Research Journal in Advanced Humanities

RJAH

https://doi.org/10.58256/v6tw8132

Research Article

Section: Literature, Linguistics & Criticism

Published in Nairobi, Kenya by
Royallite Global

Volume 4, Issue 4, 2023

Article Information
Submitted: **3rd August 2023**
Accepted: **6th October 2023**
Published: **1st November 2023**

ISSN: 2708-5945 (Print)
ISSN: 2708-5953 (Online)

How to Cite:
Hamza, M. H., & Nordin, N. R. M. (2023). Pragmatic deviation of politeness principle in Trump's political speeches. *Research Journal in Advanced Humanities*, *4*(4). https://doi.org/10.58256/v6tw8132

Pragmatic deviation of politeness principle in Trump's political speeches

Muhammad Hussain Hamza[1] **& Nur Rasyidah Mohd Nordin**[2]
School of Languages, Civilisation and Philosophy, Universiti Utara Malaysia, Malaysia
Correspondence: muhammadhussain@alkadhum-col.edu.iq
https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9033-4658

Abstract
The current study aimed to pragmatically explore the deviation from Leech's (2014) politeness maxims in the former president of the US, Donald Trump's political speeches. A qualitative approach was followed to collect and examine the data. Two oral documents; an interview and a speech that were taken from YouTube were adopted in this study as an instrumentation. These documents, which were selected purposefully to saturate the data, were Trump's interview with Fox News Channel reporters, Martha MacCallum and Bret Baier in Scranton on March 6, 2020, and Trump's direct Speech to the crowd in Illinois on June 25, 2022, in support of his candidates to win the Congressional election. A discourse analysis method was used to examine the data. The findings showed that Trump deviated from all Leech's (2014) politeness maxims. Moreover, the findings revealed that Trump deviates from the maxims to convince the people that his opponents are unacceptable, elect his candidates instead, influence the crowd to change their views of the world, ruin his rivals' image, show his period as a US president incomparable and better than other US presidents, deny accountability and reject to release others from blame, influence the public that the election was stolen to invoke wrath among his supporters, express his hatred towards others, and vent his own feelings to make people sympathetic to him.

Keywords: context, Donald Trump, impoliteness maxims, political discourse, pragmatic deviation

Public Interest Statement

The paper addresses a vital concept, which is politeness, and how politicians deviate from this concept. It attempts to bridge the gap by studying Leech's (2014) new model of impoliteness principle that has not been given attention by scholars. So, this is the first endeavour to investigate this model in political situations. It explores all of Leech's (2014) ten (im)politeness maxims in Donald Trump's political discourse. It adds to the literature in several aspects; (1) theoretically, it contributes to the literature on impoliteness in political discourses by discussing the model of (im)politeness principle, political language, and pragmatic deviation that is rarely utilized by the researchers and (2) practically, it adds new empirical findings by applying pragmatic deviation of Leech's (2014) politeness maxims in political discourses and showing the reasons behind this deviation.

1.1 Introduction

It is generally expected that language speakers follow the norms of interaction and facilitate their speech to make listeners interpret the messages they convey. Leech (2008, p. 120) states that people bring with them an idea of what is a norm of collaborative or courteous conduct for a certain conversational context. These norms are inconstant in accordance with who the talkers are; what the social relationships among them are; what the circumstantial environment regarding the sort of activity they are involved in; what needs or facilities are being performed; what the contextual assumptions with regard to the prerogatives and responsibilities of persons are, and the relative significance of numerous rights and requirements, goods and facilities. In addition to that, Hymes (1972) points out that the norms of interaction as rules of how interlocutors are supposed to behave, for example, who should talk and when, and how turns might change. However, Crystal (1995) and Wales (2011) concur that there are cases in which talkers do not adhere to the norms of communication for many reasons; stylistic or aesthetic, and so on. Those speakers usually deviate from the rules that are agreed upon.

In contrast to the standard, deviation is a set of linguistic choices out of the extent of a generally acceptable alternative (Ren & Yu as cited in Hamza & Abbood, 2020, p. 5). Wales (2011) argues that when not following the standards, speakers break the norms resulting in the presence of deviation (or deviance). To put it another way, Crystal (1995) points out that deviance is demonstrated in making unpermitted sentences or utterances because of non-compliance with what is agreed upon. Similarly, Kachru (1992) states that it mirrors a linguistic production categorized by properties that are different from the norm.

Deviation is diversely categorized; it could be triggered linguistically or pragmatically. First, linguistic deviation refers to a set of inexact features of a linguistic act. It is composed of various kinds: lexical, grammatical, and semantic deviation (Leech, 1969). Second, pragmatic deviation emerges due to the unsuitable pragmatic performance (Leech, 2008).

Indeed, pragmatic standards are crucial for a proper language use. They are divided into numerous rules violated for the sake of making a successful interaction in discourse. The normative rules that govern language use are very wide. Nonetheless, it could be claimed that the key pragmatic principles identifying suitable discourse contain politeness, cooperation, truthfulness, relevance, and some others. These maxims form the discoursal standards. However, some speakers usually do not adhere to these norms, leading to pragmatic deviation (Zidane, 2017). In the current study, attention is given to Donald Trump's political speeches that deviate from a pragmatic model; Leech's (2014) (im)politeness principle.

