Interpersonal Function of American Political Speech (Systemic Functional Linguistics Approach)

Hieronimus Canggung Darong
Universitas Katolik Santu Paulus
Ruteng, Indonesia
E-mail: hieronimusdarong@gmail.com

Abstract
This study is concerned with the interpersonal function analysis of American political speech text, by taking an example of first Obama's victory speech, based on Systemic Functional Linguistics theory (SFL). The speech text was modified into clauses which were subsequently analyzed in accordance with the goal of the analysis. The study revealed that the speech established an intimate relationship and a close distance with the audience which enables speaker to gain support and exchange information through the use of linguistics resources that are declarative clause in the mood structure, modality, and pronoun "we". This study has a great impact on language teaching and learning in terms of maintaining social relationships and exchanging meanings between teachers and students during their interactions in the classroom by taking into account the link between linguistic resources and the nature of text both spoken and written.

Keywords: Interpersonal function, speech, SFL

1. INTRODUCTION

Since discourse is a generic term, its scope is large. Discourse studies analyze units of language not only in written text but also in spoken text, for example, speech, interview, conversation, and so forth. We as listeners and readers try to understand every single meaning of the words by carefully examining words, context, and ideology lie behind both oral and written text and linking them to each other. In other words, discourse covers the use of language in its writers and speakers form. As such, discourse analysis, thereby, is an attempt to study the organization of language above the sentence or above the clause, and therefore to study larger units, such as conversation exchanges or written text (Stubbs, 1983).

As a text, speech follows a certain structure, order, viewpoint, and expresses particular values and messages as well. Pushing further, the speech can be regarded as an important social means of communication due to its significant impact on the presentation of cultural, political, and social life. This to say that speech should be examined from what and how it is expressed, the ideas and information implied, and also from its role as a reflection of the speaker. As such, it should be constructed in such a way that such an effort might be beneficial to reveal the ideology and social

Darong, Canggung, Hieronimus. (2022). Interpersonal Function of American Political Speech (Systemic Functional Linguistics Approach).
IJOTL-TL (2022, January), 7(1): 58-71. DOI 10.30957/ijoltl.v7i1.626.

context that tightly associated. Thus, it seems important for the text readers to possess some knowledge of how the text they read or read is produced.

In the field, there has been a great number of research studies concerning speech text. For example an analysis of the word choices, citation techniques, and semiotic layers (Hopke & Simis, 2016; Horváth, 2017). These studies found the words choice and semiotic layers such as gestures determine the proposition of a speech delivery. Other studies emphasized metaphor, cohesiveness, and structural pattern of a speech texts. For example, Kelly, (2020); Moragas-fernández, Calvo, & Capdevila, (2018); Nartey, (2018) put forward the metaphor as a prevailing way and a rhetoric dimension to frame political issues of political actors in their speech. Meanwhile, cohesion devices and other linguistics resources might differently contribute to frame a comprehensive understanding of the characteristics of any kind of genre (da Cunha, 2019; Schubert, 2019; Silke, Quinn, & Rieder, 2019; Zhan & Huang, 2018). Unlikely, others purposed topic modeling approach, dichotomous framework and socio-pragmatic methodology to discover thematic information within the text (Boch, 2020; Brookes & Mcenery, 2019; Fetzer & Bull, 2012; Schumacher, Hansen, Velden, & Kunst, 2019). As such, the socio discourse competence should be possessed as purposed by Cartagena and Prego-vázquez (2018).

Despite the fruitful findings of the previous research studies, what is left is the metafunctions of text. The previous studies of text analysis were particularly mapped into a three-dimensional framework namely micro-level, meso- level, and macro level. This implies that the analysis was about the text's syntax, metaphoric structure, some other surface structure of a language social, political, and historical dominations that are affecting the language. Besides, the previous studies were concerned with the field or the ideational function of the text (Wang, 2010). Meanwhile, the text itself comprises three metafunctions. Aside from ideational function (field), interpersonal (tenor) and textual function (mode) appear within the text. Eggins (1994) employing a distinctive structure of the clause for each.

