

Politeness strategies in Donald Trump's discourse

Pavić, Sven

Master's thesis / Diplomski rad

2020

Degree Grantor / Ustanova koja je dodijelila akademski / stručni stupanj: **Josip Juraj Strossmayer University of Osijek, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences / Sveučilište Josipa Jurja Strossmayera u Osijeku, Filozofski fakultet**

Permanent link / Trajna poveznica: <https://um.nsk.hr/um:nbn:hr:142:292730>

Rights / Prava: [In copyright](#) / [Zaštićeno autorskim pravom.](#)

Download date / Datum preuzimanja: **2025-01-22**



FILOZOFSKI FAKULTET
SVEUČILIŠTE JOSIPA JURJA STROSSMAYERA U OSIJEKU

Repository / Repozitorij:

[FFOS-repository - Repository of the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences Osijek](#)



Sveučilište J.J. Strossmayera u Osijeku

Filozofski fakultet Osijek

Studij: Dvopredmetni sveučilišni diplomski studij engleskog jezika i književnosti i
njemačkog jezika i književnosti – nastavnički smjer

Sven Pavić

Strategije uljudnosti u diskursu Donalda Trumpa

Diplomski rad

Mentor: doc. dr. sc. Goran Milić

Osijek, 2020.

Sveučilište J.J. Strossmayera u Osijeku

Filozofski fakultet Osijek

Odsjek za engleski jezik i književnost

Studij: Dvopredmetni sveučilišni diplomski studij engleskog jezika i književnosti i
njemačkog jezika i književnosti – nastavnički smjer

Sven Pavić

Strategije uljudnosti u diskursu Donalda Trumpa

Diplomski rad

Znanstveno područje: humanističke znanosti

Znanstveno polje: filologija

Znanstvena grana: anglistika

Mentor: doc. dr. sc. Goran Milić

Osijek, 2020.

J.J. Strossmayer University of Osijek

Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences

Study Programme: Double Major MA Study Programme in English Language and
Literature – Teaching English as a Foreign Language and German Language and
Literature

Sven Pavić

Politeness Strategies in Donald Trump's Discourse

Master's Thesis

Supervisor: Dr. Goran Milić, Assistant Professor

Osijek, 2020

J.J. Strossmayer University of Osijek

Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences

Department of English

Study Programme: Double Major MA Study Programme in English Language and Literature and – Teaching English as a Foreign Language and German Language and Literature

Sven Pavić

Politeness Strategies in Donald Trump's Discourse

Master's Thesis

Scientific area: humanities

Scientific field: philology

Scientific branch: English studies

Supervisor: Dr. Goran Milić, Assistant Professor

Osijek, 2020

IZJAVA

Izjavljujem s punom materijalnom i moralnom odgovornošću da sam ovaj rad samostalno napravio te da u njemu nema kopiranih ili prepisanih dijelova teksta tuđih radova, a da nisu označeni kao citati s napisanim izvorom odakle su preneseni.

Svojim vlastoručnim potpisom potvrđujem da sam suglasan da Filozofski fakultet Osijek trajno pohrani i javno objavi ovaj moj rad u internetskoj bazi završnih i diplomskih radova knjižnice Filozofskog fakulteta Osijek, knjižnice Sveučilišta Josipa Jurja Strossmayera u Osijeku i Nacionalne i sveučilišne knjižnice u Zagrebu.

U Osijeku, 20.7.2020.

Sven Pavić, 01222216496
ime i prezime studenta, JMBAG

Abstract

Communication patterns are unique to every individual. As a result, much can be inferred about a person by studying their utterances and the communicative context. This thesis analyzes Donald Trump's discourse, but unlike other studies that interpret its perception with the public, the focus here is mainly on Trump's use of politeness strategies which directly affect the interlocutor. The analysis shows that Trump uses all four main politeness strategies, but with varying frequencies. Their choice and usage indicate his intentions to save or threaten the interlocutor's negative or positive face and ultimately give insight into the communicative motive behind every utterance.

Keywords: Donald Trump, discourse, politeness strategies, negative face, positive face

Sažetak

Obrasci komunikacije jedinstveni su za svakog pojedinca. Kao rezultat toga, o osobi se može dosta zaključiti proučavanjem njezinih rečenica i komunikacijskog konteksta. Ovaj rad analizira diskurs Donalda Trumpa, ali za razliku od drugih studija koje tumače njegov doživljaj od strane javnosti, ovdje je naglasak uglavnom na Trumpovoj upotrebi strategija uljudnosti koje izravno utječu na sugovornika. Analiza pokazuje da Trump koristi sve četiri glavne strategije uljudnosti, ali s različitom učestalošću. Njihov izbor i upotreba ukazuju na njegove namjere da spasi ili naruši sugovornikov negativni ili pozitivan obraz te u konačnici daju uvid u komunikacijski motiv iza svake rečenice.

Ključne riječi: Donald Trump, diskurs, strategije uljudnosti, negativni obraz, pozitivan obraz

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would first like to thank Dr. Goran Milić, Assistant Professor whose lectures inspired me to pursue my interest in Linguistics and who has been a tremendous mentor during this whole process.

I would also like to acknowledge all my professors, both at the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences in Osijek and the Karl-Franzens University of Graz, whose knowledge and expertise has benefited me greatly during my study.

I am forever indebted to Ema. Without your love, all of this would not have been possible...

I wish to express my deepest gratitude to my family members who have always stressed the importance of education and offered unconditional support.

I wish to thank all my friends and colleagues who made the recurring problems and stress throughout the years more tolerable.

Table of Contents

1. Introduction.....	1
2. Pragmatics.....	3
3. Politeness	4
4. Face.....	5
5. Face threatening acts	6
5.1. First classification: Type of face that is threatened	6
5.2. Second classification: Threats to hearer's face or speaker's face	8
6. Politeness strategies.....	9
6.1. Positive politeness.....	11
6.2. Negative politeness	13
6.3. Bald on record.....	15
6.4. Off record	17
7. Aim and research questions	21
8. Methodology	22
8.1. Previous research on Donald Trump's discourse	22
8.2. Research data	22
8.3. Methods	23
9. Results and discussions	24
9.1. The frequencies of politeness strategies in Donald Trump's discourse	24
9.2. The analysis of the politeness strategies used in Donald Trump's discourse	25
9.2.1. <i>Positive politeness in Donald Trump's discourse</i>	25
9.2.2. <i>Negative politeness in Donald Trump's discourse</i>	30
9.2.3. <i>Bald on record in Donald Trump's discourse</i>	33
9.2.4. <i>Off record strategies in Donald Trump's discourse</i>	37
10. Conclusion	44
11. References.....	46
12. Appendix.....	48

1. Introduction

Communication has always been an essential part of human culture and as such, it provides an insight into the ways of social interaction and the contexts that ultimately shape human behavior. It comes as no surprise that research in that field is plentiful as humans try to outline their behavioral patterns. However, it is impossible to find the ultimate formula due to the ever-changing society and the associated norms. When it comes to aspects of social life for which it could be claimed that communication and its thorough comprehension are the most important factors, a single one could not be unanimously chosen. It is, therefore, important in research to deal with and focus on individual aspects, but at the same time not observe them as isolated instances without any connections with other spheres of human culture. It could be claimed that this thesis focuses on communication in the overall context of politics, but given the potential complexity of such wide scope, the study deals more precisely with the analysis of the discourse of a single person who happens to be a well-known figure in that world, i.e. Donald Trump. Trump is the 45th president of the United States of America, who had even prior to his presidency in 2017 attracted much attention from the public, and him winning the election only further provoked the interest of people. Communication patterns are unique to every person and, therefore, every person contains a unique discourse which ultimately shapes the society's perception of the person. As a result, much can be learnt from the way a person constructs utterances and presents them in the public. There is much research regarding Trump's discourse, one of the most notable being by Sclafani (2018), but similar to others, more often than not, there are elements taken into consideration that go beyond the linguistic aspects. Similarly, the controversies are addressed, which are connected to Trump's public identity. However, this study seeks to avoid that and rather focuses solely on Donald Trump's discourse, and that from a specific perspective of his use of politeness strategies, the theory of which was popularized by Brown and Levinson (1987).

The paper starts with the theoretical part by defining the specialized linguistic area of this research, *viz.* Pragmatics, after which in chapters 3, 4, and 5 the terms politeness and face are presented from the linguistic point of view, which is the basis for understanding the analysis. Furthermore, the concept of politeness strategies suggested by Brown and Levinson (1987) is introduced in chapter 6 and the four types (positive politeness, negative politeness, on the record, and off record) are explained and exemplified.

The analytical part of the study starts with the aims in chapter 7 whereas the methodology is presented in chapter 8. Chapter 9 contains the results and discussion which also deal with the aforementioned strategies and the frequency of their utilization in Donald Trump's discourse. Furthermore, specific strategies are analyzed which are further classifications of the four main strategies and it is argued about the context they are used in and their purpose in Donald Trump's discourse.

2. Pragmatics

Before presenting central aspects and terms of the research, it is important to identify the specialized area of this thesis with regards to the classifications in linguistics. The scope of the study and the approach taken place this research in the realm of Pragmatics. Yule (1996: 3) defines it as “the study of meaning as communicated by a speaker (or writer) and interpreted by a listener (or reader)”. He argues that the analysis focuses more on what people mean and try to convey by their utterances rather than what the isolated elements of these utterances may mean on their own. Similarly, Mey (2001: 6) claims that “[c]ommunication in society happens chiefly by means of language. However, the users of language, as social beings, communicate and use language on society’s premises; society controls their access to the linguistic and communicative means.” Also, the interpretation of these utterances relies on created constructs and specific contexts—it needs to be taken into consideration with whom a person is talking and where, when and under which circumstances the communicative situation occurs. The listener infers what is said so that they could interpret the intended meaning of the speaker. In other words, pragmatics explores how even unsaid aspects are perceived as part of the communicated, which Yule (1996: 3) identifies as “the investigation of invisible meaning”.

Consequently, there is the question of what ultimately influences the decision between the said and the unsaid. Yule (1996: 3) claims that it is about the notion of distances and that “[c]loseness, whether it is physical, social, or conceptual, implies shared experience. On the assumption of how close or distant the listener is, speakers determine how much needs to be said”. It is this last aspect that the research is principally concerned with since the theory of politeness in communication deals with existing and/or established relationships between the interlocutors.

3. Politeness

When it comes to the concept of politeness in linguistics, there are numerous interpretations of the term (for a detailed list of various politeness theories, most notable researchers and criticism, see Janney and Arndt 1993; Eelen 2001). Therefore, there is no unanimous definition and some even classify the term as *confusing* (Spencer-Oatey 2008: 15). Watts (2003: 10-11) talks about *linguistic politeness*, i.e. polite language, and claims that it is something that one is not born with, but rather has to learn and acquire through social practice. Leech (1980: 19) characterizes it as “strategic conflict avoidance [which] can be measured in terms of the degree of effort put into the avoidance of a conflict situation”. This notion is closely connected to the interaction between people, who rely on cooperation if they wish to establish a successful communication. In order to achieve this, people need to assess the communicative situation, which is constantly changing, and use appropriate interactive strategies accordingly (cf. Holmes 2006). However, Brown and Levinson (1987: 95) claim that politeness is “a major source of deviation from [...] rational efficiency” in communications due to the fact that it creates a high degree of attention to various factors which in turn slow the communication. Nevertheless, politeness is an important factor in human interaction as it is assumed that the participants are aware of the existence of certain cultural principles and norms, which they ultimately choose to accept and utilize (Yule 1996: 60).

4. Face

The concept of face was first introduced by Goffman who describes it as follows:

The term *face* may be defined as the positive social value a person effectively claims for himself by the line others assume he has taken during a particular contact. Face is an image of self delineated in terms of approved social attributes—albeit an image an image that other may share, as when a person makes a good showing for his profession or religion by making a good showing for himself. (1967: 5)

In addition, Brown and Levinson (1987: 61) define the idea of face as “something that is emotionally invested, and that can be lost, maintained, or enhanced, and must be constantly attended to in interaction”. In other words, it is the public self-image of every member of society, which they try to preserve. According to them, there are two types of face:

- (i) negative face: the basic claim to territories, personal preserves, rights to non-distraction - i.e. to freedom of action and freedom from imposition.
- (ii) positive face: the positive consistent self-image or ‘personality’ (crucially including the desire that this self-image be appreciated and approved of) claimed by interactants.

Additionally, Yule (1996: 62) argues that the positive face is a person’s need to be liked, accepted and treated as a member of a same group, i.e. to be connected, whereas negative face is the complete opposite and is characterized by independence.

This concept, although often not apparent or thought about, exists in every society as a universal component. Consequently, Brown and Levinson (1987: 61) argue that people cooperate in order to maintain face since they acknowledge the vulnerability of face:

That is, normally everyone’s face depends on everyone else’s being maintained, and since people can be expected to defend their faces if threatened, and in defending their own to threaten others’ faces, it is in general in every participant’s best interest to maintain each others’ face, that is to act in ways that assure the other participants that the agent is heedful of the assumptions concerning face [...].

However, this is not always the case and under the influence of many factors, such as context and closeness, or lack thereof, there are instances where interlocutors utilize utterances that threatened the face, be it consciously or unconsciously.

5. Face threatening acts

Acts which lead to a person needing to save or ultimately losing face are called Face Threatening Acts (FTA) (Brown and Levinson 1987: 60). Yule (1996: 61) defines FTAs as something a person says which represents a threat to the other individual's view concerning self-image. When it comes to the notion of face threatening acts and the associated phenomena, there are criticism that oppose these approaches (cf. Locher and Watts 2005; O'Driscoll 2007), but the thesis is based arguably on the most widely accepted theory, namely the one by Brown and Levinson. Given that communication is conducted on different levels, these acts can be verbal, paraverbal (tone, pitch, pacing of our voice etc.) and non-verbal (body language, facial expression etc.), but due to the nature and scope of investigation of this research, the focus lies principally on the verbal aspects. Brown and Levinson (1987: 65-68) claim that there has to be at least one FTA connected with an utterance and that in certain contexts utterances may include multiple acts functioning simultaneously. According to them, are two ways of classifying FTAs, namely depending on what kind of face is threatened and whose face is threatened.

5.1. First classification: Type of face that is threatened

This classification deals with acts that either damage the negative or the positive face of an individual. It is important to note that within this classification there is overlap as some acts inherently pose a threat to both negative and positive face.

