paper text:

Donald Trump's versus Hillary Clinton's Campaign Rhetoric in their Presidential Nomination Acceptance Speeches

Samuel Gunawan Petra Christian University, Surabaya 60236 - Indonesia   1

samgun@petra.ac.id

ABSTRACT The research sought to study the rhetoric of Donald Trump and Hillary Clinton in the U.S. 2016 presidential election. It studied how both candidates showcased their roles and political agenda **in terms of the four components of campaign rhetoric: agenda-setting,**   1 framing, character construction, and emotional resonance in their nomination acceptance speeches. Using qualitative content analysis, access was made to the core meaning of the speeches in terms of Beebe and Beebe's central ideas and main ideas of both speeches through Leanne's rhetorical techniques and de Bruijn's winning frames to be expressed in the forms of new analytical narratives. Subsequently, the study attempted to arrive at some interpretation of the underlying thought of both speeches in the light of the four components of the campaign rhetoric. The analysis showed that Trump asserted the bleak picture of America and underscored his role as hero who had the capacity to rescue; whereas Clinton who depicted more optimistic picture of America asserted her role to keep America moving forward and getting ahead. Keywords: Trump's vs Clinton's campaign rhetoric, Nomination acceptance speeches, Rhetorical techniques, Strategic positioning, Political goals.

Introduction Politicians must have excellent style of speaking to communicate their political standpoint that may great impacts on whether potential voters elect them into a position of power or not (cf. Huckle, 2017). Sedivy (2016) noted that voters generally prefer the style of a presidential candidate that matches the world as they see it. In order to appear trustworthy and presidential, a presidential candidate whose party was not in the White House must be capable of showing convincingly the failure of the administration of the ruling party, toward which the candidate is able to act as a hero or a heroine to rescue (cf. Mercieca, 2016; cf. Clementson, 2016). When accepting the Republican nomination on July 21, 2016, Donald Trump (henceforth Trump) in his Republican National Convention Speech (henceforth RNCS) gave his critical evaluation that America was facing some frightening threats that

desperately needed a new national leader to rescue (cf. Andrews, Lai, Mykhyalyshyn, and Parlapiano, 2016). According to him, only a presidential candidate capable of grasping the crises would aptly fit to lead the country. Contrastively, the following week – July 28, 2016, Hillary Clinton (henceforth Clinton) in her Democratic National Convention Speech (henceforth DNCS) foregrounded a different portrait of the reality that America was just doing fine. Obviously, these two candidates' different portraits of the American realities became the scaffolding for their contrasting rhetorical styles. On the one hand, Trump underscored the pessimistic perspectives of the realities of America that Clinton failed to grasp them. On the other hand, Clinton depicted the optimistic perspectives of the realities of America that her opponent had misrepresented. Purpose of the Research This research sought to deconstruct and compare the campaign rhetoric in Trump's RNCS and Clinton's DNCS in the U.S. 2016 presidential election. Scope of the Research This research focused on the campaign rhetoric in Trump's RNCS and Clinton's DNCS in the U.S. 2016 presidential election. Significance of the Research This research was undertaken to see the winning power of the campaign rhetoric employed by the two competing presidential candidates in their respective nomination acceptance speech in the U.S. 2016 presidential election. Literature Review Jordan and Pennebaker (2016) identified three characteristics that made up Trump's RNCS and Clinton's DNCS: emotional tone, belief certainty, and place on power, affiliation, and achievement. Judged from the emotional tone, Trump's RNCS was identified as being pessimistic: a dark portrait of America and the world. American outlook was bleak; for that reason he insisted on "making America great again". Conversely, Clinton came from the same ruling party of Barack Obama - her predecessor. Her outlook of America was quite optimistic. She kept America going ahead in line with Obama's policy (cf. also Gunawan, 2016a,b; 2017). If, on the one hand, regarding the belief certainty, Trump's RNCS showed a high degree of belief certainty as he used less cognitive processing words indicating that he had all the answers of the problems that he was pointing out; Clinton, on the other hand, in her DNCS indicated a lower degree of belief certainty indicating that she was still making some attempts to understand some issues she was pointing out. Both candidates showed a great deal of differences in their focus on power, achievement, and affiliation. Having secured his party's nomination, Trump focused more on power and status; whereas, Clinton, having been in closed touch with power, focused more on cooperation and social relationships with other important figures than on power. Meanwhile, Alter (2016) noted that Trump's messages focusing on trade, terrorism, and immigration were far more resonating than Clinton's. Considering the degree of enthusiasm between the two competing candidates, Ayres (2016) noted that Clinton was also lacking of enthusiasm in urban areas that had formerly supported her Democratic predecessor, Barack Obama, resulting in her diminishing votes in those areas. As Clinton fought head-to-head with Trump in the last stages, therefore those who could not themselves vote for Clinton had no other better choice except Trump. Obviously, voters who had formerly supported Obama turned out to shift their votes for Trump. This, therefore, became one of the decisive keys for Trump's electoral college victory (cf. Ayres, 2016). This research sought to study how Trump and Clinton assertively used the campaign rhetoric in the RNCS or the DNCS to affect their audience's beliefs, values, attitudes, and/or behaviour (cf. Charteris-Black 2011: 13-15, Lucas 2007: 400, Beebe and Beebe, 2009: 106). The success of both political figures in winning votes in the election was also attributable to the power and appropriateness of their respective campaign rhetoric to affect their audience's attitudes, behaviour, values and/or beliefs (cf. Lucas 2007: 403). Medhurst (as cited in Barret, 2016) noted that political campaign rhetoric usually consists of four essential components such as

