CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

This chapter provides the results from the analysis of the research subject. It is divided into two main sections, which are finding and discussion.

4.1   Findings

There are 185 utterances which includes modality and attributive adjectives. There are also 21 highlighted comments found in the research. Those data are retrieved based on Los Angeles Times transcript and comments from Youtube streamed on August 31 ,2016. Those data are analyzed under the domain of Fairclough (1995) Critical Discourse Analysis. The first problem is revealing the ideology behind Donald J Trump's immigration speech through textual analysis of Fairclough (1995). The first analysis section occurs to use textual analysis which involves modality and attributive adjective as the main tool to analyze the text. The second one is revealing society's perspective based on Fairclough (1995) sociocultural analysis.

4.1.1   Textual Analysis

This step analyzes the properties of the text which is taken from subject transcribed speech. As previously mentioned, there are two focuses analyzed in this step, the identification of modality based on Naplan (2012), UYSD (2012) along with the classification of the modality (Griffiths, 2006). The other focus of this step is the identification of the lexical choice of the text, specifically the used

of attributive adjective decided by the subject according to Table **2.3** – Table **2.5** about feelings and personality adjectives by *Wikispace*. Those focuses are analyzed one by one and sorted in a table form.

After transcribing the speech of the subject, the writer found that there are 285 modal verbs, 4 modal expression, and 157 attributive adjectives in 185 utterances. Those result are analyzed related to the most prominent problems in the speaker's speech which include *open border policy/visa overstay, illegal immigrant criminal, and* his opponent of the presidential election, *Hillary Clinton*.

4.1.1.1 Modal Verbs

The first textual analysis involves the use of 285 modal verbs which include the 114 of *will* and *won't,* 59 *going to,* 65 are *can,* and *can't*, 17 *would* and *wouldn't,* 14 *have to*, 9 *should*, 7 *must*, 6 *could*, 2 *got to,* and 2 *may.*

In this research, the writer decided to only use 17 modal verbs for the analysis as the representative of the subject's perspective concerning the current immigration system in U.S.A. In order to achieve to perspective of the subject, the writer has conducted to screen the modal verbs which only contain the three main problems of the speech which are *open border policy/visa overstay, illegal immigrant criminal, and Hillary Clinton* as the main result of the research. Those modal verbs used are: a. *will,* b. *won't,* c. *going to,* d. *can*, e. *can't*, f. *would,* g. *wouldn't,* h. *should* and i. *could* for the last one. Those modal verbs are classified in the form of table and elaborated based on its meaning in the form of paragraph.

Table 4.1. Modal verbs

Excerpt	Modal Word	Types	Level	Utterance	Line
1	Will	Epistemic	Medium	14	34
2	Will	Deontic	Medium	36	86
3	Won't	Epistemic	Medium	10	21
4	Going to	Epistemic	Medium	149	327
5	Going to	Epistemic	Medium	150	329
6	Can	Deontic	Medium	43	103
7	Can	Deontic	Medium	130	287
8	Cannot	Deontic	Medium	27	68
9	Cannot	Deontic	Medium	99	213
10	Would	Epistemic	Low	95	202
11	Wouldn't	Epistemic	Low	118	262
12	Wouldn't	Epistemic	Low	120	266
13	Should	Deontic	Medium	117	258
14	Should	Deontic	Medium	152	334
15	Must	Deontic	High	164	365
16	Must	Deontic	High	165	368
17	Could	Epistemic	Low	25	63

Excerpt 1- Line 34

1 *"These are valid concerns expressed by decent and patriotic citizens from all*
2 *backgrounds, all over. We also have to be honest about the fact that not everyone*
3 *who seeks to join our country __will__ be able to successfully assimilate. Sometimes it's*
4 *just not going to work out. It's our right, as a sovereign nation to choose immigrants*
5 *that we think are the likeliest to thrive and flourish and love us."*

The modal found in this excerpt is will. Will is a modal verb, which, according to Naplan's theory in table 2.1, has the medium level of its category. Will in this sentence is used as the expression of the speaker towards the audience as the reminder of the prominent possibility which occurs to happen according to the speaker's perspective that assimilation is not going to properly work for everyone

in America as in phrase "<u>that not everyone</u> who seeks to join our country will be able to successfully assimilate." Therefore, it's considered as epistemic.

Excerpt 2- Line 86

1 *"No, she's only talking about families who come here in violation of the law. We*
2 ***will*** *treat everyone living or residing in our country with great dignity. So*
3 *important."*

   The second one is also *will*, which has medium level of modal verbs. In this excerpt, the subject uses *"she"* as the subject of the paragraph which is referring to Hilary Clinton on the previous utterance. *Will* in this case is considered different from the first one due to its use as duty based on the verb after the modal verb *will* which is *treat* in line 2 "...*We will treat everyone living or residing in our country with great dignity...*". Thus, it's classified as deontic on its modality term.

