Impoliteness and Power in U.S. Political Campaign Debates: The Case of Donald Trump

Ahmad Wijanarko*, Thomas Joko Priyo Sembodo
Universitas Gadjah Mada, Indonesia

*Email: ahmed.wijanarko@gmail.com

A B S T R A C T

This research examines impoliteness strategies in the context of political campaign debates by the presidential candidates, particularly by Donald Trump against other candidates. The data used in this research, taken from the last three National Republican debates, were Donald Trump's utterances in which he employed impoliteness strategies. The data were analyzed using Garcia-Pastor's (2008) impoliteness strategies. The results show that Donald Trump employed the negative-face oriented strategies much more frequently (66.15%) than the positive-face oriented strategies (33.85%). The negative-face oriented strategy '*state the communicative act(s) as common or shared knowledge*' was the most frequently used (30.38%). These results suggest that for the purposes of asserting power in the debates, Donald Trump tends to use negative-faced oriented impoliteness strategies in his political debates.

Keywords: *Donald Trump, impoliteness strategies, political debates, power.*

INTRODUCTION

The 2016 presidential election of United States of America has caught the world's attention. Ever since Donald Trump announces his presidential candidacy in June 15 2015 (Time, 2015), he always stirs up conversations. The attention he gets actually comes from his 'controversial' remarks on Mexican or Moslem Community. Online media such as *the Wall Street Journal* and *the New York Times*, which transcribed his speeches, claimed that he said "When Mexico sends its people, they're not sending their best…They're rapists." (Times, 2015). Furthermore, he stated that "A lot of people up there can't get jobs … because China has our jobs and Mexico has our jobs" (Times, 2015).

Donald Trump himself is a real estate developer. In 1971 he became involved in large, profitable building projects in Manhattan. In 1980, he opened the Grand Hyatt, which made him the city's best-known and most controversial developer (Biography.com, 2015). As mentioned before, he became a contender on June 16, 2016 and registered for a nominee from the Republican Party. Many news outlets pay their attention to him, particularly on what he has to say. For instance, his stance on the issue of Syrian refugees fleeing from their country to Europe grinds his ears. It is enough to make him pledge to make an all Muslim ban policy. It is said that 'Trump, who has previously called for surveillance against mosques and said he was open to establishing a database for all Muslims living in the U.S., made his latest controversial call in a news release'. The article also reported that at least a few political figures condemned the statement, e.g., a renowned Republican politician, Lindsey Graham, a Republican governor Jim Gilmore, and the Obama Administration, (Diamond, 2015).

All these remarks have caused a lot of reactions. An online article published in the Huffington post discussed people's reactions over these controversial remark regarding his pitch of policy for immigrants—an issue rising at the time in media outlet that Syrian refugees, risking their

lives to reach the Greece coast to reside in Europe—"to ban all Muslims from the country". He said "People are just being too politically correct" (Itkowitz, 2015). The article thus discusses whether there is a limit on free speech in regard to the notion of political correctness itself. Moreover, Klotz (1999) published an article on politeness and political correctness. He argues that politeness integrates political correctness in the long term and in the process partly reshapes and distorts it. Because politeness is a tool in itself; it is not courtesy (Klotz, 1999, p. 157). Political correctness itself was previously explained that is a good example of how a specific bundle of perspectives should be replaced or at least partly altered by another. Well known are the attempts by various groups to change the way of looking at race, women, minorities and problem groups by means of ruling or steering language use (e.g. Mexicans, Drug lords, Rapists, in the case of Donald Trump). In addition, Klotz suggests that political correctness is, despite its initially idealistic aims, not cooperative while politeness is in danger of being instrumentalized (Klotz, 1999, p. 157). Moreover, Itkowitz (2015) also mentioned that William Safire, in a 1991 New York Times column, deconstructed the term: "The phrase began as an assertion by liberal (progressive, concerned) activists and then was turned into an attack phrase by conservative (rightwing, heartless) passivists." Thus if not being politically correct could possibly mean the negation of politeness – impoliteness – attract many voters in the United States, it is worth to analyze this paradox of how impoliteness of which Donald Trump may or may not carry out throughout this campaign could benefit him for acquiring votes. Therefore, it is interesting to investigate Donald Trump's controversial and impolite remarks. This article is an attempt to examine how Donald Trump employs impoliteness strategies in his debates with other presidential candidates from the Republican Party.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

