

Authority and Evaluation as Strategies of Legitimization in Trump's Public Speeches

Sadiq Abdulameer Raheem
Faculty of Arts, University of Kufa
sadiqa.alsalman@student.ukufa.edu.iq

Asst. Prof. Dr. Azhar Hussain Obied.
Faculty of Arts, University of Kufa
azhar.abbas@uokufa.edu.iq

Abstract:

This study is concerned with utilizing CDA to analyze and identify the main strategies of legitimization in D. Trump's public speech. As such, this study aims to (1) find out legitimization strategies processed in Trump's public speech, (2) pinpoint the evaluation and authority legitimization strategies in Trump's public speech. To achieve the aims of the study and test its hypotheses, the following procedure is followed: (1) surveying the CDA literature of the political discourse, (2) reviewing literature on legitimization, its definition, types, functions, strategies and models, (3) developing a model of analysis, (4) selecting representative extracts taken from Trump's public speeches to be the data of analysis, and (5) conducting qualitative data analysis in the light of the model developed, supported with some statistical correlations. The results of analysis revealed that the value of the significance has been reliable and this validates the first hypothesis that Trump manipulates different legitimization strategies that enhance his own ideologies towards political cases, where such discursive and rhetorical strategies have been employed to legitimize different political and economic decisions and threats concerning various ideological contexts such as the Middle East issues, terrorism, immigration and the global economic crisis.

Keywords: Legitimization, CDA, Trump, Public Speech, Evaluation, Authorization

السلطة والتقييم كاستراتيجيات للشرعة في خطابات ترامب العامة

إ.م.د. أزهار حسين عبید
كلية الآداب- جامعة الكوفة

صديق عبد الأمير رحيم
كلية الآداب- جامعة الكوفة

الملخص:

تعنى هذه الدراسة باستخدام التحليل النقدي للخطاب لتحليل وتحديد الاستراتيجيات الرئيسية لإضفاء الشرعية في خطاب دونالد ترامب العام. وعلى وجه التحديد، تتناول الدراسة كيفية ترابط الجوانب والقضايا السياسية مع أسس الأيديولوجيات والتلاعب في الخطاب السياسي في عملية "الشرعة". وبهذا، تهدف هذه الرسالة إلى (١) اكتشاف استراتيجيات الشرعة التي تمت معالجتها في خطاب ترامب العام، (٢) تحديد استراتيجيات الشرعة الأكثر شيوعاً في خطاب ترامب العام. ولتحقيق أهداف الدراسة واختبار فرضياتها، أتبع الإجراءات الآتية: (١) مسح الدراسات الخطابية النقدية لتحليل النص المرتبط بالخطابات السياسية الرئاسية والفاعلين الاجتماعيين، (٢) مراجعة الدراسات المتعلقة بالشرعة، من حيث التعريف والأنواع والوظائف والاستراتيجيات والنماذج، (٣) تطوير نموذج لتحليل عينة الدراسة، (٤) اختيار بعض المواقف المعتمدة المأخوذة من خطابات

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.36317/kaj/2023/v1.i57.12366>

Kufa Journal of Arts by University of Kufa is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

مجلة آداب الكوفة - جامعة الكوفة مرخصة بموجب ترخيص المشاع الإبداعي ٤.٠ الدولي.



ترامب العامة لتكون بيانات التحليل ، و (٥) إجراء تحليل نوعي للنصوص المختارة في ضوء ما تم تطويره في نموذج التحليل مدعوماً ببعض النتائج والنسب الإحصائية.

كشفت نتائج التحليل أن قيمة الأهمية الإحصائية كانت موثوقة، وهذا يؤكد صحة الفرضية الأولى القائلة بأن ترامب يتلاعب باستراتيجيات الشرعة المختلفة التي تعزز أيديولوجياته تجاه القضايا السياسية، حيث تم استخدام مثل هذه الاستراتيجيات الخطابية لإضفاء الشرعية على مختلف القضايا السياسية والاقتصادية إضافة إلى القرارات والتهديدات المتعلقة بالسياسات الأيديولوجية المختلفة مثل قضايا الشرق الأوسط والإرهاب والهجرة والأزمة الاقتصادية العالمية.