- (i) These acts threaten the hearer's negative face as a result of the speaker showing no interest in recognizing H's freedom of action and right to personal goods:
 - (a) orders and requests (S wants H to do, or avoid doing, an action)
 - (b) recommendations and advice (S signals that thinks H should do an action)
 - (c) reminders (S hints the H ought to remember to do something)
 - (d) threats and warnings (S indicates that there will be actions against H if he does or does not do an action)
 - (e) offers and promises (S commits to doing an action for the good of the H, who is then pressured to accept or reject the offer, and possibly in debt to S)
 - (f) statements of negative emotions —anger, hatred etc. (S shows potential desire to harm H or their personal possession)
 - (g) compliments and expressions of admiration (S implies that he would want something from H)

- (ii) These acts threaten the hearer's positive face since they demonstrate that the speaker has no concern for the addressee's wants and feelings, and that there is a negative evaluation of certain aspects of H's positive face:
- (a) disapproval, criticism, accusations, insults (S shows they do not approve or like H's goods, characteristics, values etc.)
 - (b) disagreement (S indicates his thoughts about H being wrong in his ideas and actions)
 - (c) expressions of violent emotions (H has a reason to fear S)
 - (d) inappropriate or taboo topics in a context (S indicates that he disrespects H's values)
 - (e) emotional topics, e.g. religion or politics (S creates a dangerous and stressful atmosphere for H)
 - (f) introducing bad news or boasting (S causes distress to H and has no respect for H's feelings)
 - (g) overt non-cooperative behavior during an activity, e.g. interrupting H talk or ignoring them (S indicates the lack of care for H's positive and negative face wants)
 - (h) address terms and status labeling (S misidentifies H in a disrespectful way, consciously or unconsciously)

As already mentioned, the concept of face is universal in human culture and every utterance can be associated with a minimum of one act. Cultures differ in many ways and so their unique communicative situation and associated rules may not be apparent to every individual (cf. Alavidze 2018). Therefore, in order to further present the notion of face threatening acts concerning negative and positive face, let us illustrate an example of a potential real-life situation that could be applicable to most cultural situations. For instance, during a conversation person A suggests that his interlocutor, person B, is connected to a particular group of people where his interests and wants are accepted and respected (e.g. a specific circle of friends, political party, religious organization, sports fan club etc.). However, person B would rather distance himself from that group and remain autonomous as he shares his values and ideas with other groups. As a result, person B is presented in a way which does not correspond to his self-image and his face is being threatened —negative face since it was implied that he cannot function alone as an individual and positive face since his ideas and values are presented in a distorted way. Therefore, this exemplifies that either the person's positive face or negative face might be threatened with every utterance, all depending on the communicative situation and the interlocutors' self-image.

5.2.Second classification: Threats to hearer's face or speaker's face

In the second classification there is a distinction between acts threatening H's face and the ones threatening S's face. Since the former is already listed in the section above, the following are FTAs that are threats to S:

- (i) Threats to S's negative face:
 - (a) expressing thanks (S acknowledges that he depends on others and thus decreases his level of autonomy)
 - (b) excuses (S admits his actions, that were potentially criticized by H, were wrong)
 - (c) acceptance of offers (S is forced to accept a commitment which directly opposed H's negative face)
 - (d) unwilling offers and promises (S accepts an eventual action even though he does not want to do it; if he shows the unwillingness, there is a potential threat to H's positive face)
- (ii) Threats to S's positive face:
 - (a) apologies (S implies the regret for doing a previous FTA, which damages his own face.
 - (b) acceptance of compliments (S may feel obliged to return the compliment to H)
 - (c) collapse of one's own control over the body, e.g. falling down, staggering etc., or inability to control emotions such as laughter and tears
 - (d) self-humiliation, illogical, inconsistent and stupid behavior
 - (e) confession of guilt and accountability (S has done or has not done an action or he does not know something that is expected of him)

Even in this distinction it depends on the culture and the norms that are an essential part of it. Some situations outlined above may be difficult to analyze at first if the person is not merely an observer. People tend to have unique patterns during communication and these aspects are rarely thought of in an active way. For the most part, they occur unknowingly as a response to multiple parameters of the context, such as closeness to the other person, emotional status, subject matter etc. This classification further supports the claim that face, be it negative or positive, H's or S's, is constantly challenged during communication (cf. Goffman 1967). Since it can be claimed that the individual seeks to save their current face or present themselves in a way they choose to, it is on the individual to act in order to achieve the desired effect.

6. Politeness strategies

Politeness can be seen “as a complex system for softening face threats [...] [and in] the context of the mutual vulnerability of face, any rational agent will seek to avoid these face-threatening acts, or will employ certain strategies to minimize the threat” (Brown and Levinson 1987: 1; 68). They claim that depending on the intention and the context of a communication, a specific strategy is used. Before doing so, an individual takes into consideration and evaluates the three following conditions: (a) the want to communicate the matter of an FTA, (b) the want to prioritize efficiency and urgency, and (c) the will to maintain H’s face to a certain extent. In order to further illustrate this, following is a schema that shows the possible strategies for executing FTAs.




Figure 1: Possible strategies for doing FTAs (Brown and Levinson 1987: 69).

According to the schema, there are certain ways an individual can choose from when creating a communicative situation. It is noteworthy that this selection of steps in the real world occurs nearly instantaneously as the interlocutors are aware of all the parameters of the context they are currently in. In the first step illustrated is the above condition (a): the want to communicate the matter of an FTA. There is the option not to utilize an FTA, or an utterance for that matter. The S chooses not to offend H and as a result there is no need for further action, but at the same time S did not establish the wanted communication. However, if the person chooses to do an FTA, there are further classifications which evaluate conditions (b) the want to prioritize efficiency and urgency and (c) the will to maintain H’s face to a certain extent.

The main distinction between doing and act *on record* or *off record* is whether other participants comprehend what communicative intention influenced the person in doing that particular acts. In

the case of the former, it is clear to the H what S's intention is. For example, person A promises to person B that he will help him with fix his car during the weekend. Consequently, person B unquestionably interprets person A's intention, who committed himself to an act in the future while going "on record" in doing so. In the case of the latter, the situation is contrasting. There are multiple possible interpretations of the intent as the S intentionally formulates his utterances in an ambiguous way in order to avoid being committed to a singular intent. For instance, person A says, "I am going to be late for my appointment." In this situation it is not entirely clear to person B what his next course of action should be:

- offer help and respond by saying: "Do not worry. I will drive you there!"
- give advice by suggesting a better way: "You can take this shortcut and you will get there quicker."
- reflect on person A's mistake: "You should not have spent so much time in the bathroom!"
- understand it as an invite for chatter and try to diminish the problem: "Oh, I am late all the time. Surely nobody will notice you being late."

The speaker is in this case indirectly, off record, expressing his intent, the meaning of which is still debatable.

Nevertheless, if the person chooses to produce an unambiguous act, they still have the option of doing it without redressive actions, i.e. baldly, or with redressive actions. By doing it baldly and without redressive actions, the speaker does the act explicitly and in a concise way. Some of the most apparent examples include orders. For instances, when person A says, "Get out of the car!" efficiency is paramount and there is no time to consider person B's face. It is important to mention that a speaker will do an FTA baldly only if there is minimal chance of retribution from the other person. On the contrary, acts with redressive actions take into consideration the addressee's face and are used to reduce the potential damage to the positive and negative face, respectively. Positive politeness focuses on H's positive face—his wants, needs, and desired self-image. For example, person A says to person B: "You look terrible. Can I help you with the work?" The face threat is reduced as the S constructs his utterances in a way that the FTA does not negatively reflect on the perception of H's face, but rather shows S's care for his positive face. Similarly, negative politeness shows the S's orientation towards H's face, negative face for that matter. The S wants to avoid imposing upon the H and his freedom of action and will. The intention is to make the H feel as if they were not coerced into doing something and that they are free to decide their next course of action. This can be seen in the following example where the utterance is constructed in

a way not to impede on the H: “I know this is a lot to ask and it is completely fine if you decline, but could you help me with the work?”

All in all, “[the] redressive action for FTAs usually involves forms of politeness whose indirectness serves to minimize the threat” (Zajdman 1995: 327). In other words, these forms are politeness strategies which are utilized as an attempt to reduce the effect of FTAs. Their choice also depends on the “estimation of risk of face loss”, meaning that the more an acts threatens the face of the speaker or hearer, the more it is likely that S will utilize a higher-numbered strategy (see figure 1). In order to simplify the classification, Brown and Levinson (1987: 91-227) point out the four highest-level strategies: positive politeness, negative politeness, bald on record, and off record. Following is a detailed breakdown of each strategy with examples and the payoffs for using them.

6.1. Positive politeness

Positive politeness strategies are utilized in order to reduce threat to the addressee’s positive face when FTAs are imminent. The aim is to make H’s wants, actions, belongings etc., be valued. Additionally, Brown and Levinson (1987: 101) say that it is often used in everyday communication, especially when emphasizing the closeness between the interlocutors, or even wanting to establishing a closer relationship:

[P]ositive politeness are in many respects simply representative of the normal linguistic behaviour between intimates, where interest and approval of each other’s personality, presuppositions indicating shared wants and shared knowledge [...] are routinely exchanged.

Because face is a complex concept, the strategies involved in reducing threats to it can have different forms. Therefore, following are further classifications of 15 positive politeness strategies and sentences which help exemplify every strategy:

Table 1: Positive politeness strategies

Strategy	Example
1. Attend to H's interests, needs, wants etc.	"You are tired from traveling. Come and take a break."
2. Exaggerate	"That's a beautiful shirt you have!"
3. Intensify interest to H (include the H into the event)	"I come home, and what do you think I find there?"
4. Use of in-group identity markers (of address forms, dialect, jargon etc.)	"Come here, buddy/pal/mate." "Give us three quid, wouldja mate?"
5. Seek agreement (safe topics, repetition)	A: "I had a flat tyre on the way home." B: "Oh God, a flat tyre!"
6. Avoid disagreement	A: "What is she, small?" B: "Yes, yes, she's small, smallish, um, not really small but certainly not very big."
7. Presuppose/raise/assert common ground	"Wouldn't you like a drink?" "Now, have we taken our medicine?" (doctor to patient)
8. Joke	"How about lending me this old heap of junk?" (H's new Cadillac)
9. Assert or presuppose S's knowledge of and concern for H's wants	"Look, I know you want the car back by 5.0, so shouldn't I go to town now?" (request)
10. Offer, promise	"If you cook lunch, I will wash the dishes"
11. Be optimistic	"You don't have any objections to me helping myself to a bit of cake, do you?"
12. Include both S and H in the activity	"Let's stop for a diner." (i.e. I am hungry and want to eat, so let's stop)
13. Give (or ask for) reasons	"Why don't I help you with the homework?"
14. Assume or assert reciprocity	"You helped me last week; I will help you now."
15. Give gifts to H (goods, sympathy, understanding, cooperation)	Gift-giving, both tangible and concerning human relations; fulfilling wants of being liked, cared etc.

Source: Brown and Levinson 1987: 103-129.

The above listed strategies all have in focus H's interests, wants, goods etc. Accordingly, there are payoffs associated with applying them. Brown and Levinson claim the following:

For going on record with positive politeness, a speaker can minimize the face-threatening aspects of an act by assuring the addressee that S considers himself to be 'of the same kind', that he likes him and wants his wants. Thus a criticism, with the assertion of mutual friendship, may lose much of its sting — indeed, in the assumption of a friendly context it often becomes a game (cf. Labov [1972]) and possibly even a compliment (as between opposite-sexed teenagers). Another possible payoff is that S can avoid or minimize the debt implications of FTAs such as requests and offers, either by referring (indirectly) to the reciprocity and on-going relationship between the addressee and himself [...] or by including the addressee and himself equally as participants in or as benefactors from the request or offer. (1987: 71-72)

In conclusion, strategies for positive politeness and positive politeness per se can be seen as the speaker's actions which are characterized by the focus on the hearer's positive face and can satisfy that face in some respect. It can be claimed that these forms are used in order to minimize social distance among interlocutors.

6.2. Negative politeness

“Negative politeness is redressive action addressed to the addressee's negative face: his want to have his freedom of action unhindered and his attention unimpeded” (Brown and Levinson 1987: 129). This strategy seeks to establish a social distance between the interlocutors as it minimizes the speaker's imposition, which could otherwise lead to embarrassment or awkwardness. It is claimed that negative politeness is the most common strategy used in Western cultures since it is characterized by specific social norm and etiquette which the members choose to accept (Brown and Levinson 1987: 129-130; Yule 1996: 64-65). Similar to the case with positive politeness above, the strategies involved in reducing threats to the negative face can also have different patterns. Thus, included is an additional differentiation of 10 negative politeness strategies and example sentences of each:

Table 2: Negative politeness strategies

Strategy	Example
1. Be conventionally indirect	"I'd like to borrow a cup of flour if I may."
2. Question, hedge	"There wouldn't I suppose be any chance of your being able to lend me your car for just a few minutes, would there?"
3. Be pessimistic	"So, I assume you coming tonight is unlikely, then?"
4. Minimize the imposition	"I <i>just</i> dropped by for a minute to ask if you..."
5. Give deference	"We look forward very much to eating with you." "I think I must be absolutely stupid but I simply can't understand this map."
6. Apologize	"Excuse me, but..." "I'm sorry to bother you ..."
7. Impersonalize S and H (passive, use of indefinites, pluralization, "I" and "You" avoidance)	"It would be appreciated if..." (instead of I would) "One shouldn't do things like that." (instead of You)
8. State the FTA as a general rule	"I'm sorry, but late-comers cannot be seated till the next interval."
9. Nominalize	"Your good performance on the examinations impressed us favourably." (more formal than "You performed well on the examinations and we were favourably impressed.")
10. Go on record as incurring a debt, or as not indebting H	"I'd be eternally grateful if you would ..." "I'll never be able to repay you if you ..."

Source: Brown and Levinson 1987: 132-210.

Moreover, Yule (1996: 64-65) suggest that “[n]egative politeness is characterized by distancing styles”. In his examples: “I’m sorry to bother you, but can I ask you for a pen or something?” and “I know you’re busy, but might I ask you if—em—if you happen to have an extra pen that I could, you know—eh— maybe borrow?”, it is important to emphasize the nature of questions used as negative politeness strategies. The above sentences illustrate questions which initially ask for permission in order to ask the real request (“can/might I ask you...”). This allows the person to answer the question negatively with less restrictions since there is a smaller refusal effect than there is in a situation where the request is a direct imperative. Brown and Levinson (1987: 72) outline the benefits to the speaker of using negative politeness:

[H]e can pay respect, deference, to the addressee in return for the FTA, and can thereby avoid incurring (or can thereby lessen) a future debt; he can maintain social distance, and avoid the threat (or the potential face loss) of advancing familiarity towards the addressee ; he can give a real ‘out’ to the addressee (for example, with a request or an offer, by making it clear that he doesn’t really expect H to say ‘Yes’ unless he wants to, thereby minimizing the mutual face loss incurred if H has to say ‘No’); and he can give conventional ‘outs’ to the addressee as opposed to real ‘outs’, that is, pretend to offer an escape route without really doing so, thereby indicating that he has the other person’s face wants in mind.

Conclusively, negative politeness and the associated strategies are directed at the H’s negative face as well as at reducing the imposition to it, and unlike in the case of positive politeness, these forms are effective in establishing social distance between the interlocutors.

6.3. Bald on record

According to Brown and Levinson (1987: 94-98), bald on record is used in the context of trying to “[achieve] maximally efficient communication”, which follows the conversational principles, maxims, in order to establish that efficiency. As many are not familiar with Grice’s concept of maxims, following is a brief overview (for a detailed breakdown, see Grice 1975):

- Maxim of Quality: Be non-spurious (speak the truth, be sincere).
- Maxims of Quantity: (a) Don’t say less than is required.
(b) Don’t say more than is required.
- Maxim of Relevance: Be relevant.
- Maxim of Manner: Be perspicuous; avoid ambiguity and obscurity

As a result, unlike positive and negative politeness, this strategy is characterized by there not being any effort in minimizing the threat to the hearer’s face. Since the face of the other person is considered irrelevant, the S directly addresses the H in order to express his or her own needs or to convey an immediate message (Yule 1996: 63). In order to exemplify bald on record strategies, following are cases where there is no minimization of threat to the face:

Table 3: Bald on record strategies

Cases of no face threat minimization	Example
1. Desperation and urgency	“Help!” “Watch out!”
2. Attention-getters	“Look, the point is...” “Hear me out: ...”
3. Task-oriented interaction	“Give me the hammer” “Add three cups of flour and stir vigorously.”
4. No desire to save H’s face	“Bring me wine, Jeeves.”
5. The act is in the H’s interest	“Your wig is askew; let me fix it for you.” “Your headlights are on!”