agenda-setting, framing, character construction, and emotional resonance. 1

This framework was elaborately used to analyse the campaign rhetoric of politicians from both Republican and Democratic parties who aspired presidential nomination from their respective party in the U.S. 2016 presidential election (cf. Basten, 2016; Culotta, 2016; Mueller, 2016). In this framework, agenda-setting is the choice of some issues considered to be

more salient than any other issue. Framing deals with a **selection of** some **aspect of perceived reality which** [1]

affects the outlook within a text (cf. Bernhard, 2012). Character construction focuses on one

candidate's representation of himself or herself, for instance, **as a stronger leader** [1]

or a hero/a heroine capable of solving

the problems he or she has framed (cf. Barret, **2016; Basten, 2016; Culotta, 2016). Finally, emotional resonance** is concerned **with a candidate's** power **of** triggering **the emotions** [1]

of his or her audience on some issues. In the U.S. Presidential election of 2016, Trump was obviously known to have used insulting and hateful comments to characterize his campaign rhetoric such as attacking minorities, women, and immigrants. De Bruijn (2016) noted that Trump employed seven winning frames: (1) 'much smarter' frame: attempts to find the cause or root. This represents the idea, for instance, that American opponents are smarter, but they are dishonest. Furthermore, this highlights that Trump is even much smarter than the American opponents; and he is prepared to fight for the sake of the American people, (2) 'best people' frame; this provides the impetus to replace the current weak leaders by using the best people to serve the country, (3) 'who' and 'why' frames. He often sounds insulting minorities, i.e. immigrants and moslems, such as fighting crimes among immigrants, building wall along the border to prevent from illegal immigrants, and fighting terrorism. (4) 'insulting certain people' frame: providing the best policies for the people he insulted; (5) using a 'metaframing'. He refrains from using a particular frame or addressing a particular question, but says something about it, instead.(6) 'always winning' frame: Trump is a deal maker, so he must always win, no matter what. (7) 'the economy' frame – bringing more jobs back to America; seeing foreign policy from the viewpoint of its economic benefit. He will strengthen the American military power, but will not get involved with costly military operation outside the American border. As earlier stated, Sedivy (2016) noted that Trump and Clinton employed contrasting rhetorical styles which were attributable to their different portrait of the realities of America. Unlike Trump's style that was more concrete and directly addressed to his audience, Clinton used more abstract ideas and language. From the perception of voters, a candidate would be considered more successful, if such a candidate was capable of portraying some sense of urgency, challenging the situation, and then offering its solution. According to Trump, America was gloomy; therefore, it desperately needed to be rescued. Conversely, Clinton was insisting on the optimistic status-quo conditions to move forward (cf. Gunawan, 2016a, b; 2017) Clementson (2016) identified that

Trump used more high intensity language; whereas Clinton tended to use more restrained language known as low intensity language. Which language intensity will be perceived better by voters and which character of the politician will be more trustworthy depend on how voters understand the economic conditions of their time. When the economic conditions were not well perceived by voters, the use of high intensity language would work better. Conversely, in more stable economic conditions the use of the low intensity language would serve better (cf. also Gregoire, 2016). In order to capture the very essence of each speech undertaken in this study, attempts were made to grasp their respective "central idea" (cf. Beebe & Beebe 2009: 31, 135) as the underlying thought of the speech and their "main ideas" as the key ideas making up the speech. For this purpose, the messages delivered by the texts were disclosed by means of the rhetorical techniques being used in the texts (cf. Leanne, 2010) as well the winning strategies (de Bruijn, 2016). They were then expressed in the new analytical narrative (cf. Krippendorff, 2004: 16-17). The rhetorical techniques (cf. Leanne, 2010) may be variously found, among other things, establishing common ground, speaking to audience concerns: winning heart and minds, conveying vision through personalization, personalized vision of ordinary people, denouncing and rejecting, participation and involvements, evoking event and/or iconic characters in the history, the use of resonating words/phrases from iconic figures in history, inspiring others to do great jobs, and ending up a speech by a crescendo tone to leave a lasting impression. Research Methods Qualitative content analysis was employed to analyze the two speeches systematically as the qualitative material. It sought to scrutinize the distinctive ways of how both presidential candidates got across their respective political thought and goals. The research went through successive procedures such as: determining the objects of investigation, setting up the reseach questions signposting the direction of the analysis of the texts, exploring, selecting, and collecting texts containing supporting information and evidence for the study. In such a research, the researcher had to have a full grasp of the context within which he studied the speeches. This approach required a close reading of the objects of investigation. Toward that direction, some interpretation was made in order to capture the essential meaning of both speeches (cf. Krippendorff, 2004: 16-30; cf. Schreier, 2013: 1-8, 30). Checking and rechecking processes in the analysis of the qualitative data were done as they were placed in interactive modes that allowed the process of validation leading to conclusion drawing and its verification (cf. Creswell, 2014, p. 201; cf. Miles & Hubberman 1994: 8-10). In addition, the researcher also employed two additional means of validation: clarify the bias and use peer debriefing (cf. Creswell, 2014, pp. 201-203). The first one, the researcher checked and rechecked that he produced only an honest account. The second one, the researcher benefitted some comments from a peer and senior debriefer to make the account of the research resonate well with readers other than the researcher. Data and Sources of Data The source of data for Trump's campaign rhetoric in the U.S. 2016 presidency was Trump's Republican nomination acceptance speech known in this research as RNCS (Trump, 2016). The prepared text was delivered on July 21, 2016 at the Republican National Convention held in Cleveland. Meanwhile, for Hillary Clinton's campaign rhetoric in the U.S. 2016 presidency, this research used her Republican nomination acceptance speech known as DNCS (Clinton 2016). The prepared text was delivered on July 28, 2016 at the Democratic National Convention held in Philadelphia. The data to get into Trump's and Clinton's campaign rhetoric were accessed by virtue