This research belongs to the study of pragmatics which, according to Yule (1996), is concerned with speaker meaning. It has, consequently, more to do with the analysis of what people mean by their utterances than what the words or phrases in those utterances might mean by themselves. It is also concerned with contextual meaning. This type of study necessarily involves the interpretation of what people mean in a particular context and how the context influences what it said. Yule (1996) also maintains that pragmatics is the study of how more gets communicated than is said. This approach necessarily explores how listeners can make inferences about what is said in order to arrive at an interpretation of the speaker's intended meaning. Finally, pragmatics is the study of the expression of relative distance. This perspective raises the question of what determines the choice between the said and the unsaid.

In addition, this research adopts the framework of impoliteness strategies proposed by Garcia-Pastor (2008). She developed these impoliteness strategies from Culpeper's conceptual impoliteness strategies (1996).

According to Miriam-Webster Dictionary, a zero-sum game means a situation in which one person or group can win something only by causing another person or group to lose it. As for power in impoliteness strategies within the context of political debates as zero-sum games is also crucial. In the introduction of impoliteness strategies, Culpeper employed the concept in army recruit training discourse with the consideration of 'great inequality of power' which has a lot to do with circumstances where one is more likely to be impolite.

As for impoliteness strategies themselves, Garcia-Pastor proposed positive-face and negative-face oriented strategies. She claims that face aggravating strategies yield positive and negative face aggravating moves, which form chains constituting negativity cycles. They consisted of a juxtaposition of impoliteness strategies constituting a coherent and identifiable chunk of speech by virtue of the overall aggravating function they perform with regard to the opponent's positive and negative face (2008, p. 110).

METHODS

The data sources for this research were the transcripts of the last three Republican debates and provided by the Washington Post online in which Donald Trump (DT) participated. The transcripts were downloaded to acquire more utterances as more and more candidates started pulling out from the race. The transcripts then were read to identify exchanges where impoliteness strategies were employed by DT, and the nature in which they occurred were also identified (negativity cycles or non-negativity cycles).

The data used in this research were DT's utterances in exchanges with other contenders where impoliteness strategies were used. The final count of the data shows that in three different debates, there are 70 conversations between Donald Trump and other contenders where impoliteness strategies were used, and thus were then identified and classified. The data were classified in accordance with the impoliteness strategies employed by DT in the debates. The classification follows the framework offered by Garcia-Pastor (2008).

The data were transcribed according to Jefferson's Atkinson and Heritage (1984) transcription notations, which underwent some modifications in light of the aims of this research. They were then identified and classified based on the face aggravating moves constituted by impoliteness strategies in political debates as zero-sum games outlined by Garcia-Pastor (2008).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The findings were classified into two main face aggravating strategies: positive-face oriented and negative-face oriented impoliteness strategies. The results indicate that most of the strategies that DT employed belong to the negative-face oriented impoliteness strategies during the Republican debates, as shown in Table 1. From these three debates, there are negativity cycles and non-negativity cycles identified in which impoliteness strategies are found.

Table 1. Frequency and distribution of face aggravating strategies employed by DT in the debates

No.	Strategies	n	%
Positive Face-Oriented Strategies			
1.	Convey dislike for, and disagreement with hearer (H) and close others (his/her/their things, actions, values and opinions)	30	11.54
2.	Use aggressive punning	-	-
3.	Be ironic/sarcastic	12	4.62
4.	Deny in-group status	-	-
5.	Disassociate, distance from H	13	5.00
6.	Ignore H	-	-
7.	Belittle or diminish the importance of H and H's things, actions, values and opinions	33	12.69
	Subtotal	88	33.85
Negative Face-Oriented Strategies			
8.	State the communicative act(s) as common or shared knowledge	79	30.38
9.	Indebt H	-	-
10.	Refer to rights, duties and rules not respected, fulfilled or complied with respectively	31	11.92
11.	Increase imposition weight	42	16.15
12.	Refuse H and H's things, actions, values and opinions	11	4.23
13.	Challenge	5	1.92
14.	Frighten	-	-
15.	Dare	4	1.54
	Subtotal	172	66.15
	TOTAL	260	100.00

Note:
n   : Number of occurrences
%   : percentage

Positive-face Oriented Strategies

The first sub-strategy that was discovered was '*convey dislike for, and disagreement with H and close others (his/her/their things, actions, values and opinions)*'. This particular strategy was used 30 times (11.54%). Example (1) below illustrates the use of this strategy by DT.