Again this backdrop, regardless of the constructive approach of the structure level of text and ideational function (field), this article is an attempt to examine another function of text namely the interpersonal function on a particular American political speech text based on Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) view. Since the interpersonal function is an interpretation of language in its function as an exchange and employs speaker's meaning as an intruder considering the interactive nature of relations between the addresser and the addressee, the analysis on it might be beneficial to reveal the relationship and intimacy between the speaker or writer and the reader or listener. As such, it is associated with the term grammar as a resource for expressing and evolving meaning; clause within the text organized as an interactive event between the speaker and audience.

In other words, the clauses might carry the interpersonal function representing a speech role relationship that subsequently evolves interpersonal relationships among the agents involved. As Halliday (1985) claims that whenever two people use language to interact, one of the things they do with it is establishing a relationship

Darong, Canggung, Hieronimus. (2022). Interpersonal Function of American Political Speech (Systemic Functional Linguistics Approach).

between them. Accordingly, both agents involved in communication exchanges might easily reach the goals implied in the text. Subsequently, this analysis is fruitful to both teacher and student regarding the relative power and status which subsequently contribute their level of personal involvement in the class.

2. REVIEW OF LITERATURE
2.1. SFL AT GLANCE

In general, Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL), the 'S' for 'Systemic' refers to the systemic relations and their possibilities in a system network of relations and choices pushing from general to specific features that are paradigmatic in nature. It also means that the system of meaning that is interrelated employed within the text. Meanwhile, the 'F' for 'Functional' is concerned with the functional realizations of the system in structures. As such, the system should be constructed in such a way that it has a particular function which is realized by register categories such as field, tenor, and mode. The last is L referring to the theory of Linguistics discipline and through it, the investigation of the phenomena of language might be alternatively carried out, (Halliday 1994).

Along the line with the above explanation, in the view of SFL, there are three main functions, or metafunctions of language. First, ideational or experiential metafunction that makes people be able to use language to represent experience. As such, it influenced and realized by the field of a text. Second, interpersonal metafunction contributing the social relationships thereby is realized by the register category of the tenor. Third, the textual metafunction dealing with the use of language to construct logical and coherent texts and is realized by the register category of mode.

The field is a category of register concerning what is occurring to the nature of social action. It is concerned with what the participants are dealt with, in which language figures as a required element (Martin, 1992). In other words, it is what is going on in the context, or the kind of action (as recognized by the culture) in which language is taking some part. Likely, Eggins (1994) puts the notion of field of discourse as "what the language is being used to talk about". This variable comprises not only the specific topic of discourse but also the level of technicality or specialty on the one hand or everyday quality on the other. It is the component of situation dealing with the main concern of the activity in questions. This implies that field, the continuum of which ranges from technical exclusive fields to common sense or everyday field, concerns with the topic of situation.

The tenor is the negotiation of social relationships among participants taking part in communication exchange or social action. In addition, it refers to the interacting roles and statuses of those involved in the exchange of which the text is part. Tenor as a register variable has to do with role structure (Martin, 1992). Along with the same line, the tenor is intended to concern with the social role relationships employed by the interactants (Eggins, 1994). As such, the role relationship variables

Darong, Canggung, Hieronimus. (2022). Interpersonal Function of American Political Speech
(Systemic Functional Linguistics Approach).
IJOTL-TL (2022, January), 7(1): 58-71. DOI 10.30957/ijoltl.v7i1.626.

can be distinguished into formality, politeness, intimacy, and reciprocity.