of the central ideas, the main ideas, and **the**　　　　　　　　　　　　　1

rhetorical techniques in the expression of the campaign rhetoric in their presidential nomination speeches. Data Analysis The sizes of the data were reduced by virtue

rhetorical techniques of each text (cf. Schreier, 2013, pp. 4, 30) to be expressed in the new analytical narratives.

both Trump's and Clinton's campaign rhetoric against the backdrop of the broader context of American politics (cf. Krippendorff, 2004, pp. 29, 30). To better interpret the data, the researcher also checked the accuracy of his account against both candidates' delivery of their respective speeches (cf. Trump, 2016b; Clinton, 2016b). Results Central Idea and Main Ideas of Trump's RNCS Trump started his speech focusing on his success in securing the political power as expressed in his grateful acceptance of the Republican nomination for the presidency of the United States. This would allow him well to enforce his winning frames (cf. de Bruijn, 2016). To be in common ground with his prospective voters, in the earlier part, he used the pronoun "we". By using the word "together" with his prospective voters, he further highlighted their promising milestone as the Republican was on the way towards replacing the ruling party in the White House in the U.S. 2016 presidential election. Trump used a 'metaframing' to represent a pessimistic, bleak picture of the realities of the nation in a moment of crisis (cf. Andrews et al, 2016). Following that, he underscored the use of the 'much smarter' and 'best people' frames (cf. de Bruijn, 2016) stating that only a candidate who grasped the situation would fit to save and lead the country. In this way, he was introducing himself as the right candidate who fitted properly to the frame. Using the citizens' familiarity with the alarming level of crisis in domestic affairs such as increasing violence, chaos, as well as mixed problems of illegal immigrants and crimes that had threatened peaceful citizens, he underscored his promised role as the next president who would put them all to an end. Trump personalized the example of crimes that threatened the peaceful life of citizens in the case of assassination brought about by illegal immigrant who put to an end of the life of a bright young student, Sarah: an obvious example of the failure of the existing Administration to protect its citizens. Some threats such as American trade deficit, the rising debt in the budget, the fallen infrastructures, and the staggering poverty among ordinary citizen were all used to show the bleak pictures of the realities across the country. Trump also disclosed instances of international humiliations that brought about America to suffer from some international disasters. His repetition of the phrase "(o)ne after another" was used to underscore such successive losses. The attack on the American Consulate in Libya that had caused casualties signified not only the unsafe lives of Americans overseas, but also a far less stable world. Trump used the rhetorical technique of denouncing and rejecting as he showed that this was attributable to the failure of Obama's foreign policies, especially with his appointment of Clinton as Secretary of State in his first term of presidential office. This became an effective weapon for Trump to attack Clinton who stood in the way as his opponent in the presidential election. He convinced that Clinton's legacy was not synonymous with the American legacy. Having stated the domestic and overseas disasters, he used the 'always winning' frame to underscore his determination to change the leadership of the nation. He was then ready to move forward with his 'always winning' and 'economy' frames as he made public his plan of action to put "America first". Safety was to be realized by reinforcing law and order at home. Prosperity would be created by economic reforms, new job opportunities, and new accumulated wealth to rebuild the country. Still using the rhetorical technique of denouncing and rejecting, Trump pointed out that Clinton was in favour

