

Univerzita Karlova v Praze

Filozofická fakulta

Ústav anglického jazyka a didaktiky



Bakalářská práce

Pavel Ďuriš

Evaluative language in the idiolect of Donald Trump in the context of the 2020 US presidential election

Evaluativní vyjadřování v idiolektu Donalda Trumpa v kontextu amerických prezidentských voleb roku 2020

Praha, 2022

Vedoucí práce: Mgr. Denisa Šebestová

Prohlašuji, že jsem bakalářskou práci vypracoval samostatně, že jsem řádně citoval všechny použité prameny a literaturu, a že práce nebyla využita v rámci jiného vysokoškolského studia, či k získání jiného nebo stejného titulu.

V Praze dne 15. srpna 2022

.....

I declare that the following BA thesis is my own work for which I used only the secondary literature that is listed in the references. This thesis was not used as a part of any other university study, nor was it used to obtain a different university degree.

Prague, August 15, 2022

.....

Souhlasím se zapůjčením bakalářské práce ke studijním účelům. I have no objections to the BA thesis being used for study purposes.

Acknowledgment

I would like to thank my supervisor Mgr. Denisa Šebestová for her guidance, patience, her valuable advice, and her willingness to help me tackle any problem I encountered in the writing of this thesis.

Abstrakt

Cílem této bakalářské práce je stanovit do jaké míry je v projevech Donalda Trumpa ohledně prezidentských voleb ve Spojených státech amerických z roku 2020 využito evaluativní vyjadřování. Práce má za cíl zjistit, zda převažuje použití pozitivního či negativního hodnocení v kontextu voleb. Trumpovo charakteristické použití intenzifikátorů a opakování bude také prozkoumáno ve spojitosti s hodnocením voleb. Teoretická část práce představí evaluativní vyjadřování na pozadí Martinovy a Whiteovy teorie hodnocení, které bude následně použita jako základ pro analýzu. Představeny budou také charakteristické prvky Trumpova jazyka a následně bude prodiskutováno spojení mezi manipulací v rétorice s evaluativním jazykem. Pro účely analýzy bude sestaven korpus Trumpových projevů z období po ukončení voleb. Analýza bude provedena za použití internetového korpusového manažeru Sketch Engine. Po vygenerování seznamu nejfrekventovanějších tokenů v korpusu budou vybrány tokeny s inherentní sémantickou souvislostí k tématu voleb. Jejich nejfrekventovanější adjektivní a adverbialní kolokace, kterými je evaluativní vyjadřování typicky realizováno, budou následně prohledány pro použití evaluativního vyjadřování. Výsledky vyhledávání budou interpretovány a klasifikovány za použití Martinovy a Whiteovy teorie hodnocení. Lze předpokládat, že v rámci tvrzení na téma voleb bude použit evaluativní jazyk, který bude polaritou zejména negativní. V souvislosti s evaluativním vyjadřováním bude prozkoumán také výskyt intenzifikátorů a opakování, které náleží do kategorie Graduation v rámci teorie hodnocení.

Klíčová slova: Trump, idiolekt, politický diskurz, korpusová analýza, kolokace, evaluativní jazyk, teorie hodnocení

Abstract

This bachelor thesis aims to determine to what degree evaluative language is employed by Donald Trump in speeches made regarding the 2020 US presidential election. The objective of this work is to determine whether positive or negative evaluation is more prevalent while addressing the election. Trump's characteristic use of intensification and repetition will also be investigated in relation to the evaluation of the election. The theoretical part will introduce evaluative language on the background of Martin and White's Appraisal theory, which will later be used as a framework for analysis. Several characteristic features of Trump's language will be introduced and afterwards, the link between manipulation in rhetoric and evaluative language will be discussed. A corpus of Trump's post-election speeches will be compiled for the purposes of the analysis. The analysis will be conducted using the online corpus manager Sketch Engine. After generating a list of the corpus' most frequent tokens, those with an inherent semantic relevance to the topic of elections will be selected. Their most frequent collocates will then be searched for uses of evaluative language, focusing specifically on the adjectival and adverbial collocates, which typically express evaluative meaning. The results will be interpreted afterwards, focusing on the classification of evaluative meanings found in the corpus using Martin and White's Appraisal theory. It is presumed, that evaluative language will be used while addressing the topic of the election, and that the evaluation will be predominantly negative in polarity. The presence of intensification and repetition, each belonging to the category of Graduation within Appraisal Theory, will be investigated in relation to the evaluative language as well.

Key words: Trump, idiolect, political discourse, corpus analysis, collocations, evaluative language, Appraisal theory

Table of Contents

1. Introduction	1
2. Theoretical Background	2
2.1. Emotional language	2
2.2. Evaluative language	3
2.3. Appraisal theory	5
2.3.1. Affect	6
2.3.2. Judgement	7
2.3.3. Appreciation	8
2.3.4. Linguistic means of Graduation	9
2.3.4.1. Intensification	10
2.3.4.2. Repetition	10
2.3.5. Limitations of Appraisal theory	11
2.4. Idiolect	12
2.4.1. Donald Trump's idiolect	13
2.5. Manipulation	15
3. Material and Method	16
3.1. Objective and hypothesis	16
3.2. Material	17
3.3. Selection of lemmas for analysis	17
3.4. Research method	18
3.5. Research limitations	20
4. Analysis	21
4.1. <i>Vote</i>	21
4.1.1. Identification of evaluative meaning in collocates of <i>vote</i>	22
4.1.2. <i>Fraudulent</i> as collocate of <i>vote</i>	22
4.2. <i>Election</i>	23
4.2.1. Identification of evaluative meaning in collocates of <i>election</i>	24
4.2.2. <i>Rig</i> as a collocate of <i>election</i>	26
4.2.3. <i>Corrupt</i> as a collocate of <i>election</i>	27
4.2.4. <i>Honest</i> as a collocate of <i>election</i>	28
4.2.5. <i>Fair</i> as a collocate of <i>election</i>	29
4.2.6. <i>Fake</i> as a collocate of <i>election</i>	30
4.2.7. <i>Important</i> as a collocate of <i>election</i>	31

4.2.8.	<i>Horrible</i> as a collocates of <i>election</i>	31
4.2.9.	<i>Phony</i> as a collocates of <i>election</i>	32
4.3.	Summary of findings.....	32
5.	Conclusion.....	34
	References.....	36
	Resumé.....	39
	Appendix.....	42

1. Introduction

The present bachelor thesis aims to determine which means of linguistic evaluation are utilized in Donald Trump's speeches that were delivered after the 2020 US presidential election at Trump rallies in years 2020 to 2022, wherein he addresses and contradicts the election results. The study focuses on the use of evaluative language for the purpose of persuasion and other accompanying rhetoric devices such as intensifiers and extensive repetition that are used in order to amplify the persuasive effects of evaluative language. The hypothesis of this study is that within the speeches that are the subject of the present analysis Trump relies heavily on evaluation in his language and uses emotionally packed statements in order to manipulate his audiences. The objective of this study is not to describe Trump's idiolect as a whole, but only within the bounds of the analyzed speeches.

The theoretical part of the thesis is concerned with the topics of idiolect, manipulation, evaluative language, and linguistic devices supporting the effects of evaluative language. The terms are defined and discussed both in relevance to the topic of the thesis as well as in the context of related studies. The terms emotional and evaluative language are explained and contrasted, including their relevance to political rhetoric. Different approaches to evaluation in language are introduced, focusing on Appraisal theory, which serves as the primary basis for analysis of the data collected for the purposes of the present thesis. Other linguistic strategies that are used in adjusting the degree of evaluation in language are discussed. After a brief explanation of the term idiolect, several characteristic features of Donald Trump's idiolect are introduced. Finally, the theoretical part defines manipulation, listing several common manipulation techniques often employed in political rhetoric, as well as its ties to evaluation in language.

In the practical part of the thesis, a corpus is compiled using transcripts of Trump's post-election speeches and is analyzed using the online corpus management tool *Sketch Engine*. Words with a semantic relevance to the topic of the presidential election are selected from a list of the most frequent tokens in the corpus. The collocations of these words are then analyzed and discussed based on the presence of evaluative language as well as intensification and repetition. The evaluative polarity of the collocates is examined and the results are interpreted using Appraisal theory. Finally, the ratio between positive and negative evaluation is calculated.

The topic of Donald Trump's idiolect was chosen mainly out of concern at the growing worldwide prominence of populist politics, of which Trump is seemingly one of the pioneers. Donald Trump lost the 2020 US presidential election to opposing candidate Joe Biden, and falsely alleged voter fraud. Trump's post-election speeches are a clear example of the devastating real-life consequences that manipulative rhetoric can have, such as the 2021 United States Capitol attack, which tragically ended in several casualties. Both understanding and recognizing manipulative rhetoric is of great importance, as this approach to politics can pose a grave danger to the health of society. Only through the understanding of the manipulative strategies that are being utilized in the information space, can the general public be educated about the threats of manipulative rhetoric.

2. Theoretical Background

The aim of this chapter is to introduce and define the relevant concepts connected mainly to evaluation in language and to the role of language in political rhetoric which are relevant to the subject of this work. Appraisal theory, which will be used in the analytical part of this work as a point of reference in the identification, classification and interpretation of evaluation, will be introduced. The concept of idiolect will also be introduced, first in general and afterwards with a focus on Donald Trump's idiolect. Finally, a link between evaluative language and manipulation will be discussed.

2.1. Emotional language

The original goal of this thesis was to determine what are the linguistic devices that Donald Trump utilizes in his speeches when addressing the topic of the results of the 2020 US presidential election, focusing on his use of emotional language. Veselovská divides meaning in language into descriptive and emotional – descriptive being meaning that expresses objective realities, whereas emotional meaning expresses subjective attitudes. (2017, p. 1-2) Emotional meaning in language can have further effect on the recipient that reaches beyond the mere conveying of information. Macagno and Walton explore this effect: they describe emotive words as words that “are used to elicit emotions or change our evaluation of reality.” (2014, p. 2) If speakers can use words in order to trigger an emotional response in their listeners and potentially change their view of the world, then emotional language can be a powerful tool for example in the field of political rhetoric, since politicians strive to gain power by means of influencing others. However, every individual experience is different, and so our perception of emotion necessarily must vary as well. Therefore, since emotion is wholly subjective, it is

difficult to categorize and describe it within the bounds of language. If every individual's experience of emotion is different, the interpretation of emotion in language can then vary from recipient to recipient. Subjective points of view in language can, however, also be expressed through evaluation. (Veselovská, 2017, p. 2) And according to Veselovská, the terms evaluative and emotional language are closely connected:

since we believe that evaluation always means expressing emotions and emotions usually have an evaluative nature (meaning that they can mostly be categorized within the scale between positive – negative), we use the terms emotional and evaluative interchangeably. (ibid., 2017, p. 2)

This thesis will however work with the term evaluative language instead of emotional language, as it is less likely to vary in interpretation by recipients and therefore easier to categorize and define in concrete terms.

2.2. Evaluative language

Hunston gives a definition of evaluative language, stating that evaluative language “expresses an attitude towards a person, situation or other entity and is both subjective and located within a societal value-system.” (2011, p. 1) Similarly to the emotional meaning described by Veselovská (2017), evaluative language is a subjective expression of a personal attitude, however, unlike emotion, it is not limited to individual experience. Hunston writes that “evaluation is both subjective and intersubjective,” – meaning that although “evaluative utterances express a personal opinion,” it is also important that “evaluation has the function of interacting with a social other.” (ibid., p. 12) For that reason evaluative language also plays an important role in rhetoric as “indicating an attitude towards something is important in socially significant speech acts such as persuasion and argumentation.” (ibid., p. 3) Therefore, as was the case with emotional language, the use of evaluation in language can also be a significant part of political strategy, as it can influence voters' views and opinions.

There are also, however, certain difficulties with defining evaluative language. As Hunston writes, “there is no set of language forms, either grammatical or lexical, that encompass the range of expressions of evaluation,” and that although, for example “adjectives and adverbs frequently express evaluative meaning,” that “does not mean that every adjective and adverb marks evaluation or that all evaluation can be identified in this way.” (ibid., p. 3) There are several views regarding the classification of evaluative language – Hunston lists three views on the subject.