As the third variable of the context of situation, mode deals with the role of language is playing in communication or in realizing social action (Eggins, 1994). Regarding the role of language in an interaction, the mode is classified into two facets indicating two different types of distance in the relation between language and situation that is spatial or interpersonal distance and experiential distance (Eggins, 1994). The former deals with the possibilities of immediate feedback between the interactants. This can be acknowledged by introducing the continuum of this facet of mode drawing up from the situation of having a casual chat to the situation of writing a book in which the contacts, both visually and orally, between people definitely take place. While the latter is concerned with the span of situations on the basis of the distance between language and the social process that takes place. In this respect, revealing the mode depends mainly on the ability to cope with language and context phenomena in which social action possibly occurs. Thus, the mode is the role played by language in realizing social action, including the channel (written, spoken, written to be read aloud, etc) and the degree to which language establishes what is going on in the context of purely goes along with it.

3. METHODOLOGY

As has been mentioned previously, the focus of the analysis of the text under study is to investigate the register of the interpersonal function (tenor). The purposively chosen text was Barack Obama's first victory speech. To best of my knowledge, this speech was the longest text among other USA presidents' victory speech, and the speaker himself is popularly known as a good orator. As such, I am curious to examine what and how it is through the approach of Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL). Then, it is necessary to note that the text under study, basically, has three major parts namely field, tenor, and mode which according to SFL, constitute the register categories of a text. However, as its scope, the register to analyse in this study is only the interpersonal function that so-called tenor of the text.

To make the writer easily in doing his analysis, the speech text was modified into clauses (Appendix 1) from which the text is built. The modified texts were, then, analysed in accordance with the goal of the analysis. In this study, tenor can be understood through the analysis of mood structure as shown in the example (Appendix 2), modality, and the use of pronoun which subsequently reveal the interpersonal function of the participants involved in the text.

4. RESULTS

It is necessary to note that, in this study, there are three ways of reveal the interpersonal function of the text namely, mood structure analysis, modality, and the use of the pronoun. After modifying the text into clause, the structure of mood mostly in the system of subject and finite indicating declarative as the most frequent clause used. Table 1 delineates the distribution of clause employing mood structure after the

modification process.
Table 1. Distribution of Clause

Mood system	Total	%
Declarative	239	97,15
Imperative	5	2,03
Interrogative	2	0,81
Total	246	100

Concerning the clause appearance, the dominant appearances of 239 declarative clauses in Barack Obama's Victory speech are successful in that they are functioned as statements to give as much as possible information to the audience, through which he succeeded in recalling his presidential election campaign, expressing his gratitude to his supporters, making promises and inspiring the audience to go through the difficulties of the nation.

In terms of modality (Table 2), it was found that 55 modal verbal operators are adopted in Barack Obama's Victory Speech. The most frequently adopted ones are "will" turns up for 18 times, "can" is adopted for 22 times, "must" turns up for 4 times, and "may" is used twice.

Table 2. The distribution of Modality

Modal Auxiliary	Will	can	Must	May
Modality	Inclination/futurity	ability	obligation	Expectation
Frequency	18	22	4	2

The last aspect to reveal the interpersonal function is that the use of pronouns as shown in Table 3

Table 3. The distribution of Pronoun

No	Pronoun	Occurrence
1	I	26
2	He	3
3	You	14
4	We	46
5	They	4

The use of the pronoun "we" is dominantly used by Obama during the speech. As such, Obama tends to put the audience as the agent of change in America and not I (Obama). Other pronouns were used resulting from discourse moves and commodity exchange during the speech with the audience

5. DISCUSSION

To keep the communication going, a component is indispensable for carrying out the Interpersonal Metafunction of the clause as the exchange in English. This component is called mood and is made up of subject and finite (Halliday, 1985). The subject supplies the rest of what it takes to form a proposition, namely, something by reference to which the proposition can be affirmed or denied". The Finite refers to the first functional element of the verbal group. When it comes to the roles of addressers and audience, the most fundamental purposes in any exchange are giving or demanding information and goods and services. According to Halliday (1994), in any communicative language, there are four basic speech roles: giving information, demanding information, giving goods and services, and demanding goods and services. The usual labels for these functions are the statement, question, offer, and command. The function of the statement is closely associated with a particular grammatical structure, that is, the declarative clauses; the question is related to interrogative clauses; and the command is associated with imperative clauses. The ordering of subject and finite (two elements of the mood system of the clause) in the clause (Appendix 2) plays an indispensable role in signaling speech roles and the proposition of the speech as a text

