Original Research   **Open Access**

Functional-Stylistic Analysis of Pre –Election Campaign Discourse

Alzira A. Minikeeva[*]
Kazan Federal University, Russia

Aida G. Sadykova
Kazan Federal University, Russia

Edward Lazzerini
Indiana University Bloomington, Indiana

Abstract
The paper examines expressive means in D. Trump's and H. Clinton's pre-election discourse, which is considered in syntactic level, the field of the pre-election campaign 2016. Pre-election discourse is a topical direction of modern linguistics as in the period of holding of election campaigns the activity of political figures who use multiple linguistic means aimed at making electors' to come to a necessary decision increases considerably. The analysis is conducted on official websites of both politicians, opened for the elections held in 2016 in the USA. It focuses on the expressive means in the texts of politicians in the first, second and third debates. The study is based on the theory of critical discourse analysis (Van Dijk, 2009), political discourse analysis and the theory of expressive analysis. The structural analysis shows the most wide-spread expressive means functioned in the texts of both politicians. A content analysis is viewed as expressive means (ellipse, reduplication, parceling) of the pre-election discourse to compare the number of expressive means used in both politicians' discourse. The research gives a description and analysis of the expressive means in pre-election discourse.
Keywords: Expressive means; Stylistic devices; Expressivity; Pre-election discourse; Election campaign; Election.

1. Introduction
The role of language in the politics cannot be overemphasized. Language and politics are linked to so R. Lakoff's said politics is language and language is politics (Bhatia, 2006). The results of the globalization process and cross-cultural communication are developing political communication at a different level. There has been an increasing interest in the language of politics (political speech, political discourse).

Taiwo identifies that 'the language analysis of politics texts has been accomplished within the framework of political rhetoric, linguistic-stylistic, pragmatics, discourse analysis and critical discourse analysis'. It indicates it has the significant role in the linguistic researches (Yapparova *et al.,* 2018). The politician's language could be observed as a tool of manipulation based on their intentions.

A means of manipulation in political communication has been developed in pre-election discourse. 'The pre-election discourse is a kind of political discourse in the process of political agitation of citizens for

Their decision to vote for a certain candidate' (Mazayev, 2005). These language formations within the framework of syntactical and stylistic means revealing cognitive and pragmatic features are also the attempt of analyzing the peculiarities of pre-election discourse.

Recently, researchers have shown an increased interest in pre-election discourse. The diversity of linguistic means is being researched and expanded by use in pre-election discourse. Thus, the interest in the study of the functioning of expressive means is increased in general. The present work contains a content and functional analysis of the expressive syntax and stylistic means used in the pre-election campaign texts of H. Clinton's and D. Trump's.

2. Methods
The present work observes the functioning of linguistic expressive means in stylistic analysis. Quantitative analysis, contextual methods, classification and systematization methods were used to establish linguistic expressive features of the pre-election discourse. A combination of quantitative and qualitative approaches was used in the data analysis.

3. Results and Discussions
The presidential debates while pre-election campaign in 2016 of H. Clinton's and D. Trump's texts have been analyzed in the course of a comprehensive study. The analysis of the texts studied showed that the pre-election discourse has a high level of functioning of expressive means in the content of pre-election campaign's texts (304 examples).

---

*Corresponding Author

The study is aimed at indicating peculiarities of a pre-election campaign by means of the political texts of the compared politicians through stylistic devices and means of expression in the languages considered.

In political discourse, the shades of expressions can vary from familiar to sarcastic which depend on the purpose of use it in order to give these or those linguistic expressive characteristics. For this reason, the speech of politicians are flexible and official etiquette of formulations are being broken. The discourse of politician is colored by emotional language features as reported by Sheigal (2004). The purpose of such speech acts is to convince the listeners and it influences language features of a political, pre-election in particular, discourse.

It is important to mention about specific features of pre-election discourse. According to K. Kenzhekanova, there are the 4 specific characteristics of pre-election discourse:

1. agonistic ability, i.e. competitiveness

'The basis of a political discourse is made by continuous dialogue duel between the party in power and opposition in which opponents attack at each other from time to time, hold the fort, reflect blows and take the offensive' (Dautova and Badmatsirenova, 2014).