The first view is that:

typical evaluative items include adjectives such as *terrible* and *wonderful* (or even, simply, *good* and *bad*) and that ordinary readers would often identify these as evaluative even out of context. (ibid., p. 13)

Veselovská goes on to state that certain lexical forms are inherently evaluative, meaning that they express an attitude in their very nature, and without the need for context – these are for example augmentatives, diminutives, vulgarisms or melioratives. (Veselovská, 2017, p. 21-27) The second and contrasting view states that “evaluation is heavily dependent on context,” and that viewing the items in question outside of context would be “an unreliable indicator of evaluative meaning.” (Hunston, 2011, p. 13) An example of the potential unreliability of assigning evaluative meaning out of context will be given later on in chapter 2.4.1. The final view that Hunston presents is that evaluative meaning is “indicated by such a large range of lexical and other items that it would be pointless to try and list them.” (ibid., p. 13) Although these views are largely conflicting, the subject of this thesis is evaluation expressed through collocations. For the purpose of this thesis, then, all evaluative meaning in the practical part must be examined within context. Hunston also writes that

whether a word is, in a given instance, neutral, positive, or negative can be ascertained by looking at a context no longer than a concordance of something between 80 and 500 characters long. (ibid., p. 15)

The specific length of the collocation window used in the analytical part of this thesis will be elaborated upon in the third chapter of this work.

Hunston further elaborates on the act of evaluation itself. There are a minimum of three participants in an evaluative act – first, “the evaluator,” followed by “the person, utterance, object or situation evaluated,” and last “the receiver of the information.” (ibid., p. 166) Other roles that may possibly be involved are: “the beneficiary in a positive situation, or the equivalent in a negative situation, the causer of an act of evaluation and the reporter of the act.” (ibid., p. 166). In the context of this thesis, both the evaluator and the receiver of the information will always be the same – in this case, the evaluator will be Donald Trump and the receiver the attendees of Trump rallies. The person, utterance, object or situation evaluated will vary, but samples will be selected in a way that the evaluative acts will always be relevant to the topic of the election.

In her book, Hunston also briefly introduces four of the most relevant approaches to evaluation – these being Appraisal theory; Status, Value and Relevance; Stance; and

Metadiscourse. (ibid., p. 19-24) Of these, only Appraisal theory will be elaborated on in detail, and will serve as basis for the analytical part. This theory was selected based on the fact, that it had already been utilized in existing research made on Donald Trump's use of evaluation in language (Ross and Caldwell, 2019), that will be introduced in further detail in chapter 2.4.1. of this work.

2.3. Appraisal theory

For the development of Appraisal theory, Hunston gives credit to Martin and White (2005) who outlined the theory in their book *The Language of Evaluation: Appraisal in English*. (2011, p. 19) Martin and White divide Appraisal into “three interacting domains – ‘attitude,’ ‘engagement’ and ‘graduation.’” (2005, p. 35) They define Attitude as being “concerned with our feelings, including emotional reactions, judgements of behaviour and evaluation of things,” Engagement as dealing “with sourcing attitudes and the play of voices around opinions in discourse,” and Graduation as attending to “grading phenomena whereby feelings are amplified and categories blurred.” (ibid.) They further divide the category of Attitude into sub-categories: ‘affect,’ ‘judgement and ‘appreciation.’ (ibid.) Affect is defined as dealing “with resources for construing emotional reactions.” (ibid.) The following sub-category of Judgement is defined as being “concerned with resources for assessing behaviour according to various normative principles,” (ibid., p. 35-36) and the final sub-category of Appreciation is defined as looking “at resources for construing the value of things, including natural phenomena and semiosis.” (Martin and White, 2005, p. 36) According to Martin (2000), there is a certain overlap between the three sub-categories – he views Affect as “the basic system, which is then institutionalized in two major realms of uncommon sense discourse” – those of Judgement and Appreciation. (p. 147) This idea is elaborated upon in Martin and White (2005):

One way to think about judgement and appreciation is to see them as institutionalised feelings, which take us out of our everyday common sense world into the uncommon sense worlds of shared community values. In these terms, judgement reworks feelings in the realm of proposals about behaviour – how we should behave or not; ... Appreciation on the other hand reworks feelings as propositions about the value of things – what they are worth or not.... (p. 45)

Therefore, all three of the previously mentioned sub-categories are related, with Judgement and Appreciation both stemming from Affect. In order to provide a sufficient framework for analysis, the sub-categories of Affect, Judgement and Appreciation will be elaborated on in greater detail throughout the following chapters.

Another important distinction is made by Hunston and Thompson between what they term “inscribed and evoked appraisal”:

Inscribed appraisal is explicitly expressed in the text (a *bright* kid, a *vicious* kid), whereas with evoked appraisal an evaluative response is projected by reference to events or states which are conventionally prized (a kid who *reads a lot*) or frowned on (a kid who *tears the wings off butterflies*) (Martin, 2000, p. 142, my italics)

Therefore, Appraisal can be expressed not only by evaluative words, but also by phrases comprised of words that possess no evaluative meaning when they are isolated outside of the evaluative phrase and viewed solely within context of the node word.

2.3.1. Affect

Affect can simply be defined as dealing “with the expression of emotion (happiness, fear, etc.)” (Martin, 2000, p. 142) Hunston provides an example:

ex. 1: “I *loved* the film,”

and defines Affect as “expressing attitude by construing an emotional response.” (Hunston, 2011, p. 20, my italics) Martin and White (2005) classify Affect based on six criteria, the first being whether the emotion conveyed in the course of the evaluation is “popularly construed by the culture as positive ... or negative.” (p. 46) An example illustrating the difference in polarity is given:

ex. 2: “**positive affect** – the captain was *happy*,”

ex. 3: “**negative affect** – the captain was *sad*.” (ibid., p. 47, my italics)

The following factor deals with whether the emotion is accompanied by an “extralinguistic manifestation,” or whether it is “internally experienced as an emotive state or an ongoing mental process.” (ibid.) This distinction is expressed by the categories of “behavioural” and “mental processes”:

ex. 4: “**behavioural surge** – the captain *wept*,”

ex. 5: “**mental process/state** – the captain *disliked* leaving/ the captain felt *sad*.” (ibid. p. 47, my italics)

The third factor of classifying Affect is based on whether the emotion in question is expressed as a reaction to a “specific emotional Trigger,” or whether it can be viewed as “a general ongoing mood”:

ex. 6: “**reaction to other** – the captain *disliked* leaving,”

ex. 7: “**undirected mood** – the captain was *sad*.” (ibid., my italics)

The fourth factor deals with the gradability of the emotions expressed on a scale of “low, median and high,” which, as Martin and White expect, can be applied to most lexicalisations of emotions:

- ex. 8: “**low** – the captain *disliked* leaving,”
- ex. 9: “**median** – the captain *hated* leaving,”
- ex. 10: “**high** – the captain *detested* leaving.” (ibid., p. 48, my italics)

The following variable in the typology of Affect is based on whether the expression of emotion involves intention, relating to the realis/irrealis distinction:

- ex. 11: “**realis** – the boy *liked* the present,”
- ex. 12: “**irrealis** – the boy *wanted* the present.” (Martin, 2000, p. 150, my italics)

The sixth and final factor described by Martin and White categorizes emotions into three groups “having to do with un/happiness,” covering “emotions concerned with ‘affairs of the heart’ – sadness, hate, happiness and love;” followed by the category of “in/security,” which is concerned with “emotions concerned with ecosocial well-being – anxiety, fear, confidence and trust;” and the final category of “dis/satisfaction,” which covers “emotions concerned with telos (the pursuit of goals) – ennui, displeasure, curiosity, respect.” (Martin and White, 2005, p. 49) The examples they provide are as follows:

- ex. 13: “**un/happiness** – the captain felt *sad/happy*,”
- ex. 14: “**in/security** – the captain felt *anxious/confident*,”
- ex. 15: “**dis/satisfaction** – the captain felt *fed up/absorbed*.” (ibid., my italics).

Affect serves as the basis of Attitude and provides the foundation for the following two sub-categories of Judgement and Appreciation, which will be elaborated upon in the following chapters.

2.3.2. Judgement

Hunston defines Judgement as “expressing attitude by construing a view of the behaviour of the director as a social being,” and provides the following example:

- ex. 16: ““This director *really knows what she is doing*.”” (Hunston, 2011, p. 20, my italics)

This sub-category focuses on the evaluated subject’s behaviour and deals predominantly “with moral assessments of behaviour (honesty, kindness, etc.)” (Martin, 2000, p. 142) Similarly to the sub-category of Affect, a distinction between positive and negative evaluations can be recognised in Judgements. (Martin and White, 2005, p. 52) Martin and White divide Judgement

into “judgements of esteem” and “judgements of sanction.” (ibid.) Judgements of esteem take place primarily in the context of spoken discourse, deal with the role of behavior within oral culture and are associated with esteems of “‘normality’ (how unusual someone is), ‘capacity’ (how capable they are) and ‘tenacity’ (how resolute they are).” (ibid.) Positive Judgements of esteem can also be interpreted as admiration, and the negative as critique. (ibid. p, 53) Some of the examples they provide are:

- ex. 17: “**normality**: positive – *normal, natural*; negative – *odd, peculiar*”
- ex. 18: “**capacity**: positive – *powerful, vigorous*; negative – *mild, weak*,”
- ex. 19: “**tenacity**: positive – *plucky, brave*; negative – *timid, cowardly*,” (ibid.)

Judgements of social sanction on the other hand often occur within written discourse, deal with the role of behavior under church and state and consist of Judgements of “‘veracity (how truthful someone is), and ‘propriety’ (how ethical someone is),” (ibid., p. 52) and positive Judgements of social sanction can be viewed as praise, while the negative as condemnation. (ibid., p. 53) Among some of the examples are:

- ex. 20: “**veracity**: positive – *truthful, honest*; negative – *dishonest, deceitful*,”
- ex. 21: “**propriety**: positive – *law abiding, fair*; negative – *corrupt, unfair*,” (ibid.)

The complete list of examples of Judgement that Martin and White provide is more extensive, however, not exhaustive. Furthermore, they add that the evaluative meaning of lexical items is context-dependent, and so the list they provide should be treated as a general guide to, rather than “a dictionary of the value of Judgement, which can be mechanically applied in text analysis.” (ibid., p. 52) Nevertheless, given the overall lack of resources for classifying Judgement, and evaluative meaning in general, the list will serve as a reference point for identifying evaluative meanings, as well as for their following interpretation in the analytical part of this work.

2.3.3. Appreciation

Unlike Judgement, that dealt largely with evaluating behavior, Martin and White state that Appreciation is the evaluation of “things.” (ibid., p. 56). Hunston illustrates this by an example:

- ex. 22: ““The film is *carefully balanced*,””

and goes on to define Appreciation as “expressing attitude by construing an aesthetic view of the film as an object.” (Hunston, 2011, p. 20, my italics) Appreciation then can be understood as evaluating an item through assigning it with qualities that come from a subjective view of

the item. Martin and White divide Appreciations into “‘reactions’ to things (do they catch our attention; do they please us?), their ‘composition’ (balance and complexity), and their ‘value,’” and add that both positive and negative evaluations can be recognized in Appreciation. (Martin and White, 2005, p. 56) They provide lists of examples per each category, some of them are as follows:

- ex. 23: “**reaction** (impact): positive – *captivating*; negative – *boring*,”
- ex. 24: “**reaction** (quality): positive – *beautiful*; negative – *ugly*,”
- ex. 25: “**composition** (balance): positive – *consistent*; negative – *contradictory*,”
- ex. 26: “**composition** (complexity): positive – *simple*; negative – *ornate*,”
- ex. 27: “**value**: positive – *innovative*; negative – *derivative*.” (ibid.)