Data in Table 1 confirms that Obama likes to give information to the audience regarding what and America would be. Such declarative clauses were made of mood system employing subject and finite order providing some propositions such as promises in his campaign, the actions would be and his gratitude to the supporters. The frequent use of this clause indicates that the text focused on giving information. It makes sense in the way a political speech, as a dilly employing a political mission, it is urgent and apparent for the speaker to give information and demand services. On one hand, the speaker expects to provide certain messages to the audience carrying his political attitude and assumption. On the other hand, the speaker attempts to demand and arouse the audience, as listener, to take action following the locutionary force of the speaker's words. It, therefore, complete declarative clauses, commonly dominate and regarded as a distinctive characteristic of a political speech including Obama's. As such, this finding corroborated previous studies saying that linguistics resources might differently contribute to frame a comprehensive understanding of the characteristics of any kinds of the genre (Da Cunha, 2019; Mubarak & Batam, 2007; Schubert, 2019; Silke et al., 2019; Zhan & Huang, 2018).

While in a speech, it is more significant for the addresser to build up an equal and mutually reliant relationship with the audience. Halliday (1985) states that the two kinds of messages conveyed by imperative clauses are: one is to command others to do something, the other is to invite the audience to do something together. The latter is always effected by the format of "Let's". With references to 5 imperative clauses in the data, Barack Obama chose "let us" imperative clauses, which indicates that he is not giving a direct command but making a suggestion, conviction, and persuasion. With the employment of five "let us" imperative clauses, Obama

successfully shortens the distance between him and the audience and subsequently calls on them to take actions together with him to overcome the difficulties. In this regard, the 5 imperative clauses made Barack Obama's Victory Speech more moving, appealing, and inspiring to the audience as shown in the following clauses.

> *So let us summon a new spirit of patriotism; of service and responsibility (Clause 45a)*
> *Let us remember (Clause 46a)*
> *Let us resist the temptation to fall back on the same partisanship and pettiness and immaturity (Clause 47a)*
> *Let us remember (Clause 48a)*
> *So, tonight, let* us ask ourselves (Clause 78a)

With 5 imperative clauses in the data, Obama maintains an equal and reliant or dependent relation with the audience, which is helpful in moving the audience with emotion. Thus, he can win extensive supporters and advocates.

Even the interrogative clause is not a widespread choice in a speech, but the appropriate usage of the interrogative clause can help to create an intimate dialogic style. The audience considers that they are friends with the addresser and naturally share his same proposal as delineated in the following clauses.

> *what change will they see? (Clause 79)*
> *What progress will we have made? (Clause 80)*

Apparently, through these rhetorical questions, Obama successfully attracted the audience's attention emphasize that the audience thinks and rouse the passion for overcoming the current difficulties.

Aside from the imperative and modulated interrogative structures, there is still another way of getting people to do things or not to do things, that is, modality (Table 2). It plays an important role in carrying out the interpersonal metafunction of clauses showing to what degree the proposition is valid. Modality refers to the space between "yes" and "no", showing the speaker's judgments of the probabilities or the obligations involved in what she is saying.