الكلمات المفتاحية: الشرعة، تحليل النص النقدي، ترامب، الخطاب العام، التقييم، السلطة.

1. Introduction

A new branch of applied linguistics enquiry, which has flourished over the last three decades is Critical discourse analysis (henceforth, CDA) and associated with researchers such as Roger Fowler, Norman Fairclough, Teun van Dijk and Ruth Wodak. This discipline is compatible theoretically as far as its practitioners use linguistic analysis as a basis for its interpretations of texts. CDA is “a type of discourse analytical research that primarily studies the way social power abuse, dominance, and inequality are enacted, reproduced, and resisted by text and talk in the social and political context” in order to reveal, and eventually resist social injustice (Van Dijk, 2001:352).

As such, this study concerns itself with utilizing CDA to analyze and identify the main strategies of legitimization in Trump's public speech. Very few studies have tackled the aspects of legitimization in political speeches in the light of CDA sphere. Thus, this paper attempts to bridge this gap in the previous studies.

2. Literature Review

2.1. Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA): General Overview

The term ‘critical’ is used in CDA to describe how people deal in power relationships (Gee 1990: 72). The word is primarily built by vocabulary, which illustrates and questions socioeconomic inequities that are amplified and replicated, in addition to its role in exposing secret power relations. The term “discourse” is debatable and debatable. Discourse with a small

‘d’, according to Gee, is about vocabulary in use, or how language is used in a social context. It's a way of talking about language that goes beyond sentences, allowing analysts to think about any of the topics that are going on in the language. This can be seen if each sentence is examined (ibid).

CDA, in this respect, is used primarily with the discourse dimensions of power abuse and its results such as the injustice and the inequality (Fairclough 1992: 64). Fairclough (ibid) insists that it requires true inter and multi-disciplinarity, an account of intricate relationships between power, society text, talk, social cognition, and culture.

2.2. The Concept of Legitimization

Taking into consideration the authority and power within politics, there are three interrelated important concepts which are Legitimation, Legitimization, and Legitimacy. According to the Dictionary of Politics and government by Collin (2004: 138) “Legitimation is the way in which a political system or part of a political system is given the respect of the people so that it can do its work with authority.”

Moreover, The Palgrave Macmillan Dictionary of Political Thought defines “legitimation as the process whereby power gains acceptance in the eyes of those who are governed by it, by generating a belief in its legitimacy” (Scruton, 2007: 389). The social phenomenon here is highly complex, but the political views divide between the following (ibid):

- **Legitimation** is necessary only in some political conditions, dispensable in others;
- **Legitimation** is always necessary, and should proceed through indoctrination or ‘political education’;
- (The conservative view) **legitimation** is necessary, but should proceed independently of political doctrine, and by

drawing upon civil institutions of a different order from the political (ibid).

2.3. Definitions of Legitimization

Maurer (1971:361) gives legitimization an explicitly evaluative hierarchical cast, confirming that “legitimization is the process whereby an organization justifies to a peer or super-ordinate system its right to exist.” Pfeffer et al (1975), hold this emphasis on evaluation, but assert cultural conformity and similarity instead of overt self-justification. In this view, legitimization indicates congruence and conformity between the social values related to or implied by [organizational] processes and the norms of approved behavior in the larger social system (ibid).

Besides, Suchman (1995: 574) defines legitimization as “a generalized perception or assumption that the actions of an entity are desirable, proper, or appropriate within some socially constructed system of norms, values, beliefs, and definitions”.