Excerpt 3- Line 21

1 *"Sadly, sadly there is no other way. The truth is our immigration system is worse*
2 *than anybody ever realized. But the facts aren't known because the media **won't***
3 *report on them. The politicians **won't** talk about them and the special*
4 *interests spend a lot of money trying to cover them up because they are making an*
5 *absolute fortune. That's the way it is."*

   The next modal is *won't*, a modal verb which is considered as the negative form of *will*. *Won't* is classified as the medium one of the modal verbs level. In this case, *won't* is used as a statement which contains certainty. Those certainty concern about the media and the politicians that possibly don't have any urge to reveal the condition of current immigration system in U.S.A which can be seen in line 3 "…*because the media won't report on them. The politicians won't talk about them…*". Due to its use as a statement for the term of certainty, it's considered epistemic modality.

Excerpt 4- Line 327

1 *"And Hillary Clinton is **going to** do nothing for the African- American worker, the*
2 *Latino worker. She's going to do nothing. Give me your vote, she says, on November*
3 *eighth. And then she'll say, so long, see you in four years. That's what it is."*

The next modal is *going to*. *Going to* has the similar meaning like *will*. Both

of them are modal verbs that is used to any occasion which is happened in the future.

Nevertheless, there are slight differences among them. *Going to* is considered as

prior plan which is pictured long way to the past or current evidence to support the

future prediction, but will is not and it is considered as rapid decision (now). Despite

from the slight differences, *going to* has the same element as will in the matter of

level of modality, which is classified as medium. In this case, *going to* is used as

possibility of the effect to happen. It's hardly believed that Hilary Clinton will make

a drastic positive change upon the unfair African-American and Latino worker. As

it concerns with possibility, it's classified as epistemic.

Excerpt 5- Line 329

1 *"She is **going to** do nothing. And just look at the past. She's done nothing. She's*
2 *been there for 35 years. She's done nothing. And I say what do you have to lose?*
3 *Choose me. Watch how good we're **going to** do together. Watch."*

In this excerpt, *going to* is also occurred to be used. It's similar from the

previous one which has certainty in the content. But the intention is more likely

explicit. Hereby, Donald Trump stated that Hilary has been doing nothing for the

past 35 years of her position as the part of Obama's administration concerning

immigration system and that will be possible to happen in more occasion in the

future. He explicitly suggests that by giving him the vote on 8th November. The

immigration system's obstacle will be immediately resolved. Due to its content has

the relevance to certainty, it's considered epistemic as well.

Excerpt 6- Line 103

1 *" This includes her plan to bring in 620,000 new refugees from Syria and that*
2 *region over a short period of time. And even yesterday, when you were watching*
3 *the news, you saw thousands and thousands of people coming in from Syria. What*
4 *is wrong with our politicians, our leaders if we* **can** *call them that. What the hell*
5 *are we doing?"*

The next modal analyzed is *can*, *can* is a modal verb which is categorized

into the medium level of modality. *Can* in this excerpt has the meaning as the

speaker's ability to satire the *leaders* mentioned of their capability to organize the

immigration system which is considered mistaken by the speaker as in quote "*...*

our leaders if we can call them that…" . As its modal verb meaning concerns about

the speaker's ability. It is categorized as deontic.

Excerpt 7- Line 287

1 *" If people around the world believe they* **can** *just come on a temporary visa and*
2 *never, ever leave, the Obama-Clinton policy, that's what it is, then we have a*
3 *completely open border, and we no longer have a country."*

The modal used in this excerpt is *can* as well, which is considered as

medium level of modal verb. It is used as deontic concerning the ability of illegal

immigrants <u>to come and go</u> as they only have their visa for their permission to stay

in U.S.A. The speaker believes that by their ability to stay temporary with visa

brings U.S.A into the terms "no longer a country".

Excerpt 8- Line 68

1 *" While there are many illegal immigrants in our country who are good people,*
2 *many, many, this doesn't change the fact that most illegal immigrants are lower*
3 *skilled workers with less education, who compete directly against vulnerable*
4 *American workers, and that these illegal workers draw much more out from the*
5 *system than they can ever possibly pay back.*

6 *And they're hurting a lot of our people that* **cannot** *get jobs under any*
7 *circumstances.But these facts are never reported.Instead, the media and my*
8 *opponent discuss one thing and only one thing, the needs of people living here*
9 *illegally. In many cases, by the way, they're treated better than our vets."*

The next modal is *cannot*, *cannot* is the negative form of *can*. It is considered as medium modal verb which in this case is used by the speaker to emphasize American workers who are not treated properly and also unable to get jobs due to the effect of competition against illegal immigrants with lower performance as quote in line 6 "*And they're hurting a lot of our people that cannot get jobs under any circumstances…*". Similar to the positive form, *cannot* also contains ability element inside its meaning which can be claimed that this modal use is deontic.