It should be noted that there are several ways to realize modality, such as non-verbal and verbal, through non-deliberate features and deliberate features, among the above expressive ways. One of the most common ways for the realization of modality as a function of the Mood is through modal verbal operators. When realized by modal verbal operators, modality involves degrees and scales about the validity of a proposition, which coins the term "Modal Commitment". According to Halliday in Eggins (1994), there are three main values of modal commitment are high, median and low on the scale. As such, such different scales of modal commitment differently lead to meanings. Meanwhile, Eggins himself (1994) states that modality may comprise modalisation and Modulation. The former is concerned with the speaker's judgment of the validity of the proposition and includes the scale in terms of probability (possible-probable-certain) and usuality (sometimes-usually-always). The latter deals with how confident the speaker can be in the eventual success of the exchange covering the inclination (willing-keen-determined and the degree of

obligation (allowed-supposed-required).

It was found that 55 modal verbal operators are adopted in Barack Obama's Victory Speech, of which, the most frequently adopted ones are as the following: "will" turns up for 18 times, "can" is adopted for 22 times, "must" turns up for 4 times and "may" is used twice.

Regarding the use of "Will", it is adopted for 7 times in this text to predict the future or as being a marker of the future as shown in the following clauses.

> *The road ahead will be long (Clause 32)*
> *Our climb will be steep. (Clause 33)*

"Will" can also be used as a modal verbal operator to show "strong wish and determination", which is adopted for 11 times in Barack Obama's Victory Speech.

> *that we will get there (Clause 34d)*
> *We will defeat you (Clause 53b)*

As it is mentioned, different scales of modal commitment lead to different meanings. "Will" which represents a higher scale of modal commitment signals a higher degree of certainty about the validity of a proposition. Thus, the constant use of "will" in this speech is successful in showing Barack Obama's strong mind and keen desire to lead American to go through the difficulties. Meanwhile, the higher modal commitment of "will" further confirms that more actions will be definitely taken in the future. Thus, Obama tends to give hope and anticipate the future using "will" rather than enforcing on his people, through which, a good relationship is well established.

Similarly, on one side, "can" representing a low-value modulation. Permission of "can" is seen as the lowest degree of pressure, opening the possibility for the other person to do the action but leaving the decision to them. As such, Obama uses "can" to weaken his authority, to shorten the distance between him and the audience and not to force and command them to follow his instruction. On the other side, the semantic meaning of "can" is "having the ability to do something", which is showed by the most repeated significant sentences "Yes we can" in the speech. The constant employment of "can" here is to encourage American to believe in themselves to be confident that they have the ability to do anything; telling the nation that even though the country was probably in its darkest days, there was hope; there was a chance to turn it around and climb back into the light.

"Must" representing the highest scale of modal commitment; signals the highest degree of pressure on the other person to carry out a command. And thus "must" is sometimes adopted in a political speech in that the addresser needs to show his firm determination, to call on the audience to be determined to take action in achieving their common objectives. In this speech, the use of "must" such as in clause (58c) "for what we can and must achieve tomorrow was beneficial to show Obama's firm determination to overcome the challenges and call on the American to take strong actions to achieve their targets. While "May" as was used in the clause " I may not have won your vote tonight "(51b) and " and may God bless the US" (clause 84c), it shows the possibility (Clause 51b) and expectation (Clause 84c) of Obama

himself. The possibility of being the winner as the support successfully achieved from the American (expectation).

Thus, modality can be in the form of obligation, inclination, expectation, and necessity. As such, the modality of the text under study indicates strong ability, promises, and plans. This judgment is supported by the fact that Obama mostly used "can" to indicate his strong ability in arousing the audience and "will" (inclination/futurity) more often than other models. In contrast with Horváth (2017) and Hopke and Simis (2016) saying that the combination of actions and verbal resources were beneficial to co-narrate stories or texts, in this study, the power of words is more than action.

It conveys a belief and encouragement that the speaker himself and Americans have to believe in themselves in doing anything for America. In other words, the use of "can" and "will "indicates strong expectations and toughness of the speakers to do the actions involving plans, promises for the American future.