2. aggressiveness;

'Standard speech acts of aggression in a political discourse are allocated:

− expressive wills with the semantics of exile (acts of will);
− categorical requirements and appeals;
− speech acts of a damnation (in slogan genres);
− speech acts of threat' (Mukhamadiarova and Ayupova, 2016).

3. ideological character;

'The scope of military and political interaction is such genres as military and political agreement, peace negotiations, i.e. genres, providing the ideology and course of the war from the perspective of the warring parties' (Dautova and Badmatsirenova, 2014).

4. Theatricality.

The recent researches on linguistic analysis of the texts of pre-election discourse observe the most frequent use of the means of expression as stylistic devices and expressive means. "Metaphor, conceptual metaphor in particular, can be considered the basic image" of the political text (Gaikova, 2003). According to L.A. Dautova and D.B. Badmatsirenova, ellipsis, inversion, and rhetorical sentences provide means for expressive realization and the communicants describe the topic without using complex formulations (Seredina, 2012). A recent analysis of pre-election discourse texts by O. Gaikova takes account of phonetic, lexical and syntactical aspects of the G. Bush and A. Gore pre-election campaign texts. The frequent use of antithesis, anaphora parallel constructions rhetorical questions has been found in the O. Gaikova's research paper. There are different levels of expressivity of the texts in the E. Seredina's research. The author represents such linguistic means as graphic means (bold type, italic type, and underlining), means of phonetics (reduplication), lexical means (antonym, synonym, neologism, quotation and loan), syntactical means (rhetorical question, exclamation, paralipsis, inversion) and stylistic devices (metaphor, simile, allusion, pun, paradox) (Kulkova et al., 2016).

This paper illustrates the most frequent use of the expressive means and stylistic devices functioning in the scripts of the three presidential debates D. Trump and H. Clinton in 2016. The first pre-election campaign of Trump's texts contains 36 examples of means of expression and 27 examples of stylistic devices. The first pre-election campaign of Clinton's texts comprises 30 examples of means of expression and 30 examples of stylistic devices. Regarding expressive means of language, there are ellipses (25%)[1] in the Trump's texts whereas Clinton's texts consist of ellipses (5%)[2]. Let's present "pragmatic linguistic analysis of ethnic-cultural characteristics concerning the language objectification of speech intentions" (Kulkova et al., 2016).

Donald Trump's examples of ellipsis	Hilary Clinton's examples of ellipsis
1. [It] Sounds good, doesn't work. Never going to happen. 2. [I'm] calling for a total and complete shutdown of Muslims entering the United States until countries' representatives can figure it out what the hell is going on! 3. Crime [is] at levels that nobody has seen.	4. So much talk, so little substance. [It] Makes me want to go out and do something.

These particular models of the sentence (1-4 examples) suggest the author's personal state of mind and are used to imitate the common features of the colloquial language. "Semantic features of lexemes are on the basis of creating an abstract model of concept (Dullieva, 2017).

The next expressive means functioned the politicians' texts is antiellipsis. There are antiellipses (11%) of the Trump's texts whereas Clinton's texts consist of antiellipses (10%).

---

[1] From 100% expressive means used in the 1st pre-election debates' Trump's texts
[2] From 100% expressive means used in the 1st pre-election debates' Clinton's texts

Donald Trump's examples of antiellipsis	Hilary Clinton's examples of antiellipsis
5. And in many cases, they're illegally here, illegal immigrants. 6. The companies are leaving. I could name, I mean, there are thousands of them. They're leaving, and they're leaving in bigger numbers than ever.	7. Equal pay is still a problem, and it's a problem that gets worse as you get older. 8. We also have to look at how we help families balance the responsibilities at home and the responsibilities at business.

The given examples (5-8) illustrate the use of syntactic pleonasm which serves for reinforcing an idea to understand the meaning easier and brighter.

"The mechanism includes simultaneous use of a number of complex cognitive processes" (Arsenteva and Arsenteva, 2017). The next expressive means functioned the politicians' texts is aposiopesis. There is 5% use of aposiopeses in the Trump's texts whereas Clinton's texts consist of 20% use of aposiopesis.

