

**Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research  
University of Al-Qadisiyah  
College of Education  
Department of English**

# **A Socio- Pragmatic Analysis of the Language Racism in Selected Political Speeches**

**Submitted by:**

**Nabeel Aziz**

**Bashar Abdul Jawad**

**Supervised by:**

**Asst Prof. Sawsan Kareem Al-Saaidi (Ph.d)**

**2018 A.D**

**1439 H.A**

بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم

” قُلْ هَلْ يَسْتَوِي الَّذِينَ يَعْلَمُونَ وَالَّذِينَ لَا يَعْلَمُونَ إِنَّمَا يَتَذَكَّرُ أُولُو  
الْأَلْبَابِ ”

صدق الله العلي العظيم

(الزمر – ٩ )

**To**

**Our family ... with love**

## **Acknowledgements**

We thank Allah for his help. We would like to express our gratitude to our supervisor Asst Prof. Dr. Sawsan Kareem Al-Saaidi for her advice and support.

Also we thank our friends for their encouragement and assistance.

## Table of Contents

<u>Subjects</u>	<u>Page No.</u>
Dedication	ii
Acknowledgements	iii
Table of Contents	iv
Abstract	v
Chapter One	
1.1 Speech Act Theory	1
1.2 Pragmatic	3
1.3 Pragmatic Theories	8
1.4 Sociolinguistics	10
1.5 Sociolinguistics Theory	11
Chapter Two	
2.1 Introduction	13
2.2 Data Analysis	13
Conclusions	19
References	20

Language is used for influencing people. Various means, whether honest or dishonest, are appealed to for achieving this purpose. This means that people fulfill their goals either through telling their interlocutors the truth or through deceiving and misleading them. In this regard, deception is a key aspect of many strategic interactions including bargaining, military operations, and politics. However, in spite of the importance of this topic, it has not been pragmatically given enough research attention particularly in politics.

Thus, this study sets itself the task of dealing with this issue in this genre from a pragmatic perspective. Precisely, the current work attempts to answer the following question: What is the pragmatics of deception in American presidential electoral speeches? Pragmatics, here, involves the speech acts used to issue deceptive utterances, as well as cognitive strategies. In other words, this study aims at finding out the answer to the question raised above. In accordance with this aim, it is hypothesized that American presidential candidates use certain deceptive/misleading strategies to achieve their goals. In this regard, they utilize certain strategies which is speech act theory .

## 1.1 Pragmatic

Pragmatic is one of territory which considers the manner by which context adds to importance. Pragmatics is worried about the understanding of phonetics importance in context (Fromkin, Blair, and Collins, 1999:182).

Kadmon (2001:1) states that Pragmatics has to do with language use , and with going beyond the literal meaning. According to Peccei (1999:2) that pragmatics focuses on those parts of implying that can't be anticipated by etymology learning alone and considers information about physical and social world. Chomsky expresses that pragmatics implies information of how dialect is identified with the circumstance in which it is utilized.

There are numerous elements of dialect in every day life, for example, to give discourse, declares, talk, tell, and so on. Discourse is a formal talk given to a group of people to express people contemplations (Oxford Dictionary, 1995:1142).

Yule (1996:3) defined pragmatics as the investigation of significance as imparted by a speaker (or author) and deciphered by an audience or peruser . The examination of pragmatics will be more on what individuals mean by their expressions than how the words or expressions are shaped. It includes the understanding of what individuals mean in a specific setting and how the setting impacts what is said. The approach of pragmatics additionally investigates how audience members can make deductions about what is said keeping in mind the end goal to land at a translation of the speaker's planned importance. It comes to how a lot of what is inferred is perceived as a major aspect of what is conveyed. To

put it plainly, he characterizes pragmatics as the investigation of the connections between etymological structures and the clients of those structures.