The list of examples of Appreciation will also be used as a point of reference for the identification of evaluative words in the analytical part. As is clear from the selected examples, all these categories are mostly related to the evaluation of an object’s aesthetic qualities, but each from a varying perspective:

Reaction is related to affection (emotive – ‘it grabs me’, desiderative – ‘I want it’); composition is related to perception (our view of order); and valuation is related to cognition (our considered opinions). (ibid., 57)

Martin and White provide a basis for the interpretation of Attitude in language – first, they state that “as inherently gradable meanings, the canonical grammatical realisation for attitude is adjectival.” (ibid., p. 58) As was already stated, Hunston expresses a similar idea, stating that evaluative meaning is often expressed by adjectival and adverbial constructions. (2011, p. 3) Martin and White go on to provide further examples of sentence structures typically associated with each of the three sub-categories of Attitude (2005, p. 58-59) that may be useful as a groundwork for interpretation of evaluative language but are by no means exhaustive.

2.3.4. Linguistic means of Graduation

Of the three original categories of Attitude, Engagement and Graduation, the category of Graduation is also worth expanding upon for the purposes of this thesis. Martin and White state, that “graduation has to do with adjusting the degree of an evaluation,” (ibid., p. 37) describing Graduation as being “concerned with up-scaling and down-scaling” – they go on to state that “a defining property of all attitudinal meanings is their gradability,” and that “it is a general property of values of Affect, Judgement and Appreciation that they construe greater or lesser degrees of positivity or negativity.” (ibid., p. 135) According to them, Graduation is realized by linguistic means such as “intensification, comparative and superlative morphology,

repetition, and various graphological and phonological features.” (ibid., p. 37) Of these, especially intensification and repetition will be further elaborated upon in the following chapters, first generally, then within the context of Donald Trump’s idiolect. As will be stated later in chapter 2.4.1., Donald Trump is a prolific user of both intensification (Leith, 2017; MacLeod, 2017; Perlman, 2018) as well as repetition (Björkenstam and Grigonytė, 2015; Holland and Fermor, 2017). Before they are discussed within the context of Donald Trump’s language, however, it is necessary to first introduce both terms generally.

2.3.4.1. Intensification

Intensifiers are a type of modification mostly expressed by adverbs that work as a “scaling device” for the words that they modify. (Quirk et al, 1985, p. 445) When intensifiers are used to modify adjectives, they express their gradability (ibid., p. 435) and can be divided into two categories: amplifiers, which “scale upwards from an assumed norm,” such as *very*, *terribly* or *extremely*, and downtoners, which have “a lowering effect, usually scaling downwards from an assumed norm,” such as *almost*, *barely*, or *hardly*. (ibid., p. 445) Furthermore, Martin and White (2005) add the category of “maximisers,” that “construe the up-scaling as being at the highest possible intensity,” for example *utterly* miserable, *totally* miserable or *absolutely* miserable. (p. 142) Intensifiers are void of meaning on their own – they are used to “strengthen the meaning of other expressions and show emphasis.” (*Cambridge Dictionary*) Martin and White classify them as “‘grammatical’ items on the grounds that they are a closed set and that they have no referential meaning.” (2005, p. 142-3) However, they add that “intensification is also carried out by isolated modifiers which are ‘lexical’ rather than ‘grammatical,’” for example *ice* cold or *crystal* clear. (ibid., p. 143) Partington writes that certain intensifiers used to carry a relevance to the evaluative polarity of the words they modified – for example intensifiers such as *terribly* or *awfully* used to be paired only with words of a negative evaluative polarity. Over the course of the 19th century, however, these intensifiers lost their evaluative quality, and became increasingly paired with both neutral and positive items. (Partington, 1993, p. 183-184) This means, for example, that *terribly* can be paired both with negative words like *tired*, and positive words like *clever*.

2.3.4.2. Repetition

The *Encyclopedia of the Sciences of Learning* defines repetition as “the act of copying or reproducing verbal or nonverbal behavior produced by self or other in communicative situations.” (Piirainen-Marsh and Riikka, 2012) Martin and White (2005) view repetition as a

mode of intensification, and state that it can be realised “either by the repeating of the same lexical item, ... or by the assembling of lists of terms which are closely related semantically.” (p. 144) As an example of the latter, they wrote:

ex. 28: “In fact it was probably the most *immature, irresponsible, disgraceful* and *misleading* address ever given by a British Prime Minister. (ibid.)

In her article on repetition Penelope Brown writes that repetition has many functions within language, one of them being a poetic device, which is why within certain contexts repetition may be viewed as characteristic of “high registers, formal styles, oratory, and ritual language.” (Brown, 1999, 223-224) Repetition however commonly takes place in common day-to-day speech as well. It can also play a role in political discourse where it can have what psychologist Jeremy Dean describes as the “illusion of truth” effect. (Dean, 2021) He argues that using repetition “we are exposed to a message again and again,” and so “it becomes more familiar,” and we are more likely to believe it.

2.3.5. Limitations of Appraisal theory

Appraisal theory is a comprehensive system for classifying and interpreting evaluative language, however, it has certain methodological limitations. In Fuoli’s (2018) paper devoted to the methodological process of applying Appraisal theory, he explores some of these drawbacks, beginning with the notion that

identifying expressions of appraisal in text is a complex and highly subjective task. Evaluative meanings may be conveyed both explicitly and implicitly through an open-ended range of diverse linguistic forms. Moreover, the genre and the communicative context in which a text is produced and consumed have a major impact on our interpretation of the meanings expressed. (p. 1-2)

As is the case with evaluative language in general, there is no exhaustive methodological approach that could be applied to any given discourse and yield reliable results. The identification, classification and interpretation of evaluation in language requires a degree of subjectivity. For this reason, “multiple interpretations for textual items are possible and the boundaries between the categories are not always clear-cut.” (ibid., p. 2) An analysis of evaluation in language using Appraisal theory is not only subjective, but also context dependent. Fuoli argues, that because of the heavy context dependency of evaluation, the definitions and examples provided in the literature on Appraisal theory do not always match with instances found in texts intended for analysis. (ibid.) This combined with the lack of a

well-defined and widely accepted methodology (ibid.) provides yet another argument for the necessity of a degree of subjectivity in identifying and interpreting evaluation in language.

The main problem of identifying evaluative language in discourse is the fact that “evaluation may be realized through an open-ended range of expressions of varying length and complexity and belonging to any word class,” (ibid., p. 4), meaning that there is no universal way of identifying evaluation in any given text. For that reason, Fuoli states that “it is the analyst’s ultimate responsibility to decide what counts as evaluation in any given text, which is an inherently subjective process.” (ibid.) The problem of classifying evaluation using Appraisal theory is the notion that “different interpretations for an expression are often equally plausible, and multiple category labels valid.” (ibid., p. 7) Fuoli argues that within the system of Attitude, the categories of Judgement and Appreciation can often appear ambiguous, especially “when qualities that are normally attributed to people are ascribed to the outcome of their behavior instead.” (ibid., p. 9) Despite the previously mentioned shortcomings of Appraisal theory, the framework is comprehensive and therefore should provide a sufficient foundation for the analytical part of this work.

2.4. Idiolect

An individual’s uniqueness is reflected not only in their physical appearance or their mental attributes, but in their specific use of language as well. In the linguistic section of *Oxford Bibliographies* David Wright argues that every individual possesses and uses their own variety of language, that reaches “from the level of the phoneme to the level of discourse.” (Wright, 2018). This variety is referred to as “idiolect.” The distinctiveness between individual idiolects is supposedly so clear, that Wright goes on to add that “no two people who share a common language have exactly the same linguistic repertoire.” (ibid.). Although the term idiolect encompasses all areas of language, this thesis will only be concerned with the lexical aspects of an idiolect, meaning the vocabulary that one characteristically uses. With public figures such as politicians, it is important to note that the language they use as private individuals may not be identical to the idiolect used by their public persona. As authors Matthias Eitelmann and Ulrike Schneider state in their book dedicated to Donald Trump’s idiolect:

most political discourse is mediated; that is, what we are seeing or hearing is not necessarily the politician's own language, but rather the language scripted by spokespeople, who produce a voice that is officially promoted as the politician's. (Eitelmann & Schneider, 2020, p. 7)

It is impossible to determine to what degree Donald Trump's speeches are scripted, as well as to distinguish his idiolect from that of his political persona. Due to the nature of the material collected for this thesis, only the idiolect of Donald Trump's political persona may reliably be considered the subject of analysis.

2.4.1. Donald Trump's idiolect

Donald Trump is famous not only for his vast wealth, his career in entertainment or his term as president of the United States of America, but also for his characteristic use of language. The question is whether the language of Trump's speeches is his natural idiolect or whether it is constructed as a political strategy to appeal to voters. There are several prominent features of Trump's language, such as its simplicity. Various sources agree that Trump's speaking style is on the level of an elementary school student, relying mostly on shorter sentences, using fewer syllables per word and a smaller lexical diversity than his political rivals. (Shafer, 2015; Shugerman, 2018; Wang & Liu, 2018, p. 314) It may be easy to interpret his oversimplified language as a sign of low intelligence, however, since Trump's political speeches are most likely the result of the collaborative effort of his campaign team, the reason behind the simplicity of his language may be more complicated. Eitelmann and Schneider argue that Trump uses oversimplified language in an effort to appear more relatable to voters. (2020, p. 3)

There is also evidence of Trump's use of evaluative language in his speeches, leaning heavily towards negative evaluation. In a keyword analysis study of Trump's campaign speeches from the 2016 US presidential election conducted by Jesse Egbert and Douglas Biber, the authors concluded that Trump used overwhelmingly negative evaluation, especially when referring to his political rivals – out of 24 evaluative keywords, only two were positive. (2020, p. 27). This study also provides an example of the context-dependency of classifying evaluative language – one of the keywords being *nice*, which, out of context “appears to be positive but was actually preceded by *not* nearly half of the time,” (ibid., p. 27) reversing its polarity to negative evaluation. Another keyword analysis study conducted by Andrew S. Ross and David Caldwell (2019) focused on Trump's negative evaluation of his opponent Hilary Clinton on Twitter. The study used as its foundation the Appraisal theory established by Martin and White (2005) and discovered heavy use of negative Judgements of Trump's rival Clinton, often followed by “other Judgements, such as in relation to her capacity . . . , or Appreciation, such as in relation to the value of her activities.” (Ross and Caldwell, 2019, p. 13) Ross and Caldwell

also found that Attitude, one of the categories of Appraisal, was expressed primarily through the sub-category of Judgement. (ibid.)

Trump is also a prominent user of intensifiers – his frequent uses of words such as *very* have been remarked on by many. (Leith, 2017; MacLeod, 2017; Perlman, 2018) As was stated before, intensification, belonging to the Appraisal category of Graduation, is one of the linguistic devices which can be used in order to amplify the evaluative meaning of a statement. In a study conducted by Stange, Donald Trump’s use of intensifiers in his tweets is analyzed and discussed in comparison with the tweets of democrat politicians as well as the spoken section of the COCA 2010-2017 corpus. The study confirmed that Trump is indeed a heavy user of intensifiers, having, for example, used the intensifier *very* in his tweets over eight times more often than the democrat politicians. (Stange, 2015, p. 94) Interestingly, the study also found that the second most frequent collocate of the intensifier *very* was *very*, (ibid., p. 95-96), which hints to another characteristic trait of Trump’s idiolect, namely extensive repetition. The study also found out that in his tweets, Trump greatly favors the use of amplifiers over downtoners. (ibid., p. 105) According to Stange, his heavy use of amplifiers hints at his speech being “very informal and emotionally loaded,” and unlike “more typical politicians’ speech that aims at a formal register associated with power, respectability, and trustworthiness.” (ibid., p. 105) This is also relevant to the other factors of Trump’s idiolect already mentioned, namely its oversimplification and frequent use of evaluative meaning.