of the status-quo policies (cf. Gunawan, 2016a, b; 2017), toward which he strongly challenged to change by personalizing his arguments and vision to deliver better lives for neglected citizens, laid-off workers, and crying mothers. For them, Trump would become their voices. On account of the citizens' suffering due to the political system that was lacking and neglecting law enforcement, Trump entered politics and declared his will to fight. By means of 'better people' and 'always winning' frames, he declared as the only person who knew better of the system. Consequently, he was alone who knew how to fix it. He was going to fix the system for the common good of Americans. He used the occasion to introduce Governor Mike Pence of Indiana who became Republican Vice Presidential candidate. Trump's first plan of actions was to liberate the American citizens from crime, terrorism, and lawlessness. In the race for the White House, he stated his position as a candidate of Law and Order. He drove home his promise when he took the oath of office as the U.S. president, he would restore law and order across the country. He used the rhetorical technique of denouncing and rejecting as he criticized Obama's Administration that had failed America's inner cities on education, job, and crime. Following that, Trump insisted on his 'always winning' frame as he promised when he was sworn-in as the U.S. President, he would ensure to protect the safety at home and intensify the fight against a foreign ideology and the threat from outside the country. On immigration, he would suspend immigration from countries having strong ties with terrorism. Admission would only be given to individuals who respected American values. Immigration would have to serve the interest of all Americans, not producing lower income and higher unemployment. He mentioned the grievances of parents who lost their children by using personalized examples of three parents – Mary Ann Mendoza, Sabine Durden, and Jamiel Shaw – whose children were assassinated by illegal immigrants. These were used to show the failure of the existing Administration to protect them. In order to protect the safety of Americans from crimes such drugs, violence, and illegal immigration, Trump insisted on the importance of building the wall along the border. Trump would enforce controlled immigration, quite the opposite from the policy having been enforced since Clinton as Secretary of State. Using the plural second person pronoun "you", Trump used the direct style to address the American citizens who became the victims of Clinton's failed immigration policy. To abolish poverty among workers, Trump would seek to implement fair trade policies. By using best business people in the world and enacting the policy of making America first, he promised to make America rich again. New jobs would be created and companies were not allowed to relocate their factories overseas. Trump blamed Clinton mostly as the one responsible for having initiated the destruction of the middle class economy. He underscored his slogan to say no to bad trade deals that did not place America first. Unlike his opponent, Trump promised to reform the tax laws, regulations, and energy rules. He promised to implement the largest tax reduction ever been promised by any other presidential candidate. So, his 'economy' frame would result in jobs creating-economic activities. The new economic policies would generate more and more wealth to the nation; thus, creating higher life quality for all Americans and building more and better infrastructures. He promised to give help to parents to send their kids to better school of their choice and improve healthcare by repealing and replacing Obamacare. He would rebuild the American military and take better care of the veterans. He underscored his voters' participation and involvement as he insisted on Americans to start believing in themselves and in their country as America was coming back again as a stronger country again. He personalized his vision as he was stating his compliments for the strength that he had derived from his own family's support and legacies. Having been successful in business, he swore to undertake his mission for the betterment of his country. For that reason, he called for the participation and involvement of the America people to repeal the failed politics of the past. He pleaded his prospective voters to support him to become their champion in the White House. To leave a strong impression on the parts of his prospective voters, Trump used a crescendo in ending up his speech by asserting his bold determination to make America strong, proud, safe, and great again. In view of the new analytic

drawn: "It is about time to replace the ruling party in the White House that had created the bleak future of America, and start making America great again". Furthermore, the

Trump's RNCS yields the organization of the main ideas as follows: Table 1 Organization of the main ideas in Trump's RNCS OPENING 1 Acceptance of nomination BODY 2 Republican Party will lead the country back 3 The reasons why the Republican Party will lead the country back 4 Crises of the nation: domestic issues 5 Crises of the nation: the state of affairs abroad 6 Failed foreign policies under Clinton 7 Trump's plan of action: America first 8 First task: liberating the citizens from crime, terrorism, and lawlessness 9 Controlled immigration policy 10 America first in trade deals 11 Reforming tax laws 12 Making America bigger, better, and stronger again 13 Strength from family's support 14 Working for the country: breaking away from the petty politics of the past CLOSING 15 I'm with you to make America great again

colleague associations with outstanding figures were so important to show her own public reputation. To appear strong, but still grounded in American legacy, Clinton linked her campaign's slogan "stronger together" by evoking an important event in American history, whereby representatives of former thirteen colonies came to be unified the first time for a common purpose to move forward as one nation. Related to the decisive moment of reckoning in the U.S presidential election, she applied the rhetorical technique of people's participation and involvement as she called for the support of all Americans to work together for the better future of their nation. She used the rhetorical technique of 'denouncing and rejecting' as she reminded her supporters of her opponent's massive campaign of the bleak future of the realities that America was facing. To dismiss such fear, she borrowed a famous quotation from President Franklin Delano Roosevelt - a great political icon in American history, saying that "(t)he only thing we have to fear is fear itself." Therefore, she used the rhetorical technique of participation and involvement to underscore her plea for Americans to raise up against the challenge of their nation. Denouncing and rejecting one of Trump's agenda to build a wall along the borders; instead, she insisted on building a stronger economy that would work for everyone. Her immigration policy was open to citizenship for those who were contributing to the American economy. To fight against terrorism, she was determined to keep working with all American allies. In the domestic affairs, she pointed out that America was lacking in inequality and social mobility. However, with their enduring values: freedom, equality, justice, and opportunity, she reminded of the American strength that would enable them to keep fighting those challenges. Using the rhetorical technique of denouncing and rejecting her opponent, Clinton highlighted the strength of all Americans together to face all the challenges. She fired back Trump's statement in his previous RNCS in Cleveland that stated that he could alone fix the challenges ahead. She criticized that Trump was against the nation's spirit of togetherness as vested in the Constitution when he was boasting of the tyranny of power in the hands of one single person. She underlined that this was against her conviction that no one could totally work alone.