Source: Brown and Levinson 1987: 94-101.

Although it might be claimed that some instances connected to this strategy present no threat to H’s face, upon closer analysis, the non-minimization of face threat becomes apparent. For example, in case 5: “*Your wig is askew; let me fix it for you.*”, it is evident that the action is in the hearer’s interest. However, it can be claimed that both faces are threatened in this utterance. Firstly, one’s appearance directly impacts their social status within a group, which is in this case challenged, resulting in their positive face being threatened. Secondly, the negative face is threatened as it is implied that the person is unable to remain independent and that they rely on others for help. As it is the case with other politeness strategies, there are payoffs associated with utilizing bald on record communication:

By going on record, a speaker can potentially get any of the following advantages: he can enlist public pressure against the addressee or in support of himself; he can get credit for

honesty, for indicating that he trusts the addressee; he can get credit for outspokenness, avoiding the danger of being seen to be a manipulator; he can avoid the danger of being misunderstood; and he can have the opportunity to pay back in face whatever he potentially takes away by the FTA. (Brown and Levinson 1987: 71)

Interestingly enough, this approach to communication, although classified under politeness strategies, could run the risk of not being associated with politeness per se. In many cases the utterances contain elements of offensiveness, which is quite the opposite from the general categorization (see Culpeper 1996). Nevertheless, bald on record seeks to establish efficiency in communication, which creates situations that override concerns to the face.

6.4. Off record

Off record strategy can be seen as the opposite of the bald on record since instead on utilizing directness and efficiency, it completely violates all the maxims suggested by Grice (1975). Brown and Levinson (1987: 211) describe it as follows:

A communicative act is done off record if it is done in such a way that it is not possible to attribute only one clear communicative intention to the act. In other words, the actor leaves himself an ‘out’ by providing himself with a number of defensible interpretations; he cannot be held to have committed himself to just one particular interpretation of his act. Thus if a speaker wants to do an FTA, but wants to avoid the responsibility for doing it, he can do it off record and leave it up to the addressee to decide how to interpret it.

This idea is exemplified by Fasold (1990: 162) in an everyday communicative situation. He claims that if you say, “Gosh, I’m out of money. I forgot to go to the bank”, the other person might infer you are asking for a loan. In that case they could either give you the loan or reply by saying: “Sorry, I’d like to help you out, but I’m a little short of cash myself”. If it is the latter, you still have an ‘out’, as described above, and can respond by saying “Oh. I didn’t mean I wanted you to lend me money!”. Moreover, off record is to be interpreted in a specific context since it heavily relies on pragmatics, even more than the other strategies do. An utterance like “It’s cold in here” (table 4, strategy 1) might suggest the speaker wants somebody to close the window, but the other people in the room may not register this or they choose to ignore the utterance as they were not directly addressed (Brown and Levinson 1987: 215). Pinker (2007: 441) claims that “the hearer is implicitly given the opportunity to ignore the request without a public refusal, which also means

that if [they comply] with the request, it's not because [they are] taking orders. For that reason, this indirect strategy is also "referred to as 'hints' [...] since an off the record statement may or may not succeed" (Yule 1996: 63). Following is the classification of 14 off record strategies:

Table 4: Off record strategies

Strategy	Example
1. Give hints	“It’s cold in here.” (Shut the window) “This soup’s a bit bland.” (Pass the salt)
2. Give association clues	“Are you going to market tomorrow? There’s a market tomorrow, I suppose.” (Give me a ride)
3. Presuppose	“John’s in the bathtub <i>yet</i> again.” (Criticism)
4. Understate	“It’s not half bad.”(S thinks it’s surprisingly good) “That house needs a touch of paint.” (about a peeling slum; <i>a lot of work</i>)
5. Overstate	“I tried to call a hundred times, but there was never any answer.” (apology)
6. Use tautologies	“Boys will be boys.”
7. Use contradictions	A: “Are you upset about that?” B: “Well, yes and no / I am and I’m not.”
8. Be ironic	“John’s a real genius.” (after John has just done twenty stupid things in a row)
9. Use metaphors	“Harry’s a real fish.” (difficult to interpret the meaning: He drinks / swims / is slimy / is cold-blooded like a fish)
10. Use rhetorical questions	“How many times I have to tell you...?” (Too many)
11. Be ambiguous	“John’s a pretty sharp / smooth cookie.”
12. Be vague	“Perhaps someone did something naughty.”
13. Over-generalize	“He who laughs last laughs longest.”
14. Be incomplete, use ellipsis	“Well, if one leaves one’s tea on the shaky table ...”

Source: Brown and Levinson 1987: 211-227.

As a result of utilizing off record strategies, the S can have certain benefits in the communicate situation. The first of the two main aspects being the fact that others will perceive him/her as non-coercive, and that is a quality many respect in their interlocutor. Secondly, there is avoidance of responsibility concerning potential interpretations of face damage to others, which means that if the S's utterance was perceived as face-threatening, they have an *out* since the utterance was ambiguous and open to multiple interpretations in the first place.

In summary, off record strategies rely on indirect language and ambiguity in order to remove the potential of S to impose on their interlocutors. Given the nature of off record strategies and the fact that they rely heavily on pragmatics and the context they are used in, they have a chance to cause the communicative situation to fail if the H does not interpret them as the S intended.

7. Aim and research questions

The main aim of this study was to explore utterances of Donald Trump in order to analyze the occurrence, context of use, and effect of politeness strategies in his discourse. In order to do so, the study addressed the following research questions:

- 1) Which politeness strategies are used by Donald Trump in his discourse?
- 2) How many politeness strategies are found in Donald Trump's utterances and what is the relation of occurrence between the politeness strategies?
- 3) Which specific strategies that are further classifications of the four main politeness strategies are used?
- 4) What is the effect of the politeness strategies and what do they reveal about the communicative context?

8. Methodology

8.1. Previous research on Donald Trump's discourse

If we take into consideration Trump's global popularity, it comes as no surprise that there are numerous studies on his discourse and speech patterns, all of which consider varying context of the language use. Therefore, we present several previous studies from authors that focus on similar aspects of Donald Trump's language. Sclafani (2018) claims that Trump's discourse consists of a simple vocabulary, many repetitions, and an informal tone, none of which are conventional characteristics one would expect to find in the speech of a politician (see also Vrana and Schneider 2017). Moreover, she points out Trump's use of "personal narrative, constructed dialogue, and interruptive behavior", but interestingly enough, when analyzing the language associated with the interruptions "and the positive politeness strategies that accompanied them, such as humor, we were able to discern how he managed to present a likeable persona to audiences, overcoming potential negative repercussions associated with interruptive or uncongenial linguistic behavior" (87). Similarly, Mohammadi and Javadi (2017) indicate that Trump's language "is everyday language and very easy to understand but very provocative, which may be unsavory for more educated people" (9). They argue that such discourse patterns result in emphatic sentences that are powerful, persuasive, and show power, but at the same time successfully emphasize Trump's overall ideology. It is claimed that Trump intentionally simplifies his language in order to address a wider number of people, which ultimately benefits his political agenda (Kayam 2017). All of the aforementioned elements indicate the language that is expected to be found in analyzing Trump's discourse.

8.2. Research data

The data used for this research was Donald Trump's interview with ABC News anchor David Muir on January 25 2017. This was the first interview Donald Trump gave as the 45th president of the United States of America and it took place in the White House five days after Trump's inauguration. The interview was an ABC News exclusive and the transcript was supplied on their official website. The analysis is based primarily on the transcript, but the version for television broadcast was also observed as it provided additional insight into the context and nonverbal and paraverbal aspects of the interview. The videos were courtesy of ABC News' official YouTube channel and website. However, the website only contains certain video segments since the full interview is only available to viewers located within the United States and its territories due to international rights agreements. It is important to notice that these available videos used as

additional source of information were edited before airing on television, which means that some parts are missing when compared to the full transcript. This interview was used for analysis since it was the first interview of Trump's presidency and as such it arguably set the tone of his discourse in the role of the President of the United States.

8.3. Methods

The utterances were divided in a table where it was possible to make a clear distinction of the speaker, turn number, and supply additional information of the context. Firstly, Donald Trump's utterances were observed and the politeness strategies used were identified in the right column according to the theory of politeness strategies by Brown and Levinson (1987). It is important to mention that although the interviewer's utterances were not classified and analyzed as the main focus of the study, his role as the hearer is essential in analyzing Trump's discourse and the overall context due to the nature of interviews. Secondly, the specific strategies within each of the four major categories were classified. Furthermore, observed were the frequencies of the four politeness strategies: positive politeness, negative politeness, bald on record and off record. The frequencies of the further classification of specific politeness strategies were included and the occurring strategies were supplied with utterances from the transcript. Those pieces of information were used to argue about the context of their use as well as the effect their utilization has in Donald Trump's discourse.

9. Results and discussion

9.1. The frequencies of politeness strategies in Donald Trump's discourse

The following section includes the frequency of each politeness strategy used by Donald Trump during the interview with David Muir from ABC News on January 25 2017. The interview included 243 turns of utterances from the interlocutors, 99 from David Muir and 144 from Donald Trump (for the whole transcript, see Appendix 1). It is important to mention that the number of Donald Trump's utterances which included politeness strategies was influenced by overtalk, incomplete sentences, and Trump not addressing his hearer, but rather other people due to the format of an interview.

Table 5: Frequency of politeness strategies used in Donald Trump's interview

Type of Politeness Strategy	Frequency	
	Number	Percentage
Positive politeness	36	35.64 %
Negative politeness	17	16.83 %
Bald on record	20	19.80 %
Off record	28	27.72 %
Total	101	100 %

Table 5 shows that there were 101 politeness strategies used by Donald Trump during the interview. He used 36 positive politeness, which is equal to 35.64 % of the total number of strategies used, making it the most used strategy. Moreover, off record was used 28 times, which is the second most used strategy with 27.72 % of the total amount. The two least used strategies are bald on record and negative politeness, which were used 20 (19.80 %) and 17 (16.83 %) times, respectively.

When observing the results regarding the frequency, it transpired that all four politeness strategies were used in Donald Trump's discourse. He utilized positive politeness more often than other strategies during the interviews (35.64 %). It can be claimed that he primarily attempted to

minimize the threat to H's positive face, attended to his interests and wants, and avoided conflict. With 27.72 % of Trump's utterances containing off record strategies, he utilized indirect language to reduce the chance of imposing on the H, but at the same time relying on the H to understand the implied meaning behind the utterances, which may or may not succeed. Also, in 16.83 % of the cases Trump oriented his utterances towards the H's negative face and attempted not to impose on his freedom of action, which is still less than half the cases of positive politeness. However, there were 19.80 % cases of bald on record strategies which indicate Trump's lack of attempt to minimize threat to H's face.

As a result of the data analyzed, it could be claimed that during the 2017 interview Donald Trump utilized utterances which contained 101 politeness strategies suggested by Brown and Levinson (1987), but with contrasting frequencies. In 52.47 % of cases (combined negative politeness, positive politeness) he produced utterances with consideration of the interviewer's face, in 27.72 % of cases (off record) he utilized ambiguity in order to be indirect, whereas in 19.80 % of cases (bald on record) he had no intention of saving face.

9.2. The analysis of the politeness strategies used in Donald Trump's discourse

The following section includes a detailed analysis of the politeness strategies used by Donald Trump during the interview on January 25 2017. Included are the frequencies of the further classifications of strategies for each of the four main politeness strategies: positive politeness, negative politeness, bald on record, and off record. Furthermore, every strategy is exemplified and we discuss about the associated context and effect on the communicative situation.

9.2.1. Positive politeness in Donald Trump's discourse

Positive politeness strategies are utilized in order to satisfy the addressee's positive face. It is associated with the S' intention to make H's wants and interests be valued, and as such establishes a closer relationship between the interlocutors. There are 15 positive politeness strategies (see Table 1). However, not all were found in Donald Trump's discourse during the interview. Table 6 outlines the positive politeness strategies used, and their frequencies.

Table 6: Positive politeness strategies in Donald Trump's interview

Type of positive politeness strategy	Frequency	
	Number	Percentage
1. Attend to H's interests, needs, wants etc.	1	2.78 %
3. Intensify interest to H (include the H into the event)	13	36.11 %
5. Seek agreement (safe topics, repetition)	2	5.56 %
6. Avoid disagreement	8	22.22 %
9. Assert or presuppose S's knowledge of and concern for H's wants	1	2.78 %
10. Offer, promise	11	30.56 %
Total	36	100%

Table 6 shows that there were 36 positive politeness strategies used by Donald Trump which can be further classified into 6 distinct types with varying frequencies. The most used strategies were strategy 3 *Intensify interest to H (include the H into the event)* and strategy 10 *Offer, promise*, both of which indicate Trump's attempts to establish a closer relationship with his interlocutor in order to successfully maintain the communication. On the other hand, strategy 1 *Attend to H's interests, needs, wants etc.* and strategy 9 *Assert or presuppose S's knowledge of and concern for H's wants* were used the least amount of times, which is arguably expected given the nature of an interview and the person of interest.

Let us turn to examples from the transcript for each type as well as their analysis (due to the space limitation some excerpts have been edited; for the full dialogue and context of the utterances, see Appendix 1).

➤ **Strategy 1: Attend to H's interests, needs, wants etc.**

Excerpt 1:

198 **David Muir:** You don't think it'll exacerbate the problem?

199 **President Trump:** *David, I mean, I know you're a sophisticated guy. The world is a mess. The world is as angry as it gets.*

In the example, Donald Trump pays attention to the positive face of David Muir and notices aspects of his condition. Regardless of contrasting social status, Trump acknowledges Muir's qualities and by paying him a compliment he seeks to establish a closer relationship with Muir and ultimately convince him of his statement.

➤ **Strategy 3: Intensify interest to H (include the H into the event)**

Excerpt 2:

19 **President Trump:** *You know*, when we had a prisoner in Mexico, *as you know*, two years ago, that we were trying to get out. And Mexico was not helping us, I will tell you, those days are over.

This strategy is characterized by the S trying to create a good story in order to show interest to H. The S tries to pull the H into the heart of events which are being discussed with any means possible. Donald Trump's use of *you know* and *as you know* seeks to draw Muir as a participant directly into the conversation.

Excerpt 3:

110 **David Muir:** And I just wanna ask you when does all of that matter just a little less? When do you let it roll off your back now that you're the president?

111 **President Trump:** *OK, so I'm glad you asked.* So, I went to the CIA, my first step. I have great respect for the people in intelligence and CIA.

Similar to the previous example, Trump includes his H in the conversation and addresses his utterance in a positive way and minimizes the threat to their face. It can be noted how Trump utilized this strategy at the beginning of his answer instead of replying directly. This, combined with the following part, arguably creates a story that increases the H's interest.

➤ **Strategy 5: Seek agreement (safe topics, repetition)**

Excerpt 4:

3 **David Muir:** Let me ask you, has the magnitude of this job hit you yet?