As was mentioned above, one of the key characteristics of Trump’s idiolect is also extensive use of repetition. Björkenstam and Grigonytė attribute his use of repetition “to efforts to persuade by means of influencing the emotions of the audience.” (2015, p. 41) In their study devoted to the analysis of Trump’s rhetoric during the first 100 days of his presidency, Jack Holland and Ben Fermor argue that Trump’s excessive repetition of his statements is strategic, and that by “repeating the most important elements of his discourse,” he “succeeds in driving his core identity messages home for key audiences.” (2017) So while the use of heavy repetition may seem to hint at Trump’s limited vocabulary, it also may be viewed as a strategic measure. Björkenstam and Grigonytė write that Trump “repeats words (e.g., ‘great’) as well as longer linguistic units (e.g., ‘That is so hokey’), and paraphrases himself by repeating the same content using different words (e.g., ‘give it a shot,’ ‘try it again’).” (2015, p. 43)

2.5. Manipulation

The *American Psychological Association Dictionary of Psychology* defines the act of manipulation as “behavior designed to exploit, control, or otherwise influence others to one’s advantage.” Our actions, however, can affect others regardless of whether they are motivated by personal gain. For that reason, it is necessary to differentiate between the terms of manipulation and influence. In an interview with *Forbes*, Burg defines influence as “the ability to move a person or persons to a desired action, usually within the context of a specific goal,” and states that by itself, it is neither positive nor negative. (Duncan, 2018) Burg further elaborates:

influence is negative when one manipulates others simply for someone’s own selfish purposes. Influence is positive when one persuades others in order that both/all parties obtain the results they want. The major difference is in the intent. (ibid.)

In order to determine whether someone is a manipulator, then, it is necessary to consider the intent of their persuasive act. In their article titled “Manipulative Speech Techniques in Political Discourse,” Shigapova et al. argue, however, that the “main aim of political communication is the attempt to get the power.” (2021) The attempt to gain power in itself seems a mostly selfish intent. Of course, once the power is obtained, one may wield it in a way beneficial to those who helped them achieve power, but to know the precise motives for one’s actions seems impossible. It is still, however, possible to differentiate between persuasion and manipulation even in the context of political rhetoric. Shigapova et al. outline the strategies of persuasion – the first being “argumentative strategy,” which deals with “persuading a recipient with the help of arguments,” that have a firm basis in facts or future assessments. The second strategy is “propagation strategy,” which they define as “influencing people’s behavior by making them do something, make a choice” based on promise and appeal. (ibid.) Shigapova et al. then present two strategies of manipulative political rhetoric – the first being “the self-presentation strategy,” or, in other words “the tactics of making oneself equal to others,” and the second being “the tactics of opposition,” or “dividing the society into ‘friends’ and ‘foes.’” (ibid.) They elaborate on the techniques most often used in the execution of these strategies of manipulation:

techniques as giving unfeasible promises, unproven facts, and overstatements are used as well as manipulative tactics among which there is politeness tactics, the tactics of

distracting the recipient's attention from the actual problem and overestimation tactics. (ibid.)

Another form of manipulative strategy they mention is "shaping the emotional state of the audience," and the techniques employed in executing this strategy are: "unification tactics (uniting all people as representatives of one nation), addressing the recipients' emotions, tactics of considering the audience's values (system of values)." (ibid.) This view coincides with the effects of emotional and evaluative language on the recipients' view of reality already discussed in chapters 2.1 and 2.2. Macagno and Walton (2014) discuss the manipulative effects of emotive words and state that

The emotive power of these words can make them extremely effective instruments to direct and encourage certain attitudes and choices. But at the same time, the very emotions that they evoke make them subtle tools to manipulate the other's decisions and feelings. (2014, p. 5)

Ross and Caldwell (2019) are also aware of the potentially manipulative effects of emotional and evaluative language and view the use of negative evaluation as a strategy wherein "one party or individual aims to signal that the opposition is unsuitable to carry out the task of governing." (p. 2) They go on to cite a study conducted by Gross and Johnson (2016), wherein a correlation between Trump's use of negative evaluation and a dramatic rise in his poll numbers was revealed. (p. 750)

3. Material and Method

In this chapter the objective and hypothesis of the present study will be established. Afterwards, the obtaining and compilation of material used in the analytical part will be explained, as well as how specific words were selected for the analysis and how their collocations were analyzed. Finally, research limitations will be discussed.

3.1. Objective and hypothesis

The objective of this study, as was already stated in the introductory chapter, is to analyze the idiolect of Donald Trump within the context of his post-2020 US presidential election speeches, and to determine to what degree evaluative language is being utilized while addressing the topic of the election within those speeches. The analytical part of this work aims to compare the number of positive and negative evaluation in the surroundings of words relevant to the topic of the election. By doing so, it will be possible to determine whether Donald Trump presents the topic of the presidential election in a positive or negative light. The findings of secondary literature discovered a link between evaluation in language and

manipulation, which this thesis aims to investigate. As was previously stated in chapter 2.4.1., which focused on Trump's idiolect, Trump employs evaluative language in his speeches, and predominantly that of negative polarity. Therefore, based on the findings of secondary literature, it is expected that evaluation will be employed heavily in the context of the topic of the presidential election. Furthermore, secondary literature contains evidence of Trump's use of negative evaluation and of Judgement, one of the sub-categories of Affect within Appraisal theory in particular. There is also sufficient evidence of Trump's use of Graduation, predominantly of intensification and repetition (Björkenstam and Grigonytė, 2015; Stange, 2015; Holland and Fermor, 2017; Leith, 2017; MacLeod, 2017; Perlman, 2018), therefore the presence of these two linguistic means is also expected.

3.2. Material

The material for the analytical part was drawn from the website *rev.com*¹ which specializes in speech-to-text transcription combining both speech recognition AI software, as well as human freelancers to create custom captions, transcripts and subtitles. The website, however, includes numerous freeware transcripts of various political speeches, transcripts of popular entertainment events and journalism media. Among these are also several hundred transcripts of Donald Trump's speeches. From these, only speeches that Trump delivered after the November 2020 US presidential election were selected. In order to maintain a valid data sample, an even narrower selection of speeches had to be made based on the type of audience. Since the topic of this thesis is the way Donald Trump uses language to influence his supporters, only post-election speeches delivered at Trump Rallies, events held specifically for Trump supporters, were selected. A total of eight speeches ranging from December 5, 2020, until May 1, 2022, were compiled using the online corpus manager *Sketch Engine* into a corpus of a total of 103 041 tokens.

3.3. Selection of lemmas for analysis

Using *Sketch Engine*'s "Wordlist" function a list of words was created and arranged by the frequency that they appear in the corpus. In order to avoid the repetition of identical words in varying word forms, only lemmas were searched, excluding non-words. A list of a total of 4100 lemmas was generated. From these, only the lemmas with an inherent semantic relevance to the topic of the election were selected. This was done for the purpose of analyzing the

¹ "Donald Trump Transcripts," *Rev*, <https://www.rev.com/blog/transcript-category/donald-trump-transcripts>, Accessed April 25, 2022.

potential use of evaluative language in their close proximity, in order to determine whether Trump uses evaluative language while addressing the topic of the election. These were words that even out of context related to either the election process (the lemmas selected were: “vote,” “election,” “ballot,” “campaign”), the election candidates and their political parties (“Biden,” “Trump,” “democrat,” “republican,”), to the position in question (“president,” “incumbent”) or the voters (“voter”). Out of this list a total of two most frequent lemmas were selected, as illustrated in Table 1, based on their absolute and relative frequencies, as well as their overall position in the corpus.

Table 1: Frequency of selected lemmas in corpus

	abs	%	position
<i>vote</i>	364	0,353%	44
<i>election</i>	341	0,331%	51
<i>Biden</i>	217	0,211%	83
<i>ballot</i>	159	0,154%	106
<i>president</i>	144	0,14%	118
<i>democrat</i>	103	0,1%	150
<i>voter</i>	96	0,093%	159
<i>republican</i>	95	0,092%	160
<i>Trump</i>	86	0,083%	170
<i>campaign</i>	29	0,028%	378
<i>incumbent</i>	7	0,007%	1114

In the analytical part, the previously selected lemmas will be referred to as node words, and their collocations will be the subject of analysis.

3.4. Research method

Březina defines collocations as “combinations of words that habitually co-occur in texts and corpora.” (2018, p. 67) Furthermore, they can be defined by the criteria of distance, frequency, and exclusivity. (Březina et al., 2015, p. 140) By distance Březina et al. mean “the span around a node word ... where we look for collocates,” which is also referred to as the “collocation window.” (ibid.) Based on their statistical calculations Sinclair et al. established an average collocation window by determining “how many tokens away from the node does one go before the node ceases to have any effect.” (2004, p. 42) The average they arrived at is four tokens on either side of the node word. (ibid.) As was already stated in the theoretical section of this work, the collocation window necessary for determining the evaluative polarity of a given word should be between 80 and 500 characters (Hunston, 2011, p. 15), therefore the average given by Sinclair et al. is insufficient in this case. However, Gablasova et al. add that

The distance between the node and the second-, third-, and so on order collocate is thus not the immediate window distance (as is the case for first-order collocates), but a mediated distance via an association with another word in the network. (2017, p. 158)

This means that the further away from the node the tokens are, the greater the chance they are collocates of a different node. In order to preserve the context necessary for interpreting the evaluative polarity of the node word's collocates, but at the same time maintain a window of collocates still relevant to the node word, this study will use a collocation window of five tokens on either side of the node word.

Using Sketch Engine's 'Word Sketch' method a processed list of collocates of the previously selected lemmas was generated. 'Word Sketch' produces a list of collocates sorted either by their frequency, or their typicality score. Březina argues that frequency-based collocates "have only a limited usefulness," because

the top collocates will typically be function words co-occurring with the node merely by the virtue of their frequency anywhere in the corpus. (2018, p. 68)

Therefore, the collocates were sorted based on their typicality score, otherwise known as logDice – "a statistic measure for identifying collocations," that "expresses the typicality of the collocation" and is calculated "based on the frequency of the node and the collocate and the frequency of the whole collocation (co-occurrence of the node and collocate)."² The typicality score indicates the strength of the collocation or, in other words, the likelihood of the collocation co-occurring with the given node word in comparison to other words in the corpus. Unlike other statistic measures intended for corpus analysis, typicality score does not take into account the size of the corpus, and "is only based on the frequency of words x and y and the frequency of the bigram xy ."³

By default, the 'Word Sketch' method also divides the collocates into categories based on their grammatical relationship to the node word. One of the grammatical relationships that 'Word Sketch' allows to filter collocates by is modification, which is typically expressed by adjectives and adverbs. (Quirk et al., 1985, p. 65) As was already mentioned in the theoretical part of this work, evaluative meaning is most often expressed through adjectives and adverbs. In order to narrow down the results, only the collocates classified as modifying the node word were therefore selected for analysis. Finally, the selected collocates were listed based on their

² "logDice," *Sketch Engine*, https://www.sketchengine.eu/my_keywords/logdice/, Accessed: July 28, 2022.

³ "Asociační (kolokační) míry," *Wiki Český národní korpus*, https://wiki.korpus.cz/doku.php/pojmy:asociacni_miry (My translation), Accessed: August 2, 2022.

general cooccurrence with the node word as lemmas, regardless of their grammatical relationship. Out of these collocates fifteen were selected per every node word based on their typicality score, and from this list those that possess an evaluative polarity in isolation were selected. The presence of evaluative meanings was identified based on dictionary definitions of the given collocates. The lists of examples of Judgement and Appreciation given by Martin and White (2005, p. 53-56) were also used as a point of reference in the process of identification of evaluative language. However, as was already mentioned previously in the theoretical part of the present study, the identification of evaluation in language is partly subjective, and therefore a degree of personal judgment was also employed in the selection of words with an evaluative polarity from the list of collocates. Afterwards, using Sketch Engine's 'Concordance' function, their evaluative polarity within the context of the node's collocation window established previously was analyzed. The aim was to determine whether the node words' collocates are evaluative in nature and if so to afterwards compare the frequencies of collocates of positive evaluative polarity and the collocates of negative evaluative polarity co-occur with the selected node words. The co-occurrence of intensifiers and repetition with the evaluative collocations was examined as well. Finally, where possible, the results were interpreted using Martin and White's Appraisal theory, which was introduced in the theoretical part of this work.

3.5. Research limitations

One of the most significant factors posing limitations on the present research is the fact that the research topic is still quite recent. Since the 2020 US presidential election took place less than two years prior to the writing of this thesis, and due to the fact that public gathering had been limited as a protective measure against the 2019 outbreak of the COVID-19 pandemic, not many Trump rallies have been held over the time, and so, not many speeches have been delivered. Therefore, the present research could only be based on a relatively small data set.