(1)

1.   MR   That. my point that I made was you had criticized Mitt Romney for self-

2.   deportation. You said that his strategy of self-deportation is why he lost
3.   the election. And I think people in Florida would be surprised, because,
4.   in fact, the article that was today, they interviewed a number of people
5.   that would have been willing to do those jobs, if you would have been
6.   willing to hire them to do it.
7. DT   I criticized Mitt Romney for losing the election. He had a failed president.
8.   He ran a terrible campaign. He was a terrible candidate.
9.   That's what I criticize Mitt Romney—I mean, ran.

In the example above, Donald Trump and Marco Rubio do 'power' in a discursive struggle. However, this is not a negativity cycle due to the absence of back-to-back attack and defense nature. From lines 7 - 9, Trump employed a positive face and negative face aggravating moves which are ('convey dislike for, and disagreement with the hearer and close other (his/her/their things, actions, values and opinions)' and 'Refuse H and H's things, actions, values and opinions', respectively. He displayed the disagreement with Marco Rubio's reaction against his statement from an interview days before the debate that Trump is hypocrite for criticizing Mitt Romney. Trump counteracts by disagreeing that he only criticized him for his failed campaign, which he should have won and dis agrees with Rubio's opinion.

In the following example, Trump employed this strategy again to defend himself from the statement that he once made that government in countries like Canada and Scotland paid health care for their people and it works well there and should be adapted in the U.S. In brief, by using this strategy, Donald Trump bid for expert power by conveying a disagreement with Senator Rubio and Senator Cruz.

(2)

1 TC   Donald, true or false, you've said the government should pay for
2   everyone's health care.
3 DT   That's false.
4 TC   You've never said that?
5 DT   No, I said it worked in a couple of countries...

6 TC   But you've never stood on this debate stage and says it works great in
7   Canada and Scotland and we should do it here.
8 DT   No, I did not. No I did not.
9 TC   Did you say if you want people to die on the streets, if you don't support
10   socialized health care, you have no heart.
11 DT   Correct. I will not let people die on the streets if I'm president.

In lines 3 and 8, Trump employed the strategy 'convey dislike for, and disagreement with H and close others (his/her/their things, actions, values and opinions)'. In line 5, he employed the same strategy and also the strategy 'refuse H and H's things, actions, values and opinions'. However, in line 11, he used the strategy 'state the communicative act(s) as common or shared knowledge'.

The second sub-strategy found in the debates was '*be ironic/sarcastic*'. This particular strategy was used 12 times (4.62%). In one debate with Senator Ted Cruz (TC), as shown in example 3 below, Donald Trump employed this strategy and the strategy '*belittle or diminish the importance of H and H's things, actions, values and opinions*'. In this discursive struggle, he attempts to turn the table by claiming that the senator was the one who has to relax by stating that he is relaxed.

(3)

1 TC   And—and by the way, let's be clear. (APPLAUSE) Donald claims -
2   Donald claims to care about...
3 DT   You know why? I didn't want to, but he sent me his book with his
4   autograph...
5 TC   Donald. Donald. Donald. I understand rules are very hard for you.
6   They're very confusing.
7 DT   Mr. Trump, you're doing a great job. I have his book. Thank you -- thank
8   you for the book. Go ahead.
9 TC   Donald, you can get back on your meds now.
10 DT   This is a lot of fun up here tonight, I have to tell you. (APPLAUSE)
11   Thank—thank you for the book. I really appreciate (ph).
12 TC   Donald -- Donald, relax.
13 DT   Go ahead. I'm relaxed. You're the basket case. Go ahead.

In this example, Trump employed in lines 3-4 the strategy '*state the communicative act(s) as common or shared knowledge*'. In lines 7-8 and lines 10-11, he employed the strategy '*belittle or diminish the importance of H and H's things, actions, values and opinions*'. Finally in line 13, he employed the strategy '*be ironic/sarcastic*' as well as the strategy '*belittle or diminish the importance of H and H's things, actions, values and opinions*'.