Regarding the use of pronoun (Table 3), Obama used "I" to speak of his election campaign and expressed his gratitude as shown in the following clauses

> *To my sister Maya, my sister Alma, all my other brothers and sisters,*
> *thank you so much for all the support that you've given me. (Clause 16)*
> *I am grateful to them. (Clause 17)*
> *and the best campaign team ever assembled in the history of politics*
> *(Clause 19b)*
> *you made this happen (Clause 19c)*
> *and I am forever grateful (Clause 19d)*

From the clauses above, the use of the pronoun "I" successfully describes the newly elected president into a sincere person who will remember the gratitude and try to repay it. Meanwhile the second personal pronoun "you" has a significant role in this speech, because it can help to create a dialogic style in the speech, maintaining a close intimate relation between the addresser and the audience, and thus to ensure the effective interaction of the addresser and the audience during the speech.

> *…and I know, you didn't do this just to win an election. (Clause 27b)*
> *And I know …you didn't do it for me. (Clause 27d)*
> *You did it because (Clause 28a)*
> *because you understand the enormity of the task (Clause 28b)*

Here, "you" is not only used to attract the audience's attention but also makes them feel that they are making a dialogue with their friend (the addresses). With "you" Obama shows his care and respect to the audience, thus a close intimate relation was maintained and the audience is likely to share the same attitude and assumption of the addressers.

Interestingly, the personal pronoun "we" appears at a high rate as personal pronouns in Obama's first victory speech such as in the following clauses.

> *We are, and always will be, the United States of America (Clause 3d).*
> *we can achieve to put their hands on the arc of history (Clause 4d).*

These clauses show that Obama and all the Americans are in the same boat. In this way, Obama successfully shortens the distance between him and the audience and maintains an equal and reliant relationship between them, thus greatly helps to persuade the audience to share his same proposal that is to take actions to go through the difficulties even though there are two wars, a planet in peril and the worst financial crisis in a century. The following clauses might strengthen those mentioned.

"To those -- to those who would tear the world down" (Clause 53a)
"We will defeat you" (Clause 53b).
"To those who seek peace and security" (Clause 54a)
"We support you". (Clause 54b).

Here, "we", which holds an exclusive meaning, is a signal that Obama and his government are a strong team with high spirits, holding powerful authority and determination to protect their citizen and lead their nation to a bright future. So the exclusive use of the pronoun "we" helps Obama to win Americans' great confidence in the newly elected government.

Overall, this political speech successfully creates a dialogic style, which successfully shortens the distance between the speaker and Americans, employing very accurate use of "I", "you" and "We" and that is significant for him (Obama) to win widespread support for his new government. In fact, the pronoun "We" is mostly used in the speech. The use of "we" is regarded as a sense of togetherness. It refers to the power of being hand in hand to go to the bright future of America. The speaker involves the audience or Americans in their text. Without them he is nothing. As such, it is considered as a strategy of keeping distance between the speaker and the audience. Saying it differently, the use of "we" in this speech tends to show that the speaker does not separate himself from the audience and does not put himself as the agent of change. On the other hand, he focused and involved the audience to go through for America through togetherness, not I as the speaker, as the agent of the change. In this respect, the more speaker uses "we", the closer relationship he has with the audience. Meanwhile, other pronouns such as "he" and "they" which refer to particular participants of the text, do not carry significantly to the interpersonal relationship between the speaker and the audience or Americans. By and large, the use of mood system, modality, and pronoun in the speech text under study indicate the high power or solidarity, good intimacy, and familiarity as well.

6. CONCLUSION AND IMPLICATION

Different use of mood, modality, and personal pronouns might determine the different level of interpersonal function, thus endowing the speaker different status and different purposes, and the influence on the audience. The text under study employs the interpersonal function utilizing declarative mood through which the speaker took the role of information processor and deliverer. Furthermore, he established an intimate relationship with the audience (American), which enables him to gain support and exchange the information with them.