A further methodological limitation was posed by the nature of the present study – as was already stated previously, evaluation in language is difficult to define, and so a degree of subjectivity is necessary in both the selection and the interpretation of evaluative language. Although the framework of Appraisal can prove a useful tool in analyzing evaluation in language, the theory also has methodological drawbacks. (Fuoli, 2018) One of these drawbacks is the lack of overall resources concerning both the identification of evaluation in texts and the

methodology of its interpretation. And the resources that do exist have only a limited usefulness, as the context dependency of evaluative language poses difficulties on working with the examples of evaluation cited in literature. The classification of evaluation in language using Appraisal theory can also yield ambiguous results, as the lines between the categories are at times blurred. The combination of these factors results in the necessity of approaching evaluation in language with inevitable subjectivity.

Another limitation was posed by Sketch Engine's imperfect filtering based on the grammatical relationship of collocates to the node word. This is perhaps most clearly illustrated by the example of *rig* as a collocate of *election*: the 'Word Sketch' method classified *rig* only under the category of "verbs with *election* as object," which holds true in examples such as:

ex. 29: "They *rigged* the *election*,"

but not in others like:

ex. 30: "And now based on the *rigged election*, they're destroying our country,"

wherein *rigged* acts as modifier of the node word *election*. Because of this it was deemed impossible to rely on Sketch Engine's automatic classification, and therefore, the collocate groups of other grammatical relationships were manually searched for other collocates that could be interpreted as modifying the node word.

4. Analysis

4.1. *Vote*

The most frequently occurring lemma related to the topic of the 2020 US presidential election was *vote* at a total of 364 occurrences. In Table 2 15 collocates of *vote* with the highest typicality score (logDice) are displayed. The collocates were first selected based on their classification as modifiers of the node word *vote*. Table 2 shows their overall cooccurrences with the node word, as well as their typicality score. The collocates selected for analysis are highlighted in boldface.

Table 2: Collocates of *vote*

	abs	logDice		abs	logDice
more	49	11,32	primary	4	8,43
only	11	9,55	excess	3	8,07
many	12	9,46	absentee	3	8,04
early	8	9,43	fraudulent	3	8,03
record	9	9,4	enough	3	8,02
illegal	8	9,23	mail-in	3	7,97
ballot	6	8,55	here	4	7,89
ghost	4	8,48	-	-	-

4.1.1. Identification of evaluative meaning in collocates of *vote*

Of the selected collocates, only *fraudulent* was identified as evaluative. *Cambridge Dictionary* defines *fraudulent* as something that is “dishonest and illegal.”⁴ Based on its dictionary definition, *fraudulent* may be considered as evaluative, since it expresses an attitude towards a situation that is both subjective and based in a societal value-system. While the word *fraudulent* itself is not included in Martin and White’s list of Judgements, some of its synonyms are, such as the very word used in its definition: “dishonest,” or: “deceitful”⁵ (2005, p. 53) *Fraudulent* was therefore identified as having negative evaluative polarity. Although *illegal* may seem semantically similar to *fraudulent*, it was ultimately not identified as evaluative based on its dictionary definition: “not allowed by law,”⁶ as stating that something is not allowed by law may be viewed as an expression of an objective reality, rather than a subjective evaluation.

4.1.2. *Fraudulent* as collocate of *vote*

Despite its relatively low frequency, *fraudulent* was 8,03 times more likely to cooccur with the node word *vote* than with any other word in the corpus. In two of the instances where *fraudulent* and *vote* cooccurred, *fraudulent* served as premodifier of *vote*. In the third instance,

⁴ “Fraudulent,” *Cambridge Dictionary*, <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/fraudulent>. Accessed August 1, 2022.

⁵ „Fraudulent,” *Merriam-Webster*, <https://www.merriam-webster.com/thesaurus/fraudulent>. Accessed August 10, 2022.

⁶ “Illegal,” *Cambridge Dictionary*, <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/illegal>. Accessed August 2, 2022.

fraudulent appeared within the collocation window established for the node word, however, it served as premodifier of a different noun:

ex. 31: "... when the States that *vote* are given false and *fraudulent* information."

Although a different word is premodified, the negative evaluative meaning of the collocate remains the same as in the two other instances. There is, nevertheless, a certain ambiguity in terms of classifying *fraudulent* using Appraisal systems. Having been identified as evaluative based on the presence of its synonyms on Martin and White's list of examples of Judgement (2005, p. 53), *fraudulent* seemingly belongs to the category of Judgement. Judgement, however, applies specifically to evaluations of behavior. In the corpus *fraudulent* serves as an evaluation of *votes* and *information*, both of which are more likely to be interpreted as objects, (rather than behavior, based on which the category of Appreciation would apply). Dealing predominantly with aesthetic evaluations of objects, the category of Appreciation does not correspond to the examples from the corpus either. However, as was stated in the theoretical part, the category of Judgement can apply not only to people's behavior, but to the results thereof as well, which is why *fraudulent* is an instance of Judgement in this case. Moreover, it belongs to the sub-category of Judgement of Social Sanction, and is an instance of a judgement of veracity, dealing with the honesty or dishonesty of behavior.

As regards Graduation, repetition is used in example 31, specifically in the phrase: "*false* and *fraudulent* information," wherein the same meaning is conveyed using two distinct words (*false*, *fraudulent*). *Fraudulent* is not intensified in any of the three instances where it cooccurs with *vote*.

4.2. Election

Election is the second most frequently occurring lemma that is semantically relevant to the topic of the 2020 US presidential election at a total of 341 occurrences. Within Table 3 15 collocates of *election* with the highest typicality score are displayed. As was the case with *vote*, the collocates of *election* were first selected based on their classification as modifiers of the node word. Their overall frequency as collocates of *election* is displayed in Table 3. The collocates selected for analysis are highlighted in boldface.

Table 3: Collocates of *election*

	abs	logDice		abs	logDice
rig	30	11,32	fake	3	7,86
day	23	10,67	special	2	7,55
corrupt	14	10,17	important	2	7,45
presidential	12	10,11	close	2	7,43
November	7	9,28	horrible	2	7,43
honest	6	9,06	same	2	7,39
fair	4	8,5	phony	1	6,56
last	3	7,91	-	-	-

4.2.1. Identification of evaluative meaning in collocates of *election*

Out of the selected collocates eight were identified as possessing evaluative qualities out of context: *rig*, *corrupt*, *honest*, *fair*, *fake*, *important*, *horrible* and *phony*. The lemma *rig* is not listed among the examples of Judgement and Appreciation provided by Martin and White. According to *Cambridge Dictionary* there are several verbal and nominal meanings of *rig* – since the verbal meanings coincide with the adjectival *rigged*, they will be commented upon in greater detail. The first listed definition is *rig* is in the sense of “dishonestly arrange”: “to arrange dishonestly for the result of something, for example an election, to be changed.”⁷ Therefore to state that a situation is rigged is, according to this definition, to evaluate a situation in a negative manner. The second definition of *rig* is “to fix a piece of equipment in place,” (ibid.) and in this case *rig* is not evaluative. The first meaning of *rig* is furthermore synonymous with some of the examples of Judgement of social sanction listed by Martin and White such as *dishonest* or *corrupt*. (2005, p. 53) Out of the selected collocates, the word *corrupt* is synonymous, and therefore can be interpreted as negatively evaluative. As was already stated, *corrupt* is listed as a negative Judgement of social sanction by Martin and White (ibid.). Its evaluative meaning can further be proved by its dictionary definition: “dishonestly using your position or power to get an advantage, especially for money,” or actions and behavior that can be described as “morally bad.”⁸

⁷ “Rig,” *Cambridge Dictionary*, <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/rig>, Accessed August 3, 2022.

⁸ “Corrupt,” *Cambridge Dictionary*, <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/corrupt>, Accessed August 3, 2022.

Both words *honest* and *fair* are featured on Martin and White's list of Judgements under positive Judgements of social sanction, therefore out of context they can be interpreted as positive evaluation. According to *Cambridge Dictionary*, *honest* can be defined as: "telling the truth or able to be trusted and not likely to steal, cheat, or lie,"⁹ based on which the word can be deemed evaluative as well. *Cambridge Dictionary* lists several adjectival meanings of *fair*, some of which are evaluative – *fair* in the sense of "right": (of people) "treating someone in a way that is right or reasonable, or treating a group of people equally and not allowing personal opinions to influence your judgment," (of things) "if something is fair, it is reasonable and is what you expect or deserve," (of games or competitions) "done according to the rules;" *fair* in the sense of "average": "neither very good nor very bad;" *fair* in the sense of "quite good": "(of an idea, guess, or chance) good, but not excellent;" and finally, *fair* in relation to beauty: "(of a woman) beautiful." Other adjectival meanings of *fair* are not evaluative – *fair* in the sense of "pale": "(of skin) pale, or (of hair) pale yellow or gold;" *fair* in relation to size or quantity: "quite large;" and *fair* in relation to weather: "pleasant and dry."¹⁰ All the listed evaluative meanings of *fair* are positive in polarity, except for *fair* in the sense of "average," wherein establishing the evaluative polarity is dependent on context. Nevertheless, since there are more positive meanings, *fair* will be regarded as positive out of context.

The word *fake* can be found on Martin and White's list of examples of Appreciation under the category of negative valuation (2005, p. 56) – therefore was interpreted as evaluative. *Cambridge Dictionary* defines the adjectival meaning of *fake* as something that is "intended to look like something else, esp. in order to deceive"¹¹ further supporting the interpretation of *fake* as evaluative. *Phony* can be similarly interpreted, as the words are, according to *Cambridge Dictionary*, synonymous, defining *phony* as something "represented as real but actually false; intended to deceive."¹² *Phony* is not featured on Martin and White's list of Appreciation examples (ibid.), but based on its similarity to the previously defined *fake*, it was interpreted as evaluative as well. Both words were interpreted as negative in polarity.

⁹ "Honest," *Cambridge Dictionary*, <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/honest>, Accessed August 3, 2022.

¹⁰ "Fair," *Cambridge Dictionary*, <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/fair>, Accessed August 3, 2022.

¹¹ "Fake," *Cambridge Dictionary*, <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/fake>, Accessed August 3, 2022.

¹² "Phony," *Cambridge Dictionary*, <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/phony>, Accessed August 3, 2022

Important was not featured on either of Martin and White’s lists of examples, but its adjectival meaning is defined either as being “necessary or of great value,” or “having great effect or influence.”¹³ Both of the defined meanings were interpreted as being positively evaluative. The last of the selected collocates was *horrible*, and it was not listed by Martin and White among examples of Judgement and Appreciation. *Cambridge Dictionary* defines *horrible* as being “very unpleasant or bad,”¹⁴ and among synonyms lists “bad,” which can be found on Martin and White’s list of Appreciation under the category of negative reaction. Furthermore, “bad,” along with another synonym “terrible” is listed as a typical example of evaluative meaning by Hunston (2011, p. 13). Therefore, *horrible* was identified as an instance of negative evaluation.

Out of the eight collocates selected for analysis, five were found to have negative evaluative meaning out of context, these being the collocates *rig*, *corrupt*, *fake*, *horrible* and *phony*. The remaining three collocates *honest*, *fair* and *important* were found to have positive evaluative meaning out of context.

4.2.2. *Rig* as a collocate of *election*

Out of the collocates selected for analysis *rig* had the highest typicality score of 11,32, as well as the highest typicality score out of all collocates of *election* in general. *Election* actually had the second highest typicality score in collocates of *rig* – preceded only by *steal* with a typicality score of 11,64. *Rig* and *election* cooccurred a total of 30 times, 7 out of which *rig* was used as premodifier of *election*:

ex 32: “We had a *rigged election*.”

In 11 instances *rig* was used as the adjectival part of a copular verb:

ex. 33: “The *election* was *rigged*.”

In 4 instances *rig* was classified as collocate across sentence boundaries:

ex. 34: “... everything we're seeing is a consequence of this horrible, horrible *election*. It was *rigged*.”

¹³ “Important,” *Cambridge Dictionary*, <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/important>, Accessed August 3, 2022.