Donald Trump is the 45th US president and a Republican Party member. Trump is well-known for his directness in some of his speeches and has been deemed a controversial president since his early career. His speeches are subject to wide discussions by many researchers (Azizah & Alpiah, 2018; Gusthini et al., 2018; Mariani et al., 2017; Mufiah & Rahman, 2018; Pollack, 2017; Sclafani, 2018) for using different

strategies that diverge from pragmatic rules. For example, Pollack (2017) depicts Trump as a unique U.S. president, basically, since his way to the White House was without a prior case. Similarly, Sclafani (2018) points out that Trump is deemed to be one of the most eloquently unusual, contentious, and schismatic nominees in the history of the United States presidency. Trump turned out to be known, and unknown due to his political attitudes that were seldom stated in his main drive and more clearly the way Trump stated his attitudes rhetorically which attracted experts and the community. Trump's language has been the subject of considerable discussion rhetorically; the way Trump criticized many people and politicians and oratorically; the way his utterances are incoherent and inconsistent. Consequently, the current study examines the importance of pragmatic deviation regarding politics through the study of former US President, Donald Trump's political speeches, embodying pragmatically deviant discourse. Thus, the researchers aim to show how Trump deviates from Leech's (2014) politeness principle.

Leech (2014) argues that the politeness principle is a constraint maintained in communication, affecting individuals to keep away from communicative disagreement, and keep communicative agreement. Therefore, politeness focuses on keeping away from disharmony and enhancing harmony, merely hitherto as these are obvious in interaction, specifically the kinds of meanings that are uttered or implied. Leech (2014) reframes the politeness maxims in his book (1983) and increases the number to ten politeness maxims instead of six (Generosity, Tact, Approbation, Modesty, Obligation of S to O, Obligation of O to S, Agreement, Opinion-reticence, Sympathy, Feeling-reticence). They are not regulations for a perfect demeanour. Rather, Leech (2014) claims, they can be just norms that speakers can preserve to follow because they try very hard to keep away from disagreement that could appear if each followed their schema selfishly via speech. However, Leech (2014) claims that impoliteness could be recognized as a deviation from these ten maxims of the politeness principle. Generally, impoliteness includes maximizing the speaker's value and minimizing the hearer's one.

There are several studies that have been done on Leech's (1983, 2014) politeness principle. Some studies (Atmowardoyo et al., 2018; Hasan et al., 2021; Hikmahwati et al., 2021; Jameel & Sameer, 2021; Leyang & Xiaoting, 2021; Mariani et al., 2017) have focused on Leech's (1983) old model of politeness principle that has been reframed by the writer himself in 2014. Also, they discussed how people obey the politeness maxims and the reasons behind the observance of politeness principle. Moreover, some recent studies (Akmal & Candrasari, 2019; Ewurum & Chukwu, 2018; Lustyantie & Dewi, 2019, Ogayi & Osondu, 2021) have focused on the violation of Leech's (1983) politeness principle. All the studies whether violation or non-violation of politeness maxims did not refer to Leech's (2014) model of impoliteness principle which is the focus of the present paper. Nevertheless, the researchers discovered a study that was conducted by Santoso et al. (2020) who examined Leech's (2014) politeness principle and how EFL educators and students utilize it. Yet, they did not discuss the deviation of politeness maxims, which is the attention of the current paper.

Furthermore, some recent studies have been done on impoliteness (Abdelkawy, 2019; Alemi & Latifi, 2019; Colaco et al., 2021; El-Falaky, 2019; Ibrahim, 2020; Koike et al., 2022). However, they concentrated on the application of impoliteness in dialogues and conversations adopting either Culpeper's (1996, 2011) model of impoliteness or Bousfield's (2008) impoliteness. So, there is a dearth of research in terms of deviating from Leech's (2014) politeness principle; some studies have been done on how people lessen and diminish threats to face and be polite, some have been conducted on Leech's (1983) old model, and some on other theories (Bousfield's, 2008; Culpeper, 1996, 2011). However, as far as the researcher's knowledge, no paper has focused on how people deviate from Leech's (2014) politeness maxims. This scarcity of research has motivated the researchers to conduct research on this less-explored area. The current study discusses Leech's (2014) impoliteness principle which contains ten maxims. More specifically, the objective of the

paper is to discover the types of Leech's (2014) maxims of politeness maxims that are deviated from in Trump's political speeches to fill the gap in this less studied area. Therefore, the researcher will attempt to answer the research question: What types of Leech's (2014) politeness maxims are deviated from in Donald Trump's political speeches?

2.1 Theoretical Framework

Leech (2014) presents a model of impoliteness by reversing the Grand Strategy of Politeness to the General Strategy of Impoliteness in which "the speaker will express/imply evaluative meanings that are favorable to the speaker and unfavorable to others" (p. 221). Hence, the Grand Strategy of Politeness is oriented toward agreement and face preservation while the Grand Strategy of Impoliteness is oriented towards disagreement and face threat. Therefore, the maxims of the Grand Strategy of Politeness are violated to form a new theory of impoliteness. Leech (2014) adds that impoliteness encompasses giving favourable cost to the speaker and unfavourable cost to the others. However, the deviation from these maxims is scalar like the observance of the politeness maxims.