Excerpt 9- Line 213

1   "*Number six, we are going to suspend the issuance of visas to any place*
2   *where adequate screening **cannot** occur.*"

The second *cannot* as modal verb occurs to be used in a sarcastic way by the speaker's for telling the citizen of U.S.A that there are still many places in regards of administration especially visa matters, have low performance. The speaker stated implicitly that adequate screenings are hard to be found in U.S.A. The capabilities to get it organized is still not enough. As its modal purpose has relevance to the ability or performance by the administration, it's considered as deontic as the previous one.

Excerpt 10- Line 202

1   " *Clinton's plan **would** trigger a constitutional crisis unlike almost anything we*
2   *have ever seen before. In effect, she **would** be abolishing the lawmaking powers of*
3   *Congress in order to write her own laws from the Oval Office. And you see what*
4   *bad judgment she has. She has seriously bad judgment.*"

In this excerpt, the speaker portrays the possibility of what comes next through Hilary Clinton's plan concerning the administration of the border by using *would* as the modal verb. *Would* is categorized as the lowest level of modality.

Therefore, the speaker expresses his perspective towards Clinton's plan with the lowest expectation which is about triggering the congress and the Oval office as in line 2 mentions *"…In effect, she would be abolishing the lawmaking powers of Congress in order to write her own laws from the Oval Office…"*. The speaker also decided in expanding his expectation of Clinton's plan becomes reality which is likely to happen that Clinton would change the law of congress with her own desire. Due to this sort of problem in this excerpt mostly discussing about the possibility, it's considered epistemic indeed.

Excerpt 11- Line 262

1   *"According to a report for the Boston Globe from the year 2008 to 2014 nearly*
2   *13,000 criminal aliens were released back into U.S. communities because their*
3   *home countries **would** not, under any circumstances, take them back. Hard to*
4   *believe with the power we have. Hard to believe."*

The next one is *would not*, a negative form of *would*, categorized as low modality which is used by the speaker as a way to state the fact that 13,000 criminal aliens were released and remained in U.S due to their origin country weren't able to take them in their custody. The speaker feels disappointed U.S has great power to reject their policy, but U.S government didn't do anything according to him. Instead of being seen as a strong country, the speaker sees U.S otherwise. In this case, the *would not* has the purpose to engage possibility meaning due to the modal verb is the past form of *will*. It's concerning possibility of occasion to happen beforehand as the line *take them back* portrayed. Therefore, it's epistemic.

Excerpt 12- Line 266

1   *"These 13,000 release occurred on Hillary Clinton's watch. She had the power and*
2   *the duty to stop it cold, and she decided she **would** not do it."*

The next one is *still wouldn't* in which the modal verb is categorized as low modality and in this concern, it's considered as deontic due to its excerpt main meaning about the duty that is considered Clinton's responsibility for having the position to do anything regarding the criminal aliens. In this case, the speaker expresses his great disappointment upon Clinton for not doing her duty properly.

Excerpt 13- Line 258

1   *"The result of her misconduct was the release of thousands and thousands of*
2   *dangerous criminal aliens who **should** have been sent home to their countries.*
3   *Instead we have them all over the place. Probably a couple in this room as a matter*
4   *of fact, but I hope not.".*

Another modal verb that can be found in this excerpt is *should*, *should* in this case is a modal verb that is categorized as deontic including its medium level. The speaker uses this particular modal verb as a way to express anger towards Clinton's policy that makes many criminals wandering around in U.S instead of using the country's ability to deport them to their origin country. The speaker also exaggerated this matter by saying "*Probaby a couple in this room as a matter of fact, but I hope not*" as a way to emphasize deeper satire.

Excerpt 14- Line 334

1   *"To avoid this happening in the future, I believe we **should** sunset our visa laws so*
2   *that Congress is forced to periodically revise and revisit them to bring them up to*
3   *date. They're archaic. They're ancient. We wouldn't put our entire federal budget*
4   *on auto pilot for decades, so why **should** we do the same for the very, very complex*
5   *subject of immigration?"*

The next modal verb is also *should.* This modal is also categorized deontic as the speaker decided to use this modal verb to suggest the obligation that is supposed to be done with keen and constant revision on each immigration admission to bring it up to date instead of letting the same procedure without

constant revision. The speaker also conducted a query quote which is *"…so why should we do the same for the very, very complex subject of immigration…?"* in order to make up the audience mind to agree with him.