Donald Trump's examples of aposiopesis	Hilary Clinton's examples of aposiopesis
9. The African-American community -- because -- look, the community within the inner cities have been so badly treated.	10. And I have -- well, not quite that long. I think my husband did a pretty good job in the 1990s. I think a lot about what worked and how we can make it work again. 11. But I want to -- on behalf of myself, and I think on behalf of a majority of the American people, say that, you know, our word is good. 12. But it's because I see this -- we need to have strong growth, fair growth, sustained growth.

Aposiopesis is used in the examples (9-12) as a syntactical device to convey to the target audience an upsurge of emotions. It is used when the speaker cannot proceed, his feelings confusing him of the ability to express himself in terms of language.

The next expressive means functioned the politicians' texts is aposiopesis. There are sentences with the use of repetition (44.5%) of the Trump's texts whereas Clinton's texts consist of 50% use of repetition.

Donald Trump's examples of repetition	Hilary Clinton's examples of repetition
In the audience tonight, we have four mothers of -- I mean, these are unbelievable people that I've gotten to know over a period of years whose children have been killed, brutally killed by people that came into the country illegally. We are going to cut taxes massively. We're going to cut business taxes massively.	It's inconsistent with our values as a nation - a nation which you are helping to build. I want us to invest in you. I want us to invest in your future.

The sentences (13-20) are exemplified by the functioning of repetition. It is used to intensify the utterance. These sentences demonstrate the rhythmical function of repetition.

The next expressive means functioned the politicians' texts is parceling. There are parceling (14%) of the Trump's texts whereas Clinton's texts consist of parceling (15%).

Donald Trump's examples of parceling	Hilary Clinton's examples of parceling
19. You look at the Middle East, it's a total mess. Under your direction, to a large extent. 20. They're devaluing their currency, and there's nobody in our government to fight them. And we have a very good fight. And we have a winning fight. Because they're using our country as a piggy bank to rebuild China, and many other countries are doing the same thing.	21. We teach our children that this is one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all. Not just for people who look a certain way or worship a certain way or love a certain way. For all. 22. And we did drive them to the negotiating table. And my successor, John Kerry, and President Obama got a deal that put a lid on Iran's nuclear program without firing a single shot. That's diplomacy. That's coalition-building. That's working with other nations.

The above sentences are highlighted by the use of parceling. The authors separate sentences to the fragments consciously. The aim is to emphasize the certain aspects of the idea and intensify the meaning.

Regarding stylistic devices, there are sentences with anaphora (6.5%)3 in the Trump's texts whereas Clinton's texts consist of sentences with anaphora (31%)4.

Donald Trump's examples of anaphora	Hilary Clinton's examples of anaphora
23. Iran is one of their biggest trading partners. Iran has power over North Korea.	24. All of us support funding Planned Parenthood. All of us believe climate change is real. All of us want equal pay for equal work. They [the Republican Party] don't believe in any of that. 25. Let's break down the barriers that keep people on the sidelines of our economy, especially women. Let's break down the barriers holding back our young people—especially the student debt that makes it hard to imagine ever living the life you want.

The sentences illustrate anaphora functioning in the pre-election campaign texts.

There are sentences with antithesis (34%) in the Trump's texts whereas Clinton's texts consist of sentences with antithesis (19%).

Donald Trump's examples of antithesis	Hilary Clinton's examples of antithesis
26. You have regulations on top of regulations, and new companies cannot form and old companies are going out of business. 27. I'm going to cut taxes big league, and you're going to raise taxes big league, end of story.	28. Instead of building walls, we need to be tearing down barriers. 29. If state governments [or] politicians use their power to try to restrict that right, well-off people are still going to have it. But a lot of poorer women, rural women—isolated far from a place that they can get services—are going to be denied.

Antithesis in the 26-29 sentences is used in order to show the contrast between to ideas. The pairs are similar in their structures. The reason for use of antithesis is to draw the target audience's attention directly to the contrast.

There are sentences with simile (19%) in the Trump's texts whereas Clinton's texts consist of sentences with simile (23%).