This study has some pedagogical implications. What is essential to be successful in language learning is interaction. Students' failures in communication which result in the negotiation of meaning, requests for explanation, or reorganization of message contribute to classroom interaction interpersonally. Understanding how the interpersonal function of language might make it possible for teachers and students to interact, to exchange meanings, and to take a stand effectively. Of greater importance is that such understanding leads the classroom agents to maintain the relationship with each other, influences behavior, and knows how to expresses their viewpoints. As such, it is realized by certain grammatical features such as the order of subject and finite, modality, pronoun showing how information is exchanged. In other words, one challenging aspect of language learning is about how to evolve and maintain social relationships in interactions. These challenges might be well-managed by looking at fruitful linguistic resources used namely, the mood system, modality, and the use of pronoun following the discourse move occurring during classroom interactions using SFL perspective.

REFERENCES

Boch, A. (2020). Increasing American Political Tolerance: A Framework Excluding Hate Speech. Socius: Sociological Research for a Dynamic World Volume, 6, 1–12. https://doi.org/10.1177/2378023120903959

Brookes, G., & Mcenery, T. (2019). The utility of topic modelling for discourse studies: A critical evaluation. Discourse Studies, 21(1), 3–21. https://doi.org/10.1177/1461445618814032

Cartagena, M. C. C., & Prego-vázquez, G. (2018). Participation frameworks and socio-discursive competence in young children : The role of multimodal strategies. Discourse Studies, 21(2), 1–24. https://doi.org/10.1177/1461445618802656

Da Cunha, I. (2019). A corpus-based analysis of textual genres in the administration domain. Disocurse Studies, 22(1), 1–29. https://doi.org/10.1177/1461445619887538

Eggins. S.1994. An Introduction to Systemic Functional Linguistics. London: Pinter

Fetzer, A., & Bull, P. (2012). Doing leadership in political speech : Semantic processes and pragmatic inferences. Discourse & Society, 23(2), 127–144. https://doi.org/10.1177/0957926511431510

Halliday, M. A. K. 1994. An introduction to functional grammar. London: Arnold.

Halliday, M.A.K. 1985. Introduction to Functional Grammar. London: Edward Arnold

Hopke, J. E., & Simis, M. (2016). Response to 'Word choice as political speech ': Hydraulic fracturing is a partisan issue. Public Understanding of Science, 26(1), 124–126. https://doi.org/10.1177/0963662516643621

Horváth, J. (2005). Critical Discourse Analysis of Obama's Political Discourse. Language, literature and culture in a changing 45–56.

Kelly, C. R. (2020). Donald J. Trump and the rhetoric of ressentiment. Quarterly Journal of

Speech, 106(1), 2–24. https://doi.org/10.1080/00335630.2019.1698756

Martin, J.R. 1992. English Text: System and Structure, Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Co.

Matthiessen, C. 1990. Lexico Grammatical Cartography: English Systems. Department of Linguistics, University of Sydney: Miemo.

Moragas-fernández, C. M., Calvo, M. M., & Capdevila, A. (2018). The process en route: the metaphor of the journey as the dominant narrative for the political discourse in Catalonia. Critical Discourse Studies, 15(5), 1–23. https://doi.org/10.1080/17405904.2018.1468787

Nartey, M. (2018). ' I shall prosecute a ruthless war on these monsters … ': a critical metaphor analysis of discourse of resistance in the rhetoric of Kwame Nkrumah. Critical Discourse Studies, 16(2), 1–18. https://doi.org/10.1080/17405904.2018.1535987

Schubert, C. (2019). ' OK , well , first of all , let me say …': Discursive uses of response initiators in US presidential primary debates. Discourse Studies, 21(4), 438–457. https://doi.org/10.1177/1461445619842734

Schumacher, G., Hansen, D., Velden, M. A. C. G. Van Der, & Kunst, S. (2019). A new dataset of Dutch and Danish party congress speeches. Research and Politics, 6(2), 1–7. https://doi.org/10.1177/2053168019838352

Silke, H., Quinn, F., & Rieder, M. (2019). Telling the truth about power ? Journalism discourses and the facilitation of inequality. Critical Discourse Studies, 16(3), 1–7. https://doi.org/10.1080/17405904.2019.1568897

Stubbs, M. 1983. Discourse Analysis: The Sociolinguistic Analysis of Natural Language. University of Chicago.