¹⁴ “Horrible,” *Cambridge Dictionary*, <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/horrible>, Accessed August 3, 2022.

In the remaining 8 instances of *rig* and *election* cooccurring, *rig* was used as a verb, either by itself:

ex. 35: “They rigged it like they've never *rigged* an *election* before.”

or as complement to causative *have*:

ex. 36: “And then we *had the election rigged* and stolen, and now they're going wild over there.”

Although these meanings can be interpreted as evaluative, the focus of this thesis is evaluation realized by adjectives, therefore these 8 verbal realizations of *rig* were not considered in this analysis. Within the remaining 22 realizations of *rig*, which were the subject of this analysis, the evaluative relationship between *rig* and *election* is the same, meaning that *rig* is used to evaluate *election*. This holds true even for the instances wherein *rig* was classified as collocate across sentence boundaries, as can be seen in example 34, where *election* is the antecedent of *it*, the object evaluated by *rig*. Out of context *rig* was selected based on its similarity to examples listed by Martin and White in negative Judgements of social sanction, and within context this classification remains plausible, as it negatively evaluates the results of behavior within the context of individuals' behavior under the rule of state. Based on the definition of *rig* given earlier, it was determined to fall under the category of negative Judgement of propriety, as it is condemning the election from an ethical standpoint.

Intensifiers were not used in combination with *rig*; however repetition was used in five total instances by coordinating the evaluative *rig* with a synonymous word, namely *steal* (“... the presidential *election* was *rigged* and *stolen*, ...) and *dishonest* (“... when you have *dishonest* and *rigged elections*.”) In both of the examples listed, repetition was employed to emphasize the already negative evaluative meaning of *rig*.

4.2.3. *Corrupt* as a collocate of *election*

Corrupt was the second most frequent of the selected evaluative collocates of *election* at a total of 14 cooccurrences, having a high typicality score of 10,17 as well. In 12 of the 14 total cooccurrences, *corrupt* served as premodifier of *election*, as can be seen in the following example:

ex. 37: “It was a *corrupt election*.”

In the remaining two instances, *corrupt* served as the adjectival complement to the copular *be*:

ex. 38: “Number one, the *elections* are totally *corrupt* in our country.”

ex. 39: “... nobody until I came along, had any idea how *corrupt* our *elections* were.”

Despite the differing grammatical relationships, in all instances *corrupt* was used in reference to *election*. As was the case previously, even though *corrupt* is not used in direct reference to behavior, it is used in reference to the results of behavior, therefore *corrupt* was identified as Judgement. Since all the realizations of *corrupt* were recognized as condemnation of *election*, it was recognized as negative Judgement, and as it is condemning the election from an ethical standpoint, it belongs to the sub-category of Judgement of propriety.

In two instances, one of which is illustrated in example 38, *corrupt* was intensified by *totally*, which belongs to the category of maximizers, up-scaling the evaluative meaning to the highest possible intensity. Repetition was not used in combination with *corrupt*.

4.2.4. *Honest as a collocater of election*

Honest cooccurred with *election* 6 times and had a typicality score of 9,06. In 4 of the total occurrences *honest* was used as premodifier to *election*:

ex. 42: “Would've been so much better if we had [sic] an *honest election*, but we'll be able to do it again.”

In the remaining 2 instances *honest* was used as the adjectival part of a copular verb phrase:

ex. 43: “Their *elections* are more *honest* than what we've been going through in this country.”

Despite Trump's reputation for the use of negative evaluation, *honest* retains the positive evaluative polarity which was identified out of context. Trump is, however, not using *honest* to evaluate the 2020 US presidential election in any of the instances where *honest* cooccurs with *election* – instead, he is either referring to a hypothetical election he would deem *honest* (ex. 42), or to elections in foreign countries:

ex. 44: “Just take a look, take third world countries. Their elections are more honest than what we've been going through in this country,”

or elections that took place in the past:

ex. 45: “You know when *elections* were much more *honest* instead of sitting around for 48 days, we have boxes stored in that storage room.”

Honest was listed among Martin and White's examples of positive Judgement of social sanction under the category of veracity. This categorization holds true with all the instances where *honest* was used in the corpus as they evaluate the truthfulness of *election*. *Honest* was not intensified, but in one instance repetition was used:

ex. 46: "We must elect strong, brave America first leaders who will be true champions for the people and for free, *fair* and *honest elections*."

In example 46 the repetition was realized by expressing the same meaning using a different word – in this case *fair*, which expresses a similar meaning to *honest*.

4.2.5. *Fair* as a collocates of *election*

Fair cooccurred with *election* 4 times throughout the corpus and had a typicality score of 8,5. In all the 4 occurrences, *fair* was used as premodifier of election:

ex. 47: "If I won or lost, all I want is a *fair* election."

Like *honest*, *fair* was listed among Martin and White's examples of positive Judgement of social sanction, however, under the category of propriety. *Fair* was previously defined as upholding the rules, which applies in the corpus, wherein *fair* is used in reference to an election that is held according to the rules. Therefore, *fair* in this context belongs to the category of propriety as well, since it is used to evaluate the election from an ethical standpoint. In all the instances where *fair* cooccurred with *election*, the evaluative polarity is positive since, the *election* that is being referred to is hypothetical, except for one instance:

ex. 48. "You know what the world says about us now? They said we don't have free and *fair elections* and you know what else?"

Based on the context of the sentences in example 48, *elections* is used to refer to US elections in general. Since *fair* is preceded by don't, the evaluative polarity is reversed, making this the only instance, where the evaluative polarity of *fair* is negative.

Fair was not intensified but was emphasized using repetition in two instances:

ex. 49: "and we will not stop until we have restored our American birthright of *honest*, *free*, and *fair elections*."

In this example, *fair* is repeated by means of a semantically similar word *honest* as was the case in the previous chapter. The other instance where *fair* was repeated was already listed as example 46.

4.2.6. *Fake as a collocate of election*

Out of the 3 total occurrences of *fake*, it was used as premodifier of *election* twice:

ex. 50: “We’ve amassed overwhelming evidence about a *fake election*.”

In the other instance of *fake* and *election* cooccurring, it premodified a different noun in the target vicinity of the node word:

ex. 51: “In every *fake news* story about the *election*, they always begin by stating that claims are unproven.”

In this example *fake* is used to evaluate the noun *news*, therefore it will not be taken into account as evaluating *election* even though it occurred within the collocation window of *election*. *Fake*’s lower exclusivity as collocate of *election* is reflected by its comparatively lower typicality score of 7,86 – even within the selected collocation window *fake* has a stronger collocate in a different word than *election* in 1 of the 3 instances.

Based on the dictionary definition of *fake* – as something that is intended to look as something else in order to deceive others¹⁵ – it was determined that *fake* retains its negative evaluative polarity in context of the corpus as well. However, on Martin and White’s list of examples of appraisal, *fake* categorized as Appreciation. Since Appreciation deals predominantly with evaluations of an object’s aesthetic qualities, *fake* was interpreted as another instance of negative Judgement of social sanction within the context of the corpus. Since this evaluation is dealing with the perceived truthfulness of the election, *fake* was identified as belonging to the sub-category of Judgement of social sanction dealing with veracity. No intensifiers were used with *fake*, but in one of the instances repetition was employed:

ex. 52: “And of course, hold *fake, phony elections*.”

In this example, repetition is realized by repeating *fake* with an element of the same meaning – in this case *phony*, which was identified as synonymous in chapter 4.2.1.

¹⁵ “Fake,” *Cambridge Dictionary*, <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/fake>, Accessed August 3, 2022.

4.2.7. *Important as a collocator of election*

Important only cooccurred twice with *election* and the collocator had a typicality score of 7,45. In both instances of the two words cooccurring, *important* served as a premodifier to *election*:

ex. 53: “So this is now what we're doing, a far more *important election* than it was two days ago.”

In both instances the evaluative polarity is positive. In this case, the only object under evaluation is *election*, which is evaluated solely based on its qualities without any reference to behavior – therefore it was interpreted as positive Appreciation, falling under the sub-category of Valuation, which deals with the value of evaluated objects. In example 53, it is impossible to determine whether the election that is being referred to is the 2020 election based on the context of the sentence. In the other instance where *important* cooccurs with *election*, it is the 2016 presidential election that is being referred to:

ex. 54: “We won the most *important election*, 2016.”

In the case of *important* no intensification or repetition was used.

4.2.8. *Horrible as a collocator of election*

In both instances where *horrible* and *election* cooccurred, *horrible* served as a premodifier of *election*:

ex. 55: “... everything we're seeing is a consequence of this horrible, *horrible election*.”

The evaluative polarity of *horrible* is negative in both instances, and although it was identified as Appreciation out of context, in the context of the corpus it was identified as Judgement – the election was evaluated as horrible in reaction to the alleged voter fraud; therefore, the evaluation was made based on the results of behavior, rather than evaluating the election as an isolated object. As it was used to condemn the election from an ethical standpoint it was identified as belonging to the sub-category of Judgement of social sanction dealing with propriety. The negative evaluation was furthermore emphasized by means of repetition as can be seen in example 55 (*horrible, horrible*).

4.2.9. *Phony* as a collocate of *election*

The word *phony* cooccurred with *election* only once and had the lowest typicality score out of the collocates selected for analysis. In the one instance where it was used as a collocate of *election* it served as a premodifier to *election*:

ex. 52: “And of course, hold fake, *phony elections*.”

Based on its similarity to *fake*, *phony* was identified as negatively evaluative out of context – this identification holds true within context as well. Since the election was evaluated as *phony* because of the alleged voter fraud, it was be interpreted as negative Judgement of social sanction dealing with veracity as well as was the case with *fake*. No intensifiers were used with *phony*, however, as was already illustrated in example 52 the word is repeated by means of a semantically related word, which in this case was *fake*.

4.3. Summary of findings

The aim of the present thesis was to establish whether Donald Trump uses evaluative language regarding the 2020 US presidential election. The theoretical part introduced evaluation in language and Appraisal theory, providing a framework for analysis, and summarised the findings of previous research into Trump’s language. A corpus of Donald Trump’s speeches spanning from the end of 2020 to mid-2022 was constructed, from which words with a semantic relevance to the topic of the 2020 election were selected. Based on frequency *vote* and *election* were selected for analysis, focusing solely on evaluation in words classified as modifiers of the two selected node words. The findings illustrate how often evaluation is used in the collocates of *vote* and *election*, whether the evaluation is positive or negative in polarity, as well as how often intensification and repetition, frequent features of Donald Trump’s language as well as a part of Appraisal theory, is used. Significant differences between the use of evaluation with *vote* and *election* have been found.

Out of the fifteen modifying collocates of *vote* with the highest typicality score (Table 2), only one was identified as evaluative (*fraudulent*). The overall frequency of the fifteen collocates was 130 cooccurrences, with *fraudulent* cooccurring with *vote* only three times. Therefore, only 2,3% of the cooccurrences were interpreted as evaluative, all of these were negative in polarity. Intensification was used only in one instance, and repetition was not used at all.

Eight of the fifteen modifiers of *election* with the highest typicality score (Table 3) were identified as evaluative (*rig, corrupt, honest, fair, fake, important, horrible, phony*). The fifteen collocates cooccurred with *election* in a total of 113 instances, 53 of which were identified as evaluative, making 46,9% of the cooccurrences evaluative. 20,8% of the evaluative cooccurrences were found to be positive, while 79,2% negative. Intensification was only used twice and was used exclusively with negatively evaluating collocates. Repetition was used nine times – seven times with negatively evaluating collocates and twice with positively evaluative collocates.

Although Trump used evaluation to a much higher degree with *election* than he did with *vote*, the evaluative collocates of both node words are predominantly negative, supporting the findings of secondary literature. Negative evaluation occurred a total of 53 times, being 82,8% of all evaluative meaning. Positive evaluation, on the other hand, occurred 11 times, adding up to a total of 17,2% of all evaluative meaning. Furthermore, based on sentential context, all the positive evaluations cooccurring with *election* were interpreted as not referring to the 2020 US presidential election, but either a hypothetical election, elections in the past, or elections in other countries. All the evaluative collocations were identified as instances of Judgement, except *important*, which was identified as Appreciation.