Against the backdrop of the slogan "stronger together", not only for her campaign but also for a guiding principle to build the nation to the future, with great confidence she declared her acceptance of the Democratic Party's nomination for the president of the U.S.A. To stress her common ground with every American, despite her previous long records of experience as former first lady, Senator, and Secretary of State, she insisted on starting all from a very humble beginning like most ordinary Americans. To make her vision more vivid, she personalized it in the lives of ordinary people. Citing the life of Anastasia Somoza, she pointed out her own fight for a better education. Citing some eyewitnesses such as Ryan Moore, Lauren Manning - victims and survivors of 9/11, Debbie St. John, she personalized her fight for the Children's Health Insurance Program. Clinton also highlighted a milestone as America nominated her as the first woman presidential candidate. She reminded the importance of the history that she and the people would be writing together. She owed to her Democratic predecessor's merit in having uplifted the economy. However, she convinced her voters not to be satisfied with the status quo. She called for America to keep ahead and stay ahead. She reminded that there were still some deep-seated problems since recession that could not have been overcome through recovery. For those reasons, some could have felt that they were left out and neglected. Therefore, in the spirit of the Democratic Party, in order to win her voters' heart and minds, she was speaking to her audience concerns: doing more to ensure that all Americans would have better lives. She highlighted that her goal as president would be to create more job opportunities, especially in some economically less lucky areas. She would demand more tax return from corporates that so far had not contributed to the country. She would keep working on comprehensive immigration reform to boost the economy and keep families together. To drive home some key issues of her political agenda and how America ought to be, she introduced them following the introductory clause "I believed" as many as eight times. Calling for people's participation and involvement, she reminded every American who shared such beliefs that her campaign was also theirs. She underscored her further call for the people's support as she also repeated six times the introductory clause "if you believe" to be followed by some of her important political goals for the nation. She promised to make the biggest investments in order to create more good jobs in her first one hundred days of office. Based on her long records in having passed laws, treaties, and having launched new programs, she pleaded Americans to give her a chance to execute her political goals in the White House. She put Trump's slogan "America first" into a question as he could not refrain himself from his private business interests, and "making America great again" simply means making things in America again. She underscored that America was in need of steady leadership: on the international level, a leader who knew that America was strong when working with its allies around the world; on the domestic level, a leader who knew how to keep the nation safe and care for veterans. She criticized that Trump was not apt to be the U.S. commander-in-chief as he failed to give due respect to the U.S. veterans at home. Neither would he be trusted with the nuclear weapon. Clinton highlighted that America's power required the good character of the commander-in-chief: it would not be someone who possessed an unsteady character like Trump, but she herself was the one who would deserve such a position. America had to heal the divides among themselves on many issues such as gun, race, immigration, and many others. She convinced Americans to work together to solve their nation's problems. They would have to dismiss the divisive rhetoric like insulting language practiced by Trump. Unlike Trump who offered just empty promises, Clinton was speaking to win the American people's hearts and minds as she convinced them to have bold agenda such as creating more security, more jobs, and better opportunity for young generation. They could create them all by working together. Nobody could work alone as Trump had boasted. She personalized her vision of the ordinary people by providing an anecdote of her own mother who kept encouraging her to fight for good. By so doing, she sent a message for all Americans together to move forward to make things better. She used a crescendo tone in ending up her speech to persuade voters to do great things. She reiterated the legacy in the story of America as their leaders came together the first time for the common purposes to make things