Leech (2014) remarks that it is important to distinguish that impolite behaviour is parallel to polite one in that both are frequently implicated. In other words, both of them are likely to be implicated rather than stated. However, the attitude to utilize implicature is possibly powerful regarding impoliteness because it functions as a self-protective one. The talker could argue not to be impolite, and the increase of impoliteness into more fierce conflict could be avoided.

Leech (2014) believes that analogous to Grice's cooperative principle, the politeness principle could be broken, suspended or disobeyed. A justifiable politeness model should be the foundation for a model of impoliteness because it is a non-adherence or infringement of the politeness maxims. The deviation of the ten maxims is shown in the following Table:

Table 1. The Deviation of Leech's (2014) Politeness Maxims

Number of the maxim	Deviation of the maxim	Label for the deviated maxim	Typical speech-act types
1	Give an unfavorable value to O's wants	Generosity	Refusing, threatening
2	Give a favorable value to S's wants	Tact	Ordering, demanding
3	Give an unfavorable value to O's qualities	Approbation	Insulting, complaining, telling off
4	Give a favorable/high value to S's qualities	Modesty	Boasting, being complacent
5	Give an unfavorable/low value to S's obligation to O	Obligation of S to O	Withholding thanks or apologies
6	Give a favorable/high value to O's obligation to S	Obligation of O to S	Demanding thanks and apologies
7	Give an unfavorable/low value to O's opinions	Agreement	Disagreeing, contradicting
8	Give an favorable/high value to S's opinions	Opinion reticence	Being opinionated
9	Give an unfavorable/low value to O's feelings	Sympathy	Expressing antipathy to O
10	Give a favorable/high value to S's feelings	Feeling reticence	Grumbling, grousing

Note. S = speaker; O = other(s), typically the addressee

3.1 Literature Review

There is a relatively small body of literature that is concerned with pragmatic deviation found in literary works (Castiglione, 2013; Zidane, 2017). The first study was done by Castiglione (2013) who focused on "semantic and pragmatic deviances in two poems by Geoffrey Hill and Susan Howe". Castiglione argued that deviations are considered as intrusions, or associations of complexity. A qualitative method of research was used in this paper to examine the data of the two works gained through an understanding assignment given to ten English freshmen and included easy open-ended questions. The results of the paper indicated that such deviations were to be considered as associations of complexity. However, Castiglione (2013) claimed that this paper is a preliminary phase; further practical measures are necessary. Similarly, Zidane (2017) pragmatically explored the use of deviation in literary works when analyzing different examples extracted from different novels. In general, this paper endeavoured to reveal the influence of pragmatic deviation to the weightiness of artistic texts and the variance of how to use language. The paper concluded that pragmatic deviation is frequently used in literary genres so as to display the characters' viewpoints and to decorate the author's style. Thus, it becomes a stylistic tool for mirroring a language use within literary discourse. Henceforth, it could be a style of novelty completed through the curiosity and features of the formed texts, whether in literary texts or not. Nevertheless, both studies are criticized as they lack discussion and show no acquaintance with related findings. Also, they have not adopted any pragmatic model for their analysis of the literary texts. Thus far, very few studies have been done on pragmatic deviation in all fields and many on other types of deviation, especially in the field of literature. Therefore, this current study intends to fill this theoretical, methodological, and empirical gap and investigate pragmatic deviation in the field of politics which has been paid little attention as far as pragmatic deviation is concerned.

There are several studies that have been done on Leech's politeness principle model (Akmal & Candrasari, 2019; Atmowardoyo et al., 2018; Ewurum & Chukwu, 2018; Hasan et al., 2021; Hikmahwati et al., 2021; Jameel & Sameer, 2021; Leyang & Xiaoting, 2021; Lustyantie & Dewi, 2019; Mariani et al., 2017; Ogayi & Osondu, 2021)

Hasan et al. (2021) investigated Leech's (1983) politeness model in the play *King and I* which were written by Rodger and Hammerstein and the way the dramatis personae used the politeness maxims in their conversations to accomplish a successful interaction. The investigators, who used a qualitative method to gather and investigate the literary text, analyzed nine instances and focused on imperative dialogues and the maxims of generosity and tact. The results uncovered that the dramatis personae observe the maxim of generosity by showing a high cost to others' wants and that of tact by giving a low value to their wants and causing no impositions on others, especially in requesting, ordering, and advising. Analogous to Hasan et al. (2021), Leyang and Xiaoting (2021) conducted a study on the same model, aim, approach, and genre of writing which is Lao She's play *Teahouse*. Six dialogues were analyzed. Different from Hasan et al. (2021), Leyang and Xiaoting (2021) explored all six maxims. The findings of the generosity and tact maxims are similar to those of Hasan et al. (2021). Besides, the findings of the approbation maxim showed how the characters praise each other and show mutual respect while the modesty maxim is used to express humbleness. Also, the maxim of agreement is adhered to by avoiding any kind of contradiction when the characters engaged in a dialogue, and the same with that of sympathy by being sympathetic to each other. By the same token, Hikmahwati et al. (2021) investigated the same model of politeness and also the strategies of Brown and Levinson's (1987) politeness theory in *Akeelah and the Bee* film; two scripts: the film and the books. Also, the researchers followed the same approach. Parallel to the findings of Hasan et al. (2021), the characters observed all six politeness maxims. What is more, the characters mitigated their dialogues by utilizing some strategies; positive politeness and negative politeness.