Excerpt 15- Line 365

1 *"Right now, however, we're in the middle of a jobs crisis, a border crisis and a*
2 *terrorism crisis like never before. All energies of the federal government and the*
3 *legislative process **must** now be focused on immigration security. That is the only*
4 *conversation we should be having at this time, immigration security. Cut it off."*

Another modal verb which can be found is *must*. *Must* is categorized as a modal verb with high level of modality. *Must* is related to necessity in terms of its meaning. In this case, the speaker uses *must* to state a particular problem which is immigration security that is necessary to be focused on as in line 3 which is "*….all energies of the federal government and the legislative process must now be focused on immigration security…"*. Due to it is related to necessity for the modal verb meaning, it's considered as deontic.

Excerpt 16- Line 368

1 *"Whether it's dangerous materials being smuggled across the border, terrorists*
2 *entering on visas or Americans losing their jobs to foreign workers, these are the*
3 *problems we **must** now focus on fixing. And the media needs to begin demanding to*
4 *hear Hillary Clinton's answer on how her policies will affect Americans and their*
5 *security."*

The next one is *must* as well. Related to the previous excerpt, the speaker decided to use the same modal verb in order to emphasize more on the necessary things to be concerned which is the immigration system previously mentioned. *Must* here is also used as deontic due to its similar meaning which is necessity along with its high level of modality.

Excerpt 17- Line 63

1 *"On top of that, illegal immigration costs our country more than $113 billion*
2 *dollars a year. And this is what we get. For the money we are going to spend on*
3 *illegal immigration over the next 10 years, we **could** provide 1 million at-risk*
4 *students with a school voucher, which so many people are wanting."*

In this excerpt, *could* is found as the modal verb which is used by the speaker. *Could* is classified as possibility or certainty for its meaning within its low level of modality. The speaker uses this modal to comment upon the fact that illegal immigration has cost U.S $113 billion dollars a year and suggest that the fund was possible to be used for other important matters such as school voucher for student with more needs in regards of their education. Noticing its use as probability or certainty for something that can be happened in the past. It's claimed as epistemic.

4.1.1.2 Modal Expression

The second textual analysis involves the use of 6 modal expressions according to USYD (2012) on table **2.2**. Those modality are divided into 2 *want* which express *inclination,* a modal adverb *constantly* which expresses *usuality,* a modal adverb *permanently* which expresses *usuality*, *often* which expresses *usuality* and never which expresses *usuality* as well.

In this research, the writer decided to only use one of each potential modal for the analysis as the representative of the object's perspective concerning the current immigration system in U.S.A as well. Those modal are classified in the form of table and elaborated based on its meaning in the form of paragraph.

Table 4.2 Modal expression

Excerpt	Modal Word	Types	Level	Paragraph	Line
18	Want	Inclination	High	45	107
19	Want	Inclination	High	52	121

20	Constantly	Usuality	High	35	84
20	Permanently	Usuality	High	35	85
21	Often	Usuality	Medium	114	249
22	Never	Usuality	High	124	270

Excerpt 18- Line 107

1 *"And do you notice all the time for weeks and weeks of debating my plan, debating,*
2 *talking about it, what about this, what about that. They never even mentioned her*
3 *plan on immigration because she doesn't **want** to get into the quagmire. It's a tough*
4 *one, she doesn't know what she's doing except open borders and let everybody come*
5 *in and destroy our country by the way."*

In this statement, the speaker decided to use *want* which can be defined as

a modal word expressing inclination with high level of modality. The speaker uses

this modal word to prove that his opponent, Hilary Clinton never mentioned

immigration system as a major problem in U.S. He implies that Clinton never had

the urge to get herself into the complicated matters which can be seen on line 3 *"she*

doesn't want to get into the quagmire".

Excerpt 19- Line 121

1 *"Above and below ground sensors. Towers, aerial surveillance and manpower to*
2 *supplement the wall, find and dislocate tunnels and keep out criminal cartels and*
3 *Mexico you know that, will work with us. I really believe it. Mexico will work with*
4 *us. I absolutely believe it. And especially after meeting with their wonderful,*
5 *wonderful president today. I really believe they **want** to solve this problem along*
6 *with us, and I'm sure they will… ."*

Hereby, the speaker uses another *want* in order to elaborate his plan

concerning the criminal cartels to sneak inside U.S community. The speaker

emphasizes his plan with this modal expressing *inclination* by referring the

Mexican people which he believes that they have the same purpose with him in

immigration matters as in line 6 "*... . I really believe they want to solve this problem along with us, and I'm sure they will*".