. In fact, as Berger and Luckmann (1966) have proposed, all of language is a means of legitimization. This definition will be the procedural definition of the study. Legitimization is an important concept that has been extensively studied in social and political sciences, in philosophy and in law (Lavrusheva 2013: 73). Thus, Speakers, in most cases, for the endeavor of regaining their interlocutor’s approve or support, aim to justify their actions, ideas or behavior. At least once a day, every person tries to justify or legitimize an action, decision, or opinion. Moreover, both legitimacy and argumentation are relied heavily on language for achieving these attempts.

3. The Eclectic Model of Analysis

The model of analysis will be an eclectic one relying on different sources of legitimization since there is no comprehensive model of strategies that can achieve the aims of this study and cover both discursive and rhetorical strategies and devices of legitimization. The main models are: Antonio Reyes (2011) and Van Leeuwen (2007).

3.1 Discursive Strategies of Legitimization Authority and Evaluation

Vaara et al (2006: 794) state that legitimization strategies are defined as “specific, not always intentional or conscious, ways of employing different discourses or discursive resources to establish legitimization” or Il-legitimization. Such strategies may be used in either a scheduled or unplanned manner. Authorization, rationalization, and moral appraisal, are the three primary forms of legitimization techniques. These strategies of legitimization are summarized as follows: the “way in which language functions and is used for the construction of legitimization” (ibid).

3.1.1 Authorization

Van Leeuwen (2008:105) says that the first strategy, authorization, is associated to the power of tradition, law, ideology, custom, and of person to whom an institutional power is given for exerting certain kinds of authority. There are six sub-categorical authorities under the authorization strategy of legitimization known as impersonal authority, personal authority, expert authority, role model authority, the authority of tradition, and the authority of conformity (ibid).

3.1.1.1 Personal Authority

“personal authority legitimization typically takes the form of a verbal process clause in which the projected clause, the authority’s utterance, contains some form of obligation modality” (Halliday 1985: 129).

Abdi & Basarati (2018: 90) explain that the efficiency of personal authority legitimization is gained from the authority's utterance. While some forms of obligation modality incorporated within a person's discourse in personal authority, the expertise not status what provides the legitimization of the expert authority. The legitimization for an action, within the role model authority, may be supported by some references to the examples of the role models or eminent group leaders in a group or in the body of society(ibid).

3.1.1.2 Public Authority

It is not accurate that all authority legitimization is performed on a personal basis (Van Leeuwen 2007: 96). Laws, rules, and regulations often have an impersonal authority. The response to the unspoken "why" question is "because the laws (rules, regulations, instructions, etc.) say so," not "because I say so," "because Dr. Juan says so," or "because Penny Minter-Kemp does so." Personal and impersonal bodies ('The laws state that...'; 'The statute states that...') will also be the focus of verbal procedure clauses. However, the crucial aspect that must be present in all legitimizations is the use of nouns like 'policy,' 'regulation,' 'rule,' 'law,' etc., or their cognate adjectives and adverbs (e.g. 'compulsory,' 'mandatory,' 'obligatory,' etc.) in impersonal clauses like (ibid):

- It is the policy in her area to admit children termly after their fifth birthday.
- Playtime is usually a compulsory break in the program.

3.2 Moral Evaluation

Moral evaluation often forms or generates legitimization by referring to “value systems” (Van Leeuwen 2008: 106). Moral evaluation is often associated with specific discourses of moral values, although these discourses may not explicitly incorporate words like “good,” “bad,” “evil,” or “virtuous.” As Van Leeuwen argues, moral evaluation can only be identified on the basis of analysts’ “commonsense cultural knowledge” (p. 110). That is because discourses on moral values are “only hinted” by using adjectives that change these moral discourses into commonsensical motives such as normality, health, hygiene, benefit, and so on (ibid).