Like the above studies, Jameel and Sameer (2021) and Mariani et al. (2017) pragmatically examined

Leech's (1983) model of politeness. They used another model in their studies, Searle's (1969) speech act theory. However, both studies adopted political discourses; Jameel and Sameer's (2021) chosen sample is Richard Nixon's and George W. Bush's selected political speeches while that of Mariani et al. (2017) is Donald Trump's election triumph speech. Besides, Jameel and Sameer (2021) used qualitative and quantitative methods while Mariani et al. (2017) followed a qualitative method. Similar to the above-mentioned studies, the results of these two papers unveiled that those political leaders observed all six politeness maxims.

Identical to Jameel and Sameer (2021) and Mariani et al. (2017), Atmowardoyo et al. (2018) did a research on the same model of politeness in the interaction of EFL teachers and pupils in Grade VIII of SMP Negeri twenty-three Makassar. Still, the same qualitative approach was followed, but structured methods were used to gather data; interviews and observations. The findings of the paper are equal to the above studies. Furthermore, the researcher argued that the politeness principle generates intimacy between the teacher and his pupils, creates esteem conduct of pupils, and benefits them to have an encouraging tendency toward the lecture that noticeably stimulates them to partake more enthusiastically in the learning process. Finally, Atmowardoyo et al. (2018) recommended further studies in different areas, especially regarding the deviation of politeness principle. This point motivated the researchers to conduct a study on the deviation of Trump's political language. The above-mentioned studies have focused on Leech's (1983) old model of politeness principle that was reframed by the writer himself in 2014. Also, these studies are restricted to the observance of the maxims and do not show how these maxims are deviated from. Therefore, the present study is in contrast to these studies and explores Trump's deviation of not only six maxims, but all of Leech's (2014) ten politeness maxims.

Several new researches have given attention to the violation of Leech's (1983) politeness principle (Akmal & Candrasari, 2019; Ewurum & Chukwu, 2018; Lustyantie & Dewi, 2019; Ogayi & Osondu, 2021). Also, these studies adopted the same qualitative approach. Akmal and Candrasari (2019) conducted a study to investigate politeness in the candidates' debates in 2017 to be elected the governor of Aceh province. The results showed that some of the candidates violated some maxims; tact, generosity, and modesty. Similarly, Ewurum and Chukwu (2018) did a study on the violation of the politeness principle in agitators' language in selected Nollywood eco-films. Like the findings of Akmal and Candrasari (2019), Ewurum and Chukwu (2018) argued that the agitators in the films did not use mitigating strategies by violating all of Leech's politeness maxims not only some. By the same token, Ogayi and Osondu (2021) studied the violation of the politeness principle in Akachi Ezeigbo's novel *Roses and Bullets*. Identical to the previously mentioned studies, Ogayi and Osondu (2021) claimed that the characters did not adhere to all of Leech's politeness maxims. Similar to them, Lustyantie and Dewi (2019) investigated non-observance of the politeness principle in Lenong Betawi's funny talk known *Anak Durhaka*. However, Lustyantie and Dewi (2019) took a further step by exploring the observance of these maxims and used various data collection instruments, for example, interviews, observations, and documents. The findings of the study exhibited that politeness maxims were not followed in some situations. What is more, politeness maxims were followed in some other situations. Finally, the researchers recommended further research to be done on the non-observance of Leech's politeness principle in various areas, especially in the political language. This motivates the researchers to study Leech's model of politeness, the new reframed one (2014), and apply it to the political language.

Leech (2014) presents a new model for the violation of the maxims and suggests a new model for analyzing the deviation of language. All the studies reviewed above whether observance or non-observance of politeness maxims did not refer to Leech's (2014) reframed impoliteness principle model which is the focus of the present paper. However, the researchers discovered a study that was conducted by Santoso et al. (2020) who examined Leech's (2014) politeness principle and how EFL educators and students utilize

it. The investigators gathered the textual information by using observation and questionnaire instruments and analyzed them qualitatively. The results revealed that the two teachers use and observe all of Leech's (2014) maxims of politeness except modesty which is not found in their findings. Yet, they did not discuss the deviation of the politeness principle.

Leech (2014) claims that impoliteness has been given significant attentiveness as a subject of inquiry recently because of the high frequency of impolite behaviour and the markedness of impolite behaviour, which becomes noticeable when occurring. Therefore, scholars have begun to investigate this phenomenon proposing and applying different theories of impoliteness to various situations. The following are recent studies that have been done on impoliteness (Abdelkawy, 2019; Alemi & Latifi, 2019; Colaco et al., 2021; El-Falaky, 2019; Ibrahim, 2020; Koike et al., 2022).

Abdelkawy (2019) conducted a study on impoliteness in the Arab TV political program *Al-Atijah Al-Muakis* (*the opposite direction*) broadcasted on Al-Jazeerah, a Qatari TV channel. The researcher chose two episodes applying Culpeper's (2011) impoliteness model to explore its strategies and categories. A qualitative approach was followed to gather and examine the textual information that were seventy-six examples found in the two episodes. The findings of the study revealed that numerous insulted examples were used in the program including all the categories of the model. Similar to Abdelkawy (2019), El-Falaky (2019) studied the same Culpepper's impoliteness model in the first Egyptian TV debate between two presidential candidates Abdel M. Aboul Fotouh and Amr M. Moussa. However, this paper used qualitative and quantitative methods to analyze the data that were composed of thirteen examples. The results of the study showed that both leaders used various strategies of impoliteness to show power, misrepresent each other political reputation, and threaten each other.