Cutting (2002:2) defined pragmatics as the study deals with the meaning of words in context, analyzing the parts of meaning that can be explained by knowledge of the physical and social world, and the socio-psychological factors influencing communication, as well as the knowledge of time and place in which the words are uttered or written. This approach studies the context, text, and function. Based on its term, pragmatics focuses on the meaning of words in interaction and how a speaker and a hearer communicate more information than the words they use. The speaker's meaning is dependent on assumptions of knowledge shared by both. Pragmatics also deals with texts, or pieces of spoken or written discourse. That means how language becomes meaningful and unified for its users. Moreover, pragmatics concerns with function which means that it analyses the speakers' purposes in speaking or in interacting verbally.

From the definitions stated by the experts above, it can be concluded that pragmatics is the study of language use and its users that involves the context necessitated from the spoken or written discourse. It focuses on analysing a deeper meaning of certain utterances rather than a surface meaning. However, it needs understanding at the heart of the listeners (or readers) to share the same knowledge with the speakers (or writers) so that the intended meaning may be achieved by both (Ibid.).

In addition, Leech (1983:6) stated that pragmatics is the study of meaning which is related to the speech situations. Further he explains that pragmatics can be seen as a way to solve problems which can arise, both from the perspective of a



speaker and a hearer. For example from the speaker's point of view, the problem is the planning about how to produce an utterance. On the other hand, from the hearer's point of view, the problem is related to the interpretation, which forces the hearer to be able to interpret the possible reason that makes the speaker saying the utterance.

Meanwhile, Mey (1993:42) considered pragmatics as the study of human language uses' condition, which has a close relationship with the context of society. Similarly, Levinson (1983:5) states that pragmatics is the study of the use of language in communication. In this study, people try to see the relation between language and contexts.

## **1.2 Speech Act Theory**

A speech act in linguistics and the philosophy of language is an utterance that has performative function in language and communication. According to Kent Bach, "almost any speech act is really the performance of several acts at once, distinguished by different aspects of the speaker's intention: there is the act of saying something, what one does in saying it, such as requesting or promising, and how one is trying to affect one's audience." The contemporary use of the term goes back to J. L. Austin's (1962) development of performative utterances and his theory of locutionary, illocutionary, and perlocutionary acts. Speech acts are commonly taken to include such acts as promising, ordering, greeting, warning, inviting and congratulating. (Virbel, 2015:53).

Speech acts can be analysed on three levels:

1-A locutionary act, the performance of an utterance: the actual utterance and its

ostensible meaning, comprising phonetic, phatic and rhetic acts corresponding to the verbal, syntactic and semantic aspects of any meaningful utterance.

2-An illocutionary act: the pragmatic 'illocutionary force' of the utterance, thus its intended significance as a socially valid verbal action.

3-An perlocutionary act: its actual effect, such as persuading, convincing, scaring, enlightening, inspiring, or otherwise getting someone to do or realize something, whether intended or not. (Finch,2002:1).

There is a common sense argument shared by philosophers and linguists in favour of the possible extension of speech act theory to discourse analysis. This argument is the following :Speech acts are not isolated moves in communication : they appear in more global units of communication, defined as conversations or discourses (Ibid.).

Vanderveken (1994: 53) gives an explicit version of this thesis when asserting that: speakers perform their illocutionary acts within entire conversations where they are most often in verbal interaction with other speakers who reply to them and perform in turn their own speech acts with the same Collective intention to pursue with success a certain type of discourse. Thus, above all,the use of language is a social form of linguistic behavior. It consists, in general, of ordered sequences of utterances made by several speakers who tend by their verbal interactions to achieve common discursive goals such as discussing a question, deciding together how to react to a certain situation, negotiating, consulting or more simply to exchange greetings and talk for its own sake (Wierzbicka, 1987:2).

The basis of this argument is that conversation is made of sequences of speech acts. This certainly is a plausible theoretical claim, but gives rise to a

certain number of objections, raised mainly by Searle (1992) in his skeptical argument. These objections concern essentially the possible relations between questions and answers in conversation, and can be stated as follows. First of all, questions are defined in speech acts theory as requests for information, and as such impose representative acts as replies. But this cannot be correct, since a reply may have another illocutionary point (as a promise) if the question is a request for a promise.