According to Said (2011: 60), moral evaluation is a form of legitimization that is based on moral principles. In certain cases, intrinsic meaning is clearly asserted by the use of adjectives to determine the validity of a societal activity. They may also be caused by contrasting a common norm with one that has positive or negative connotations in order to legitimize or delegitimize it. Nationalistic words and metaphors, as well as repetition and rhetorical questions, may also separate moral values from conventional justifications (ibid).

3.2.1 Evaluation

Adjectives, as Leech (1966: 130) states, “play a key role in moral evaluation legitimization.” Leech believes that certain adjectives are both “designative” and “attributive” in his study of advertisement English. They express both tangible attributes of actions or objects and laud them in terms of certain realm of values: “praise is mingled with practicality,” as in the case of common advertisement adjectives like “green, crisp, cool, golden.” It, too, conceals religious judgment and tries to hide it from discourse and argument. Many of the explanations in the corpus for the “first day at school” corpus use adjectives like normal and natural to explain parents reactions. These adjectives

then change a nominal group with a nominalized reference to a practice (or one or more of its constituent actions or reactions) as its head (as in “a normal and balanced response”) or an attribute in a relational clause with the practice (or one or more of its constituent actions or reactions) as its subject (as in “being upset is natural”) (ibid).

As discussed above, evaluative adjectives play a key role in legitimization by assessment, according to Van Leeuwen (2007: 97-100). It's important to acknowledge that such adjectives can be troublesome because they can both convey and laud concrete attributes of actions or things. It can be difficult to tell the difference between the natural and moral orders, but Van Leeuwen notes that, unlike the natural order, the moral order can be altered by human action. Though simple adjectives like "positive" and "evil" may be used to claim evaluation, Van Leeuwen focuses on adjectives like "usual," "real," "stable," and "useful," since they were often used in an evaluative way in his content (ibid).

3.2.2 Abstraction

Abstractions arise when behaviors are represented in “abstract ways that moralize them by distilling from them a quality that links them to discourses of moral values” (Van Leeuwen & Wodak 1999: 132). When using normative abstraction, speakers prefer to legitimize claims by aligning them with positive cultural principles and traditions, or delegitimize arguments by aligning them with negative values (Said 2011: 67). Moral abstraction, according to Van Leeuwen, is one of the least clear ways of legitimization. Rather than a clearly mentioned statement, it seems to be a clear explanation of what is going on. Speakers sometimes highlight some elements while avoiding others, or they may use nationalistic language to defend social activities (Van Leeuwen 2007: 99).

A way to convey moral evaluation is by abstraction. Abstraction “is about referring to practices in abstract ways and linking them to discourses of moral values, which ‘moralizes’ and therefore legitimizes the practices by highlighting a certain desirable quality.” Instead of suggesting “the child goes to school for the first time,” as Van Leeuwen suggests (2007: 99), we might mean “the child achieves freedom,” which legitimizes school practice into a language of independence. Similarly, in the following example, the practice of community collaborations is legitimized by rhetoric of teamwork, with the highlighted desirable attribute of being able to collaborate well with others as the highlighted desirable quality (Kauppala2017: 9).

- By partaking in group projects, the students improve their ability to collaborate with others.

3.2.3 Comparison

Analogies are another means to convey moral evaluation, when comparisons in rhetoric usually have a legitimizing or de-legitimizing function (Kauppala2017: 9). When using analogies, the answer to the question "why?" is "because it's similar to another behavior synonymous with good moral principles." Analogies are inherently context-dependent, since an action may be correlated with positive or negative qualities depending on the circumstances. Analogies may be expressed directly or indirectly in terms of analogy. Similarity conjunctions or situations of contrast may be used to express explicit comparison, as in the following example (ibid):

- Referencing will become as automatic as brushing your teeth if you practice it often enough.

Furthermore, Van Leeuwen (2007) explains implicit comparison in the following way: “An activity that belongs to one social practice is described by a term which, literally, refers to an activity belonging to another social practice, and the positive or negative values which, in the

given socio-cultural context, are attached to that other activity are then transferred to the original activity” (ibid: 99).