Similarly, Colaco et al. (2021) did a research to examine the occurrence of impoliteness strategies utilized by people in their political debates and uncover their motives for utilizing these strategies. The researcher adopted Culpeper's (1996) impoliteness model to qualitatively analyze the data that included one hundred fifty-five impolite examples taken from the online news portal Malaysiakini. The researchers argued impolite strategies existed to show irritation, more precisely, suppress irritation. The same impoliteness model and methodology were followed by Alemi and Latifi (2019) who also studied Bousfield's (2008) impoliteness model in the discussions between Republicans and Democrats, the chief American political parties in 2013, over the government shutdown subject. The purpose of the paper is to explore the occurrence of impoliteness strategies used by the two parties against each other. The results of the paper unveiled that all the strategies are utilized to make their contenders behave upon their predilections. Lastly, the researchers pointed out that there is a scarcity of impoliteness research in the field of politics, recommending more studies on this less explored area.

Identical to Colaco et al. (2021) and Alemi and Latifi (2019), Ibrahim (2020) attempted to study impolite speech on Twitter and the influence of age and sex on the utilization of impolite tweets on political matters. However, the researcher qualitatively and quantitively analyzed one hundred tweets that were posted by English netzines that commented on different political matters. Also, Culpepper's (1996) impoliteness model was adopted. Similarly, the findings of the study indicated that Twitter is full of impolite political comments that are utilized to insult and mock people. Similar to Ibrahim (2020), Koike et al. (2022) also did a study on the impoliteness of some tweets of the Real Academia Española. The researchers claimed that impoliteness should be seen from the viewpoint of the persons, mirroring their own experiences and familiarity, and recognizing the standards of their societies. However, the researchers, like Alemi and Latifi (2019), followed Bousfield's (2008) impoliteness model to analyze the data that included fifty-six tweets between various netizens. Equal to the findings of Ibrahim (2020), which unveiled the majority of viewers judged the insults impolite. What is more found, there were several harmonies concerning the concept of

impoliteness to which sets of individuals appeared to position themselves in common. Finally, the researchers argued that the politeness theories focused on face-to-face interaction and limited literature on impoliteness, recommending researchers do more studies on this less-researched area.

The studies reviewed above concentrated on the application of impoliteness in dialogues and conversations adopting either Culpeper's (1996, 2011) model of impoliteness or Bousfield's (2008) impoliteness. The current study discusses Leech's (2014) impoliteness model which contains ten maxims. More specifically, the study investigates the deviation of these maxims in Trump's political speeches to fill the gap in this less studied area.

4.0 Methodology

Creswell (2007) points out a perfect study necessitates referring to paradigms or worldviews in the researcher's research or at least, being conscious that these worldviews have an effect on the researcher when conducting his\her study. Qualitative investigators use worldviews that consist of a group of views they refer to in their studies, and the kinds have recurrently progressed gradually. Four worldviews represent the beliefs of researchers and shape the practice of the research they refer to in their qualitative studies: pragmatism, advocacy/participatory, constructivism or interpretivism, and postpositivism. Since the investigator is concerned with the construction and interpretation of meaning and reality, constructivism is the most suitable paradigm for the current study.

The present paper adopts a descriptive qualitative method since the researchers collect the data from words and sentences (Hamza et al., 2022). Creswell (2012), Merriam and Tisdell (2016), and Vanderstoep and Johnston (2009) state qualitative researchers use non-statistical data instead of statistical ones to express what they learn about a specific phenomenon to explore a problem and develop a detailed understanding. Thus, according to Dornyei (2007), a qualitative study is intrinsically based on language. Moreover, the researchers apply a discourse analysis method to pragmatically analyze Trump's deviant speech according to the context which has a crucial role in understanding language deviation. To examine the data according to this method, the researchers adopt Leech's (2014) model of (im)politeness principle.

4.1 Research Sample

The kind of sampling technique the researchers follow in this qualitative study is non-random probability sampling, or more specifically, purposeful sampling. Merriam and Tisdell (2016) point out that such a sample is dependent on the supposition that the researcher desires to find out, comprehend, and get a sense of so that he or she can solve the problem of the study. Taylor (2001) believes that in analyzing qualitative data, including qualitative discourse data, the researcher is likely to use a much smaller sample because, according to Bowen (2005), the prominence is on quality rather than quantity. The sample of the current paper is Trump's interview with Fox News Channel reporters, Martha MacCallum and Bret Baier in the Fox News Town Hall in front of the people who are given an opportunity to ask him some questions directly. This happened in Scranton on 3\6\2020 to talk about different issues. Also, the sample includes Trump's direct Speech to the crowd in Illinois on 6/25/2022 in support of candidate Congressperson Mary Miller to be re-elected and Darren Bailey to be elected as the governor of Illinois.

4.2 Instrumentation and Data Collection Procedures

Merriam and Tisdell (2016) and Polkinghorne (2005) state that in qualitative studies, three main instruments exist: interviewing, observing, and documenting. The current paper employs the third type which is documents, more specifically visual (oral) documents. Thus, the instrument used in this study is in the form of an oral document (preexisting data) that is taken from YouTube to answer the research question. The

researchers watched the videos and then transcribed them to be coded and ready for analysis.