Donald Trump's examples of simile	Hilary Clinton's examples of simile
30. They're devaluing their currency, and there's nobody in our government to fight them. And we have a very good fight. And we have a winning fight. Because they're using our country as a piggy bank to rebuild China, and many other countries are doing the same thing. 31. Our airports are like from a third world country.	32. If Mr. Trump gets his way, it will be like Christmas in the Kremlin. It will make America less safe and the world more dangerous. 33. Like President Obama, I do not believe that we should again have a hundred thousand American troops in combat in the Middle East.

The function of the simile used here is to illustrate and compare an expressive aspect of the statements.

There are sentences with metaphor (40.5%) in the Trump's texts whereas Clinton's texts consist of sentences with metaphor (27%).

Donald Trump's examples of metaphor	Hilary Clinton's examples of metaphor
34. We are a dumping ground to the rest of the world. 35. Our jobs are fleeing the country. They're going to Mexico.	36. I know Donald's very praiseworthy of Vladimir Putin, but Putin is playing a really tough, long game here. 37. And we are a big-hearted, fair-minded country.

---

3 From 100% stylistic devices used in the 1st pre-election debates' Trump's texts
4 From 100% stylistic devices used in the 1st pre-election debates' Clinton's texts

The politicians use metaphor in their texts from linguistic aspects – to manipulate by the target audience thoughts on certain points.

4. Summary

The study of pre-election discourse in H. Clinton's and D. Trump's texts shows that the expressive means are widely used in pre-election debates. The quantitative and qualitative analysis shows the functioning of the expressive means of language which is stated to be the fact of expressivity of pre-election discourse. The results were deduced from the content analysis of individual discourse analysis (D. Trump's discourse and H. Clinton's discourse).

5. Conclusions

A pre-election discourse has its discourse forming features which are determined by the aims of political communication – a contest for power. Modern text, the presidential debates in USA 2016, has proved the high level of expressivity in the pre-election discourse. The linguistic peculiarities such as the expressive means of a language and stylistic devices make possible to judge the significance of studying the category of expressivity in pre-election discourse. It is important to identify them in order to study all the ways and means of speech influence on the target audience and to understand all these techniques by the target audience.

Acknowledgements

References

Arsenteva, E. and Arsenteva, Y. (2017). Extended metaphor as one of the types of occasional use of phraseological euphemisms, An experimental study.

Bhatia, A. (2006). Critical discourse analysis of political press conferences. *Discourse & Society,* 17(2): 173-203.

Dautova, L. A. and Badmatsirenova, D. B. (2014). Linguistic peculiarities of pre-election discourse, American pre-election discourse. Filologicheskie nauki. *Voprosy teori i praktiki, Tambov, Gramota,* 39(9): 53-59.

Dullieva, K. (2017). Semantic fields, Formal modelling and interlanguage comparison. *Journal of Quantitative Linguistics,* 24(1): 1-15.

Gaikova, O. V. (2003). Election discourse as a genre of political communication, On the english material.

Kulkova, M. A., Denisova, E. A. and Zinecker, T. H. (2016). Prohibitive in the intercultural communication. *Modern Journal of Language Teaching Methods*: 202-06.

Mazayev, A. Y. (2005). Political discourse, A factor of the addressee. Available: http://www.ostu.ru/conf/ruslang2005/trend1/mazaeva.htm

Mukhamadiarova, A. F. and Ayupova, R. A. (2016). Concept" love" in american and tatar female poetry. *Journal of Organizational Culture, Communications and Conflict,* 20: 234.

Seredina, E. V. (2012). Features of American political cartoon as a sign. *Vestnik Kostroskogo Gosudarstvennogo Universiteta,* 18(3): Available: http://dlib.rsl.ru/viewer/01005533016#?page=1

Sheigal, E. I. (2004). *Semiotika politicheskogo diskursa, Semiotics of political discourse.* Gnozis: Moscow.

Van Dijk, T. A. (2009). *Society and discourse, How social contexts influence text and talk.* Cambridge University Press.

Yapparova, V. N., Ageeva, J. V. and Agmanova, A. Y. (2018). Pre-election discourse as a special type of institutional discourse. *Conscience,* 9: 245.