Excerpt 20- Line 84 & 85

1 *"Nothing even comes a close second. Hillary Clinton, for instance, talks **constantly***
2 *about her fears that families will be separated, but she's not talking about the*
3 *American families who have been **permanently** separated from their loved ones*
4 *because of a preventable homicide, because of a preventable death, because of*
5 *murder."*

     Constantly is a modal adverb which is taken from the modal word *constant*. It expresses usuality and entitled with high level of modality. The speaker uses such term in order to simply counter Hillary Clinton's fear if immigration system change is implemented that *"families will be separated"*. Nonetheless, the speaker countered its statement by giving the fact that many American families have already been *permanently* separated from their loved ones due to the current policy which are caused by crimes of the illegal immigrants doing. The counter statement itself uses *permanently* which has more weight than *constantly* as *permanent* means *won't change* forever.

Excerpt 21- Line 249

1 *"And by the way, the results are horrific, horrific. There are **often** terrible*
2 *consequences, such as Casey Chadwick's tragic death in Connecticut just last year.*
3 *Yet despite the existence of a law that commands the Secretary of State to stop*
4 *issuing visas to these countries."*

     The next one is the use of *often*. *Often* is classified as a modal which expresses *usuality* similar to modal adverb *constantly* and *permanently*. Although their type is similar, *often* has medium level of its modality class. The speaker uses this *usuality* type of modal in order to indicates the result of releasing criminals

back to U.S community. In addition to the statement, he implies *some* of the result with a sample of a case involving Casey Chadwick's as the victim of the policy according to his perspective.

Excerpt 22- Line 270

1   *"Number eight, we will finally complete the biometric entry-exit visa tracking*
2   *system which we need desperately. For years Congress has required biometric*
3   *entry-exit visa tracking systems, but it has never been completed. The politicians*
4   *are all talk, no action, **never** happens. **Never** happens."*

The last analysis of modal expression uses *never*. This modal refers to *usuality* for its type. *Never* also refers to high level of modality of its class. The speaker conducted to use this modal as a disappointment relating to the *entry-exit visa tracking* which has not been completed by the government. He implies that the politicians haven't done their job in spite of the problem. *Never* here also indicates the same meaning as *permanently* which means can't be changed, yet it is considered negative for this case rather than *permanently* which has neutral meaning. The speaker also use the same modal expression in this case in order to emphasize his statement as in line 3 and 4 says "…*The politicians are all talk, no action, **never** happens. **Never** happens."*

4.1.1.3 Adjectives

The third textual analysis involves the use of 157 attributive adjectives in 185 utterances. Those attributive adjectives concerning the positive and negative meaning towards the perspective of the speaker. Due to the occasion that let the writer screen the use of adjectives and its frequency related to those three elements

mentions in the speech (open border, illegal immigrant criminal, and Hillary Clinton) in order to reveal the speaker perspective concerning of immigration system, those adjectives have been narrowed into 27 attributive adjectives.

Those adjectives are including the use of positive ones such as 8 *good* followed by the negative ones which stand for 3 *weak,* 7 *dangerous,* 4 *bad,* and 5 *horrible*.

In this research, the writer decided to only use one of each potential adjective for the analysis as the representation of the speaker's perspective which has meaning prominent upon each statement in context. Those attributive adjectives are classified in the form of table and elaborated based on its meaning in the form of paragraph.

Table 4.3 Adjectives

Excerpt	Adjective Word	Types (✔)			
		Personality	**Feelings**	**Positive**	**Negative**
23	Weak	✔	_	_	✔
24	Dangerous	✔	_	_	✔
25	Good	_	✔	✔	_
26	Bad	_	✔	_	✔
27	Horrible	✔	_	_	✔

Excerpt 23- Line 45

1 *"This includes incredible Americans like 21year old Sarah Root. The man who*
2 *killed her arrived at the border, entered Federal custody and then was released into*
3 *the U.S., think of it, into the U.S. community under the policies of the White House*
4 *Barack Obama and Hillary Clinton. **Weak**, **weak** policies. **Weak** and foolish*
5 *policies."*

The first analysis of the attributive adjective is *weak*. *Weak* is an adjective that is categorized as personality adjective with negative meaning due to it modifies the *policies* as noun. This word is used by the speaker to state a criminal case that happened to a young girl named Sarah Root that was killed by an illegal immigrant under the policy of Obama and Hillary Clinton. As a way of expressing anger and disappointment towards <u>the incapability of the *policies*</u>, the speaker negatively comments upon the policy by using *weak*. The word is also used in rows of the line in order giving more emphasis in regards of what happened to the victim.