Merriam and Tisdell (2016) believe that one of the best sources of data is documents for many reasons: (1) they could be superior to interviews and observations on a specific topic, (2) they are effortlessly attainable and freely available, (3) the kind of data gained from interviewing or observing persons is possible to be utilized in a similar way as that of documents, (4) all kinds of documentary data assist the investigator to discover meaning, enhance comprehension, and uncover insights that are related to the problem of the research, (5) documentary data are stable and unbiased as the researcher does not take part in the process of making them as it is the case with other methods of collecting data, (6) they are unobtrusive; not affected by the process of the research since they are basically existing, and (7) they are found in the reality as they are made out of the real-life situations.

The current paper follows the following procedures: (1) the researchers watch the oral documents, (2) they choose the most useful documents that are related to the research question, (3) they determine their authenticity and completeness, (4) they transcribe the data, and (5) they put the data of the document in Microsoft Office Word documents to be coded.

4.3 Data Analysis Procedures

The researchers follow a qualitative discourse analysis method to analyze Trump's deviant speech. Vanderstoep and Johnston (2009) mention that a discourse analysis method can be used to analyze pre-existing data such as films, transcripts, dialogues, newspapers, records, and tapes.

Johnstone (2018) and Merriam and Tisdell (2016) concur that the investigator analyzing discourses, fundamentally, investigates speeches or writings that are utilized in context. Consequently, the researchers conduct a pragmatic study on several extracts of Trump's political speeches by following Leech's (2014) politeness principle to address the question of the paper. The researchers follow some procedures: (1) arranging the data on the computer, (2) reading and re-reading the transcribed document until immersion, (3) coding the data, (4) applying a discourse analysis method to examine the data, (5) analyzing some Trump's political quotations, and (6) showing the findings, discussions, and conclusions.

5.0 Findings

This section explores Trump's political speeches according to a discourse analysis method to answer the research question. The section presents the findings by analyzing Trump's political speeches according to Leech's (2014) ten (im)politeness maxims. To saturate the data analysis, two oral documents were chosen to answer the research question. These are (1) Trump's direct Speech to the crowd in Illinois and (2) Trump's interview with Fox News Channel reporters, Martha MacCallum and Bret Baier.

THEME 1– Generosity Maxim

Trump: "The people of your great state are going to vote to fire the radical left Democrats…. We are going to end Nancy Pelosi. She's crazy. We're going to end her political career…. She's been so bad for our country." (2022, 02:31)

Context: In his speech in Illinois in support of his candidates, Trump is talking to the crowd about the US House Speaker Nancy Pelosi who is a member of the Democratic Party and the US House Speaker. Trump threatens to end the reign of Democrat Party and Pelosi's career describing her as a crazy woman who is bad for the US.

From Leech's viewpoint, Trump deviates from the maxim of generosity by giving a low cost to other's wants; showing offense rather than an advantage to Pelosi's wants in this context. Trump indirectly vows and threatens Pelosi to fire her from the US House calling her a crazy and bad woman. Trump is

infuriated and promises to put an end to her job as the US Speaker House. To deviate from this maxim, Trump attempts to convince the people that Pelosi is so bad for them and should be fired from the US House and elects his candidates who will make America great again as he claims.

THEME 2 – Tact Maxim

Trump: "They need to stop the invasion of our country. It is truly an invasion. As we restore the rule of law to the immigration system, we must also restore law and order to our streets." (2022, 34:44)

Context: In his speech in Illinois in support of his candidates, Trump is talking to the crowd about the issue of immigration in the US. During his presidency, Trump ordered severe decrees to stop receiving immigrants from other nations. Trump is against bringing them to the US and therefore, a lot of talks with the countries that facilitate the entrance of their citizens to the US are made. Trump threatened them with severe measures and taxes if they did not put an end to this issue. However, after his period, Trump still wants others to put an end to this as if Trump is still in his position.

According to Leech's perspective, Trump deviates from the maxim of tact by giving a high value to the speaker's wants and increasing the imposition on others. Here, Trump does not give any freedom to Biden's administration to have choices and therefore they have to follow Trump's order to stop immigrants from entering the US and nothing else. Deviating from this maxim, Trump thinks he is still in the position to give orders to others and have them done regardless of his position which is a former US president. Furthermore, Trump attempts to influence the crowd to make them believe that this is not just immigration, but an invasion that should be stopped. Therefore, Trump forcefully imposes his wants on others.

THEME 3 – Approbation Maxim

Trump: "J. B. Pritzker…is one of the worst. I had to deal with this guy…on COVID, he was as bad as anybody there is. He did a horrible job….He was a disaster. His numbers are terrible. Everybody's fleeing your state" (2022, 19:59).

Context: In his speech in Illinois in support of his candidate Darren Baily to be elected as Illinois governor in 2022, Trump is talking to the crowd about J. B. Pritzker who is the 43rd governor of Illinois. Trump attacks Pritzker and his handling of the COVID-19 outbreak in this city. Trump describes the situation in the city and how people are running away because of the large number of the infected and dead cases.

In conformity with Leech's outlook, Trump deviates from the maxim of approbation by giving a low cost to Pritzker's qualities and insulting him by showing disrespect for him. Trump believes that Pritzker is a terrible leader and should not be re-elected as an Illinois governor because he did a terrible job in dealing with the disease that affected the people and caused numerous causalities during his period as the governor of this city. In fact, making degrading remarks about Pritzker, Trump attempts to ruin Pritzker's image and persuade people not to re-elect him and instead vote for his candidate Darren who will save the city as Trump claims.