4 **President Trump:** *It has periodically hit me. And it is a tremendous magnitude. And where you really see it is when you're talking to the generals about problems in the world. And we do have problems in the world. Big problems. The business also hits because the -- the size of it. The size.*

Agreement may also be stressed by the repetition of parts which the person has said. By doing so, it is demonstrated that one has heard correctly the utterance and might indicate emotional agreement, interest or surprise with the utterance. Trump repeats the words *hit* and *magnitude* that Muir previously used. He had the option of formulating his answer in a number of ways, but he chooses to repeat parts of his interlocutor's utterance and add *periodically* and *tremendous*. In that way he answers the questions while simultaneously showing agreement with Muir.

➤ **Strategy 6: Avoid disagreement**

Excerpt 5:

47 **David Muir:** But 3 to 5 million illegal votes?

48 **President Trump:** *Well, we're gonna find out. But it could very well be that much. Absolutely.*

As the name suggests, this strategy indicates that there is will to avoid disagreement between the interlocutors. It is important to observe the way the answer is formulated. Although he might genuinely disagree or not know the answer, Trump never uses *no* or directly disagrees with the question, but rather softens the utterance by claiming that there is a possibility in Muir's assertion.

Excerpt 6:

82 **David Muir:** And you're saying those people who are on the rolls voted, that there are millions of illegal votes?

83 **President Trump:** *I didn't say there are millions. But I think there could very well be millions of people. That's right.*

It is interesting to see how Trump responds to Muir's question. Instead of directly disagreeing with the complete statement as the first part was incorrect, he does not give too much attention to that, but rather acknowledges the possibility of Muir's claim and agrees with the idea behind it. This in turn shows consideration of H's face.

➤ **Strategy 9: Assert or presuppose S's knowledge of and concern for H's wants**

Excerpt 7:

171 **President Trump:** I don't want people to chop off the citizens or anybody's heads in the Middle East. *Okay?* Because they're Christian or Muslim or anything else. *I don't want -- look, you are old enough to have seen a time that was much different.* You never saw heads chopped off until a few years ago.

This strategy attempts to indicate that S and H are cooperators, and as a result potentially pressures H to agree and cooperate. It is done in a way meant to assert or imply knowledge of H's situation. The use of *okay?* and the following statement show that Trump implies to know Muir well enough to make such claims. He wants Muir to understand his point of view and be cooperative in the communicative situation and for that purpose he formulated his utterance in a way that shows his knowledge of the situation. An important thing to have in mind are the alternative ways of formulating this such as *you are wrong, you do not understand* etc. It could be claimed the Trump utilized this strategy in order to minimize face threat to his interlocutor.

➤ **Strategy 10: Offer, promise**

Excerpt 8:

154 **David Muir:** Let me ask you about a new report that you were poised to lift a ban on so-called CIA black sites of prisons around the world that have been used in the past. Is that true?

155 **President Trump:** *Well, I'll be talking about that in about two hours. So, you'll be there and you'll be able to see it for yourself.*

Offers and promises redress the potential threat to face in a way that they show S consideration for H's since he shows willingness to provide what H wants. It shows good intention of the S. Although Trump had the option to dismiss the question or say *no*, he utilized the politeness strategy in order to save Muir's face. It could be argued that he does not want to disclose that information, but he clearly announces an act in the future that will satisfy the wants of his interlocutor. Whether the act will be fulfilled is another subject matter, but at the time of the utterance a direct rejection and, therefore, face threat was avoided.

Excerpt 9:

154 **David Muir:** Which countries are we talking about?

155 **President Trump:** ... *you'll be hearing about it in two hours because I have a whole list. You'll be very thrilled. You're looking at people that come in, in many cases, in some cases with evil intentions. I don't want that. They're ISIS. They're coming under false pretense. I don't want that.*

In this example Trump avoids answering the question and redirects the topic to his liking. However, while doing so, he shows consideration of Muir's face as he does not directly dismiss the question. He offers a solution to Muir's wants in the future and announces a favorable outcome for him. It could be claimed that Trump tactically utilizes this strategy in order to present himself in the best possible way since he is not imposing on his H, but at the same time he is not answering questions about controversial and potentially classified topics.

9.2.2. Negative politeness in Donald Trump's discourse

Negative politeness strategies are utilized in order to address the hearer's negative face. They are associated with the S' intention not to impose on H's want to have freedom of action and autonomy, and as such create a social distance between the interlocutors. There are 10 negative politeness strategies (see Table 2). However, not all were found in Donald Trump's discourse during the interview. Table 7 outlines the negative politeness strategies used, and their frequencies.

Table 7: Negative politeness strategies in Donald Trump's interview

Type of negative politeness strategy	Frequency	
	Number	Percentage
2. Question, hedge	5	29.41 %
4. Minimize the imposition	7	41.18 %
5. Give deference	2	11.76 %
6. Apologize	3	17.65 %
Total	17	100%

Table 7 shows that there were 17 negative politeness strategies used by Donald Trump which can be further classified into 4 distinct types with varying frequencies. The most used strategy was strategy 4 *Minimize the imposition* which suggests Trump's consideration of H's face and the want not to impose on his interlocutor. Strategy 5 *Give deference* and strategy 6 *Apologize* were used the least amount of times by Trump, which could indicate the understanding of the communicative context and the associated formality level.

The following are examples from the transcript for each type as well as their analysis (due to the space limitation some excerpts have been edited; for the full dialogue and context of the utterances, see Appendix 1).

➤ **Strategy 2: Question, hedge**

Excerpt 10:

104 **President Trump:** So, here's the point, you have a lot of stuff going on
possibly. I say *probably*. But *possibly*. We're gonna get
to the bottom of it.

This strategy is based on the assumption that conventional communication includes one's intent to force their own arguments, which in turn poses a potential threat to cooperation in the interaction. As a result, this strategy reduces the commitment to such assumptions and interactional threats. Donald Trump utilizes *possibly* and *probably* in order not to take full responsibility for the

truth of the utterance and not to coerce his H into that assumption which can damage the communicative intention.

Excerpt 11:

104 **President Trump:** Now, I'll say this -- *I think* that if that didn't happen, first of all, would -- would be a great thing if it didn't happen. But *I believe* it did happen. And *I believe* a part of the vote would've been much different.

In this examples Trump uses *I think* and *I believe* to not take full responsibility for the truth of the utterance which could otherwise adversely affect the H's want to cooperate. Forms like *would* further distance the speaker and reduce the impact of the statement.

➤ **Strategy 4: Minimize the imposition**

Excerpt 12:

17 **President Trump:** But I'm *just* telling you there will be a payment. It will be in a form, perhaps a complicated form. And you have to understand what I'm doing is good for the United States. It's also going to be good for Mexico

The utilization of *just* in the utterance defused the FTA as it reduces the seriousness of the statement. This is evident when compared to the same utterance without *just* and it can be claimed that by adding the word, the imposition in reduced.

Excerpt 13:

122 **David Muir:** Not me personally.

123 **President Trump:** Not you personally but your network -- and they tried to demean the speech.

This is the continuation of several previous utterances where Trump accused Muir and other networks of downplaying his speech. He used *you*, probably meaning the network Muir represents, but Muir inferred it as a personal attack against him and acted accordingly. In turn 123 Trump tries to minimize the imposition to his H and explains his thought process from the previous utterance.

➤ **Strategy 5: Give deference**

Excerpt 14:

- 1 **David Muir:** Mr. President, it's an honor to be here at the White House.
2 **President Trump:** *Thank you very much, David.*

Excerpt 15:

- 242 **David Muir:** Mr. President, thank you
243 **President Trump:** *Thank you very much. Appreciate it.*

The two excerpts are from the beginning and end of the interview. In both cases Donald Trump utilizes the same strategy as he humbles himself. He thanks his interlocutors and shows his appreciation for him. This in turn raises the perceived social status of the H and his negative face.

➤ **Strategy 6: Apologize**

Excerpt 16:

- 146 **David Muir:** And if they're unable to fix it?
147 **President Trump:** It can't be a great city. *Excuse me.* It can't be a great city if people are shot walking down the street for a loaf of bread. Can't be a great city.

By apologizing for an FTA, the S indicates their hesitation to infringe on H's negative face and by doing so, the imposition is redressed to a certain extent. Trump uses the strategy by utilizing *Excuse me*, and if one observes the context, it is apparent that he interrupts Muir and ignores his question, but he wanted to finish his thought. However, he shows consideration and seeks to reduce the threat to Muir's face by using an apology within his utterance.

9.2.3. Bald on record in Donald Trump's discourse

Bald on record strategies are characterized by the intent to achieve maximally efficient communication. However, at the same time there is no consideration of H's face which is ignored

or considered irrelevant in the context of conveying an intended message. There are five bald on record strategies (see Table 3), nonetheless, not all were found in Donald Trump's discourse during the interview. What follows is a table with the used bald on record strategies and their frequencies.

Table 8: Bald on record strategies in Donald Trump's interview

Type of bald on record strategy	Frequency	
	Number	Percentage
2. Attention-getters	10	50 %
4. No desire to save H's face	9	45 %
5. The act is in the H's interest	1	5 %
Total	20	100%

Table 8 shows that there were 20 bald on record strategies used by Donald Trump which can be further classified into 3 distinct types with varying frequencies. Strategy 2 *Attention-getters* and strategy 4 *No desire to save H's face* were used the most by Trump as he disregarded his speaker and created urgency in order to emphasize the importance of his utterances. The single utterance containing strategy 5 *The act is in the H's interest* suggests the rarity of that intention in Trump's discourse.

What follows are examples from the transcript for each type as well as their analysis (due to the space limitation some excerpts have been edited; for the full dialogue and context of the utterances, see Appendix 1).

➤ **Strategy 2: Attention-getters**

Excerpt 17:

84 **David Muir:** You tweeted though ...

85 **President Trump:** And I also say this ...

86 **David Muir:** ... you tweeted, "If you deduct the millions of people who
voted illegally, I won the popular vote."

87 **President Trump:** *David, and I also say this*, if I was going for the popular vote I would've won easily. But I would've been in California and New York. I wouldn't have been in Maine. I wouldn't have been in Iowa.

Attention-getters are used when the S seeks to speak with maximum efficiency. In that situation he provides metaphorical urgency for additional emphasis. In the example it can be seen that both participants want to utter an idea at the same time. Donald Trump stops this and says *David, and I also say this*. Another interpretation of this could be *David, stop talking and listen already*, i.e. he emphasizes the urgency of his statement and that his H should stop and listen.

Excerpt 18:

148 **David Muir:** And if they are unable to fix it, that's when you would send in the feds?

149 **President Trump:** Well, so far they have been unable. It's been going on for years. And I wasn't president. *So, look, when President Obama was there two weeks ago making a speech, very nice speech*. Two people were shot and killed during his speech. You can't have that.

Urgency is often introduced with words such as *listen, hear me out, and look*. Trump emphasizes his statement with *So, look* and continues talking when he has his interlocutor's attention. It can be seen that in both excerpts there is no attempt to minimize the face threats since efficiency and urgency is preferred.

➤ **Strategy 4: No desire to save H's face**

Excerpt 19:

133 **President Trump:** I said the men and women that I was talking to who came out and voted will never be forgotten again. *Therefore I won't allow you or other people like you to demean that crowd and to demean the people that came to Washington, D.C., from faraway places because they like me*. But more importantly they like what I'm saying.

134 **David Muir:** I just wanna say I didn't demean anyone who was in that crowd. We did coverage for hours ...

135 **President Trump:** *No, I think you're demeaning by talking the way you're talking. I think you're demeaning. And that's why I think a lot of people turned on you and turned on a lot of other people. And that's why you have a 17 percent approval rating, which is pretty bad.*

This strategy arguably illustrates the disregard for H's face in the most obvious way. There is no redress as the S is powerful and has no need to fear H's retaliation or non-cooperation. Some statements could be interpreted as clear threats and insults to the H. For instance, Trump says: *Therefore I won't allow you or other people like you to demean that crowd and to demean the people that came to Washington, D.C.* He directly addresses Muir and implies that he is a bad person who, together with others, does unacceptable actions. This continues in the second utterance and although Muir tries to defend himself, Trump insists twice on him being *demeaning*. Trump even states the consequences of such Muir's, or the network's, alleged actions and further supports it with factual data: *And that's why you have a 17 percent approval rating, which is pretty bad.* It is clear that in these utterances Trump has no consideration of H's face. The context allows for such utterances as the social status of both interlocutors is apparent and there is no significant attempt from Muir to dispute Trump's claims. This strategy could be interpreted as offensive, which bald on record often is.

➤ **Strategy 5: The act is in the H's interest**

Excerpt 20:

1118 **President Trump:** You and other networks covered it very inaccurately. *I hate to say this to you and you probably won't put it on but turn on Fox and see how it was covered.* And see how people respond to that speech.

A further case of non-minimization of face threat occurs when the act is in H's interest. Therefore, it is claimed that there is no need for redress. By Trump saying: *I hate to say this to you and you probably won't put it on but turn on Fox and see how it was covered*, he implies that their action was wrong. However, he softens the statement at the beginning with *I hate to say this* and the

advice he offers. Although he is discrediting the H, at the same time he is offering a way for improvement, which could be seen as sympathetic advice.

9.2.4. *Off record strategies in Donald Trump's discourse*

Off record strategies are acts which are done in a way so that it is not possible to attribute a single communicative intention to them. The S does this in order to have the possibility to claim numerous interpretations if he is held responsible for a particular FTA. This means that he seeks to avoid responsibility for doing an act and it is ultimately up to the addressee to interpret the intended context and meaning. It is important to mention that there is a certain level of ambiguity associated with every off record strategy, some being more and some being less ambiguous. There are 14 off record strategies (see Table 4), nonetheless, not all were found in Donald Trump's discourse during the interview. Table 9 outlines the off record strategies used and their frequencies.

Table 9: *Off record strategies in Donald Trump's interview*

Type of off record strategy	Frequency	
	Number	Percentage
1. Give hints	2	7.14 %
3. Presuppose	2	7.14 %
5. Overstate	2	7.14 %
8. Be ironic	2	7.14 %
10. Use rhetorical questions	8	28.57 %
11. Be ambiguous	7	25 %
12. Be vague	5	17.86 %
Total	28	100%

Table 9 shows that there were 28 off record strategies used by Donald Trump which can be further classified into 7 distinct types with varying frequencies. The most used strategies were strategy 10 *Use rhetorical questions*, strategy 11 *Be ambiguous*, and strategy 12 *Be vague*, all of which suggest Trump's indirectness in order to avoid being accused of threatening his interlocutor's face, but at the risk of unclear communicative intention.

We will again offer examples from the transcript for each type as well as their analysis (due to the space limitation some excerpts have been edited; for the full dialogue and context of the utterances, see Appendix 1).

➤ **Strategy 1: Give hints**

Excerpt 21:

113 **President Trump:** I got a standing ovation. It lasted for a long period of time. *What you do is take -- take out your tape -- you probably ran it live.* I know when I do good speeches. I know when I do bad speeches. That speech was a total home run. They loved it. I could've ...

Strategy 1 relies on the H to search for a possible interpretation of the relevance of the utterance. It may be not apparent at first, but there is S's motive behind the utterance. Regarding the context, Donald Trump is explaining to Muir how his speech was a success despite the fact that many claimed otherwise. His utterance: *What you do is take -- take out your tape -- you probably ran it live* should indicate to Muir to rewatch the recording as he is correct. He is trying to support his claim and includes the H in the act.

Excerpt 22:

200 **President Trump:** The world is a total mess. Take a look at what's happening with Aleppo. Take a look what's happening in Mosul. Take a look what's going on in the Middle East. And people are fleeing and they're going into Europe and all over the place. The world is a mess, David.