Secondly, certain questions require a directive as a reply, and not a representative, when the question contains a modal auxiliary verb. The third counter-example is given by indirect responses, which do not satisfy syntactic conditions, although the answer is pragmatically appropriate (Vanderveken :1994, 57).

To these three arguments, we could add an even more embarrassing one : “Answer” is not a specific illocutionary force, which could be analysed by the seven components of illocutionary force. “Answer” is a functional discursive qualification, but certainly not the semantic definition of a speech act type. These objections make explicit an important difference between the structure of illocutionary acts and the structure of conversation. In speech act theory, and more precisely in illocutionary logic, illocutionary force is decomposed into seven components, which are all necessary conditions for the successful and non defective accomplishment of illocutionary acts (Ibid.).

These components are the illocutionary point, the degree of strength of the illocutionary point, the mode of achievement of the illocutionary point, the propositional content conditions of the illocutionary act, the preparatory conditions of the illocutionary act, the sincerity conditions of the illocutionary act, and finally

the degree of strength of the sincerity conditions. That predictions about the sequencing in conversation are difficult to come by follows from the fact that the internal structure of illocutionary acts (and more specifically the set of conditions for success) cannot determine the set of possible replies for any type of illocutionary act (Smith,1991:17).

By contrast, discourse analysis, while specifying sequential relations in discourse between speech acts, does not constrain sequencing in conversation depending on the set of possible components of illocutionary force. The constraints are not structural, in the sense of speech act theory, they are on the contrary functional. This means that the basic structures of conversation exchanges are made of lower order conversational units which carry functional properties. If speech act theory has been used so extensively within this paradigm of discourse analysis , it is because the functional properties associated with speech acts as units of meaning have been exported to speech acts as units of communication and discourse. This has several consequences for the description of speech acts within discourse analysis. (Brown ,1987:3 ).

Harris (1951 :5) admitted that so far we have identified various ways in which a speaker can mean something when uttering a meaningful sentence. Now let one look at utterances differently, as a kind of intentional action. With intentional action, what one intends can contribute to what one is doing. For instance, moving one's arm in a certain way can count not only as pushing away a bag of potato chips but also, partly because of one's intention, as trying to stay on one's diet and as trying to impress one's spouse.

When one speaks he or she can do all sorts of things, from aspirating a

consonant, to constructing a relative clause, to insulting a guest, to starting a war. These are all, pre-theoretically, speech acts done in the process of speaking. The theory of speech acts, however, is especially concerned with those acts that are not completely covered under one or more of the major divisions of grammar, phonetics, phonology, morphology, syntax, Semantics, or under some general theory of actions. Even in cases in which a particular speech act is not completely described in grammar, formal features of the utterance used in carrying out the act might be quite directly tied to its accomplishment, as when we request something by uttering an imperative sentence or greet someone by saying, “Hi!” Thus, there is clearly a conventional aspect to the study of speech acts. Sometimes, however, the achievement cannot be so directly tied to convention, as when we thank a guest by saying, “Oh, I love Chocolates”. ( Sadock ,1974 :460).

There is no convention of English to the effect that stating that one loves chocolates counts as an act of thanking. In this case, the speaker’s intention in making the utterance and a recognition by the addressee of that intention under the conditions of utterance clearly plays an important role. Note that whether convention or intention seems paramount, success is not guaranteed. The person to whom the conventionalized greeting “Hi!” is addressed might not speak English, but some other language in which the uttered syllable means “Go away!”, or the guest may not have brought chocolates at all, but candied fruit, in which cases these attempts to extend a greeting and give a complement are likely to fail. On the other hand, failure, even in the face of contextual adversity, is also not guaranteed. Thus, one may succeed in greeting a foreigner who understands nothing of what is being said by making it clear through gesture and tone of voice that that is the intent. Much of speech act theory is therefore devoted to striking the proper balance between convention and intention. (Sadock,1974 :460).