4. Data analysis, Results and Discussion

This section presents data description, data collection, methods of analysis, the analysis, the results and the discussion of the results.

The data selected for this study are represented by (8) extracts (illustrated by extracted texts) taken from (6) randomly collected speeches delivered by American President D. Trump in different situations and topics such as the Iranian crisis, the Syrian civil war, and terrorism. These data are taken from websites (that will be listed in the bibliography in detail) such as <https://www.politico.com/> and <https://www.rev.com>. The data have been selected depending on the aims of the study and variety of contexts and topics to be of more value, validity, reliability and effectiveness. These speeches have been accessed and downloaded online in the 20th of Sept. 2021. Their time duration extends from 2016 to 2021.

The detailed contextual factors of the data are presented in Table (1) below:

Table (1): Data Contextual Factors

No. of speech	Speaker	Audience	Time	Place	Topic
1	=	The American Nation	January 8, 2020	The white House	The Iranian missile attack
2	D. Trump	The United Nations	September 25, 2018.	The UN General Assembly	America's sovereignty
3	=	The people of Youngstown, Ohio.	August 15, 2016.	Youngstown, Ohio.	Fighting terrorism

4.1.2 Methods of Analysis

The method of analysis is the eclectic model developed and adapted in section three above. It encompasses two levels of analysis in the process of 'legitimization': discursive strategies and rhetorical appeals. The current study incorporates a qualitative data analysis in which selective illustrative examples of the data of the study will be analyzed in terms of the eclectic model to find out the general strategies of 'legitimization' in Trump's speeches.

4. 2. Data Analysis

In this part of the practical side of the study, it encompasses representative illustrative examples of different strategies of 'legitimization' used by Trump to legitimize various decisions, procedures, threats and criticisms, including discursive strategies and rhetorical appeals. The following section will be devoted for the discursive strategies.

4.2.1 Discursive Strategies

Different discursive strategies are adopted to legitimize the suggestion to have a new strategy towards different political and economic topics in local and global spheres and to justify various important decisions in local and global affairs that are not limited to the Middle East crises. These strategies include the following ones:

A-Authorization

This discursive strategy is realized by the following substrategies:

1- Public authorization

This discursive strategy can be exemplified by the following extracts:

Text (1)

" This year, we also took another significant step forward in the Middle East. In recognition of every sovereign state to determine its own capital, I moved the U.S. Embassy in Israel to Jerusalem.

...America's policy of principled realism means we will not be held hostage to old dogmas, discredited ideologies, and so-called experts who have been proven wrong over the years, time and time again..." (Web source:1)

Analysis

The context of this part of Trump's speech to the UN leaders and members reflects Trump's decision where the American Embassy in Israel is moved to Jerusalem (AL-Quds) which represents one of the most sacred places for Muslims and Christians. His decision disturbed many Islamic and Arab countries.

Adopting the discursive strategy of **public authorization**, Trump depended on American principles of realism. The resort to such general public and commonly agreed upon basics and grounds is supposed to support Trump's claims of legitimization of many steps and decisions, one of which is the move of the embassy to Al-Quds in the current context. At the end of saying, he criticized old-fashioned dogmas or beliefs which he thinks as impractical or wrong. Even old advisors are strongly underestimated.

Text (2)

"Iran's leaders sow chaos, death, and destruction. They do not respect their neighbors or borders, or the sovereign rights of nations.

... The sanctions will stay in place until denuclearization occurs." (Web source: 2)

Analysis

The context of this text is that Trump, in his speech to the UN members, tries to motivate the international assembly to stop Iran of spreading mass and negative power in the neighbouring countries. He tries to propose more sanctions against Iran.

Public authorization as a discursive strategy of 'legitimization' is clearly used in this extract which involves a reference to Iran's violation of international conventions, rules and principles of borders respect and the independency rights of other countries. Trump wants to pretend more objective in presenting his authority as a president of USA relying on public authority of the UN and the global rules of countries communication and treatment. He legitimizes his threat against Iran depending on his claim that it deviates of the international policy of states good neighbourhood and respect.