In another debate with Marco Rubio, which was moderated by Chris Wallace (CW), Donald Trump employed this strategy. It started off with Marco Rubio's remark which was also the strategy be ironic/sarcastic. He implied that Donald Trump would not really answer the question. Thus in replying to this claim, Trump struck back with ironic utterance as well. He ironically asked Senator Marco Rubio not to worry about him not answering question. Not only he was being ironic, but he also turned the table by employing the strategy 'belittle or diminish the importance of H and H's things, actions, values and opinions' by giving his opponent a nickname 'little Marco' due to the fact that Marco was the youngest candidate in the presidential race for the Republican party nominee. He hoped that by giving this nickname, audience would not forget of this fact. By using sing this strategy, Donald Trump was bidding for expert power by being ironic/sarcastic against Senator Rubio and Senator Cruz's remarks.

(4)

1	CW	I have a policy question for you, sir.
2	MR	Let's see if he answers it.
3	DT	I will. Don't worry about it, Marco. Don't worry about it. Don't
4		worry about it little Marco, I will.
5	MR	All right, well, let's hear it big Donald.
6	DT	Don't worry about it, little Marco.

The next sub strategy found in the data debates was '*disassociate, distance from H*'. This strategy was used 13 times (5%). The occurrence of this strategy seems to relate to Donald Trump's candidacy. In spite of his involvement in political scene, he has not been knee-deep in this scale of becoming the Republican Party nominee for the presidential race. Therefore, he sees himself as an outsider of the bigger picture of this political scene. He took this notion into his advantage. In fact, in all of the statements found being this

strategy deals with his constant claim of all politicians rarely act for the greater good of the people of the United States. He claimed that his long and self-proclaimed successful businessmen background could actually have more impact for them once he is in the office. Below is an example of the use of this strategy.

(5)

1	DT	Thank you. Nobody knows politicians better than I do. They're all talk,
2		they're no action, nothing gets done. I've watched it for years. Take a
3		look at what's happening to our country. All of the things that I've been
4		talking about, whether it's trade, whether it's building up our depleted
5		military, whether it's taking care of our vets, whether it's getting rid of
6		Common Core, which is a disaster, or knocking out Obamacare and
7		coming up with something so much better, I will get it done. Politicians
8		will never, ever get it done. And we will make America great again. Thank
9		you.

Another strategy devised by Trump was '*belittle or diminish the importance of H and H's things, actions, values and opinions*'. This strategy was used 33 times (12.69%). This strategy is also significant in this finding. It is because it was mostly used by Trump in the form of insults or nicknames. One example is when Senator Marco Rubio made a remark on Donald Trump, accusing him if he ever to realize his plan to build a wall, he would employ an illegal immigrant as a cheaper labor not the people of the U.S., instead. Trump replied in this discursive struggle by claiming that Marco Rubio's remark is nothing but a sound bite.

(6)

1	MR	Yeah, a couple points. If he builds the wall the way he built Trump
2		Towers, he'll be using illegal immigrant labor to do it. The second...
3	DT	(APPLAUSE) Such a cute sound bite.
4	MR	But it -- no, it's not a sound bite. It's a fact. Again, go online and Google it.
5		Donald Trump, Polish workers. You'll see it. The second thing, about the
6		trade war -- I don't understand, because your ties and the clothes you make

7		is made in Mexico and in China. So you're gonna be starting a trade war
8		against your own ties and your own suits.
9	DT	All right, you know what?
10	MR	Why don't you make them in America?
11	DT	Because they devalue their currency -- they devalue their currencies...
12	MR	Well, then make them in America.
13	DT	... that makes it -- well, you don't know a thing about business. You lose
14		on everything...
15	MR	Well, make them in America.
16	DT	Let me just tell you -- they de-value their currency. They de-value their
17		currency. They de-value their currencies.
18	MR	Well then, make them in America.
19	DT	That makes it -- well, you don't know a thing about business. You lose on
20		everything you do.
21	MR	Well, make them in America.