Real-life acts of speech usually involve interpersonal relations of some kind: A speaker does something with respect to an audience by saying certain words to that audience. Thus it would seem that ethnographic studies of such relationships and the study of discourse should be central to speech act theory, but in fact, they are not. Such studies have been carried out rather independently of the concerns of those philosophers and linguists who have devoted their attention to speech acts. This is perhaps not a good thing, has argued, but since it is the case, anthropological and discourse based approaches to speech acts will not be covered in this handbook entry (Ibid:46)

### **1.3 Pragmatic Theories**

William James 1902 famously presented his pragmatic theory of meaning by posing the simple question “what difference would it practically make to anyone if this notion rather than that notion were true?” James’s pragmatic method of clarifying the meaning of conceptions was simply to trace what he called their respective “practical consequences.” (Festenstein,1997:21).

Pragmatic theories emphasize on the reader’s relation to the work. The work is treated as something that is constructed to achieve certain effects on the audience. Effects may be for the aesthetic pleasure, instruction or any kind of emotion. Despite the fact that pragmatic criticism originated in the Roman times, Philip Sidney, a Renaissance critic, is one of its most influential theorists. For Sidney, poetry has a clear-cut purpose to achieve certain effect in an audience. Good poets are those who write both to delight and teach, or in other words, for delightful instruction (Festenstein,1997:21).

However, Lovejoy (1908:29) proposed that James confounds two incongruent criteria of the meaningfulness of propositions. According to the first criterion, a proposition is meaningful if it refers to or predicts future experiences regardless of whether the proposition is believed or not; according to the second, a proposition is meaningful if belief in that proposition results in some experiences on the part of the believer, despite the fact no predication by way of future experiences can be deduced from its truth.

Many sympathetic commentators have since held that there is a duality inherent to James's pragmatism about meaning. Consequently, James has often been regarded as allowing for merely subjective emotions and interests to play a role in the pragmatist determination of not only the meaning but the truth of the proposition. The two criteria Lovejoy separates are not inconsistent; rather, by pragmatist lights, they are inseparably related. If a proposition has meaning in the light of the first criterion, it is meaningful by the second, and vice versa (Perry, 1958:32).

## **1.4 Sociolinguistics**

Holmes (1992:1) stated that sociolinguistics is the study of the relationship between language and society. Language in one society is different from that in another society. People have their own language variation. Languages provide a variety of how to say something, to address, to greet others, to describe things, and to pay compliments.

Besides, Spolsky (1998: 3) considered sociolinguistics as the field which

focuses on studying the relationship between society and language, between the uses of language and the social structures in which the users of language live.

Wardaugh (2006: 10) defined that there are four possible relationships between language and society. The first relationship is that social structure may either influence or determine linguistic structure and/or behaviour. The second relationship is directly opposed to the first. Linguistic structure and/or behaviour may either influence or determine social structure. The third possible relationship is that the influence is bi-directional: language and society may influence each other. The last possibility is that there is no relationship between language and society.

Furthermore, Wardaugh (2006: 13) explained that sociolinguistics concerns with investigating the relationships between language and society with the goal of having a better understanding of language structure of and of how language functions in communication.

Coulmas in Wardaugh (2006: 13) said that sociolinguistics investigates how social structure influences the way people talk and how language varieties and patterns of use correlate with social attributes such as class, sex, and age.

To sum up, sociolinguistics studies the relationship between language and society. Society and language influence each other. Moreover, sociolinguistics concerns with the use of language in social context.

## **1.5 Sociolinguistics Theory**



In 1980, in this journal, Joshua Fishman presented the major theoretical issue in sociolinguistics as being the link between microsociolinguistic and macrosociolinguistic processes. In 1984 that is still the case, although the issue is receiving more explicit attention than it did four years ago (Agar,1982:82).