Excerpt 24- Line 93

1 *"President Obama and Hillary Clinton support sanctuary cities. They support*
2 *catch and release on the border. they support visa overstays. They support the*
3 *release of **<u>dangerous, dangerous, dangerous,</u>** criminals from detention. And, they*
4 *support unconstitutional executive amnesty."*

The second analysis uses *dangerous* as the attributive adjective. *Dangerous* is classified as personality adjective as well concerning the use to modify the noun *criminals* with negative meaning. The speaker in this statement decided to use *dangerous* as the adjective because of the case mentioned like Sarah Root and others that happened to be the victim of criminals with illegal status. In this statement, the speaker try to enlist the fact that Hillary supports sanctuary, visa overstays and other policy that makes the number of criminal case increased in U.S.

Excerpt 25- Line 177

1 *"And put more of them on the border instead of behind desks which is **<u>good</u>**. We*
2 *will expand the number of border patrol stations significantly."*

The third one is *good*. *Good* is a common adjective which is classified in this case as feelings adjective with positive meaning. *Good* in this case is used to modify the speaker's own statement and plan to overcome the problem happening

in the border which he thinks is a great idea to put more patrols there instead of putting men behind the desk.

Excerpt 26- Line 200

1 *"Clinton's plan would trigger a constitutional crisis unlike almost anything we have*
2 *ever seen before. In effect, she would be abolishing the lawmaking powers of*
3 *Congress in order to write her own laws from the Oval Office. And you see what*
4 ***bad*** *judgment she has. She has seriously **bad** judgment."*

The fourth analysis is concerning adjective *bad*. Bad in this statement is a negative adjective that portrays the speaker's feelings towards the judgement which will be made by Hillary Clinton if she won the vote. The speaker expresses his feeling by elaborating the effect of Hillary's plan that would possibly cause constitutional crisis and make her own laws. The speaker also intends to emphasize his negative perspective related to the *bad* adjective which is used two times in a row on the same line.

Excerpt 27- Line 42

1 *"Countless Americans who have died in recent years would be alive today if not for*
2 *the open border policies of this administration and the administration that causes*
3 *this **horrible, horrible** thought process, called Hillary Clinton."*

The last analysis of the attributive adjective uses *horrible*. *Horrible* is considered as a negative personality adjective due to the statement conducted by the speaker. The speaker stated that many lives has thrown away in vain due to Hillary Clinton's administrative policy in U.S. Horrible in this excerpt is used as an adjective that modifies Hilary Clinton through other phrase use like "*horrible, horrible*" phrase. Therefore, the speaker is on purpose to mock Hillary as *horrible* agent.

4.1.1.4 The use of Modal and Adjective in Statements

The last textual analysis involves the use of modality and adjectives in the same statements. It includes the use of *adjective* and *modal verbs*, then followed by *modal expression* along with *adjectives*. The data are elaborated in the form of sentences.

1. **Adjective and Modal Verb**

   *"The result of her misconduct was the release of thousands and thousands of **dangerous** criminal aliens who **should** have been sent home to their countries. Instead we have them all over the place. Probably a couple in this room as a matter of fact, but I hope not."* (line 255)

This sample involves the use of modal verb *should* which in this is categorized as deontic with medium level of modality and portrayed in means of duty. An adjective *dangerous* is also found in the sample which classifies its negative personality type. It is used to modify the noun *criminal aliens*. The combination of the sample portrays the duty by using *should* of deporting the noun which is *criminal aliens* by using the *dangerous* adjective, in which it gives more deep intention of how should the system works according to the speaker.

2. **Modal Expression and Adjective**

   *"I've had a chance to spend time with these **incredible** law enforcement officers, and I **want** to take a moment to thank them. What they do is **incredible**."* (line 179)

The last sample involves modal expression *want* which indicates inclination with high level of modality along with the adjective *incredible* which is categorized positive personality adjective. This sample concerns about the gratitude of the speaker upon the *incredible* law enforcement that had served the country in a proper way especially to U.S community relating to immigration system. It is a duty that

needs to be prioritized to thank of what they did, so the speaker decided to use *want* as modal expression which has high level of modality.

4.1.2 Sociocultural Analysis

Sociocultural analysis as one of the dimensional approach according to Fairclough (1995) focuses on the effect towards society or any responses in regards of the speech decided by the speaker. As for the research, this analysis are based on YouTube comments which is limited from the upload date, August 31st 2016 live until the election day on November 8th 2016. The analysis also focuses on the representative data that has been highlighted since the video speech uploaded. The researcher found 21 highlighted comments from Youtube which consists of 14 positive comments and 7 negative comments. Those are elaborated in the form of paragraph.