better for the next generation In view of the new analytic

"Americans should work together to keep ahead and stay ahead". Furthermore, the

DNCS yields the following list of the main ideas: Table 2 Organization of the main ideas in Clinton's NDCS OPENING 1a Greeting: audience 1b Greeting: whole family and friends/colleaques 1c Introducing vice president candidate 1d Acknowledging the contributing role of Bernie Sanders and his supporters BODY 2 America moves forward with the legacy of the founding fathers: stronger together 3 Facing the challenges of the future together 4 Acceptance for presidential nomination 5 A long record in public services started from humble beginnings to keep fighting for change 6 A milestone toward a more perfect union: a nomination of a woman for president 7 Writing a history together in the years ahead 8 Doing more to help Americans live better 9 Plea for people's support 10 Action plan for the biggest investment to create good-paying jobs 11 Keeping America safe and honoring the people who do it 12 Together to solve America's problems CLOSING 13 Facing the future with courage and confidence : be stronger together Essential components of Trump's campaign rhetoric in RNCS Agenda setting Trump asserted his political agenda to liberate the American people from crimes, terrorism, and lawlessness. His plan of actions was to put "America first". By such agenda, it would be mandatory that everything should be directed for the best interest of America, both at home and abroad. Trump would use smarter business people to tackle trade deals in order to accumulate more wealth to rebuild the nation to become great again. Safety would be reinforced by realizing law and order as preconditions for prosperity. His new economic policies would result in more dollars pouring into the country to improve the quality of the people's lives, create more jobs, and, new accumulated wealth to rebuild the country. Framing Trump framed his campaign rhetoric with the most threatening picture of the realities in America. Threats at home could be found such as crimes, terrorism, and violence that afflicted across the country; illegal immigrants with criminal records that were at large threatening the lives of peaceful citizens; poverty and unemployment that threatened minorities; budget deficit that left no improvement to broken infrastructures. In international affairs, the failed foreign policies had caused America to suffer from international humiliation and war. In Trump's argument, the failed foreign policies were attributed to the failed international policies of Obama's administration due to his appointment of Clinton as Secretary of States in his first term of presidential office. Character construction Against the bleak picture of the realities in America, Trump foregrounded his role as the only hero who had the capacity to rescue America from its threatening crises. Thus, he represented himself as the right figure who fitted properly to lead the nation. His definite plan of actions was to abolish poverty and violence at home and to tackle war and destruction abroad. He attacked his democratic rival, Clinton, as totally unfit to the ticket to the White House as she failed to grasp the bleak conditions of America. Trump did not give a credit to his opponent's former role as Secretary of State who proved to have caused America to suffer from international humiliation, war, and trade deficit. Trump also severely attacked her credibility on ground of her illegal e-mails stored on her private server as obstructing scrutiny into her crimes. Having been successful in business, Trump made known that his exclusive mission to enter into politics was to work for the country and fight for the common good of the American people. Emotional resonance The America's threatening crises both at home and abroad as underscored by Trump sounded powerfully to trickle the American prospective

voters' heart and minds (cf. Alter, 2016). Therefore, the crises became the strong reasons for his political agenda to change the national leadership in the White House. Trump's messages sounded more straightforward than Clinton's to the American voters. For laid- off factory workers and miners who became the victims of unfair trade deals, and those of Americans who felt neglected and abandoned, he declared himself available to become their voice. Trump's severe attack on the failed policies of the existing administration and the mandate to continue the ruling party in the figure of the status-quo presidential candidate Clinton gave more impetus to Trump's plan to put America first aimed to make America great again. Essential components of

Clinton's campaign rhetoric in DNCS **Agenda setting Clinton**   1

insisted on America to move forward and get ahead with the legacy of the nation's founding fathers: "stronger together". She reminded Americans of the same strength that would enable them to overcome the nation's challenges. She gave a credit to her democratic predecessor's success that she would continue. However, she also reminded Americans of some remaining deep-seated problems that could not have been overcome that would have to be addressed. She highlighted her goal as the next president to create more job opportunities, especially in some economically less lucky areas. She underscored her agenda such as creating more security, more jobs, and better opportunities for young generation. Following the democratic legacy of a strong sense of community, Americans were called to solve the nation's problems together. She convinced her prospective voters that nobody could work alone as Trump had boasted of. She would demand tax return from corporates that so far had not contributed to the country. She would keep working on comprehensive immigration reform to boost the economy and keep families together. She insisted on building a stronger economy that would work for everyone. Framing To appear strong, but still grounded in the American legacy, Clinton highlighted her campaign's slogan "stronger together": all Americans should work together to face all the nation's challenges. She dismissed Trump's statement in his previous RNCS in Cleveland that had stated that he could alone fix the challenges ahead. She presented her long record in public services to make herself better prepared to be the next president. Character construction Clinton showcased herself as a character who started from humble beginnings to keep fighting for change. She showed her position as a political figure who was backed up by strong family ties and colleague associations. She reminded that America was in need of steady leadership: on the international level, a leader who knew that America was strong when working with its allies around the world; on the domestic level, a leader who knew how to keep the nation safe and care for veterans. She attacked Trump's unsteady character who did not qualify him to be the U.S. commander-in-chief as he had failed to give due respect to the U.S. veterans at home; neither would he be trusted with the nuclear weapon. Instead, Clinton asserted herself as the one who would deserve such a position. She reminded the people of the importance of the history that she and the people would be writing together. Emotional resonance Clinton's tendency to use more language of low intensity stating everything from optimistic perspectives, quite different from Trump's, might have sounded less kicking to American voters (cf. Clementson, 2016). She reminded Americans of some remaining problems since recession that could not have been overcome through recovery and, therefore, needed a priority to address. She was speaking to her audience concerns: doing more to guarantee that all Americans would have better lives. She highlighted that her goal as president would be to create more job opportunities, especially in some economically less lucky areas. Discussion Trump's agenda presentation sounded much more kicking than Clinton's (cf.Alter, 2016). Trump was targeting to liberate the American people from crime, terrorism, and lawlessness which jeopardizing across the country. He was aiming to put America first, both at home and abroad. Clinton's agenda sounded less kicking as she