A more fundamental distinction between theoretical linguistics and variationist sociolinguistics relates to their respective approaches to variability. The principles set out by Weinreich, Labov, and Herzog (1968) are still taken as axiomatic by variationists; namely, a language system that did not display variability would not only be imaginary but dysfunctional, since structured variability is the essential property of language that fulfils important social functions and permits orderly linguistic change.

Chambers and Trudgill (1998: 127) has discussed the role of the *linguistic variable* as a structural unit, parallel to such units as the phoneme and noun phrase in linguistic theory. Chambers points out that, from the earliest days of structural linguistics, analysts produced descriptions and generalizations based on an underlying assumption that linguistic structure was fundamentally categorical.

Gumperz (1971:223) has observed that sociolinguistics is an attempt to find correlations between social structure and linguistic structure and to observe any changes that occur. There are two branches of sociolinguistics which approach this issue in different ways. These two branches are interactionist and variationist sociolinguistics. Interactionist sociolinguistics is principally interested in what language use can tell us about social processes, and therefore a central concern is the social meaning of language use. Variationist sociolinguistics is interested in

accounting for linguistic variation and change, at least partly as a product of the social distribution of language varieties. It is, therefore, less concerned with meaning as process, and more concerned with the interaction of linguistic and social systems; in this view the significance of language is mainly symbolic.

Chambers (2002: 3) is even more direct: ‘Sociolinguistics is the study of the social uses of language, and the most productive studies in the four decades of sociolinguistic research have emanated from determining the social evaluation of linguistic variants. These are also the areas most susceptible to scientific methods such as hypothesis-formation, logical inference, and statistical testing.’ However, as Gumperz and others have been quick to indicate, such studies do not exhaust sociolinguistic investigation, nor do they always prove to be as enlightening as one might hope.

## **Chapter Two**

### **2.1 Introduction**

Politic is always relates to activities that makes influence actions and policies in government or society. One of the aim of politics is involves the use of power to another by affecting their behavior. In politics, people needs political strategy and the method to do it is varies depend on the purpose. Political strategy deals with many perspective strategies where the basic strategy is the way of the purpose invented and used to obtain the objective (Khalifa ,2017:120).

Political strategy is crucial tools for campaign and election. Political strategy proposes a pathway to success when the society understands the background of candidates and reasons for them to vote for. Basic way to do it is use speech campaign because society will knows personality of candidates by sharing their thought. By using speech, society feels that the candidate stand beside them and have the same thought. This strategy can gain society symphaty. When they are able to obtain sympathy, the succession in gaining power soon come through (Ibid:22).

## **2.2 Data Analysis**

### **Text 1**

“Black guys counting my money! I hate it. ... I think that the guy is lazy. And it’s probably not his fault, because laziness is a trait in Blacks.”

In this extract, Trump describes the status of Black people who counting his money as envy. This shows an illocutionary act of hating to express his explicit racist sentiment towards the Black people and this is linguistically conveyed by the use of declarative sentence "I hate it...". He also uses an illocutionary act of insulting saying that "laziness is a trait in Blacks." Actually, he emphasizes his insult through repeating the word "lazy" because he considers the Black people are minorities in USA which are not in his view have any rights comparable to the White people.

### **Text 2**

“So ladies and gentlemen...I am officially running... for president of the United States, and we are going to make our country great again” .

In this quotation Trump creates a direct link between him being elected president and America being restored to its former greatness. He states as a fact that he will be ‘the greatest jobs president that God ever created’, by bringing back jobs and money from overseas

### **Text 3**

“America First will be the major and overriding theme of my administration. But to chart our path forward, we must first briefly take a look back. We have a lot to be proud of.”

By using the tools of critical discourse analysis, one can identify the ideological connection and claims of power between Trump and his followers. Critical Discourse Analysis can be defined as the uncovering of implicit ideologies in the texts as it unveils the underlying ideological prejudices and therefore the exercise of power in texts. From this perspective, one can deconstruct the appeal of Trumpism as a defense of the whiteness of America.