Excerpt 22 shows Trump utilizing multiple utterances which are hints to his H. He suggests that Muir should recall the events listed and uses them as support for his arguments. Trump is briefly listing the events without detailed explanations and hints to Muir that these are unfavorable events, which ultimately all lead into his main argument of the world being a mess. This hint may not succeed if Trump's interlocutor were not to know the events he listed, however, he made an

assumption based on the context and Muir's social status and profession. This also shows the importance of correct interpretation of the context.

➤ **Strategy 3: Presuppose**

Excerpt 23:

- 238 **David Muir:** So, no one who has this health insurance through Obamacare will lose it or end up with anything less?
- 239 **President Trump:** You know, when you say no one I think no one. Ideally, in the real world, you're talking about millions of people. *Will no one. And then, you know, knowing ABC, you'll have this one person on television saying how they were hurt. Okay. We want no one. We want the answer to be no one.*

Donald Trump's utterance makes Muir search for the interpretation and relevance of the prior event suggested by Trump. Trump relies on Muir to infer the meaning of his utterance and that they both know how similar situations in the news resolve. He also presupposes an event to happen based on previous knowledge and experience acquired. It is interesting to observe how this utterance also offers Trump the possibility to avoid responsibility for an act. Trump does a rebuttal in advance and suggests a possible scenario in order to defend his statement, after which he clearly expresses his opinion.

Excerpt 24:

- 190 **President Trump:** It's gonna be very, very hard. I don't want terror in this country. *You look at what happened in San Bernardino. You look at what happened all over. You look at what happened in the World Trade Center. Okay, I mean, take that as an example.*

Trump indirectly formulates his utterance and wants Muir to infer the meaning. He lists examples from which he wants Muir to observe a pattern. He presupposes a potential scenario. The aim of this utterance is to make his interlocutor understand and ultimately agree with him and his statements by utilizing claims based on previous events.

➤ **Strategy 5: Overstate**

Excerpt 25:

75 **David Muir:** He seems obsessed with the idea that he could not have possibly lost the popular vote without cheating and fraud." I wanna ask you about something bigger here. Does it matter more now...

76 **President Trump:** *There's nothing bigger. There's nothing bigger.*

Trump is using overstatement and claiming *There's nothing bigger* than a legitimate electoral system. Besides the exaggeration in the claim, there are arguably other implicatures behind the claim. Trump may mean that the other person is minimizing the seriousness of the problem and wants to avoid the subject matter, therefore, he is addressing the statement anew. Also, it could be claimed that he is trying to further promote himself as a public figure who adheres to the rules.

➤ **Strategy 8: Be ironic**

Excerpt 26:

22 **President Trump:** We have a \$60-billion trade deficit. *So, if you want, I can wait two years and then we can do it nice and easily.* I wanna start the wall immediately. Every supporter I have -- I have had so many people calling and tweeting and -- and writing letters saying they're so happy about it. I wanna start the wall. We will be reimbursed for the wall.

Trump says the opposite of what is actually meant and by doing that, he indirectly conveys the intended meaning. It is important for the addressee to have enough clues that the S is being ironic, which Muir arguably has and they are in this case contextual.

Excerpt 27:

- 143 **David Muir:** ... you mentioned federal assistance. There's federal assistance and then there's sending in the feds. I'm just curious would you take action on your own?
- 144 **President Trump:** I want them to fix the problem. You can't have thousands of people being shot in a city, in a country that I happen to be president of. *Maybe it's okay if somebody else is president.* I want them to fix the problem. They have a problem that's very easily fixable.

It is interesting to observe Trump's utterance in this excerpt: *Maybe it's okay if somebody else is president.* He is being ironic and it is up to the interlocutor to interpret the meaning behind the utterance. It is common sense that no one would publicly condone such action and it is obvious that Trump is utilizing irony to emphasize that these events are unacceptable. Also, it could be claimed that he is discrediting other previous presidents and presidential candidates as he portrays himself being better in that particular situation. However, it is not clear if he meant someone in particular and who that person might be. This in turn are the characteristic of off record strategies as the speaker minimizes the possibility of being held accountable for an act.

➤ **Strategy 10: Use rhetorical questions**

Excerpt 28:

- 192 **David Muir:** Are you at all concerned -- are you at all concerned it's going to cause more anger among Muslims...
- 193 **President Trump:** *Anger?*
- 194 **David Muir:** ... the world?
- 195 **President Trump:** There's plenty of anger right now. *How can you have more?*

The use of rhetorical questions means that the person asks a question without intention of obtaining an answer, which in turn contradicts the purpose of the question. In this example Trump says *How can you have more?*, but does not expect or wait for Muir's answer. In the interview he continues to talk although there was no turn to supply an answer. In this use the answer is implicated and rhetorical questions are used for emphasis of a claim.

people that did things that we're not going to find out about. But we will find out because we need a better system where that can't happen.

Excerpt 31 shows Trump indirectly addressing the previous topic of illegal votes. It can be seen that he is deliberately being ambiguous with his statement as to avoid answering the question. With such formulations, together with parts that contradict each other (*I say you're gonna find out. You can never really find...; ...we're not going to find out about. But we will find out...*), it is not possible for the H to comprehend the intended meaning.

➤ **Strategy 12: Be vague**

Excerpt 32:

134 **David Muir** When does construction begin?

133 **President Trump:** *As soon as we can. As soon as we can physically do it.*

Another instance of off record strategy and the associated indirectness is being intentionally vague with the statement. It can be seen that Trump is being vague and does not reveal many pieces of information. He chooses to answer the question, but the answer does not contain the information Muir's seeks.

Excerpt 33:

214 **David Muir** What got my attention, Mr. President, was when you said,
 "Maybe we'll have another chance."

215 **President Trump:** *Well, don't let it get your attention too much because
 we'll see what happens. I mean, we're gonna see what
 happens. You know, I told you and I told everybody else
 that wants to talk when it comes to the military I don't
 wanna discuss things.*

This examples further shows Trump' utilization of vagueness in communication. This is especially seen in the use of *we'll see what happens* and *we're gonna see what happens* as Trump does not directly address the question.

10. Conclusion

The aim of this thesis was to analyze politeness strategies (as suggested by Brown and Levinson 1987) in Donald Trump's discourse with respect to their frequencies and associated context and effect. It was shown that Trump utilized all four types of politeness strategies: positive politeness, negative politeness, bald on record, and off record, but with varying frequencies. It was demonstrated that, depending on the distinct context and communicative intent, every politeness strategy used by Donald Trump during the interview on 25 January 2017 had a different effect on the communication: positive politeness strategies establishing a relationship between the interlocutors, negative politeness not questioning the interlocutor's independence, bald on record addressing the interlocutor directly without face threat minimization, and off record implying meaning and relying on the interlocutor to correctly interpret the context and ultimately the intention.

Positive politeness was used the most by Trump during the interview. It was used in order to minimize the threat to the interlocutor's positive face and it included the following strategies (in descending order of frequency): intensify interest to H, offers and promises, avoid disagreement, seek agreement, attend to H's interests, needs and wants, and assert or presuppose S's knowledge of and concern for H's wants. These strategies establish a closer relationship between Trump and his interlocutor as they minimize the differences suggested by social status and show consideration of the interlocutor's face. It could be claimed that he preferred to utilize positive politeness in order to portray himself as a competent participant of communication who can follow and adjust to context requirements.

The second most used strategy was off record and it included the following strategies (the first three being in descending order of frequencies and the rest was utilized the same number of times): use rhetorical questions, be ambiguous, be vague, give hints, presuppose, overstate, and be ironic. These strategies contain a certain level of ambiguity and Trump utilized them in order to avoid being held responsible for possible FTAs since the intended meaning is unclear and the interpretation of the utterances is left up to the H. What is more, Trump arguably utilized off record strategies since his role in the world of politics dictates this kind of communication, the full meaning of which the general population ultimately does not need to comprehend.

The third most used strategy in Trump's discourse was bald on record. This strategy favors communicative efficiency rather than consideration of interlocutor's face to any extent. The following bald on record strategies were used (in descending order of frequency): attention-getters, no desire to save H's face, and the act is in the H's interests. By using these strategies, Trump disregarded the H's face and it could be claimed that he showed impolite behavior and demonstrated his superior social status and no fear of consequences. However, the frequency of this strategy is considerably lower than the combined frequency of the other three strategies, all of which show consideration of H's face. Although he might be in a position to disregard his interlocutors, it could be concluded that it is not in Trump's interest as a public figure to associate himself with such behavior.

The least used strategy in strategy was negative politeness which suggests Trump's consideration of his interlocutor's negative face. It included the following strategies (in descending order of frequency): minimize the imposition, question and hedge, apologize, and give deference. These strategies are utilized in order to establish a distance between the interlocutors. In these utterances Trump considered S's negative face and attempted not to impose on his freedom of action and autonomy. It could be said that the reason that negative politeness was used less frequently than positive politeness is also in Trump's role as a president. It is arguably in his interest to focus more on peoples' positive faces in order to appear more considerate of their personal qualities and differences rather than their freedom and autonomy, the status of which is for the most part a given.

In conclusion, it can be claimed that the presented results are in accordance with previous studies on Trump's discourse. Consequently, this opens up potential avenues for further research that would closely compare the findings and designed analyses of multiple similar research. Also, given the relatively small scale of the study, it would be possible to analyze data on a larger scale by examining numerous transcripts of Trump's communication, and potentially taking into consideration and correlating different contexts, social roles, and time periods of Donald Trump's discourse.

11. References

- Alavidze, Maia (2018). Politeness in president Donald Trump's speeches. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Thought* 07(03): 119-126.
- Brown, Penelope, and Stephen C. Levinson (1987). *Politeness. Some universal in language usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Culpeper, Jonathan (1996). Towards an anatomy of impoliteness. *Journal of Pragmatics* 25(3): 349–367.
- Eeelen, Gino (2001). *A Critique of Politeness Theories*. Manchester: St Jerome Publishing.
- Fasold, Ralph W. (1990). *The Sociolinguistics of Language*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Goffman, Erving (1967). *Interaction Ritual: Essays on Face-to-Face Behaviour*. New York: Anchor Books.
- Grice, Herbert P. (1975). Logic and Conversation. In: Cole, Peter and Morgan, Jerry L. (eds.): *Syntax and Semantics, 3: Speech Acts*. New York: Academic Press. pp. 41-58.
- Holmes, Janet (2006). *Politeness Strategies as Linguistic Variables*. Wellington: Elsevier Ltd.
- Janney, Richard W., and Horst Arndt (1993). Universality and relativity in cross-cultural politeness research: A historical perspective. *Multilingua. Journal of Cross-Cultural and Interlanguage Communication* 12(1): 13–50.
- Kayam, Orly (2017). The Readability and Simplicity of Donald Trump's Language. *Political Studies Review* 16(1): 73–88.
- Labov, William (1972). Rules for Ritual Insults. In: Sudnow, David (ed.): *Studies in Social Interaction*. New York: The Free Press, pp. 120-169.
- Leech, Geoffrey N. (1980). *Explorations in Semantics and Pragmatics*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Locher, Miriam A., and Richard J. Watts (2005). Politeness Theory and Relational Work. *Journal of Politeness Research. Language, Behaviour, Culture* 1(1): 9-33.
- Mey, Jacob L. (2001). *Pragmatics: An Introduction* (2nd edn.). Oxford: Blackwell.

- Mohammadi, Mohammad, and Javad Javadi (2017). A Critical Discourse Analysis of Donald Trump's Language Use in US Presidential Campaign, 2016. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics & English Literature* 6(5): 1-10.
- O'Driscoll, Jim (2007). What's in an FTA? Reflections on a chance meeting with Claudine. *Journal of Politeness Research. Language, Behaviour, Culture*, 3(2): 243-268.
- Pinker, Steven (2007). The evolutionary social psychology of off-record indirect speech acts. *Intercultural Pragmatics* 4(4): 437-461.
- Sclafani, Jennifer (2018). *Talking Donald Trump: A Sociolinguistic Study of Style, Metadiscourse, and Political Identity*. New York: Routledge.
- Spencer-Oatey, Helen ed. (2008). *Culturally Speaking: Culture, Communication, and Politeness Theory*. London; New York: Continuum Int. Publishing Group.
- Vrana, Leo, and Gerold Schneider (2017). Saying Whatever It Takes: Creating and Analyzing Corpora from US Presidential Debate Transcripts. *The 9th International Corpus Linguistics Conference, 24 July 2017 – 28 July 2017, Birmingham*: 537-544.
- Watts, Richard J. (2003). *Politeness*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Yule, George (1996). *Pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Zajdman, Anat (1995). Humorous face-threatening acts: Humor as strategy. *Journal of Pragmatics* 23(3): 325–339.

Data

- ABC News (26 January 2017a). TRANSCRIPT: ABC News anchor David Muir interviews President Trump. Available at: <https://abcnews.go.com/Politics/transcript-abc-news-anchor-david-muir-interviews-president/story?id=45047602> (visited on 20 June 2020).
- ABC News (26 January 2017b). Trump Full Interview with David Muir | ABC News. Available at: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=SkHa2-c_8Pk (visited on 20 June 2020).

12. Appendix

Appendix 1: Full transcript of Donald Trump's interview with David Muir (ABC News) on January 25 2017.