Negative-face Oriented Strategies

The first sub-strategy of negative-faced oriented strategies found in the debates was '*state the communicative act(s) as common or shared knowledge*'. This particular strategy was the most frequently used impoliteness strategy employed by Donald Trump in all the three debates. This strategy was employed 79 times (30.38%). This suggests that this sub-strategy might have been one of Trump's strategies that appealed best to the Republican voters or voters in general.

This is one of the strategies that is not thoroughly explained by Garcia-Pastor (2008). However, she provides adequate examples in her findings. The significant number of this strategy's occurrence relates to the fact that a lot of the contenders drill Trump with questions about with his extreme policies. For instance, he had been criticized for his going-to-be policy of building a border wall between United States and Mexico, as shown in lines 2-3, lines 16-17, lines 20-22, lines 24-25 and line 27 in example (7) below. This did not seem to be a radical policy, but when he added that Mexico would somehow pay the bill for the whole construction, it raised some questions.

(7)

1	MR	In fact, some of the people...
2	DT	And by the way, I've hired -- and by the way, I've hired tens of

3		thousands of people over at my job. You've hired nobody.
4	MR	Yes, you've hired a thousand from another country...
5	DT	You've had nothing but problems with your credit cards, et cetera.
6		So don't tell me about that.
7	MR	Let me just say -- let me finish the statement. This is important.
8	DT	You haven't hired one person, you liar.
9	MR	He hired workers from Poland. And he had to pay a million dollars
10		or so in a judgment from...
11	DT	That's wrong. That's wrong. Totally wrong.
12	MR	That's a fact. People can look it up. I'm sure people are Googling it
13		right now. Look it up. "Trump Polish workers," you'll see a million
14		dollars for hiring illegal workers on one of his projects. He did it.
15		(APPLAUSE) That happened.
16	DT	I've hired tens of thousands of people over my lifetime. Tens of
17		thousands...
18	MR	Many from other countries instead of hiring Americans.
19	DT	Be quiet. Just be quiet. (APPLAUSE)
20		Let me talk. I've hired tens of thousands of people. He brings up
21		something from 30 years ago, it worked out very well. Everybody
22		was happy.
23	MR	You paid a million dollars.
24	DT	And by the way, the laws were totally different. That was a whole
25		different world.
26	WB	Thank you.
27	DT	But I've hired people. Nobody up here has hired anybody

The second negative-face sub-strategy found in Trump's debates was '*refer to rights, duties and rules not respected, fulfilled or complied with respectively*'. This strategy was employed 31 times (11.92%). This particular strategy is to some extent the more refined form of '*belittle or diminish the importance of H and H's things, actions, values and opinions*'. One example is when Senator Cruz asserted that Donald, in spite of stating that he would cut deals in Washington, stated that his history of financially supporting Democrat politicians, yet now running for a republican party nominee for the office would not be good character for a president. Donald Trump

counteracted by employing negative face aggravating moves which are ('*Increase imposition weight*'), and ('*Refer to rights, duties and rules not respected, fulfilled or complied with respectively*'). By doing so, he replied by stating that senator Ted Cruz was the one who was more likely to corrupt by insinuating that Trump accepting donors from Citibank and Goldman Sachs for his campaign and his past was irrelevant.

(8)

1	TC	and Donald, if you want to be liked in Washington, that's not a good
2		attribute for a president.
3	DT	Here's a man -- Robin Hood. This is Robin Hood over here. He talks
4		about corruption. On his financial disclosure form, he didn't even put
5		that he's borrowed money from Citibank and from Goldman Sachs,
6		which is a total violation. He didn't talk about the fact that he pays almost
7		He just left it off, and now he's going to protect the people from the big
8		bad banks. Give me a break.

The next sub-strategy used by Trump in the debates was '*increase imposition weight*'. This strategy was used 42 times (16.15%). It is interesting to notice that two sub-strategies, '*belittle or diminish the importance of H and H's things, actions, values and opinions*' and '*increase imposition weight*', sometimes appeared together in the three national debates. With these sub-strategies, Donald Trump cast himself as one who was more likely to bring peace in the Middle East rather than senator Marco Rubio, by referring to Senator Rubio's different thinking, as shown in example (9) below. He stressed that point by employing this strategy (referring to Marco Rubio with pronoun 'you'). In addition, Trump devised increase imposition weight and stated the communicative act(s) as common or shared knowledge. In this way, he did not just impose himself of the same issue (which could be repetitive), he also attempted to see the peace issue in his perspective as a businessman – viewing it as a deal. This was an effort to give the audience knowledge that a peace trait can be viewed/achieved like a deal.