### **Text 4**

“They are killing us, but you don’t hear that from anyone else. They will never make America great again. They don’t even have a chance. They are controlled fully; they are controlled fully by the lobbyists, by the donors and by the special interests. Fully, they control them”

In the above text, Trump resorts to equivocation for the sake of misleading the public and convincing them to elect him. He violates the maxim of manner by making use of an expression with no clear reference. He utilizes the pronoun “they” four times without specifying its referent as in “They are killing us”, “They will never make America great again”, “They don’t even have a chance”, and “They are controlled fully”. In the previous utterances, Trump resorts to the ambiguous use of pronouns. He uses the pronoun "they" with no specified reference to issue his tendentious utterances. Thus, his utterances are misleading. The speech act that has been resorted to in the aforementioned text is that of assertion (precisely, insincere assertion) because Trump asserts things from his point of views with the aim of attacking others for the sake of advertising himself.

## **Text 5**

“So, ladies and gentlemen, I am officially running for President of United States and we are going to make our country great again”

Trump utilizes the deceptive strategy of depersonalization in the aforementioned text. Although, he begins his statement with the personal pronoun “I”, he, then, shifts to the inclusive pronoun “we”. By using such a strategy, Trump tries to avoid taking responsibility for what he says so he dissociates himself from his message shifting the focus to aspects of the external context. He intends to reduce his liability by sharing the responsibility with others. This elusion is misleading.

Accordingly, Trump violates the maxim of manner by not being clear. By doing so, Trump intends to shuffle off affording the whole responsibility for making America great again. Concerning the speech act utilized in the foregoing text, it is that of assertion, particularly announcing. Trump announces that he is officially running for President of the United States. Moreover, he employs the cognitive strategy of positive self-representation by saying “we are going to make our country great again”.

He intends to say that if he is elected, he will make America great again. Another cognitive strategy is that of lexical presupposition. Iterative lexical presupposition is evident in “we are going to make our country great *again*”, where “again” is used here to presuppose that America was great before.

## **Text 6**

“I will be the greatest job president that god ever created, I tell you that. I'll bring back our jobs, and I'll bring back our money”

Trump is giving ostensible promises, that is, long-term promises which he himself is not sure whether he will be able to fulfill or not. By saying “I will be the greatest job president that god ever created” and “I'll bring back *our jobs*”, he is deceiving the public in the hope of being elected. Thus, he violates the maxim of quality; he says something which he is not sure of its fulfillment in the future. Trump uses a commissive speech act, particularly, the speech act of promising; he promises the public to end unemployment by providing jobs. He also promises them to bring back their money “I'll bring back our money”.

Furthermore, Trump makes use of the cognitive strategy of positive self-representation. He magnifies himself by saying that he will be the greatest job president that god ever created. In a similar vein, he utilizes a metaphor-an extended conceptual metaphor- by saying that he will be the “greatest job president”.

## **Text 7**

"When President Clinton honored the bargain, we had the longest peacetime expansion in history, a balanced budget, and the first time in decades we all grew together, with the bottom 20 percent of workers increasing their incomes by the same percentage as the top 5 percent. When President Obama honored the bargain, we pulled back from the brink of depression, saved the auto industry, provided health care to 16 million working people, and replaced the jobs we lost faster than after a financial crash. We face new challenges in our economy and our democracy. We're still working our way back from a crisis that happened because time-tested values were replaced by false promises"

The speech acts utilized in the prior text are those of insincere assertion. Hillary makes various claims “When President Clinton”, “When President Obama” and “We face new challenges”. As regards to the cognitive strategy employed, it is that of presupposition. Existential presupposition is manifested in “When President Clinton”, “When President Obama”, and “We face new challenges in our economy” where Hillary presupposes the existence of persons called Clinton and Obama who worked as Presidents of the United States. Further, she presupposes the existence of new challenges that face people in America. These existential presuppositions are based on the assumption that the hearers are already aware of

the presupposed information.