Turn	Politeness Strategies
<p>1. DAVID MUIR: Mr. President, it's an honor to be here at the White House.</p>	
<p>2. PRESIDENT TRUMP: Thank you very much, David.</p>	<p>Negative politeness (strategy 5)</p>
<p>3. DAVID MUIR: Let me ask you, has the magnitude of this job hit you yet?</p>	
<p>4. PRESIDENT TRUMP: It has periodically hit me. And it is a tremendous magnitude. And where you really see it is when you're talking to the generals about problems in the world. And we do have problems in the world. Big problems. The business also hits because the -- the size of it. The size.</p>	<p>Positive politeness (strategy 5)</p>
<p>5. I was with the Ford yesterday. And with General Motors yesterday. The top representatives, great people. And they're gonna do some tremendous work in the United States. They're gonna build plants back in the United States. But when you see the size, even as a businessman, the size of the investment that these big companies are gonna make, it hits you even in that regard. But we're gonna bring jobs back to America, like I promised on the campaign trail.</p>	

<p>6. DAVID MUIR: And we're gonna get to it all right here.</p>	
<p>7. PRESIDENT TRUMP: Good.</p>	<p>Good, you better! / Good, as you wish. Off Record (strategy 11)</p>
<p>8. DAVID MUIR: Mr. President, I want to start -- we're five days in. And your campaign promises. I know today you plan on signing the order to build the wall.</p>	
<p>9. PRESIDENT TRUMP: Correct.</p>	
<p>10. DAVID MUIR: Are you going to direct U.S. funds to pay for this wall? Will American taxpayers pay for the wall?</p>	
<p>11. PRESIDENT TRUMP: Ultimately it'll come out of what's happening with Mexico. We're gonna be starting those negotiations relatively soon. And we will be in a form reimbursed by Mexico which I will say ...</p>	
<p>12. DAVID MUIR: So, they'll pay us back?</p>	
<p>13. PRESIDENT TRUMP: Yeah, absolutely, 100 percent.</p>	<p>Positive politeness (strategy 6)</p>
<p>14. DAVID MUIR: So, the American taxpayer will pay for the wall at first?</p>	
<p>15. PRESIDENT TRUMP: All it is, is we'll be reimbursed at a later date from whatever transaction we make from Mexico. Now, I could wait a year and I could hold off the wall. But I wanna build the wall. We have to build the wall. We have to stop drugs from pouring</p>	<p>Bald on record (strategy 2)</p>

<p>in. We have to stop people from just pouring into our country. We have no idea where they're from. And I campaigned on the wall. And it's very important. But that wall will cost us nothing.</p>	
<p>16. DAVID MUIR: But you talked -- often about Mexico paying for the wall. And you, again, say they'll pay us back. Mexico's president said in recent days that Mexico absolutely will not pay, adding that, "It goes against our dignity as a country and our dignity as Mexicans." He says ...</p>	
<p>(OVERTALK)</p>	
<p>17. PRESIDENT TRUMP: David, he has to say that. He has to say that.¹ But I'm <i>just</i> telling you there will be a payment.² It will be in a form, perhaps a complicated form. And you have to understand what I'm doing is good for the United States. It's also going to be good for Mexico.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Interrupted: Bald on record (strategy 2) 2. Negative politeness (strategy 4)
<p>18. We wanna have a very stable, very solid Mexico. Even more solid than it is right now. And they need it also. Lots of things are coming across Mexico that they don't want. I think it's going to be a good thing for both countries. And I think the relationship will be better than ever before.</p>	
<p>19. You know, when we had a prisoner in Mexico, as you know, two years ago, that we were trying to get out. And Mexico was not helping us, I will tell you, those days are over. I think we're gonna end up with a much better relationship with Mexico. We will have the wall and in a very serious form Mexico will pay for the wall.</p>	<p>Positive politeness (strategy 3)</p>
<p>20. DAVID MUIR: What are you gonna say to some of your supporters who might say, "Wait a minute, I</p>	

thought Mexico was going to pay for this right at the start."	
<p>21. PRESIDENT TRUMP: Well, I'd say very simply that they are going to pay for it. I never said they're gonna pay from the start. I said Mexico will pay for the wall. But what I will tell my supporters is, "Would you like me to wait two years or three years before I make this deal?" Because we have to make a deal on NAFTA. We have to make a new trade deal with Mexico because we're getting clobbered.</p>	Negative politeness (strategy 4)
<p>22. We have a \$60-billion trade deficit. So, if you want, I can wait two years and then we can do it nice and easily. I wanna start the wall immediately. Every supporter I have -- I have had so many people calling and tweeting and -- and writing letters saying they're so happy about it. I wanna start the wall. We will be reimbursed for the wall.</p>	Off Record (strategy 8)
<p>23. DAVID MUIR: When does construction begin?</p>	
<p>24. PRESIDENT TRUMP: As soon as we can. As soon as we can physically do it. We're ...</p>	Off record (strategy 12)
<p>25. DAVID MUIR: Within months?</p>	
<p>26. PRESIDENT TRUMP: I would say in months. Yeah, I would say in months. Certainly planning is starting immediately.</p>	Positive politeness (strategy 6)
<p>27. DAVID MUIR: People feel ...</p>	
(OVERTALK)	

<p>28. PRESIDENT TRUMP: We'll be having some really good, really solid plans within a short period of time.</p>	
<p>29. DAVID MUIR: When people learn of the news of this wall today there are gonna be a lot of people listening to this. And I wanna ask about undocumented immigrants who are here -- in this country. Right now they're protected as so-called dreamers -- the children who were brought here, as you know, by their parents. Should they be worried -- that they could be deported? And is there anything you can say to assure them right now that they'll be allowed to stay?</p>	
<p>30. PRESIDENT TRUMP: They shouldn't be very worried. They are here illegally. They shouldn't be very worried. I do have a big heart. We're going to take care of everybody. We're going to have a very strong border. We're gonna have a very solid border. Where you have great people that are here that have done a good job, they should be far less worried. We'll be coming out with policy on that over the next period of four weeks.</p>	<p>Positive politeness (strategy 10)</p>
<p>31. DAVID MUIR: But Mr. President, will they be allowed to stay?</p>	
<p>32. PRESIDENT TRUMP: I'm gonna tell you over the next four weeks. But I will tell you, we're looking at this, the whole immigration situation, we're looking at it with great heart. Now we have criminals that are here. We have really bad people that are here. Those people have to be worried 'cause they're getting out. We're gonna get them out. We're gonna get 'em out fast. General Kelly is -- I've given that as his number one priority.</p>	<p>Positive politeness (strategy 10)</p>
<p>33. DAVID MUIR: Senator Jeff Sessions, your pick for attorney general, as you know during his confirmation hearing said that ending DACA, this is President Obama's policy protecting the dreamers -- that, "Ending it certainly would be constitutional." That you could</p>	

end the protection of these dreamers. Is that a possibility?	
34. PRESIDENT TRUMP: We're gonna be talking with -- attorney general. He will soon be the attorney general. He's done fantastically well. We're all very proud of him. I thought he was treated very, very unfairly. He's a brilliant man and he's a very good man. He'll do a fantastic job. I'll be speaking to him as soon as he's affirmed.	
35. DAVID MUIR: So, it's a possibility.	
36. PRESIDENT TRUMP: We will be talking to the attorney general.	Off record (strategy 12)
37. DAVID MUIR: I wanna ask you about something you said this week right here at the White House. You brought in congressional leaders to the White House. You spoke at length about the presidential election with them -- telling them that you lost the popular vote because of millions of illegal votes, 3 to 5 million illegal votes. That would be the biggest electoral fraud in American history. Where is the evidence of that?	
38. PRESIDENT TRUMP: So, let me tell you first of all, it was so misrepresented. That was supposed to be a confidential meeting. And you weren't supposed to go out and talk to the press as soon as you -- but the Democrats viewed it not as a confidential meeting.	Bald on record (strategy 2)
39. DAVID MUIR: But you have tweeted ...	
(OVERTALK)	
40. DAVID MUIR: ... about the millions of illegals ...	

<p>41. PRESIDENT TRUMP: Sure. And I do -- and I'm very ...</p>	<p>Positive politeness (strategy 6)</p>
<p>(OVERTALK)</p>	
<p>42. PRESIDENT TRUMP: ... and I mean it. But just so you -- it was supposed to be a confidential meeting. They turned it into not a con... Number two, the conversation lasted for about a minute. They made it -- somebody said it was, like, 25 percent of the ... It wasn't. It was hardly even discussed.</p>	<p>Negative politeness (strategy 4)</p>
<p>43. I said it. And I said it strongly because what's going on with voter fraud is horrible. That's number one. Number two, I would've won the popular vote if I was campaigning for the popular vote. I would've gone to California where I didn't go at all. I would've gone to New York where I didn't campaign at all.</p>	
<p>44. I would've gone to a couple of places that I didn't go to. And I would've won that much easier than winning the electoral college. But as you know, the electoral college is all that matters. It doesn't make any difference. So, I would've won very, very easily. But it's a different form of winning. You would campaign much differently. You would have a totally different campaign. So, but ...</p>	<p>Positive politeness (strategy 3)</p>
<p>(OVERTALK)</p>	
<p>45. PRESIDENT TRUMP: ... you're just asking a question. I would've easily won the popular vote, much easier, in my opinion, than winning the electoral college. I ended up going to 19 different states. I went to the state of Maine four times for one. I needed one.</p>	<p>Negative politeness (strategy 4)</p>

<p>46. I went to M-- I got it, by the way. But it turned out I didn't need it because we ended up winning by a massive amount, 306. I needed 270. We got 306. You and everybody said, "There's no way you get to 270."¹ I mean, your network said and almost everybody said, "There's no way you can get to ..."² So, I went to Maine four times. I went to various places. And that's the beauty of the electoral college. With that being said, if you look at voter registration, you look at the dead people that are registered to vote who vote, you look at people that are registered in two states, you look at all of these different things that are happening with registration. You take a look at those registration for -- you're gonna s-- find -- and we're gonna do an investigation on it.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Bald on record (strategy 4) 2. Positive politeness (strategy 6)
<p>47. DAVID MUIR: But 3 to 5 million illegal votes?</p>	
<p>48. PRESIDENT TRUMP: Well, we're gonna find out. But it could very well be that much. Absolutely.</p>	<p>Positive politeness (strategy 6)</p>
<p>49. DAVID MUIR: But ...</p>	
<p>50. PRESIDENT TRUMP: But we're gonna find out.</p>	<p>Off record (strategy 12)</p>
<p>(OVERTALK)</p>	
<p>51. PRESIDENT TRUMP: <i>In fact, I heard one of the other side, they were saying it's not 3 to 5. It's not 3 to 5.</i> I said, "Well, Mr. Trump is talking about registration, tell--" He said, "You know we don't wanna talk about registration." They don't wanna talk about registration.</p>	<p>Negative politeness (strategy 2)</p>
<p>52. You have people that are registered who are dead, who are illegals, who are in two states. You have people registered in two states. They're registered in a New</p>	

York and a New Jersey. They vote twice. There are millions of votes, in my opinion. Now ...	
53. DAVID MUIR: But again ...	
54. PRESIDENT TRUMP: I'm doing an ...	
(OVERTALK) *Both interrupting each other*	
55. PRESIDENT TRUMP: ... investigation. David, David, David ...	Bald on record (strategy 2)
56. DAVID MUIR: You're now, you're now president of the United States when you say ...	
(OVERTALK)	
57. PRESIDENT TRUMP: <i>Of course, and I want the voting process to be legitimate.</i>	Insulted: Bald on record (strategy 4)
58. DAVID MUIR: But what I'm asking ...	
59. PRESIDENT TRUMP: The people that ...	
60. DAVID MUIR: ... what I'm asking that -- when you say in your opinion millions of illegal votes, that is something that is extremely fundamental to our functioning democracy, a fair and free election.	
61. PRESIDENT TRUMP: Sure. Sure. Sure.	Positive politeness (strategy 5)

62. DAVID MUIR: You say you're gonna launch an investigation.	
63. PRESIDENT TRUMP: Sure, done.	Positive politeness (strategy 10)
64. DAVID MUIR: What you have presented so far has been debunked. It's been called ...	
(OVERTALK)	
65. DAVID MUIR: ... false.	
66. PRESIDENT TRUMP: No, it hasn't. Take a look at the Pew reports.	Bald on record (strategy 4)
67. DAVID MUIR: I called the author of the Pew report last night. And he told me that they found no evidence of voter ...	
(OVERTALK)	
68. DAVID MUIR: ... fraud.	
69. PRESIDENT TRUMP: Really? Then why did he write the report?	Off record (strategy 10)
70. DAVID MUIR: He said no evidence of voter fraud.	

<p>71. PRESIDENT TRUMP: Excuse me, then why did he write the report?</p>	<p>Off record (strategy 10)</p>
<p>(OVERTALK)</p>	
<p>72. PRESIDENT TRUMP: According to Pew report, then he's -- then he's groveling again. You know, I always talk about the reporters that grovel when they wanna write something that you wanna hear but not necessarily millions of people wanna hear or have to hear.</p>	<p>Off record (strategy 11)</p>
<p>73. DAVID MUIR: So, you've launched an investigation?</p>	
<p>74. PRESIDENT TRUMP: We're gonna launch an investigation to find out. And then the next time -- and I will say this, of those votes cast, none of 'em come to me. None of 'em come to me. They would all be for the other side. None of 'em come to me. But when you look at the people that are registered: dead, illegal and two states and some cases maybe three states -- we have a lot to look into.</p>	<p>Positive politeness (strategy 10)</p>
<p>75. DAVID MUIR: House Speaker Paul Ryan has said, "I have seen no evidence. I have made this very, very clear." Senator Lindsey Graham saying, "It's the most inappropriate thing for a president to say without proof. He seems obsessed with the idea that he could not have possibly lost the popular vote without cheating and fraud." I wanna ask you about something bigger here. Does it matter more now ...</p>	
<p>76. PRESIDENT TRUMP: There's nothing bigger. There's nothing bigger.</p>	<p>Off record (strategy 5)</p>
<p>77. DAVID MUIR: But it is important because ...</p>	

<p>78. PRESIDENT TRUMP: Let me <i>just</i> tell you¹, you know <i>what's important</i>², millions of people agree with me when I say that if you would've looked on one of the other networks and all of the people that were calling in they're saying, "We agree with Mr. Trump. We agree." They're very smart people.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Negative politeness (strategy 4) 2. Positive politeness (strategy 3)
<p>79. The people that voted for me -- lots of people are saying they saw things happen. I heard stories also. But you're not talking about millions. But it's a small little segment. I will tell you, it's a good thing that we're doing because at the end we're gonna have an idea as to what's going on. Now, you're telling me Pew report has all of a sudden changed. But you have other reports and you have other statements. You take a look at the registrations, how many dead people are there? Take a look at the registrations as to the other things that I already presented.</p>	<p>Positive politeness (strategy 10)</p>
<p>80. DAVID MUIR: And you're saying ...</p>	
<p>(OVERTALK)</p>	
<p>81. PRESIDENT TRUMP: And you're gonna find ...</p>	
<p>82. DAVID MUIR: ... those people who are on the rolls voted, that there are millions of illegal votes?</p>	
<p>83. PRESIDENT TRUMP: I didn't say there are millions. But I think there could very well be millions of people. That's right.</p>	<p>Positive politeness (strategy 6)</p>
<p>84. DAVID MUIR: You tweeted though ...</p>	

<p>85. PRESIDENT TRUMP: And I also say this ...</p>	
<p>86. DAVID MUIR: ... you tweeted, "If you deduct the millions of people who voted illegally, I won the popular vote."</p>	
<p>87. PRESIDENT TRUMP: David, and I also say this, if I was going for the popular vote I would've won easily. But I would've been in California and New York. I wouldn't have been in Maine. I wouldn't have been in Iowa. I wouldn't have been in Nebraska and all of those states that I had to win in order to win this. I would've been in New York, I would've been in California. I never even went there.</p>	<p>As in: David, listen already: Bald on record (strategy 2)</p>
<p>88. DAVID MUIR: Let me just ask you, you did win. You're the president. You're sitting ...</p>	
<p>89. PRESIDENT TRUMP: That's true.</p>	<p>Insulted, proudly uttered: Bald on record (strategy 4)</p>
<p>90. DAVID MUIR: ... across from me right now.</p>	
<p>91. PRESIDENT TRUMP: That's true.</p>	
<p>92. DAVID MUIR: Do you think that your words matter more now?</p>	
<p>93. PRESIDENT TRUMP: Yes, very much.</p>	<p>Off record (strategy 5)</p>
<p>94. DAVID MUIR: Do you think that that talking about millions of illegal votes is dangerous to this country without presenting the evidence?</p>	

<p>95. PRESIDENT TRUMP: No, not at all.</p>	
<p>(OVERTALK)</p>	
<p>96. PRESIDENT TRUMP: Not at all because many people feel the same way that I do. And ...</p>	
<p>97. DAVID MUIR: You don't think it undermines your credibility if there's no evidence?</p>	
<p>(OVERTALK)</p>	
<p>98. PRESIDENT TRUMP: No, not at all because they didn't come to me. Believe me. Those were Hillary votes. And if you look at it they all voted for Hillary. They all voted for Hillary. They didn't vote for me. I don't believe I got one. Okay, these are people that voted for Hillary Clinton. And if they didn't vote, it would've been different in the popular.</p>	<p>Negative politeness (strategy 2)</p>
<p>99. Now, you have to understand I¹ -- I focused on those four or five states that I had to win. Maybe she didn't. She should've gone to Michigan. She thought she had it in the bag. She should've gone to Wisconsin, she thought she had it because you're talking about 38 years of, you know, Democrat wins.² But they didn't. I went to Michigan, I went to Wisconsin. I went to Pennsylvania all the time. I went to all of the states that are -- Florida and North Carolina. That's all I focused on.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Bald on record (strategy 2) 2. Positive politeness (strategy 3)
<p>100. DAVID MUIR: Mr. President, it does strike me though that we're relitigating the presidential campaign, the election ...</p>	