(9)

1	DT	And, with your thinking, you will never bring peace. You will
2		never bring peace...
3	MR	... Donald, might be able to (inaudible) Palestinians and Arabs, but
4		it's not a real estate deal...
5	DT	... Excuse me, I want to be able to bring peace
6	WB	... Senator
7	DT	He will never be able to do it. I think I may be able to do it,
8		although I will say this. Probably the toughest deal of any kind is
9		that particular deal.

The next sub-strategy devised by Trump was '*refuse H and H's things, actions, values and opinions*'. This strategy was employed 11 times (4.23%) in the three debates. This strategy may appear similar to the strategy of '*convey dislike for, and disagreement with the hearer and close other (his/her/their things, actions, values and opinions*'. However, the difference is that the latter does not convey a refusal of imaginary or real imposing offers from the adversary. In example (10) below, in lines 12–13, Donald Trump employed the strategies '*refer to rights, duties and rules not respected, fulfilled or complied with respectively*' and '*refuse H and H's things, actions, values and opinions*'. Donald Trump employed the strategies to disagree with Governor Jon Kasich's (JK) claim that Donald Trump wants a socialized medicine. This strategy is not just a disagreement, because he then elaborates on how John Kasich has been parading with the claim. That elaboration is again another impoliteness strategy.

(10)

1	JK	Now let me tell you if you're a small business owner, Donald
2		Trump's socialized medicine, putting the government in charge of
3		your health care would kill more jobs than Obamacare, and if
4		you're elderly, the results of socialized medicine in every country
5		on earth where it's been implemented has been rationing, has been
6		the government saying, no, you don't get that hip replacement, you
7		don't get that knee replacement, the government is in charge of

8		your health care. I'll tell you this. As president...
9	WB	Senator...
10	TC	... I will repeal every word of Obamacare. (APPLAUSE)
11	WB	Thank you, thank you. Mr. Trump?
12	DT	I do not want socialized medicine, just so you understand. He goes
13		around saying oh, he wants it. I do not want socialized medicine. I
14		do agree with him that it's going to be a disaster, Obamacare, for
15		the economy.

Another sub-strategy used by Donald Trump was '*challenge*'. This strategy was used only five times (1.92%) in the three debates. This strategy is not exactly similar to the meaning of the word itself. This strategy, while possessing the speaker's impositions on the hearer to do or say certain thing on certain issue, it also conveys the speaker's disagreement. The example below illustrates the use of this strategy by Donald Trump in the debates.

(11)

1	HH	A response, Mr. Trump, then Mr. Rubio
2	DT	Again, I think I gave them both checks to be exactly honest. I think
3		they both liked me very much. But the fact is that'
4	TC	But you called for Bush to be impeached.
5	DT	Well, I think Bush did a hell of a bad as far as that's concerned.
6		You know it and so do I.
7	TC	But you gave him a check and called for him to be impeached.
8	DT	Be honest. Be honest. No, this was before. The check came early.
9		But let me just tell you, Syria, he's saying that I was in favor of
10		Syria, he's saying that I was in favor of Syria. He said I was in
11		favor of Libya? I never discussed that subject. I was in favor of
12		Libya? We would be so much better off if Gadhafi were in charge
13		right now.

In this example, Donald Trump employed the strategy, in line 8, where he demands Senator Ted Cruz to be more truthful in giving a statement on him. In this way, he also disagrees with that accusation as well.

The last strategy used by Donald Trump was '*dare*'. This is another strategy that is not explained thoroughly by Garcia-Pastor (2008). This strategy was used four times (1.54%). One occasion in which Donald Trump used this strategy was when he and Senator Marco Rubio had a debate moderated by Megyn Kelly over defeating Hillary Clinton. This sub-strategy appeared together with the sub-strategy '*state the communicative act(s) as common or shared knowledge*'. The clues to identify this strategy lie in such phrases as 'believe me' and 'I will...' which could be interpreted as ironic. However, it was found that they are not at all ironic. In this debate Senator Marco Rubio argued that the Republican Party nominee should be the one who would beat Hillary Clinton, who was most likely to be the Democrat Party nominee in the polls. When he received his turn, Donald Trump attempted to rebut that idea by daring the hearer and audience in general that if he and the senator were to race against one another, he would win. According to Trump, due to the fact that they were not put together yet, he still had a chance to win against Hillary regardless of the current polls.