THEME 4 – Modesty Maxim

Trump: "Over four incredible years we achieved more than perhaps any administration in history. We did it despite all of the things that were done to us. Compare how great America was just two years ago with… today" (2022, 25:21).

Context: In his speech in Illinois in support of his candidates, Trump is talking to the crowd about the situation in the US during his four-year period and other periods. He requests them to compare his time as a US president with Biden's time. He criticizes Biden's administration and the way it deals with local and international issues.

Following Leech's point of view, Trump deviates from the maxim of modesty by boasting and giving a high value to his quality when he believes that his period as a US president is better than any US president in the history of the US. during his presidency, Trump believes that the US was great and influential, but now it is no longer great. This is extremely obvious in his statements; "you look at Biden, we're America last" (Trump, 2022). Trump endevours to show that his period as a US president is incomparable and better than any US president's so as to create a perfect image in the minds of the US audience to vote for his Congress candidates and ignore Biden's candidates.

THEME 5 – Obligation of S to O Maxim

Martha MacCallum: "…Do you think that you should make any apology for what you've said about liberal judges or not?" (2020, 10:37).

Trump: "…a Justice [Ginsburg] come out and criticize me badly. And I just responded…. But if they say something to me, I'm not allowed to say back. You had another justice say something that was somewhat derogatory, and all I did was respond" (2020, 10:40).

Context: Trump's interview with Fox News Channel reporters, Martha MacCallum and Bret Baier in the Fox News Town Hall in front of the people who are given an opportunity to ask Trump some questions directly. Here, Reporter MacCallum asks Trump whether it is possible to make an apology to Judge Ginsburg due to Trump's criticisms of her. Trump does not like to apologize to her as she was being condescending and instead, he wants her to do so.

According to Leech's politeness principle, Trump deviates from the maxim of obligation of S to O by giving a low cost to the speaker's obligation to others. Here, when asked to make an apology, Trump refuses to apologize to Judge Ginsburg as he responds to her criticisms. Consequently, Trump believes that it is a matter of reciprocated criticisms between him and her. In fact, Trump does not like to confess his misconduct as he does not want to assume full accountability and release her from blame. In addition, Trump believes he did not do something bad to make him apologize and consequently, he never said "I am sorry" or "I apologize".

THEME 6 – Obligation of O to S Maxim

Martha MacCallum: "…Do you think that you should make any apology for what you've said about liberal judges or not?" (2020, 10:37).

Trump: "…We had a justice come out and criticize me badly…. Justice Ginsburg …during the election, she came out, she had to apologize. It was a terrible thing she said. She should have never been allowed to say it" (2020, 10:40).

Context: Trump's interview with Fox News Channel reporters, Martha MacCallum and Bret Baier in the Fox News Town Hall in front of the people who are given an opportunity to ask him some questions directly. Here, Reporter MacCallum asks Trump whether it is possible to make an apology to Judge Ginsburg due to Trump's criticisms of her. Trump does not like to apologize to her because she talks badly about him. From Leech's point of view, Trump deviates from the obligation of O to S maxim by giving a high cost to others' obligation to the speaker who demands apologies from others. Here, Trump demands the Judge's apology for what she said about him, despite Trump's severe criticism of her. In fact, deviating from this maxim, Trump expresses no care about the Judge and wants her to apologize to him for slamming him. Trump does not want to shoulder the blame for the criticism he made. Trump feels that she is wrong and has to be blamed, not him because he is the victim of severe, unjustified criticisms, and therefore, he is vindicated.

THEME 7 – Agreement Maxim

Trump: "It's politically incorrect. See, I disagree with them. We will also keep men out of women's sports. Is that okay? Very unfair" (2022, 41:33).

Context: In his speech in Illinois in support of his candidates, Trump is talking to the crowd about banning transgender women from joining sports that are related to women. This is Trump's promise that would be done if the US voters re-elected Trump as the US president in 2024. Journalist Yurcaba (2022) reports that including transgender persons in sports squads is less likable. Most US citizens around 62 percent, mentioned that transgender sportspersons have to be permitted to join the sports squads that are related to their real gender when they were born.

To follow Leech's viewpoint, Trump deviates from the maxim of agreement by giving a low value to the other's opinion. Here, Trump disagrees with those who support the idea of giving rights to transgender women to participate in women's sports. Trump does not soften his contradiction with others and criticizes them for making such decisions. In fact, Trump, deviating from this maxim, attempts to gain the voters' voices as the majority of the US is against the idea of transgender women participating in women's sports as stated by Yurcaba (2022).

THEME 8 – Opinion Reticence Maxim

Trump: "If I renounced my beliefs, which I won't do, if I agreed to stay silent, if I stayed at home, if I said that a corrupt, election was wonderful, the persecution would stop immediately. But I can't do that…" (2022, 13:26).

Context: In his speech in Illinois in support of his candidates, Trump is talking to the crowd about the election after losing the presidential race to Biden. Trump does not accept the results of the election and insists that it is corrupted and stolen despite the fact that the investigation showed no evidence to support his claims (Eggers et al., 2021).

