. Anchor Academic Publishing.
- American Presidential Debates, (2016). *The POLITICO Online magazine*. Retrieved from (<https://www.politico.com/section/magazine>)

- Arvay, A. (2004). Pragmatic aspects of persuasion and manipulation in written advertisements. *Acta Linguistica Hungarica*, 51(3), pp. 231-261.
- Asya, S. A. (2013). Linguistic manipulation: Definition and types. *International Journal of Cognitive Research in science, engineering and education*. 1(2), pp. 1-5.
- Austin, J. L. (1962). *How to do things with words*. University Press, Oxford.
- Baron, M. (2003). Manipulativeness. *Proceedings and Addresses of the American Philosophical Association*. 77(2), pp. 37-54.
- Blass, R. (2005). *Manipulation in the speeches and writings of Hitler and the NSDAP from a cognitive pragmatics viewpoint*. Bielefeld. Cornelia Sen.
- Beeman, Rachel, D. 2018. What are the three characteristics of Trumpism?: A Discourse Analysis of Trump's Four Major Campaign Speeches. *Political Analysis*, 19(2), pp. 4-16.
- Brusenskaya, L., Gavrilova, G., & Malycheva, N. (2005). *Dictionary of Linguistic Terms*. Rostov University Press. Rostov-on-Don.
- Demeter, M. (2017). Control, Communication, and the Voice of the Leader. A Control-Character Analysis of the 2016 US Presidential Debate. *An International Journal of Pure Communication Inquiry*, 5(1), pp. 40-64.
- Díaz-Valdés, D., & De La, C. (2017). *A study of political manipulation in discourse: Comparing Hitler and Trump's speeches*. Madrid: Universidad Complutense MA thesis.
- Greenhill, K. M. (2018). How Trump Manipulates the Migration Question: The Use and Abuse of Extra-Factual Information. *Foreign Affairs*, pp. 1-5.
- Handelmann, S. (2009). *Thought Manipulation, The Use and Abuse of Psychological Trickery*. Santa Barbara, California. Greenwood. Publishing House.
- Ivanova I., Burlakova V., & Pocheptsov G. (1981). *Theoretical Grammar of the Modern English Language*. High School Publishing. Moscow.
- Leontyev, A. (1981). *Psychological Peculiarities of the Lecturer*. Knowledge Press. Moscow.
- Malmkjaer, K. (2010). *Speech -Act Theory. The Linguistics Encyclopedia*, 3rd ed. New York, NY: Routledge.
- McCornack, S. (1992). Information manipulation theory. *Monographs*, 59(1), pp. 1-16.
- Meister, J. C., Horstmann, J., Petris, M., Jacke, J., Bruck, C., Schumacher, M., & Flüh, M. (2019). CATMA 6.0.0 (Version 6.0.0). Zenodo.
- Nguyen, Q. N., & Sawalmeh, M. H. M. (2020). Trump's Strategies in the First Presidential Debate: A Critical Discourse Analysis. *International Journal of Linguistics, Literature and Translation*, 3(5), pp. 68-77.
- Ramos Palacios, L. M. (2018). *The 2016 US Presidential Debates: A Discourse Analysis Approach*. Cadiz, Spain: Universidad de Cadiz dissertation.
- Quinonez, E. S. (2018). *Welcome to America: A critical discourse analysis of anti-immigrant rhetoric in Trump's speeches and conservative mainstream media*. San Bernardino, USA: California State University dissertation.
- Searle, J. R. (1969). *Speech Acts*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, Mass.
- Vaz de Oliveira, & Ulisses, T. (2020). Social Evaluation as a Persuasive Resource in Political Discourses: Clinton vs. Trump. *Bakhtiniana, São Paulo*, 15(3), pp. 210-238.
- Weisser, M. (2014). *Corpus pragmatics: A handbook*. Cambridge University Press.
- Zhang, H., Afzaal, M., & Liu, C. (2020). American Populism in Digital Era: Strategies of Manipulation in Donald Trump's Election Tweets. *Revista Argentina de Clínica Psicológica*. 29(3), pp. 1273-1280.
- Zheltuhina, M. (2004). *Specifics of Speech Influencing Means in The Language of the Media*. Science Publishing. Moscow.