## **Conclusions**

The findings of the pragmatic and statistical analyses verify the hypothesis set at the beginning of the study. Precisely, the American presidential candidates in question utilize certain deceptive strategies to achieve their goals ,such as metaphor, presupposition, and positive-self representation and negative other representation. Moreover, they exploit assertive and commissive speech acts.

As far as speech acts are concerned, the pragmatic and statistical analyses have shown that deception in the data under scrutiny is mainly defined as an insincere assertion whose main point is that of persuasion. Moreover, the commissive speech act of promising is also evident in the act of deception, notably in political deception.



## References

Agar, M. 1982. Whatever happened to cognitive anthropology? Human organization. 41.

Austin ,John Langshaw How to Do Things With Words. Cambridge (Mass.) 1962, paperback: Harvard University Press

Chambers, J. K. (2002). Studying Language Variation: An Informal Epistemology. In Chambers et al. (2002).

Chambers, J. K. (2003). *Sociolinguistic Theory: Linguistic Variation and its Social Significance*. 2nd edn. Oxford: Blackwell.

Crystal , David (1984) Applied Sociolinguistics. London :Academic Press Inc.

Darweesh, Abbas Degan (2016) “A Critical Discourse Analysis of Donald Trump's Sexist Ideology” *Journal of Education and Practice* [www.iiste.org](http://www.iiste.org) ISSN 2222-1735 (Paper) ISSN 2222-288X (Online)  
Vol.7, No.30,

Finch, G.(2002). *Word of Mouth: A New Introduction to Language and Communication*. New York: Palgrave.

Gumperz, John Joseph (1971) *(Language in Social Groups* . Stanford: Stanford University Press

Harris , Z.(1951) *Methods in Structural Linguistics*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press).

Holmes, Janet An Introduction to Sociolinguistics (2013) Routledge :Taylor and Francis.

Karthik, Deep Shikha (2013) “Pragmatics and Language Communication” *The Criterion An International Journal in English ISSN*, Vol. IV. Issue III

Khalifa , Taher Ben Bigotry, (2017) “Sexism, and Xenophobia: How Do They Manifest in Donald Trump’s Discourse?” *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science Invention (IJHSSI) ISSN (Online): www.ijhssi.org* ,Volume 6 Issue12.

Puig, M. B. (2003). Pragmatics and Discourse Analysis.Internet: <http://culture.gencat.net>.

Sperber, D. and Wilson, D. (1986). *Relevance*. London: Basil Blackwell.

Putri, Cynthia, (2017) “The Construction of Meaning: Pragmatics Versus Sociolinguistics”.

<https://kuldoc.com/.../the-construction-of-meaning-pragmatics-versus>.

Rachman1, Andhita, Sofi Yuniarti, (2017) “Critical Discourse Analysis in Donald Trump Presidential Campaign to Win American’s Heart,” *TELL Journal*, Volume 5, Number 2.

Searle, J. (1969). *Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language*. London: Cambridge University Press.

Searle, J. (1978). *Indirect Speech Acts*. London: Cambridge University Press.

Smith, Peter Wilfred Hesling (1991) *Speech Act Theory, Discourse Structure and Indirect Speech Acts*, The University of Leeds

Vanderveken, Daniel(1994). *Essays in Speech Act Theory*. Benjamins: Amsterdam 1994.

Virbel , Jacques , (2015) “Speech Act Theory and Instructional ,” Texts Springer International Publishing Switzerland K. Chemla, J. Virbel (eds.), *Texts, Textual Acts and the History of Science*, Archimedes 42, DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-16444.

Wilson, J. G. (1997). “Sexism, Racism and Otherism”. In Biagi, S and Kern-forxworth, M. (Eds.) *Facing Difference: Race, Gender and Mass Media*. California Pine Forge Press.