(OVERTALK)	
<p>101. PRESIDENT TRUMP: No, no. We're looking at it for the next time. No, no, you have to understand, I had a tremendous victory, one of the great victories ever. In terms of counties I think the most ever or just about the most ever. When you look at a map it's all red. Red meaning us, Republicans.</p>	Positive politeness (strategy 6)
<p>102. One of the greatest victories ever. But, again, I ran for the electoral college. I didn't run for the popular vote. What I'm saying is if there are these problems that many people agree with me that there might be. Look, Barack Obama -- if you look back -- eight years ago when he first ran -- he was running for office in Chicago for we needed Chicago vote.</p>	
<p>103. And he was laughing at the system because he knew all of those votes were going to him. You look at Philadelphia, you look at what's going on in Philadelphia. But take a look at the tape of Barack Obama who wrote me, by the way, a very beautiful letter in the drawer of the desk. Very beautiful. And I appreciate it. But look at what he said, it's on tape. Look at what he said about voting in Chicago eight years ago. It's not changed. It hasn't changed, believe me. Chicago, look what's going on in Chicago. It's only gotten worse.</p>	
<p>104. But he was smiling and laughing about the vote in Chicago. Now, once he became president he didn't do that. All of a sudden it became this is the foundation of our country. So, here's the point, you have a lot of stuff going on possibly. I say probably. But possibly. We're gonna get to the bottom of it.</p>	Negative politeness (strategy 2)
<p>105. And then we're gonna make sure it doesn't happen again. If people are registered wrongly, if illegals are registered to vote, which they are, if dead people are registered to vote and voting, which they do. There are some. I don't know how many. We're gonna</p>	Negative politeness (strategy 2)

<p>try finding that out and the other categories that we talk about, double states where they're -- registered in two states, we're gonna get to the bottom of it because we have to stop it. Because I agree, so important. But the other side is trying to downplay this. Now, I'll say this -- I think that if that didn't happen, first of all, would -- would be a great thing if it didn't happen. But I believe it did happen. And I believe a part of the vote would've been much different.</p>	
<p>106. DAVID MUIR: And you believe millions of illegal votes ...</p>	
<p>107. PRESIDENT TRUMP: Well, we're gonna find out.</p>	Off record (strategy 12)
<p>108. DAVID MUIR: Let me ask you this ...</p>	
<p>109. PRESIDENT TRUMP: We're gonna find out. And -- and, by the way, when I say you're gonna find out. You can never really find, you know, there are gonna be -- no matter what numbers we come up with there are gonna be lots of people that did things that we're not going to find out about. But we will find out because we need a better system where that can't happen.</p>	Off record (strategy 11)
<p>110. DAVID MUIR: Mr. President, I just have one more question on this. And it's -- it's bigger picture. You took some heat after your visit to the CIA in front of that hallowed wall, 117 stars -- of those lost at the CIA. You talked about other things. But you also talked about crowd size at the inauguration, about the size of your rallies, about covers on Time magazine. And I just wanna ask you when does all of that matter just a little less? When do you let it roll off your back now that you're the president?</p>	
<p>(OVERTALK)</p>	

<p>111. PRESIDENT TRUMP: OK, so I'm glad you asked. So, I went to the CIA, my first step. I have great respect for the people in intelligence and CIA. I'm -- I don't have a lot of respect for, in particular one of the leaders. But that's okay. But I have a lot of respect for the people in the CIA.</p>	<p>Positive politeness (strategy 3)</p>
<p>112. That speech was a home run. That speech, if you look at Fox, OK, I'll mention you --- we see what Fox said. They said it was one of the great speeches. They showed the people applauding and screaming and -- and they were all CIA. There was -- somebody was asking Sean -- "Well, were they Trump people that were put--" we don't have Trump people. They were CIA people.</p>	
<p>113. That location was given to me. Mike Pence went up before me, paid great homage to the wall. I then went up, paid great homage to the wall. I then spoke to the crowd. I got a standing ovation. In fact, they said it was the biggest standing ovation since Peyton Manning had won the Super Bowl and they said it was equal.¹ I got a standing ovation. It lasted for a long period of time. What you do is take -- take out your tape -- you probably ran it live. I know when I do good speeches. I know when I do bad speeches. That speech was a total home run. They loved it. I could've ...²</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Negative politeness (strategy 2) 2. As in: Rewatch the recording: Off record (strategy 1)
<p>(OVERTALK)</p>	
<p>114. PRESIDENT TRUMP: ... gotten ...</p>	
<p>115. DAVID MUIR: You would give the same speech if you went back ...</p>	
<p>116. PRESIDENT TRUMP: Absolutely.</p>	

<p>117. DAVID MUIR: ... in front of that wall?</p>	
<p>118. PRESIDENT TRUMP: People loved it. They loved it. They gave me a standing ovation for a long period of time. They never even sat down, most of them, during the speech. There was love in the room. You and other networks covered it very inaccurately. I hate to say this to you and you probably won't put it on but turn on Fox and see how it was covered. And see how people respond to that speech.</p>	<p>Bald on record (strategy 5)</p>
<p>119. That speech was a good speech. And you and a couple of other networks tried to downplay that speech. And it was very, very unfortunate that you did. The people of the CIA loved the speech. If I was going to take a vote in that room, there were, like, 300, 350 people, over 1,000 wanted to be there but they couldn't. They were all CIA people. I would say I would've gotten 350 to nothing in that room. That's what the vote would've been. That speech was a big hit, a big success -- success. And then I came back and I watched you on television and a couple of others.</p>	<p>Bald on record (strategy 4)</p>
<p>120. DAVID MUIR: Not me personally.</p>	
<p>(OVERTALK)</p>	
<p>121. PRESIDENT TRUMP: And they tried to demean. Excuse me?</p>	
<p>122. DAVID MUIR: Not me personally.</p>	
<p>123. PRESIDENT TRUMP: Not you personally but your network -- and they tried to demean the speech. And I know when things are good or bad. A poll just came out on my inauguration speech which</p>	<p>Negative politeness (strategy 4)</p>

<p>was extraordinary that people loved it. Loved and liked. And it was an extraordinary poll.</p>	
<p>124. DAVID MUIR: I guess that's what I'm getting at. You talked about the poll, the people loving your inaugural speech and the size of your ...</p>	
<p>125. PRESIDENT TRUMP: No, because you bring it up.</p>	<p>Utterances 125-130: Bald on record (strategy 4)</p>
<p>126. DAVID MUIR: I'm asking, well, on day one you ...</p>	
<p>127. PRESIDENT TRUMP: Well, you just brought it up. I didn't bring it up. I didn't wanna -- talk about the inauguration speech. But I think I did a very good job and people really liked it. You saw the poll. Just came out this morning. You bring it up. I didn't bring it up.</p>	
<p>128. DAVID MUIR: So, polls and crowd size and covers on Time, those still matter now that you're here as president.</p>	
<p>129. PRESIDENT TRUMP: Well, you keep bringing it up. I had a massive amount of people here. They were showing pictures that were very unflattering, as unflattering -- from certain angles -- that were taken early and lots of other things. I'll show you a picture later if you'd like of a massive crowd.</p>	<p>Positive politeness (strategy 10)</p>
<p>130. In terms of a total audience including television and everything else that you have we had supposedly the biggest crowd in history. The audience watching the show. And I think you would even agree to that. They say I had the biggest crowd in the history of inaugural</p>	

<p>speeches. I'm honored by that. But I didn't bring it up. You just brought it up.</p>	
<p>131. DAVID MUIR: See, I -- I'm not interested in the inaugural crowd size. I think the American people can look at images side by side and decide for themselves. I am curious about the first full day here at the White House, choosing to send the press secretary out into the briefing room, summoning reporters to talk about the inaugural crowd size. Does that send a message to the American people that that's -- that's more important than some of the very pressing issues?</p>	
<p>132. PRESIDENT TRUMP: Part of my whole victory was that the men and women of this country who have been forgotten will never be forgotten again. Part of that is when they try and demean me unfairly 'cause we had a massive crowd of people. We had a crowd -- I looked over that sea of people and I said to myself, "Wow."</p>	
<p>133. And I've seen crowds before. Big, big crowds. That was some crowd. When I looked at the numbers that happened to come in from all of the various sources, we had the biggest audience in the history of inaugural speeches. I said the men and women that I was talking to who came out and voted will never be forgotten again. Therefore I won't allow you or other people like you to demean that crowd and to demean the people that came to Washington, D.C., from faraway places because they like me. But more importantly they like what I'm saying.</p>	<p>Bald on record (strategy 4)</p>
<p>134. DAVID MUIR: I just wanna say I didn't demean anyone who was in that crowd. We did coverage for hours ...</p>	
<p>(OVERTALK)</p>	

<p>135. PRESIDENT TRUMP: No, I think you're demeaning by talking the way you're talking. I think you're demeaning. And that's why I think a lot of people turned on you and turned on a lot of other people. And that's why you have a 17 percent approval rating, which is pretty bad.</p>	<p>Bald on record (strategy 4)</p>
<p>136. DAVID MUIR: Mr. Trump, let's talk about many of the things that have happened this week. Chicago. Last night you tweeted about the murder rate in Chicago saying, "If Chicago doesn't fix the horrible carnage going on I will send in the feds."</p>	
<p>137. PRESIDENT TRUMP: Right.</p>	
<p>138. AVID MUIR: You will send in the feds? What do you mean by that?</p>	
<p>139. PRESIDENT TRUMP: It's carnage. <i>You know, in my speech I got tremendous -- from certain people the word carnage.</i> It is carnage. It's horrible carnage. This is Afghanistan -- is not like what's happening in Chicago. People are being shot left and right. Thousands of people over a period -- over a short period of time.</p>	<p>Positive politeness (strategy 3)</p>
<p>140. This year, which has just started, is worse than last year, which was a catastrophe. They're not doing the job. Now if they want help, I would love to help them. I will send in what we have to send in. Maybe</p>	<p>Positive politeness (strategy 3)</p>

<p>they're not gonna have to be so politically correct. Maybe they're being overly political correct. Maybe there's something going on. But you can't have those killings going on in Chicago. Chicago is like a war zone. Chicago is worse than some of the people that you report in some of the places that you report about every night ...</p>	
<p>141. DAVID MUIR: So, I will send ...</p>	
<p>142. PRESIDENT TRUMP: ... in the Middle East.</p>	
<p>143. DAVID MUIR: ... you mentioned federal assistance. There's federal assistance and then there's sending in the feds. I'm just curious would you take action on your own?</p>	
<p>144. PRESIDENT TRUMP: I want them to fix the problem. You can't have thousands of people being shot in a city, in a country that I happen to be president of. <i>Maybe it's okay if somebody else is president.</i> I want them to fix the problem. They have a problem that's very easily fixable.</p>	<p>Off record (strategy 8)</p>
<p>145. They're gonna have to get tougher and stronger and smarter. But they gotta fix the problem. I don't want to have thousands of people shot in a city where essentially I'm the president. I love Chicago. I</p>	<p>As in: I am too good for this; this is not happening under my presidency: Off record (strategy 11)</p>

know Chicago. And Chicago is a great city, can be a great city.	
146. DAVID MUIR: And if they're unable to fix it?	
(OVERTALK)	
147. PRESIDENT TRUMP: It can't be a great city. Excuse me. It can't be a great city if people are shot walking down the street for a loaf of bread. Can't be a great city.	Trump interrupted, but wanted to continue: Negative politeness (strategy 6)
148. DAVID MUIR: And if they are unable to fix it, that's when you would send in the feds?	
(OVERTALK)	
149. PRESIDENT TRUMP: Well, so far they have been unable. It's been going on for years. And I wasn't president. So, look, when President Obama was there two weeks ago making a speech, very nice speech. Two people were shot and killed during his speech. You can't have that.	Bald on record (strategy 2)
150. DAVID MUIR: Let me ask ...	

<p>151. PRESIDENT TRUMP: They weren't shot at the speech. But they were shot in the city of Chicago during his speech. What -- what's going on? So, all I'm saying is to the mayor who came up to my office recently -- I say, "You have to smarten up and you have to toughen up because you can't let that happen. That's a war zone."</p>	
<p>152. DAVID MUIR: So, this is an "or else." This is a warning?</p>	
<p>153. PRESIDENT TRUMP: I want them to straighten out the problem. It's a big problem.</p>	
<p>154. DAVID MUIR: Let me ask you about a new report that you were poised to lift a ban on so-called CIA black sites of prisons around the world that have been used in the past. Is that true?</p>	
<p>155. PRESIDENT TRUMP: Well, I'll be talking about that in about two hours. So, you'll be there and you'll be able to see it for yourself.</p>	<p>Notice how Trump did not dismiss the question or say no: Positive politeness (strategy 10)</p>
<p>156. DAVID MUIR: Are you gonna lift the ban?</p>	
<p>157. PRESIDENT TRUMP: You're gonna see in about two hours.</p>	<p>Positive politeness (strategy 10)</p>

<p>158. DAVID MUIR: The last president, President Obama, said the U.S. does not torture. Will you say that?</p>	
<p>159. PRESIDENT TRUMP: Well, I have a general who I have great respect for, General Mattis, who said - - I was a little surprised -- who said he's not a believer in torture. As you know, Mr. Pompeo was just approved, affirmed by the Senate. He's a fantastic guy, he's gonna be the head of the CIA.</p>	<p>Positive politeness (strategy 3)</p>
<p>160. And you have somebody fabulous as opposed to the character that just got out who didn't -- was not fabulous at all. And he will I think do a great job. And he is -- you know, I haven't gone into great detail. But I will tell you I have spoken to others in intelligence. And they are big believers in, as an example, waterboarding.</p>	<p>Positive politeness (strategy 3)</p>
<p>161. DAVID MUIR: You did tell me ...</p>	
<p>(OVERTALK)</p>	
<p>162. PRESIDENT TRUMP: Because they say it does work. It does work.</p>	
<p>163. DAVID MUIR: Mr. President, you ...</p>	

(OVERTALK)	
164. DAVID MUIR: Mr. President, you told me during one of the debates that you would bring back waterboarding and a hell of a lot worse.	
165. PRESIDENT TRUMP: I would do ...	Positive politeness (strategy 6)
(OVERTALK)	
166. PRESIDENT TRUMP: I would do -- I wanna keep our country safe. I wanna keep our country safe.	
167. DAVID MUIR: What does that mean?	
168. PRESIDENT TRUMP: When they're shooting -- when they're chopping off the heads of our people and other people, when they're chopping off the heads of people because they happen to be a Christian in the Middle East, when ISIS is doing things that nobody has ever heard of since Medieval times, would I feel strongly about waterboarding?	Off record (strategy 10)
169. As far as I'm concerned we have to fight fire with fire. Now, with that being said I'm going with General Mattis. I'm going with my secretary because I	Off record (strategy 11)