stressed more on America to keep ahead on top of her predecessor's achievement. The ways the messages of their respective lines of thought and political goals having been packed were significantly different. Trump was expressing lavishly the alarming crises that America was facing to the highest points of desperation about the American lives ahead. In this way, he foregrounded some sense of urgency as America was in a point of no return that prompted a change in the national leadership in the White House. This was exactly the kind of strategy applied by a candidate whose party was not the ruling party (cf. (cf. Mercieca, 2016; cf. Clementson, 2016). Meanwhile, Clinton was seeing the problems of the nation as some remaining deep-seated problems that could not have been overcome completely by Obama's administration. As a whole, in her political stand, she judged and praised that Obama's administration was successful. In addition of her long involvement in public positions, she also praised that she herself became a better person because of her friendship with him. On ground of Obama's successful administration, therefore, she convinced the American people to keep and stay ahead, and with the enduring strength of the American legacy, all Americans could work together to face and solve the remaining challenges, of which all sounded more a status-quo political thoughts and goals (cf. Gunawan, 2016a, b; 2017). The two presidential candidates' characters were laid bare to prospective voters to scrutinize. Coming from a successful business career to enter politics with a mission to secure America and made it great again, Trump declared that being "politically correct" was no longer important; neither was the deceptive rhetoric of the Democratic party. He insisted on being the only smarter guy who knew how to fix what was wrong in America (cf. Trump's seven winning strategies as cited by de Bruijn, 2016). He would insist on using the smarter people to back him up in his pursuit of America to become great again. Trump's seven winning strategies were assertively spelled out throughout his RNCS. Conversely, Clinton underscored her long career in public service to back up her candidacy. Unfortunately, she was under Trump's severe attack on her credibility for her broken policies in her former role as Secretary of States and her questionable case of keeping her private e-mail server while serving in a public office. Clinton directed her attack on Trump as he did not qualify as a steady leader, a would-be president who could be trusted for a position as Commander-in-chief. On ground of her long services in public offices, she claimed to be a more suited to such a position. Following the Democratic values that gave more weight on the role of the communities, she insisted on 'writing the history together" with the people as stated by the campaign slogan of the Democratic nomination as being "stronger together". In accordance with Sedivy's opinion (2016), on the one hand, Trump's depiction of the threatening picture of America was a strategy to foreground some sense of urgency. This allowed him to showcase his role as a hero to bring a solution to the crisis (cf. Mercieca, 2016; cf. Clementson, 2016). This was needed to assert the power by a new comer who aspired a position in the White House. Accordingly, this allowed him to foreground his capability to raise up the nation. Unlike Clinton who tended to use low intensity language – more restrained language, Trump's use of high intensity language and more direct language needed to get across his political goals and thought more conspicuously (cf. Clementson , 2016) . Therefore, Trump's rhetoric of America's threatening crises both at home and abroad became the strong reasons for his political goal to change the national leadership in the White House. Despite Clinton's denouncement and rejection of Trump who was threatening America massively, Trump represented himself as the right figure who fitted properly to the call to lead and rescue the nation (cf. Sedivy, 2016, cf. Mercieca, 2016; cf. Clementson, 2016). He highlighted his mission to abolish poverty and violence at home and to tackle war and American destruction abroad. Trump had a simpler , but clearer message than Clinton. Conclusion Following the analysis and discussion of Trump's and Clinton's presidential nomination acceptance speeches of 2016, several conclusions can be drawn: 1) The contrast between Trump's RNCS and Clinton's DNCS was well-noted in the light

frame, character construction, emotional resonance. 2) Trump argued how bad the realities in America were and Clinton failed to grasp them. Conversely, Clinton showed how good the realities were and Trump, her opponent, as a political newcomer was paranoid. These two different styles served to become the distinct scaffolding for the two candidates' rhetorical styles. 3) Trump's highlights of the threatening realities of America to be followed by the showcase of his capacity to tackle the issues sounded more resonating, especially as his RNCS was magnified by his winning strategies, of which the latter was less obvious in Clinton's DNCS. 4) Both Trump's RNCS and Clinton's DNCS skilfully incorporated some rhetorical techniques. Both also incorporated personalization in the expression of their visions by means of relevant anecdotes of the lives of ordinary people. In doing this research, the researcher was restricted to internet sources as his main access to the sources of information and relevant data of the study. In order to avoid some biases, the researcher examined carefully his narratives and made his best to produce only an honest description based on the data. In addition, he also made good use of a debriefer from the beginning of the researcher just to make sure to have a second opinion from a senior scholar who reviewed and gave candid assessment of the research draft.