2- Personal Authorization

Text (3)

"Every solution to the humanitarian crisis in Syria must also include a strategy to address the brutal regime that has fueled and financed it: the corrupt dictatorship in Iran." (Web source:3)

Analysis

The context of this text is that in his speech to the UN, Trump, as a speaker of the text, attempted to legitimize his criticism towards the Iranian policy and its intrusion in the affairs of other countries. He considers it as a sample of dictator leadership.

In the extract above, **personal authorization** which involves one of the modal verbs of suggestion or obligation (must), is clearly implemented in this extract in order to enhance and legitimize his rejection of the Iranian policy and to convince the international world to

support sanctions against it. Thus, he insists that it is a must to deal with those who helped the Syrian government. Therefore, he legitimized his threat by his personal opinion. Moreover, he refers to an individual deed represented by a 'brutal regime' which reflects accusing Bashar Al-Assad of being dictator and against the rights of his people in Syria.

Text (4)

"Last week, we took decisive action to stop a ruthless terrorist from threatening American lives. At my direction, the United States military eliminated the world's top terrorist, Qasem Soleimani. As the head of the Quds Force, Soleimani was personally responsible for some of the absolutely worst atrocities.

Those days are over. Iran has been the leading sponsor of terrorism, and their pursuit of nuclear weapons threatens the civilized world. We will never let that happen." (Web source: 4)

Analysis

The above-mentioned extract involves Trump's speech to the Americans after his decision to attack one of the Iranian leaders who is accused of terrorism. He wants to legitimize his decision to limit Iran's power. The legitimization is indirectly triggered here to justify his threats towards Iran.

As a **personal authority**, this strategy is reflected in Trump's saying that his decision was as a president of America who must take an act against what he calls terrorism, and since he relies on individual and personal activities of others, particularly 'General Soleimani'. It is also evident in saying 'at my direction'. He considers Iran as a state that threatens the international security. He legitimates killing their leaders since he is the one who has the authority to do that.

B- Moral Evaluation

Legitimation by moral evaluation is supposed to rely on moral values. In some cases, the moral value is simply asserted by the use of adjectives to evaluate a social practice as legitimate:

Text (6)

"East strongly supported my decision to withdraw the United States from the horrible 2015 Iran Nuclear Deal and re-impose nuclear sanctions. Iran's neighbors have paid a heavy toll for the region's [regime's] agenda of aggression and expansion.

...pressure to deny the regime the funds it needs to advance its **bloody** agenda.

...all to line their own pockets and send their proxies to wage war. Not good.

America's policy of principled realism means we will not be held hostage to old dogmas, discredited ideologies, and so-called experts who have been proven wrong over the years, time and time again. " (Web source: 6).

Analysis

Here, Trump criticizes Iranian leaders by affirming that they take their people's money to their pockets and to finance their 'militias' in the neighbouring countries. As such, Trump adopts **a negative evaluation** of the Iranian regime and policy.

Moreover, he evaluates Iranian leaders as 'aggressive' and 'expansionists'. On the other hand, he attempt to positively evaluate his policy describing it as more practical and 'real'.

At the same time, he negatively compare his new policy to old ones which are represented as being 'old-fashioned' and 'ideological'. Besides, he described the nuclear deal with Iran which issued in the Obamite administration as being 'horrible'. Trump employs different **moral evaluations** to explicate and invoke his legitimization against Iranian

policy. His evaluations are mostly explicit using explicit expressions, attributes of the Iranian deeds and activities. For instance, he believes that the regime is 'bloody' and 'not good'. Thus, Iranian leaders, for him, are against virtuous goodness and this violates the moral aspect of normality.

c- Mythopoesis

This strategy refers to the use of previous and similar cases and stories and narrations that would serve what is being legitimized. Such tales are either moral ones or cautionary ones. Trump implemented some narrations to support his plans, claims and suggestions. For instance, he mentioned Iranian acts and negative policy towards religious rights and other events to legitimize more sanctions against its leaders:

Text (7)

"And we ask all nations to support Iran's people as they struggle to reclaim their religious and righteous destiny.