<p>think Pompeo's gonna be phenomenal. I'm gonna go with what they say. But I have spoken as recently as 24 hours ago with people at the highest level of intelligence. And I asked them the question, "Does it work? Does torture work?" And the answer was, "Yes, absolutely."</p>	
<p>170. DAVID MUIR: You're now the president. Do you want waterboarding?</p>	
<p>171. PRESIDENT TRUMP: I don't want people to chop off the citizens or anybody's heads in the Middle East. Okay? Because they're Christian or Muslim or anything else. I don't want -- look, you are old enough to have seen a time that was much different. You never saw heads chopped off until a few years ago.</p>	<p>Positive politeness (strategy 9)</p>
<p>172. Now they chop 'em off and they put 'em on camera and they send 'em all over the world. So we have that and we're not allowed to do anything. We're not playing on an even field. I will say this, I will rely on Pompeo and Mattis and my group. And if they don't wanna do, that's fine. If they do wanna do, then I will work for that end.</p>	
<p>173. I wanna do everything within the bounds of what you're allowed to do legally. <i>But do I feel it works? Absolutely I feel it works. Have I spoken to people at the top levels and people that have seen it</i></p>	<p>Hypophora: Off record (strategy 10)</p>

<p><i>work? I haven't seen it work. But I think it works. Have I spoken to people that feel strongly about it? Absolutely.</i></p>	
<p>174. DAVID MUIR: So, you'd be okay with it as ...</p>	
<p>175. PRESIDENT TRUMP: I wanna keep ...</p>	
<p>176. DAVID MUIR: ... president?</p>	
<p>177. PRESIDENT TRUMP: ... no, I wanna -- I will rely on General Mattis. And I'm gonna rely on those two people and others. And if they don't wanna do it, it's 100 percent okay with me. Do I think it works? Absolutely.</p>	
<p>178. DAVID MUIR: Mr. President, I wanna ask you about refugees. You're about to sign a sweeping executive action to suspend immigration to this country.</p>	
<p>179. PRESIDENT TRUMP: Right.</p>	
<p>180. DAVID MUIR: Who are we talking about? Is this the Muslim ban?</p>	

<p>181. PRESIDENT TRUMP: We're talking about -- no it's not the Muslim ban. But it's countries that have tremendous terror. It's countries that we're going to be spelling out in a little while in the same speech. And it's countries that people are going to come in and cause us tremendous problems. Our country has enough problems without allowing people to come in who, in many cases or in some cases, are looking to do tremendous destruction.</p>	
<p>(OVERTALK)</p>	
<p>182. PRESIDENT TRUMP: You look at what's happening ...</p>	
<p>183. DAVID MUIR: Which countries are we talking about?</p>	
<p>184. PRESIDENT TRUMP: ... you'll be hearing about it in two hours because I have a whole list. You'll be very thrilled. You're looking at people that come in, in many cases, in some cases with evil intentions. I don't want that. They're ISIS. They're coming under false pretense. I don't want that.</p>	<p>Positive politeness (strategy 10)</p>
<p>185. I'm gonna be the president of a safe country. We have enough problems. Now I'll absolutely do safe zones in Syria for the people. I think that Europe has</p>	

<p>made a tremendous mistake by allowing these millions of people to go into Germany and various other countries. And all you have to do is take a look. It's -- it's a disaster what's happening over there.</p>	
<p>186. I don't want that to happen here. Now with that being said, President Obama and Hillary Clinton have, and Kerry have allowed tens of thousands of people into our country. The FBI is now investigating more people than ever before having to do with terror. They - - and it's from the group of people that came in. So look, look, our country has a lot of problems. Believe me.¹ I know what the problems are even better than you do.² They're deep problems, they're serious problems. We don't need more.</p>	<p>Muir wanted to say something and even used his hand to signalize; Trump preemptively acted:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Bald on record (strategy 2) 2. Bald on record (strategy 4)
<p>187. DAVID MUIR: Let me ask you about some of the countries that won't be on the list, Afghanistan, Pakistan, Saudi Arabia. Why are we going to allow people to come into this country ...</p>	
<p>188. PRESIDENT TRUMP: You're going to see -- you're going to see. We're going to have extreme vetting in all cases. And I mean extreme. And we're not letting people in if we think there's even a little chance of some problem.</p>	<p>Positive politeness (strategy 10)</p>
<p>189. DAVID MUIR: Are you at all ...</p>	

(OVERTALK)	
<p>190. PRESIDENT TRUMP: We are excluding certain countries. But for other countries we're gonna have extreme vetting. It's going to be very hard to come in. Right now it's very easy to come in. It's gonna be very, very hard. I don't want terror in this country. You look at what happened in San Bernardino. You look at what happened all over. You look at what happened in the World Trade Center. Okay, I mean, take that as an example.</p>	Off record (strategy 3)
<p>191. DAVID MUIR: Are you at all ...</p>	
(OVERTALK)	
<p>192. DAVID MUIR: ... concerned -- are you at all concerned it's going to cause more anger among Muslims ...</p>	
<p>193. PRESIDENT TRUMP: Anger?</p>	Off record (strategy 10)
<p>194. DAVID MUIR: ... the world?</p>	
<p>195. PRESIDENT TRUMP: There's plenty of anger right now. How can you have more?</p>	

<p>196. DAVID MUIR: You don't think it'll ...</p>	
<p>197. PRESIDENT TRUMP: Look, David ...</p>	<p>Bald on record (strategy 2)</p>
<p>198. DAVID MUIR: ... exacerbate the problem?</p>	
<p>199. PRESIDENT TRUMP: ... David, I mean, I know you're a sophisticated guy.¹ The world is a mess. The world is as angry as it gets. What? You think this is gonna cause a little more anger?² The world is an angry place. All of this has happened. We went into Iraq. We shouldn't have gone into Iraq. We shouldn't have gotten out the way we got out.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Positive politeness (strategy 1) 2. Off record (strategy 10)
<p>200. The world is a total mess. Take a look at what's happening with Aleppo. Take a look what's happening in Mosul. Take a look what's going on in the Middle East. And people are fleeing and they're going into Europe and all over the place. The world is a mess, David.</p>	<p>As in: You should know that: Off record (strategy 1)</p>
<p>201. DAVID MUIR: You brought up Iraq and something you said that could affect American troops in recent days. You said, "We should've kept the oil but okay maybe we'll have another chance." What did you mean by that?</p>	

<p>202. PRESIDENT TRUMP: Well, we should've kept the oil when we got out. And, you know, it's very interesting, had we taken the oil, you wouldn't have ISIS because they fuel themselves with the oil. That's where they got the money. They got the money from leaving -- when we left, we left Iraq, which wasn't a government. It's not a government now.</p>	<p>As in: I would not have made such mistake: Off record (strategy 11)</p>
<p>203. And by the way, and I said something else, if we go in and do this. You have two nations, Iraq and Iran. And they were essentially the same military strength. And they'd fight for decades and decades. They'd fight forever. And they'd keep fighting and it would go -- it was just a way of life. We got in, we decapitated one of those nations, Iraq. I said, "Iran is taking over Iraq." That's essentially what happened.</p>	
<p>204. DAVID MUIR: So, you believe we can go in and take the oil.</p>	
<p>205. PRESIDENT TRUMP: We should have taken the oil. You wouldn't have ISIS if we took the oil. Now I wasn't talking about it from the standpoint of ISIS because the way we got out was horrible. We created a vacuum and ISIS formed. But had we taken the oil something else would've very good happened. They would not have been able to fuel their rather unbelievable drive to destroy large portions of the world.</p>	

<p>206. DAVID MUIR: You've heard the critics who say that would break all international law, taking the oil. But I wanna get to the words ...</p>	
<p>(OVERTALK)</p>	
<p>207. DAVID MUIR: ... that you ...</p>	
<p>208. PRESIDENT TRUMP: Wait, wait, can you believe that? Who are the critics who say that? Fools.</p>	<p>Off record (strategy 10)</p>
<p>209. DAVID MUIR: Let, let me ...</p>	
<p>210. PRESIDENT TRUMP: I don't call them critics. I call them fools.</p>	
<p>211. DAVID MUIR: ... let me talk about your words ...</p>	
<p>212. PRESIDENT TRUMP: We should've kept -- excuse me. We should've taken the oil. And if we took the oil you wouldn't have ISIS. And we would have had wealth. We have spent right now \$6 trillion in the Middle East. And our country is falling apart.</p>	<p>Negative politeness (strategy 6)</p>

(OVERTALK)	
<p>213. PRESIDENT TRUMP: Our roads -- excuse me. Our roads, our bridges, our schools, it's falling apart. We have spent as of one month ago \$6 trillion in the Middle East. And in our country we can't afford to build a school in Brooklyn or we can't afford to build a school in Los Angeles. And we can't afford to fix up our inner cities. We can't afford to do anything. Look, it's time. It's been our longest war. We've been in there for 15, 16 years. Nobody even knows what the date is because they don't really know when did we start. But it's time. It's time.</p>	<p>Negative politeness (strategy 6)</p>
<p>214. DAVID MUIR: What got my attention, Mr. President, was when you said, "Maybe we'll have another chance."</p>	
<p>215. PRESIDENT TRUMP: Well, don't let it get your attention too much because we'll see what happens. I mean, we're gonna see what happens. You know, I told you and I told everybody else that wants to talk when it comes to the military I don't wanna discuss things.</p>	<p>Off record (strategy 12)</p>
<p>216. I wanna let -- I wanna let the action take place before the talk takes place. I watched in Mosul when a number of months ago generals and politicians would get up and say, "We're going into Mosul in four</p>	

<p>months." Then they'd say, "We're going in in three months, two months, one month. We're going in next week."</p>	
<p>217. Okay, and I kept saying to myself, "Gee, why do they have to keep talking about going in?" All right, so now they go in and it is tough because they're giving the enemy all this time to prepare. I don't wanna do a lot of talking on the military. I wanna talk after it's finished, not before it starts.</p>	
<p>218. DAVID MUIR: Let me ask you, Mr. President, about another promise involving Obamacare to repeal it. And you told The Washington Post that your plan to replace Obamacare will include insurance for everybody. That sounds an awful lot like universal coverage.</p>	
<p>219. PRESIDENT TRUMP: It's going to be -- what my plan is is that I wanna take care of everybody. I'm not gonna leave the lower 20 percent that can't afford insurance. Just so you understand people talk about Obamacare. And I told the Republicans this, the best thing we could do is nothing for two years, let it explode. And then we'll go in and we'll do a new plan and -- and the Democrats will vote for it. Believe me.</p>	<p>Negative politeness (strategy 4)</p>
<p>220. Because this year you'll have 150 percent increases. Last year in Arizona 116 percent increase, Minnesota 60 some-odd percent increase. And I told</p>	

<p>them, except for one problem, I wanna get it fixed. The best thing I could do as the leader of this country-- but as wanting to get something approved with support of the Democrats, if I didn't do anything for two years they'd be begging me to do something. But I don't wanna do that. So just so you unders-- Obamacare is a disaster.</p>	
<p>221. It's too expensive. It's horrible health care. It doesn't cover what you have to cover. It's a disaster. You know it and I know it. And I said to the Republican folks-- and they're terrific folks, Mitch and Paul Ryan, I said, "Look, if you go fast -- and I'm okay in doing it because it's the right thing to do. We wanna get good coverage at much less cost." I said, "If you go fast we then own Obamacare. They're gonna put it on us. And Obamacare is a disaster waiting to explode. If you sit back and let it explode it's gonna be much easier." That's the thing to do. But the right thing to do is to get something done now.</p>	<p>Positive politeness (strategy 3)</p>
<p>222. DAVID MUIR: But you ...</p>	
<p>223. PRESIDENT TRUMP: So I wanna make sure that nobody's dying on the streets when I'm president. Nobody's gonna be dying on the streets. We will unleash something that's gonna be terrific.¹ And remember this, before Obamacare you had a lot of people that were very, very happy with their health care.²</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Off record (strategy 11) 2. Bald on record (strategy 2)

<p>224. And now those people in many cases don't even have health care. They don't even have anything that's acceptable to them. Remember this, keep your doctor, keep your plan, 100 percent. Remember the \$5 billion website? Remember the website fiasco. I mean, you do admit that I think, right? The website fiasco.</p>	<p>Off record (strategy 10)</p>
<p>225. Obamacare is a disaster. We are going to come up with a new plan ideally not an amended plan because right now if you look at the pages they're this high. We're gonna come up with a new plan that's going to be better health care for more people at a lesser cost.</p>	
<p>226. DAVID MUIR: Last question because I know you're gonna show me around the White House. Last question on this. You've seen the estimate that 18 million Americans could lose their health insurance if Obamacare is repealed and there is no replacement. Can you assure those Americans watching this right now that they will not lose their health insurance or end up with anything less?</p>	
<p>227. PRESIDENT TRUMP: So nobody ever deducts all the people that have already lost their health insurance that liked it. You had millions of people that liked their health insurance and their health care and their doctor and where they went. You had millions of people that now aren't insured anymore.</p>	

<p>228. DAVID MUIR: I'm just asking about the people ...</p>	
<p>229. PRESIDENT TRUMP: No, no.</p>	
<p>230. DAVID MUIR: ... who are nervous and watching ...</p>	
<p>231. PRESIDENT TRUMP: We ...</p>	
<p>232. DAVID MUIR: ... you for reassurance.</p>	
<p>233. PRESIDENT TRUMP: ... here's what I can assure you, we are going to have a better plan, much better health care, much better service treatment, a plan where you can have access to the doctor that you want and the plan that you want. We're gonna have a much better health care plan at much less money.</p>	<p>Positive politeness (strategy 10)</p>
<p>234. And remember Obamacare is ready to explode. And you interviewed me a couple of years ago. I said '17 -- right now, this year, "'17 is going to be a disaster." I'm very good at this stuff. "'17 is going to be a disaster cost-wise for Obamacare. It's going to explode in '17."</p>	<p>Positive politeness (strategy 3)</p>

<p>235. And why not? Obama's a smart guy. So let it all come do because that's what's happening. It's all coming do in '17. We're gonna have an explosion. And to do it right, sit back, let it explode and let the Democrats come begging us to help them because it's on them. But I don't wanna do that. I wanna give great health care at a much lower cost.</p>	
<p>236. DAVID MUIR: So, no one who has this health insurance through Obamacare will lose it or end up ...</p>	
<p>237. PRESIDENT TRUMP: You know, when you ...</p>	<p>Positive politeness (strategy 3)</p>
<p>238. DAVID MUIR: ... with anything less?</p>	
<p>(OVERTALK)</p>	
<p>239. PRESIDENT TRUMP: ... say no one I think no one. Ideally, in the real world, you're talking about millions of people. Will no one. And then, you know, knowing ABC, you'll have this one person on television saying how they were hurt. Okay. We want no one. We want the answer to be no one.</p>	<p>Off record (strategy 3)</p>
<p>240. But I will say millions of people will be happy. Right now you have millions and millions and millions of people that are unhappy. It's too expensive and it's no</p>	

<p>good. And the governor of Minnesota who unfortunately had a very, very sad incident yesterday 'cause he's a very nice guy but -- a couple of months ago he said that the Affordable Care Act is no longer affordable.</p>	
<p>241. He's a staunch Democrat. Very strong Democrat. He said it's no longer affordable. He made that statement. And Bill Clinton on the campaign trail -- and he probably had a bad night that night when he went home -- but he said, "Obamacare is crazy. It's crazy." And you know what, they were both right.</p>	<p>Positive politeness (strategy 3)</p>
<p>242. DAVID MUIR: Mr. President, thank you.</p>	
<p>(OVERTALK)</p>	
<p>243. PRESIDENT TRUMP: Thank you very much. Appreciate it.</p>	<p>Negative politeness (strategy 5)</p>
<p>* * *END OF TRANSCRIPT* * *</p>	