(12)

1	MR	... Of all the people on this stage, he performs the worst against
2		Hillary Clinton.
3	DT	Wrong...
4	MR	... If you're our nominee, we will lose...
5	DT	... I beat Hillary Clinton. I beat Hillary Clinton in many polls...
6	MR	...You lose by (INAUDIBLE) points (ph). She will wipe you out.
7	DT	I beat Hillary Clinton in many polls...
8	MR	If you're our nominee (INAUDIBLE)...
9	MK	... Hold on, Senator, hold on...
10	DT	... I think I'm talking...
11	MR	... Oh, excuse me (INAUDIBLE)...
12	DT	... I beat Hillary Clinton...
13	MK	... Hold on, hold on, hold on...
14	DT	... I hope you think (INAUDIBLE)...
15	MK	... The audience cannot understand when you're talking over each
16		other. Finish your point, Mr. Trump.
17	DT	... I beat Hillary Clinton in many polls. The Cue (ph) poll just came
18		out. I beat Hillary Clinton in a recent Fox poll, I beat Hillary

19	Clinton in USA Today, I beat her today in a poll in Ohio. I beat I'm
20	the only one that beats Hillary Clinton. I beat and I have not started
21	on Hillary yet. Believe me, I will...

Negativity Cycles

This section presents the characteristics of negativity cycle in Trump's debates. These characteristics include 1) nature of equal composition of positive and negative aggravation (impoliteness strategies) 2) the contender's aim to the contender's intention to discredit the opponent and coerce him/her into a determinate course of action by means of positive and negative face impoliteness, and 3) The aim to control the topic of the interaction and hold the floor.

Regarding the first characteristic, this appears in a forty-line debate about health care system between Donald Trump and Senator Marco Rubio. The discursive struggle started off with Marco Rubio's insincere question of what kind of plan Donald Trump proposed for the health-care system in the U.S. and calling out his statement of lines around the state is a game of mapping of sort. In this debate Donald Trump used the strategies of be ironic/sarcastic, convey dislike for, and disagreement with H and close others (his/her/their things, actions, values and opinions, and belittle or diminish the importance of Hand H's things, actions, values and opinions. Donald Trump subsequently employed the strategy belittle or diminish the importance of Hand H's things, actions, values and opinions to defend the face aggravation move. In response, Senator Marco Rubio employed the same strategies be ironic/sarcastic. Later on Donald Trump employed the strategy of refer to rights, duties and rules not respected, fulfilled or complied with respectively. He continued by devising the strategy state the communicative act(s) as common or shared knowledge. In response, Senator Marco Rubio made a clearer statement when he accused Donald Trump that his plan was not clear to the senator. The senator employed the strategy convey dislike for, and disagreement with H and close others (his/her/their things, actions, values and opinions and the strategy state the communicative act(s) as common or shared knowledge. This debate continued until the last line uttered by Donald Trump.

The second characteristic is the aim to discredit the opponent and coerce him/her into a determinate course of action by means of positive and negative face impoliteness. This characteristic appeared in a debate about hiring employee between Donald Trump and Senator Marco Rubio. In total, Donald Trump used three positive-faced strategies and thirteen negative-faced strategies in this debate.

This debate shows that Marco Rubio, the one with the time for him to discussed on the issue had to combat with constant efforts by Donald Trump to discredit him of being incorrect over the issue of Donald Trump was not in the least a great businessman. Donald Trump's discrediting remarks included the fact that Senator Rubio never hired anybody leading to his statement of him being a 'lousy' businessman. He also explained the fact that the issue Senator Rubio brought was from his past, thus irrelevant. However, in this discursive struggle initiated by Donald Trump's interruption, Senator Rubio also did discredit and coerce Donald Trump into a course of action. Throughout the entire discursive struggle, Senator Rubio also employed such impoliteness strategies to achieve that goal as well. His effort to discredit Trump was just on the fact that Donald Trump was not the great businessman as he constantly established whether in the debate or in the political campaign in general.