Wang, J. (2010). A Critical Discourse Analysis of Barack Obama s Speeches. Journal of Language Teaching and Research, 1(3), 254–261. https://doi.org/10.4304/jltr.1.3.254-261

Zhan, H., & Huang, S. (2018). Critical genre analysis : investigating interdiscursive performance in professional practice. Critical Discourse Studies, 15(5), 1–4. https://doi.org/10.1080/17405904.2018.1468788

APPENDIX 1. Example of Clause Modification for Mood Structure Analysis

1a.   If there is anyone out there
1b.   who still doubts that America is a place
1.c.   where all things are possible;
1.d.   who still wonders if the dream of our founders is alive in our time
1.e.   who still questions the power of our democracy,
1.f   tonight is your answer.
2.a.   It's the answer told by lines
2.b.   that stretched around schools and churches in numbers this nation has never seen
2.c.   by people who waited three hours and four hours,
2.d.   it is the answer by many for the very first time in their lives,
2.e.   because they believed that this time must be different;
2.f.   that their voices could be that difference.
3.a.   It's the answer spoken by young and old, rich and poor, Democrat and Republican, black, white, Hispanic, Asian, Native American, gay, and straight, disabled and not disabled – Americans
3.b.   who sent a message to the world
3.c.   that we have never been just a collection of individuals or a collection of the Red States and the Blue States:
3.d.   we are and will be, the United States of America.
4a   ………………………………………………………….
83.a   This is our time
83.b.   to put our people back to work
83.c.   and open doors of opportunity for our kids;
83.d.   to restore prosperity
83.e.   and promote the cause of peace;
83.f.   to reclaim the American dream
83.g.   And reaffirm that fundamental truth –
83.h   that out of many, we are one;
83.i.   that while we breathe,
83.j   we hope,
83.k   and where we are met with cynicism and doubt,
83.l   and those who tell us that we can't,
83.m.   we will respond with that timeless creed
83.n   that sums up the spirit of a people:
83.o   yes, we can.
84.a   Thank you,
84.b   God bless you,
84.c   and may God bless the United States of America.

APPENDIX 2. Example of Mood Structure Analysis

1. a.   if there is anyone out there

If	There	is	anyone	out there
Adjunct Conj	Subject	Finite	Complement	Adjunct: Circums
RESIDUE	MOOD		RESIDUE	

1b.   who still doubts that America is a place

Who	still doubts		that America is a place
Subject	Finite	Predicator	Complement
MOOD	RESIDUE		

1. c.   where all things are possible;

where	all things	are	possible
WH Adjunct	Subject	Finite	Complement
RESIDUE	MOOD		RESIDUE

1. d.   who still wonders if the dream of our founders is alive in our time

Who	still	wonders	If the dream of our founders is alive in our time
Subject	Mood Ad	Finite	Predicator	Complement
MOOD	Mood Ad	MOOD	RESIDUE

1.e.   who still questions the power of our democracy,

who	still	questions	the power of our democracy
Subject	Mood Adjunct	Finite	Predicator	Complement
MOOD	RESIDUE	MOOD	RESIDUE

1.f   tonight is your answer.

tonight	is	your answer
Adjunct: Circums	Finite	Complement
RESIDUE	MOOD	RESIDUE

84.b   God bless you,

God	bless	you
Subject	Finite	Predicator	Complement
MOOD	RESIDUE		

84.c   and may God bless the United States of America..

and	may	God	bless	The U.S. of America
Adjunct:Conjuctive	Finite	Subject	Predicator	Complement
RESIDUE	MOOD		RESIDUE	