Table 4 shows the instances of negative and positive evaluation in the collocates of *vote* and *election* combined, illustrating the use of intensification and repetition across both evaluative polarities.

Table 4: intensification and repetition in negative and positive collocates of *vote* and *election*

	abs	%		abs	%
N – intensification	3	5,7	P – intensification	0	0
N – repetition	7	13,2	P – repetition	2	18,2
N - total	53		P – total	11	

As can be seen in Table 4, Trump was more likely to use intensifiers with negative evaluation and repetition with positive evaluation. Table 5 shows the categories of intensification and repetition combined in negative and positive collocates of *vote* and *election*, as well as the total percentages of evaluation emphasized by Graduation and evaluation not emphasized by Graduation.

Table 5: graduation in negative and positive collocates of *vote* and *election*

	abs	%		abs	%
N – with Graduation	10	18,9	P – with Graduation	2	18,2
N – without Graduation	43	81,1	P – without Graduation	10	81,8
Graduation - total		18,75	Without Graduation - total		81,25

The findings of the analytical part of this work therefore suggest that, although by a small margin of only 0,7%, Trump uses means of Graduation (intensification, repetition) to emphasize negative evaluation more than he does with positive evaluation. Nevertheless, the fact that the positive evaluations were not made in reference to the 2020 US presidential election, but rather hypothetical elections, elections of foreign countries, or elections of the past needs to be considered when interpreting the findings of the present analysis.

5. Conclusion

The objective of this thesis was to establish whether Trump uses evaluative language in relation to the 2020 election and a hypothesis was established that Trump would use predominantly negative evaluation when addressing the topic of the election, emphasizing the negative evaluative meaning by means of intensification and repetition. The findings of the analytical part show a discrepancy between the use of evaluation in combination with the two most frequent words related to the topic of the election – *vote* being evaluated in only 2,3% of the cooccurrences with modifiers and *election* being evaluated in 46,9%. Therefore, evaluation was used in relation to the election, only not consistently. Nevertheless, 82,8% of all evaluative meaning that was identified was found to be negative in polarity, confirming the hypothesis that predominantly negative evaluation was used. Graduation was used in a total of 18,75% of the evaluative meanings, confirming the supposition that evaluation would be emphasized by intensification or repetition, although to a smaller degree than expected.

A link between manipulation and evaluation in language was established in the theoretical part. Based on the findings of secondary literature, which found a connection between Trump’s use of negative evaluation and a rise in his poll numbers, Trump’s extensive use of negative evaluation can be interpreted as a political strategy designed to improve his position. The initial motivation for the selection of this thesis topic was the seeming rise of populist rhetoric worldwide and the desire to understand the effects of this rhetoric on its recipients. The topic Donald Trump’s language was selected based on his swift rise in the

political world despite his inexperience and his overall unorthodox approach to politics. The objective of this study was to find whether features of Donald Trump's language could be interpreted as manipulative. This was ultimately confirmed upon establishing the link between evaluation and manipulation in the theoretical part and identifying Trump's heavy use of negative evaluation of the election in the analytical part. Donald Trump's negative evaluation of the election was therefore interpreted as being motivated by political strategy designed to sow uncertainty of the election results in the eyes of his supporters.

As a study of an individual's idiolect, this thesis did not provide any comparison to any other individuals addressing the same topic. It would be interesting to contrast Trump's use of evaluation in the context of the election to the speeches of his rival Joe Biden on the topic of the 2020 election. Furthermore, the study was limited by the data set size, and would likely yield more interesting and potentially more reliable results with a larger data set. More detailed research could further be conducted by analyzing the collocates of the other lemmas that were identified as having a semantic relevance to the topic of the election, and by analyzing more collocates of the selected words as well. Based on the findings concerning Trump's use of intensification and repetition, a further inquiry could also be made into his use of intonation and emphasis in spoken language, but such an approach would be beyond the scope of the present study.

References

- “Asociační (kolokační) míry.” *Wiki Český národní korpus*. Accessed: August 2, 2022, https://wiki.korpus.cz/doku.php/pojmy:asociacni_miry
- Björkenstam, Kristina Nilsson and Gintarė Grigonytė. “I Know Words, I Have the Best Words: Repetitions, Parallelisms and Matters of (In)Coherence,” In *Linguistic inquiries into Donald Trump's language: from 'fake news' to 'tremendous success'*, eds. Eitelmann, Mathias and Ulrike Schneider (London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2015), 41-61.
- Březina, Václav. *Statistics in Corpus Linguistics: A Practical Guide*. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2018). doi:10.1017/9781316410899.
- Březina, Václav, et al. “Collocations in context: A new perspective on collocation networks.” *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics* 20, no. 2, (2015): 139–173. doi: 10.1075/ijcl.20.2.01bre.
- Brown, Penelope. “Repetition.” *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 9, no. 1/2, (1999): 223–26. *JSTOR*, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/43102472>. Accessed 1 Jun. 2022.
- Dean, Jeremy. “Illusion of Truth Effect: Repetition Makes Lies Sound True.” *Psyblog*. July, 30, 2021. <https://www.spring.org.uk/2021/07/illusion-of-truth.php>
- “Donald Trump Transcripts.” *Rev*. <https://www.rev.com/blog/transcript-category/donald-trump-transcripts>. Accessed April 25, 2022
- Duncan, Rodger Dean. “Influence Versus Manipulation: Understand The Difference.” *Forbes*. December 21, 2018. <https://www.forbes.com/sites/rodgerdeanduncan/2018/12/21/influence-vs-manipulation-understand-the-difference/?sh=21354073470c>
- Egbert, Jesse and Douglas Biber. “It's Just Words, Folks. It's Just Words: Donald Trump's Distinctive Linguistic Style.” In *Linguistic inquiries into Donald Trump's language: from 'fake news' to 'tremendous success'*, eds. Eitelmann, Mathias and Ulrike Schneider (London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2015), 17-40.
- Eitelmann, Mathias and Ulrike Schneider. *Linguistic inquiries into Donald Trump's language: from 'fake news' to 'tremendous success.'* London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2015.
- “Fair.” *Cambridge Dictionary*. <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/fair>. Accessed August 3, 2022.
- “Fraudulent.” *Cambridge Dictionary*. <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/fraudulent>. Accessed 1 August 2022.
- “Fraudulent.” *Merriam-Webster*. <https://www.merriam-webster.com/thesaurus/fraudulent>. Accessed August 10, 2022.
- Fuoli, Matteo. “A step-wise method for annotating APPRAISAL.” *Functions of Language* 25, no. 2, (2018). doi: 10.1075/fol.15016.fuo
- Gablasova et al. “Collocations in Corpus-Based Language Learning Research: Identifying, Comparing, and Interpreting the Evidence.” *Language Learning* 67, no. 1 (2017): UKAZ, <https://onlinelibrary-wiley-com.ezproxy.is.cuni.cz/doi/full/10.1111/lang.12225>
- Gross, Justin H. and Kaylee T. Johnson. “Twitter Taunts and Tirades: Negative Campaigning in the Age of Trump.” *PS: Political Science and Politics* 49, no. 4 (2016): <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1049096516001711>
- Holland, Jack and Ben Fermor. “Trump’s Rhetoric at 100 Days: Contradictions within Effective Emotional Narratives.” *Critical Studies on Security* 5, no. 3 (2017): *ResearchGate*, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/318700417_Trump%27s_Rhetoric_at_100_Days_Contradictions_within_Effective_Emotional_Narratives

- “Honest.” *Cambridge Dictionary*. <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/honest>. Accessed August 3, 2022.
- Hunston, Susan. *Corpus Approaches to Evaluation*. New York: Routledge, 2011.
- “Intensifiers (very, at all).” *Cambridge Dictionary*. <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/grammar/british-grammar/intensifiers-very-at-all> Accessed 30 May 2022
- Leith, Sam. “Trump’s rhetoric: a triumph of inarticulacy.” *Guardian*, January 13, 2017. <https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2017/jan/13/donald-trumps-rhetoric-how-being-inarticulate-is-seen-as-authentic>
- “logDice.” *Sketch Engine*. https://www.sketchengine.eu/my_keywords/logdice/. Last accessed: July 28, 2022,
- Macagno, Fabrizio, and Douglas Walton. *Emotive Language in Argumentation*. Cambridge University Press, 2014.
- MacLeod, Meredith. “Analysis: We’ve read all President Trump’s tweets, so you don’t have to.” *CTV News*, April 28, 2017. <https://www.ctvnews.ca/world/analysis-we-ve-read-all-president-trump-s-tweets-so-you-don-t-have-to-1.3389513>
- “Manipulation.” *American Psychological Association Dictionary of Psychology*. <https://dictionary.apa.org/manipulation>
- Martin, J. R. “Beyond exchange: APPRAISAL systems in English,” In: Hunston, S., Thompson, G. (eds.) *Evaluation in Text*. (Oxford: Oxford University Press: 2000): 142-175.
- Martin, J. R., and P. R. R. White. *The Language of Evaluation: Appraisal in English*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005.
- Partington, Alan. “Corpus Evidence of Language Change The Case of the Intensifier.” In *Text and Technology: In Honour of John Sinclair*, eds. Baker, Mona, Gill Francis and Elena Tognini-Bonelli. (Philadelphia/Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 1993), 177-192
- Perlman, Merrill. “A very good reason not to use ‘very.’” *Columbia Journalism Review*, January 23, 2018. https://www.cjr.org/language_corner/very-trump-tweet-intensifier.php
- Piirainen-Marsh, Arja, and Riikka Alanen. “Repetition and Imitation: Opportunities for Learning.” In *Encyclopedia of the Sciences of Learning*, eds. Seel N.M. (Boston: Springer, 2012). https://link.springer.com/referenceworkentry/10.1007/978-1-4419-1428-6_657
- “Rig.” *Cambridge Dictionary*. <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/rig>. Accessed August 3, 2022.
- Ross, Andrew S., and David Caldwell. “‘Going negative’: an APPRAISAL analysis of the rhetoric of Donald Trump on Twitter.” *Language and Communication*. doi: 70. 10.1016/j.langcom.2019.09.003
- Quirk, Randolph, et al. *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. New York: Longman Group Limited, 1985.
- Sinclair et al. *English Collocation Studies: The OSTI Report*. Continuum, 2004. EBSCO Accessed July 21, 2022. <https://search-ebSCOhost-com.ezproxy.is.cuni.cz/login.aspx?direct=true&AuthType=ip,shib&db=e000xww&AN=377528&lang=cs&site=ehost-live&scope=site>
- Shafer, Jack. “Donald Trump Talks Like a Third-Grader.” *Politico*, August 13, 2015. <https://www.politico.com/magazine/story/2015/08/donald-trump-talks-like-a-third-grader-121340/>
- Shigapova, Farida Finsurovna, et al. “Manipulative Speech Techniques in Political

- Discourse.” *Propósitos y Representaciones*, 9 (2021):
https://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=&ved=2ahUKEwizrtfgjIr4AhUW_6QKHYdyDEcQFnoECAgQAQ&url=https%3A%2F%2Fdiarioet.unirioja.es%2Fdescarga%2Farticulo%2F8111677.pdf&usg=AOvVaw27p8WyK00raCQQJfotyieq
- Shugerman, Emily. “Trump speaks at level of 8-year-old, new analysis finds.” *Independent*, 9 January, 2018. <https://www.independent.co.uk/news/world/americas/us-politics/trump-language-level-speaking-skills-age-eight-year-old-vocabulary-analysis-a8149926.html>.
- Stange, Ulrike. Very Emotional, Totally Conservative, and Somewhat All over the Place: An Analysis of Intensifiers in Donald Trump's Speech. In *Linguistic inquiries into Donald Trump's language: from 'fake news' to 'tremendous success'*, eds. Eitelmann, Mathias and Ulrike Schneider (London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2015), 87-108.
- Veselovská, Kateřina. *Sentiment Analysis in Czech*. Institute of Formal and Applied Linguistics, 2017.
- Wang, Yaqin, and Haitao Liu. “Is Trump Always Rambling like a Fourth-Grade Student? An Analysis of Stylistic Features of Donald Trump’s Political Discourse during the 2016 Election.” *Discourse & Society* 29, no. 3 (2018): 299–323. *JSTOR*, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/26499913>. Accessed 30 May 2022.
- Wright, David. “Idiolect.” *Oxford Bibliographies*, 29 November 2018. <https://www-oxfordbibliographies-com.ezproxy.is.cuni.cz/view/document/obo-9780199772810/obo-9780199772810-0225.xml>. Accessed 26 May 2022

Resumé

Bakalářská práce nazvaná „Evaluativní vyjadřování v idiolektu Donalda Trumpa v kontextu amerických prezidentských voleb roku 2020“ má za cíl stanovit do jaké míry byl v projevech Donalda Trumpa po ukončení prezidentských voleb ve Spojených státech amerických v roce 2020 využit evaluativní jazyk v kontextu vyjádření týkajících se voleb.