... The Iranian people are rightly outraged that their leaders have embezzled billions of dollars from Iran's treasury, seized valuable portions of the economy, and looted the people's religious endowments, all to line their own pockets and send their proxies to wage war. Not good. " (Web source: 7).

Analysis

In the text above, Trump utilized **moral tales** (represented by mentioning what is going on there in Iran concerning religious rights and circumstances) to motivate the world's leader to support Iranians who confronted serious events that oppressed their social and religious rights especially in the last demonstrations and protests. This is reflected in his saying: ' their leaders have embezzled billions of dollars from Iran's treasury, seized valuable portions of the economy, and looted the

people's religious endowments". He also mentioned the world's countries agreement of his decisions of sanctions against Iran.

Text (8)

"This year, we also took another significant step forward in the Middle East. In recognition of every sovereign state to determine its own capital, I moved the U.S. Embassy in Israel to Jerusalem." (Web source: 8).

Analysis

He implies that Iran rejected such a decision which is, for him, a step towards peace in the area. In this context, he attempts to justify the move of the American Embassy to al-Quds in order to be a cautionary tale of the future assumptions and expectations that could threaten Israel and America. The moral status of religious places like Al-Quds is highly emphasized here though indirectly. Thus, the legitimization of the move of embassy is both moral and political one.

4.3 Findings

The analysis revealed the following findings:

- 1- Moral evaluations and future hypotheses have been the least strategies in comparison to other discursive strategies of legitimization in Trump's public speech, they added some human colourings to the rational justifications and standpoints where they involved sociopolitical, cultural, or nationalistic values and norms he resorted to in speeches.
- 2- The arguments specified rational employment that they usually justified the threats, ideologies and decisions in the light of generally accepted moralized motives and evaluations.

3- Trump inclined to pretend that he knows his audience very well and that he employed discursive strategies that can be accepted by a major part of the public.

4- Trump seems to employ more rationalized statements and logical arguments to be more persuasive to his listeners. As such, rational justifications and publicly agreed statements, constitutional articles, international agreements are expected to be more powerful and influential on others in political ideologies and speeches.

5. Conclusions

In the light of the findings of the qualitative data analysis, the following concluding remarks can be presented:

1- As indicated in the findings and the results of analysis all strategies have been used by Trump, and this validates the first hypothesis that Trump manipulates different legitimization strategies that enhance his own ideologies towards political cases, where such discursive and rhetorical strategies have been employed to legitimize different political and economic decisions and threats concerning various ideological contexts such as the Middle East issues, terrorism, immigration and the global economic crisis.

2- Depending on the results of each discursive strategy, the second hypothesis has been accepted. This implies that he resorts to what is accepted by most people to effect his audience of what he was talking about. Rational justifications and publicly agreed statements, constitutional articles, international agreements are expected to be more powerful and influential on others in political ideologies and speeches. Trump seems to be logically and mentally estimated by others in order to be more persuasive in public speech.

3- President Trump wants to pretend that he knows his audience and that he employed discursive strategies that can be accepted by a major part of the public. Therefore, he is found out to use objective judgments and

evaluations that are agreed upon by most listeners in different sociopolitical contexts and backgrounds.

4- It is significant to notice that although the arguments indicated rational employment they usually justified the threats, ideologies and decisions in the light of generally accepted moralized motives and evaluations. This implies that Trumpist public discourse is overloaded with reasonableness statements that coincide with moral and emotional underpinnings.