References Alter, J. (2016). Seven reasons why Hillary Clinton lost and Donald Trump won. Retrieved from http://www.thedailybeast.com/articles/2016/11/14/seven-reasons-why-hillary clinton-lost-and-donald-trump-won.html Andrews, W., Lai, K.K.R., Mykhyalyshyn, I., and Parlapiano, A. (2016, July 26). 'Stronger Together' and 'I Am Your Voice' — How the nominees'convention speeches compare. Retrieved from https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2016/07/29/ us/elections/trump-clinton-pence-kaine- speeches.html?_r=0 Ayres, W. (Nov. 28, 2016). Threading the needle. Retrieved from http://www.usnews.com/ opinion/articles/2016-11-28/how-trump-lost-the-popular-vote-and-won-the-2016-election Barrett, M.A.(2016). Jeb Bush candidate announcement speech analysis. In Rhetorical Analyses of the Announcement Speeches of Presidential Hopefuls. Paper 8 http://digitalcommons.augustana.edu/rapres/8 Basten, Anna R. (2016). Clinton frames her campaign. Rhetorical Analyses of the Announcement Speeches of Presidential Hopefuls. http://digitalcommons.augustana.edu/rapres/10 Beebe, S. A. & Susan, J. B. (2009). Public Speaking Handbook, 7th edn. Boston: Pearson. Bernhard, L. (2012). Campaign strategy in direct democracy. Basingstoke: Palgrave Mcmillan. Charteris-Black, J. (2011). Politicians and rhetoric: The persuasive power of metaphor, 2nd edn. New York: Palgrave Macmillan. Clinton, H. R. (2016a, July 28). Hillary Clinton's DNC speech: full text. Retrieved from http://edition.cnn.com/2016/07/28/politics/hillary-clinton-speech-prepared-remarks-transcript/ Clinton, H. R. (2016b). Hillary Clinton's Full Presidential Nomination Speech at the 2016 DNC. Retrieved from https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ToS5Hn9CV-E Clementson, D. E.(2016b). Clinton vs. Trump: Whose acceptance speech hit the right note? Retrieved from http://edition.cnn.com/2016/07/28/politics/hillary-clinton-speech-prepared-remarks- transcript/ Creswell, J. W. (2014). Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches, 4th edn. Thousand Oaks, California: SAGE Publications. Culotta, Christina. (2016). Descriptive analysis of Bernie Sanders Announcement Speech. Rhetorical Analyses of the Announcement Speeches of Presidential Hopefuls. Paper 4. http://digitalcommons.augustana.edu/rapres/4 de Bruijn, H. (2016). Donald Trump's rhetoric: An analysis of his frames. Retrieved from http://www.tbm.tudelft.nl/en/current/latest-news/donald-trumps-rhetoric-an-analysis- of-his- frames Gregoire, C. (2016, March 31). A Surprising thing happens when presidential candidates use emotional language. Retrieved from http://www.huffingtonpost.com/entry/ Donald- trump- emotional-inflammatorylanguage_us_56e84b60e4b0860f99da8d3e Gunawan, S. (2016a).

Style of Obama's bid for the second term of the U.S. presidential office. Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences, Vol. 7 (1) S1, Jan. 2016, pp. 213-221. Gunawan, S. (2016b). A comparison of Obama's 2007 and Hillary Clinton's 2015 bids for presidency speeches. K@ta, Volume 18, Number 2, December 2016, pp. 56-62. Gunawan, S. (2017). Hillary Clinton's presidential campaign rhetoric: Making America whole again. Kasetsart Journal of Social Sciences, 38 (2017) 50-55. Huckle, B. (2017). Rhetoric techniques used by Clinton & Trump. Retrieved from https://secondnature.com.au/blog/the-rhetoric-techniques-of-clinton-and-trump/ Jordan, K.N. and Pennebaker, J.W. (2016, Aug. 1). Accepting the nomination: A comparison of the speeches of Trump and Clinton. Retrieved from https://wordwatchers.wordpress. com/2016/08/01/accepting-the-nomination-a-comparison-of-the-speeches-of-trump-and - clinton/ Krippendorff, K. (2004). Content Analysis: An introduction to its methodology. Thousand Oaks, California: SAGE Publication Leanne, S. (2010). Say it Like Obama and Win, Expanded edn. N.Y: McGraw Hill. Lucas, S. E. (2007). The Art of Public Speaking, 9th edn. New York: McGraw-Hill. Mercieca, J. (2016, July 22). The rhetoric of Trump's acceptance speech. Retrieved from http://www.houstonchronicle.com/local/gray-matters/article/Parsing-Trump-s-acceptance- speech-8403188.php Miles, M.B. & Hubberman, A.M. (1994). Qualitative Data Analysis. Thousand Oaks, California: SAGE Publications. Mueller, R.G. (2016). Chris Christie. Rhetorical Analyses of the Announcement Speeches of Presidenial Hopefuls.Paper 6.http://digitalcommons.augustana.edu/rapres/6 Schreier, M. (2013). Qualitative Content Analysis in Practice. Los Angeles: SAGE Publications. Sedivy, J. (Sept 09, 2016). How their rhetoric could doom Trump and Clinton. Retrieved from http://www.politico.com/magazine/story/2016/09/trump-clinton-rhetoric-reality-214233 Trump, D. (2016a). Full Text: Donald Trump's 2016 Republican National Convention Speech. Retrieved from abcnews.go.com/Politics/full-text-donald-trumps-2016-republican-national- convention/story?id=40786529 Trump, D. (2016b). Full Speech: Donald Trump - Republican National Convention. Retrieved from https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=4CVTuOyZDI0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15