Excerpt 28 – Positive Comment of Jason K

1 *"I honestly can't understand how any proud American could possibly not agree*
2 *with what Trump said in this speech. Why would any American not want an America*
3 *that puts Americans first?"*

The commenter in figure 4.1 represents 65 people leaving their opinion in the comment section as the one of the positive responses. Since the daily news talks about some of the American people disagree with the speaker's plan to fix America such as line 1 *"I honestly can't understand how any proud Americans could possibly not agree with Trump… ."* The commenter give a positive comment that has intention to defend the speaker's perspective which he claims the possibility of some of the people not agree with it. The commenter supports his opinion by his

logical questioning the mentioned *proud Americans* with sentence *"Why would any American would not want an America that puts America first?"*.

Excerpt 29 – Positive Comment of Yael Ra

1 *"The adolescent comments and the pathetic accusations of 'racist/kkk/Hitler'*
2 *should let you know how terrific this speech was. It's a speech made by a*
3 *president!."*

The second commenter in figure 4.2 represents 48 people leaving their opinion as one of the positive responses as well. Many of the U.S society view the speaker's speech has the element of racism because it talks illegal immigrant and explicitly satire other nations such as Syria and Mexico. Nevertheless, according to Yael RA it has not been done in any racist purpose. It talks about the system that should be tightened for other nations to join the U.S community as a fairness for America. The commenter also believes redundantly that the speaker suits the best to be the president by saying *"it's a speech made by a president!"*

Excerpt 30- Negative Comment of Kwality Kontrol

1 *"He talks to his followers like they're stupid... Oh wait"*.

The third commenter in figure 4.3 gives a different response with other 30 people which is considered negative. The commenter disagrees with the speaker's perspective because he thinks the speaker's speech is only intended to give what the audience wants to hear by using the line *"He talks to his follower like they're stupid… oh wait"*. From the line itself, the interpretation of the commenter also can be seen as rude satire with soft tone to the speaker's follower by emphasizing the

word *stupid*. It is proved after the *stupid* word he added the phrase *oh wait* which

he thinks by means that *they really are stupid*.

Excerpt 31 – Negative Comment of Charles

1   *"What a hateful, RACIST JACKASS. He is a national disgrace"*

The fourth commenter with other 11 people also leaves a negative response to the speech. Similar to figure 4.2 matters, which talks about the speech has element racism. The commenter thinks that the whole speech given to the audience was unfortunately a plan that should be disagreed with. It can be portrayed from its hard tone as the line says *"What a hateful, RACIST JACKASS. He is a national disgrace"*. From the line itself, it can be seen the disappointment upon the speaker with the rude word *JACKASS*

4.2   Discussion

This section particularly elaborates the answer for the problems of the study by using the analysis displayed in the previous section which is finding and analysis. In this research, the main subject of the analysis is the political perspective taken from speaker's speech and the effect towards the audience's own perspective upon the speaker's ideology by applying critical discourse analysis (CDA) of Fairclough (1995;1996) and screen into only two of the three dimensional approaches of analysis; textual analysis in which this research focuses on the analysis based on modality and attributive adjective , and sociocultural analysis in which taken from commenters of social media, Youtube.

According to Griffiths (2006), modality is about grouping the meaning based on the notion of necessity and possibility. Due to the research subject is considered political campaign speech, modal verbs and modal expression use are prominent and important whereas those two elements mentioned in Griffiths related. Therefore, seeking the object's perspective suits the use of modal verbs and modal expression along with the level of each modal mentioned by the speaker. In

order to meet the result of the analysis, Naplan (2012) and USYD (2012) are used in this research for the main parameter of textual analysis.

Textual analysis portrays that over 285 modal verbs which are found in the transcribe speech, there are 17 prominent modal verbs as representatives of the main subject. Those 17 modal verbs include eight epistemic and nine deontic. Griffiths (2006) differs modality into two types which epistemic mainly related to the level of truth value of proposition signifies probability. Meanwhile, deontic prefers to the speaker's attitude, the general idea of the idea proposition based on its meaning constraint as *duty, permission* or ability.