Motivací ke zvolení tématu se stal zdánlivě sílící celosvětový vliv populistické a manipulativní rétoriky ve veřejném prostoru. Subjektem pro analýzu byl zvolen Donald Trump zejména z důvodu jeho již slavně neortodoxního užití jazyka. Práce byla dále motivována událostmi 6. ledna roku 2021, kdy došlo k útoku na Kapitol Spojených států amerických vykonaném příznivci Donalda Trumpa v reakci na výsledek prezidentských voleb z roku 2020, při kterém zemřelo 5 lidí a dalších 50 bylo zraněno. K analýze byly vybrány pouze projevy, které byly proneseny na Trumpových setkáních s jeho příznivci. V projevech, které byly předmětem analýzy byl výsledek voleb Trumpem opakovaně zpochybněn. Pokud lze události útoku na Kapitol interpretovat jako důsledek Trumpových projevů, jednalo by se o zářný příklad nebezpečí, které může manipulativní a populistická rétorika představovat pro širokou veřejnost.

Cílem bakalářské práce tedy bylo identifikovat, zda může Trumpovo vyjadřování k výsledku voleb být interpretováno jako manipulativní a také jaké rysy jeho jazyka lze interpretovat jako manipulativní. Na základě spojení mezi evaluativností v jazyce a manipulací podloženém literaturou byla práce soustředěna na evaluativní vyjadřování v jazyce Donalda Trumpa. Předmětem zkoumání byly kolokáty slov sémanticky se vztahujících k tématu voleb – zvláště adjektivní a adverbialní kolokáty, mezi kterými se evaluativnost v jazyce vyskytuje nejčastěji. Závěr práce nabízí informace o tom, v jakém světle Trump volby prezentuje.

V úvodní části práce je stručně představen obsah jednotlivých kapitol práce, stejně tak jako hypotéza, celkový cíl práce a individuální motivace volby tématu.

Teoretická část práce poskytuje vhled do problematiky emočního a evaluativního vyjadřování v jazyce. Obecné definice těchto jazykových jevů jsou představeny na základě prací Kateřiny Veselovské a Susan Hunston. Představuje také Martinovu a Whiteovu teorii hodnocení, tedy jeden z předních systémů obsahujících systematické metody k identifikaci, klasifikaci a interpretaci evaluativního jazyka. V této části jsou představeny základní kategorie teorie hodnocení, které jsou také ilustrovány pomocí příkladů. Příklady, které Martin and White

uvádí zásadně pomohly jak při identifikaci evaluativnosti v kontextu korpusu, tak při její interpretaci. V rámci jedné z kategorií teorie hodnocení je představeno také použití intenzifikátorů a opakování za účely zvýraznění hodnocení v jazyce. Následně je obecně představen termín idiolekt, který je posléze ilustrován na příkladu idiolektu Donalda Trumpa. V práci je citováno několik studií zabývajících se charakteristickými jazykovými rysy Donalda Trumpa, zejména jeho použitím zjednodušeného jazyka, negativní evaluace, intenzifikátorů a opakování. Následně je představen koncept manipulace, je ilustrováno několik příkladů manipulace v rétorice a je prodiskutováno spojení mezi manipulací a evaluativností v jazyce.

Na základě transkriptů projevů získaných z webového portálu *rev.com*, věnujícímu se transkripci mluveného jazyka za použití umělé inteligence a lidských zdrojů byl sestaven korpus, čítající 103 041 slov. Projevy využitě k sestavení korpusu pocházejí z doby v rozmezí od prosince roku 2020 do května roku 2022. Korpus byl analyzován za pomoci webového korpusového manažeru Sketch Engine, ve kterém byl nejprve vygenerován seznam nejfrekventovanějších lemmat. Z tohoto seznamu byla vybrána lemmata s inherentní sémantickou souvislostí k tématu voleb. Následně byly analyzovány kolokace vybraných lemmat – pomocí Sketch Engine byly izolovány adjektivní a adverbialní kolokáty vybraných lemmat a z těchto kolokátů byly dále vybrány lemmata, které byly identifikovány jako evaluativní i mimo kontext korpusu. Jejich identifikace byla provedena na základě slovníkových definic a seznamů příkladů evaluativních vyjádření uvedených Martinem a Whitem. Vybrané evaluativní kolokáty byly analyzovány v kontextu korpusu na základě polarity jejich hodnocení a výskytu intenzifikátorů a opakování v jejich okolí.

Mezi některá omezení práce patřilo například omezené množství dat, které bylo ovlivněno několika faktory. Prvním faktorem, který měl vliv na malé množství projevů Donalda Trumpa byl časový horizont sledovaných událostí – v době psaní této práce byly prezidentské volby z roku 2020 událostí starou teprve rok a půl – v tomto časovém rozmezí tedy Trump nepřednesl více projevů, ze kterých by bylo možné sestavit rozsáhlejší korpus. Dalším omezením byla pandemie onemocnění COVID-19, která probíhala od prosince roku 2019 až do doby psaní této práce a významně omezila možnost veřejného shromažďování. Limitace práce však neplynuly pouze z omezeného množství dat k analýze, vyplývaly také ze samotné povahy tématu práce. Přestože Martinova a Whiteova teorie hodnocení nabízí rozsáhlá metodologická doporučení k systematizaci evaluativního jazyka, není však vyčerpávající. Jak nejen sami Martin a White, ale také Hunston uvádí, identifikace, klasifikace a interpretace

evaluativního jazyka vždy vyžaduje určitou míru subjektivity, jelikož není možné stanovit univerzální pravidla hodnotícího jazyka, která by byla aplikovatelná v jakémkoliv kontextu.

Výsledky práce odhalují nekonzistentní použití evaluativního jazyka v kontextu voleb. V závěru práce je prodiskutována frekvence evaluativního jazyka ve spojení s jednotlivými slovy vybranými pro analýzu. V kontextu kolokací zvoleného lemmatu *vote* bylo identifikováno pouze 2,3 % modifikátorů jako evaluativních. Naproti tomu adjektivní a adverbiální kolokáty lemmatu *election* byly ze 46,9 % identifikovány jako evaluativní. Dále je vypočítán poměr mezi pozitivní a negativní evaluací a je poukázáno na využití intenzifikátorů a opakování jak ve spojitosti s pozitivní a negativní evaluací, tak s hodnocením obecně. Výsledky analýzy poukazují na převažující užití negativního hodnocení v idiolektu Donalda Trumpa. Celkem 82,8 % celkových identifikovaných hodnocení voleb bylo interpretováno jako negativní. Na základě spojení mezi užitím evaluativnosti v jazyce a manipulativní rétorikou, které bylo představeno v teoretické části a výsledků analýzy odhalujících výrazné použití negativní evaluace v kontextu voleb v idiolektu Donalda Trumpa lze dojít k závěru, že Trumpovo využití evaluativního jazyka je součástí politické strategie, jejímž cílem je vytvořit v očích Trumpových stoupců nejistotu ohledně výsledků voleb.

Sekce Bibliografie uvádí seznam publikací a zdrojů, které byly využity ke zpracování bakalářské práce.

Sekce Appendix představuje seznam příkladů z korpusu použitých v rámci práce. Z důvodu rozsahu materiálu použitého k sestavení korpusu byly využité projevy uvedeny pomocí hypertextových odkazů na jejich transkripty na již zmíněné stránce *rev.com*. Samotný korpus, který byl z projevů sestaven, bude uveden pomocí hypertextového odkazu na internetový korpusový manažer Sketch Engine, pomocí kterého byl korpus zkompilován a následně analyzován.

Appendix

1. "They *rigged* the *election*,"
2. "And now based on the rigged election, they're destroying our country."
3. "... when the States that vote are given false and fraudulent information."
4. "We had a rigged election."
5. "The election was rigged."
6. "... everything we're seeing is a consequence of this horrible, horrible election. It was rigged."
7. "They rigged it like they've never rigged an election before."
8. "And then we had the election rigged and stolen, and now they're going wild over there."
9. "It was a corrupt election."
10. "Number one, the elections are totally corrupt in our country."
11. "... nobody until I came along, had any idea how corrupt our elections were."
12. "Would've been so much better if we had an honest election, but we'll be able to do it again."
13. "Their elections are more honest than what we've been going through in this country."
14. "Just take a look, take third world countries. Their elections are more honest than what we've been going through in this country,"
15. "You know when elections were much more honest instead of sitting around for 48 days, we have boxes stored in that storage room."
16. "We must elect strong, brave America first leaders who will be true champions for the people and for free, fair and honest elections."
17. "If I won or lost, all I want is a fair election."
18. "You know what the world says about us now? They said we don't have free and fair elections and you know what else?"

19. “and we will not stop until we have restored our American birthright of honest, free, and fair elections.”

20. “We’ve amassed overwhelming evidence about a fake election.”

21. “In every fake news story about the election, they always begin by stating that claims are unproven.”

22. “And of course, hold fake, phony elections.”

23. “So this is now what we’re doing, a far more important election than it was two days ago.”

24. “We won the most important election, 2016.”

25. “... everything we’re seeing is a consequence of this horrible, horrible election.”

26. “And of course, hold fake, phony elections.”

“Donald Trump Cullman, Alabama Rally Speech Transcript,” *rev.com*,
<https://www.rev.com/blog/transcripts/donald-trump-cullman-alabama-rally-speech-transcript>.
Accessed 21 October 2021

“Donald Trump Des Moines, Iowa Rally Speech Transcript October 9,” *rev.com*,
<https://www.rev.com/blog/transcripts/donald-trump-des-moines-iowa-rally-speech-transcript-october-9>. Accessed 21 October 2021

“Donald Trump Georgia Rally Transcript Before Senate Runoff Elections December 5,”
rev.com, <https://www.rev.com/blog/transcripts/donald-trump-georgia-rally-transcript-before-senate-runoff-elections-december-5>. Accessed 21 March 2022.

“Donald Trump Perry, Georgia Rally Speech Transcript September 25,” *rev.com*,
<https://www.rev.com/blog/transcripts/donald-trump-perry-georgia-rally-speech-transcript-september-25>. Accessed 21 October 2021.

“Donald Trump Phoenix, Arizona Rally Speech Transcript July 24,” *rev.com*,
<https://www.rev.com/blog/transcripts/donald-trump-phoenix-arizona-rally-speech-transcript-july-24>. Accessed 21 October 2021.

“Donald Trump Rally in Selma NC North Carolina 4/9/22 Transcript,” *rev.com*,
<https://www.rev.com/blog/transcripts/donald-trump-rally-in-selma-nc-north-carolina-4-9-22-transcript>. Accessed 25 April 2022.

“Donald Trump Speech “Save America” Rally Transcript January 6,” *rev.com*,
<https://www.rev.com/blog/transcripts/donald-trump-speech-save-america-rally-transcript-january-6>. Accessed 21 October 2021.

“Donald Trump Wellington, Ohio Rally Speech Transcript: First Rally Since Leaving Office,” *rev.com*, <https://www.rev.com/blog/transcripts/donald-trump-wellington-ohio-rally-speech-transcript-first-rally-since-leaving-office>. Accessed 21 October 2021.

“Trump,” *Sketch Engine*,
<https://app.sketchengine.eu/#dashboard?corpname=user%2Fpavel.duris1%2Ftrump>.