5- Although moral evaluations and future hypotheses have been the least in comparison to other discursive strategies of legitimization in Trump's public speech, they added some human colourings to the rational justifications and standpoints where they involved sociopolitical, cultural, or nationalistic values and norms he resorted to in speeches. Decisions were aligned with normative values that are accepted, at least, by the Americans and then, by the international community.

6- Context has been of great value and affectivity on the understanding and analysis of legitimization in different political situations. Legitimization strategies do not occur incidentally or urgently since it should be based on solid justifications and contextual factors that support and greases its wheels.



References

- Abdi, R., & Basarati, A. (2018). Legitimation in discourse and communication revisited: A critical view toward legitimizing identities in communication. *International Journal of Society, Culture & Language*, 6 (1), 86-100.
- Collin, P.H, (2004). Dictionary of politics and government, London : Bloomsbury
- Deephouse, D. Bundy, J. Tost, L. & Suchman, M. (2017). Organizational Legitimacy: Six Key Questions, in: Greenwood, R., Oliver, C., Lawrence, T.B., Meyer, R.E. (eds.), *The Sage Handbook of Organizational Institutionalism*. Sage, Thousand Oaks, CA, pp. 27–54.
- Fairclough, N. (1992). *Discourse and Social Change*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Fairclough, N. (2003). *Analysing Aiscourse: Textual Analysis for Social Research*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Gee, P. (1990). *Social Linguistics and Literacies* (2nd edition 1996). Falmer Press: London.
- Halliday, M.A.K. (1985) *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*. London: Arnold.
- Lavrusheva, O. (2013). Discursive Legitimation Strategies in the Media. Case Study of the UK Retail Planning Policy. Unpublished Master's thesis, Aalto University School of Business, Helsinki, Finland.
- Leech, G. (1966). *English in Advertising*. London: Longman.
- Maurer, J. G. (1971). *Readings in Organizational Theory: Open System Approaches*. New York: Random House.
- Pfeffer, J. (1981). Management as Symbolic Action: The Creation And Maintenance Of Organizational Paradigms, In L.L. Cummings & B. M. Staw (eds.), *Research in Organizational Behavior*, (13), 1-52, Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Rachman, A. & Yuniarti, S. (2017).,Critical discourse analysis in Donald Trump presidential campaign to win American's heart.' *TELL Journal*, Vol. 5 No. 2.

Scruton, Roger, (2007)., The Palgrave Macmillan Dictionary of Political Thought. London : Palgrave Macmillan UK : Imprint: Palgrave Macmillan.

Suchman, M. (1995). Managing Legitimacy: Strategic and Institutional Approaches. *Academy of Management Review*, 20, 571-611. *The Academy of Management Review*. 20, 571. 10.2307/258788.

Van Dijk, T. A. (2001). Multidisciplinary Critical Discourse Analysis: A plea for diversity. In R.Wodak & M. Meyer (eds.), *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*. London: Sage.

Van Leeuwen, T. (2007). Legitimation in discourse and communication. *Discourse & Communication*, 1(1), 91–112. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1750481307071986>

Van Leeuwen, T. (2008). *Discourse and Practice: New Tools for Critical Discourse Analysis*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Vaara, E. & Tienari, J. (2008). A Discursive Perspective on Discursive Legitimation Strategies in Multinational Corporations. *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 33, No. 4: pp. 985-993.



Web-sources:

1- <https://www.rev.com/blog/transcripts/donald-trump-cpac-2021-speech-transcript-dallas-tx>.

2- <https://www.politico.com/story/2016/08/donald-trump-immigration-address-transcript-227614>

3-<https://www.rev.com/blog/transcripts/donald-trump-speech-2020-un-general-assembly-transcript>

4- <https://ml.usembassy.gov/remarks-by-president-trump-to-the-74th-session-of-the-united-nations-general-assembly/>

5- <https://www.politico.com/news/2020/01/08/trump-speech-on-iran-missile-attack-full-statement-and-transcript-096196>