Eight epistemic modality identified in the text only consist of four medium modality that includes *will* (paragraph 14), *won't* (paragraph 10), going to (paragraph 148) and going to (149). Meanwhile, four low modality are also spotted in the text which consists of *would* (paragraph 94), *wouldn't* (paragraph 117), *wouldn't* (paragraph 119). And *could* (paragraph 25). According to Griffith (2006) the use of medium modality has the likelihood of probability for the occasion to happen rather than low modality. The speech subject of this study is conducted for a purpose of political campaign. In order to overcome the concern of convincing audiences, presenting each idea in proper ways are necessary. As for this case, the choice of modal verbs on every context is one of the important things matters to convey the ideology.

On the other hand, nine deontic modality identified in the text consist of two high modality that include *must* (paragraph 163), and *must* (paragraph 164) followed by seven medium modality that include *will* (paragraph 36)*, can*

(paragraph 43), *can* (paragraph 129)*, cannot* (paragraph 27)*, cannot* (paragraph 98), *should* (paragraph 116)*, and should* (paragraph 151). Those deontic modality are used to convey the speaker's idea about the *duty* and *ability* in order to overcome the *visa* issues and *dangerous illegal criminals*.

There are also three concerns which enhance the speaker's ideology in this research related to epistemic modality and deontic modality. For, the opinion of the speaker that portrays persuasion upon audience to be realistic about <u>not everyone can assemble with assimilation entirely</u> and the idea of prioritizing U.S than others as in excerpt 1 by using *will*. Second, the speaker decided to state the worse circumstances happening in U.S concerning immigration system in which immigrants' delicacy to use temporary visa as in excerpt 7 by using can. Nevertheless, the speaker's strike down on his rival, Hillary Clinton which he believes is not capable of improving the <u>condition of African-American worker</u>.

The other is six modal expressions found in this research. Those modal expressions include two types which are high and medium according to (UYSD, 2012). The high level involves two *want* (inclination), modal adverb *constantly* (usuaility), *permanently* (usuaility), *never* (usuaility). As for medium one is *often* (usuaility). Hereby, the speaker conducts similar opinion regarding visa and the incapabilities of Hillary Clinton to overcome the problem with a slight difference matters such as the consequences of visa issues that results the leash of dangerous criminal taking family members in U.S as in excerpt 21 by using medium modal expression *often* (usuality).

Moreover, 27 representatives of attributive adjectives are also used in this research to convey the speaker's ideology and persuasion upon the audience. Those attributive adjectives consist of the use of 8 positives that include *good,* followed by 19 negatives which stand for 3 *weak*, 7 *dangerous*, 4 *bad*, and 5 *horrible*. Those attributive adjectives are also used for the concerns mentioned previously such as *immigration policy, dangerous criminal,* and Hillary Clinton as the rival of the speaker. For instance, excerpt 24 which mainly talks about the policy that took the life of Sarah Root by using *weak* (negative personality adjective). The emphasis of this particular adjective can be noticed from its use in a row on a statement. The same case happened with the adjective *dangerous*. *Dangerous* is also used in a row to give more emphasize for the audience due to the incapability of current policy concerning immigration system.

Furthermore, 21 highlighted Youtube comments are also found in the research as responses of the audiences. Those responses are considered as form of the speaker's speech effect towards the society (Fairclough, 1995). The majority of the commenters are likely to agree with the idea delivered by the speaker. It can be seen from the majority of 14 positive comments. For instance, commenter of figure 4,1 that represents 65 people trusting the speaker capability to put U.S forward than other countries in regards of prosper. However, 7 negative amounts of comments are also found in Youtube. The majority of the negative commenters mainly disagree with the speaker's idea to overcome the immigration policy because of likelihood to trigger racism to happen in U.S. The example of the negative

comments can be seen from figure 4.4 that represents 11 people with similar idea upon the policy.

In comparison to sociocultural analysis extracted from the comments, the majority of the responses are more positive rather than negative. The society of U.S can be considered to agree with the speaker's perspective upon the immigration system found in the analysis which mainly discussed about the *open border policy*, *dangerous immigrant criminals*, and incapability of *Hilary Clinton* to solve the problems. It is also supported by success of the speaker, *Donald Trump*, elected on the past 8th November 2016 as the new president of the U.S with excellence of 3 % over his rival, *Hillary Clinton*.

Related to the previous study, the researcher found similarities among the present research and the previous studies. Overall, the present research and the previous research analyzed the existence of ideology and perspective can be spotted by using Fairclough (1995;1996) CDA theory which consists of three-dimensional approach; textual analysis, discursive practice, and sociocultural analysis. However, the approach and methods used between present research and the previous research is slightly different. Fauzan (2014) focuses on using the whole three-dimensional approach without leaving the discursive practice on the research. He also focuses on complex grammatical order for the textual analysis unlike the present study focuses on the use of modality and attributive adjective. Nevertheless, both of the studies reveal the perspective or ideology contained in the text.