The last characteristic is the aim to control the topic of the interaction and hold the floor. This characteristic can be seen in a debate cycle over economy between Donald Trump and Senator Marco Rubio. In this cycle, Trump used fifteen impoliteness strategies. In this cycle some of the strategies primarily functioned to control the topic in order to radiate the image of ability to handle every attack from contenders and possibly return back the favor with other face-aggravation moves.

From this debate cycle, it could be inferred that Donald Trump indeed employed such impoliteness strategies to control the topic of the interaction and hold the floor as he is the one on the dais in his turn to talk on the issue brought up

by the moderator. Donald Trump, in the middle of his statement regarding the explanation why he made his products he sold (including merchandise for his campaign, e.g. hats, shirts) in countries like China, Mexico, etc, was cut off by Senator Rubio's attempt to discredit him by challenging him to make them in America in order for more Americans to have jobs. Senator Rubio's efforts to discredit Donald Trump include the fact that Trump having bankrupted four companies, starting a fake university where a lot of lawsuits ended up being settled by Donald Trump, etc. In order to rebut these accusations, Donald Trump attempted to hold the floor and stop the interruptions by Senator Rubio. His efforts included claiming that he won most of the lawsuits and finally ask for 'permission' to respond to those which failed because the moderator claimed that he had responded thus implying that he failed to strike back on the facts that Senator Rubio had consistently added up. However, Trump's attempts of trying to hold back the floor still appeared concrete.

From the discussion, it can be seen how impoliteness strategies occur in negativity cycles and how it is played out.

CONCLUSION

This article examines the use of impoliteness strategies by Donald Trump in political debates as zero-sum games against other contenders. From a total of 70 conversations, it was found that Donald Trump employed ten out of fifteen impoliteness strategies proposed by Garcia-Pastor (2008), four in the category of positive-face oriented strategies and six in the category of negative-face oriented strategies. The findings indicated that negative-face oriented impoliteness strategies were the most frequent strategies used by Donald Trump in the three National Republican debates.

The results also show that Donald Trump used the strategy *'state the communicative act(s) as common or shared knowledge'* more frequently than the other strategies. In addition, the framework proposed by Garcia-Pastor (2008) has proved to be fit for the case of Donald Trump. It is shown by an objectivity on the characteristics of negativity cycles but still lacks on the objectivity

of the strategies offered as well in terms of a difference between similar strategies (e.g. '*Convey dislike for, and disagreement with H and close others (his/her/their things, actions, values and opinions*') and '*Refuse H and H's things, actions, values and opinions*'). Nevertheless, the applicability of the framework applied in different contexts is promising and therefore is recommended for future research.

REFERENCES

Donald Trump Biography. http://www.biography.com/people/donald-trump-9511238.Accessed in March 24, 2016.

Culpeper, J. (1996). "Towards an Anatomy of Impoliteness." *Journal of Pragmatics 25*: 349-367. Print.

Diamond, Jeremy. "Donald Trump: Ban all Muslim travel to U.S.". CNN Politics. 8 December 2015: Web. http://edition.cnn.com/2015/12/07/politics/donald-trump- muslim-ban-immigration/. Accessed in March 24, 2016.

Garcia-Pastor, M. D. (2008). Political campaign debates as zero-sum games: Impoliteness and power in candidates exchanges. In D. Bousfield and M. A. Locher (eds.), *Impoliteness in Language: Studies on its Interplay with Power in Theory and Practice*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Itkowitz, C. (2015). "Donald Trump says we're all too politically correct. But is that also a way to limit speech?" The Huffington Post 9 December 2015. Web. https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/inspired-life/wp/2015/12/09/donald-trump-says-were-all-too-politically-correct-but-is-that-also-a-way-to-limit-speech/ Accessed in February 28, 2016.

Klotz, P. (1999). "Politeness and Political Correctness: Ideological Impliciations." *Pragmatics 9* (1), pp. 155-161.

Yule, George. (1996). *Pragmatics.* New York: Oxford University Press.