In conformity with Leech's point of view, Trump deviates from the maxim of opinion reticence by giving a high cost to his opinion. Here, Trump expresses himself strongly, in such a way that his opinion matters more than anyone else. Trump refuses to accept the election and believes that it is rigged and stolen. Not only does Trump reject the results of the election, but he believes that if he kept silent and remained at home, the harassment would cease at once. However, Trump will not keep silent and insists on his position that the election is frauded. In fact, Trump attempted to influence the public that the election was stolen and that he was the victim of the corrupted election and presidential harassment to invoke wrath among his supporters, and therefore riots erupted.

THEME 9 – Sympathy Maxim

Trump: "Kinzinger…is out, he quit. Almost all of the impeachers are gone, you know the 10 impeachers? We won a big one the other day, he got slaughtered. Name is Rice from South Carolina, he was out, he's gone" (2022, 12:35).

Context: In his speech in Illinois in support of his candidates, Trump is talking to the crowd about the ten House Republicans who have endorsed a single article of impeachment, accusing Trump of "incitement of insurrection" over the Jan. 6, 2021 riots at the U.S. Capitol following the election in 2021 in which Trump lost the presidential race to Biden. The article reads that Trump, addressing his followers on the day of the unrest, "willfully made statements that, in context, encouraged — and foreseeably resulted in — lawless action at the Capitol, such as: 'if you don't fight like hell you're not going to have a county anymore" (Naylor, 2021). Trump talks about two of them Kinzinger and Rice who lost the House election.

From Leech's view, Trump deviates from the maxim of sympathy by giving an unfavourable value

to Kinzinger and Rice's feelings and showing antipathy toward them. Trump gloats about them and the other impeachers, and how they lost the election using harsh words such as "got slaughtered" and "gone" as if Trump avenged them and feels ecstatic for the misfortune they got. Deviating from this maxim, Trump tries to express his hatred towards the ten impeachers who caused harm to him and shows the people the consequences of the wrongdoings of the impeachers.

THEME 10 – Feeling Reticence Maxim

> Trump: It [America] is a nation that is begging Venezuela and Saudi Arabia for oil. It is a nation that surrendered in Afghanistan, leaving dead soldiers, American citizens, and $85 billion worth of the finest military equipment in the world behind. It's a nation that allowed Russia to devastate a country, Ukraine, killing hundreds of thousands of people. And it will only get worse. It would never have happened with me and it didn't happen with me (2022, 01:00:18).

Context: In his speech in Illinois in support of his candidates, Trump is talking to the crowd about the bad situation the US has during the Biden's administration.

Taking Leech's point of view into consideration, Trump deviates from the maxim of feeling reticence by giving a high value to his own feelings. Here, Trump grumbles about the situation in the US that faces a lot of issues under Biden's rule. Trump describes the US as a weak nation that begs to get oil, surrenders to Afghanistan, and permits Russia to ruin Ukraine and kill persons. Trump boasts that if he were the president of the US, this would never happen. In fact, Trump attempts to vent his own feelings by making the crowd sympathetic to him and showing his own great achievements during his administration in comparison with Biden's. Consequently, the people will be influenced and convinced that Trump's candidates are the best choices and should be elected.

5.1 Discussions of the Findings

The objective of the current paper is to discover the types of Leech's (2014) maxims of politeness principle that are deviated from in Trump's political speeches. The study adopts a qualitative approach and a discourse analysis method to answer the research question. The findings reveal that Leech's (2014) ten (im) politeness maxims are deviated from in Trump's political speeches. This is in line with Leech's theory of (im) politeness principle that suggests the deviation of these maxims. Also, the findings of the current study are consistent with those of some studies conducted by Akmal and Candrasari (2019), Ewurum and Chukwu (2018), Lustyantie and Dewi (2019), and Ogayi and Osondu (2021) who showed speakers' deviation from politeness maxims. For instance, Ewurum and Chukwu's (2018) findings revealed that the agitators in the Nollywood eco-films violated Leech's maxims. Correspondingly, Ogayi and Osondu (2021) found that the characters in Akachi Ezeigbo's novel *Roses and Bullets* did not observe the politeness maxims. In the same vein, Akmal and Candrasari's (2019) results exhibited that some of the twelve governor candidates of Aceh province violated some maxims; tact, generosity, and modesty. In addition, Lustyantie and Dewi (2019) explored the observance and non-observance of Leech's (1983) politeness principle in Lenong Betawi's funny talk and found that the speakers observed and did not observe the maxims in different situations.

However, the findings of this study are contrary to many studies (Atmowardoyo et al., 2018; Hasan et al., 2021; Hikmahwati et al., 2021; Jameel & Sameer, 2021; Leyang & Xiaoting, 2021; Mariani et al., 2017; Santoso et al., 2020) that showed speakers' adherence to politeness maxims. For example, Atmowardoyo et al. (2018) analyzed the speeches of EFL teachers and thirty-eight pupils. The results of the paper argued that the teacher and students observed all the Leech's (1983) six maxims. Similarly, the findings of Hikmahwati et al. (2021) showed that the characters of *Akeelah and the Bee* film observed all Leech's (1983) six politeness

maxims. Likewise, Leyang and Xiaoting (2021) argued that the characters in Lao She's play *Teahouse* followed the politeness maxims. Besides, Hasan et al. (2021) found that Leech's (1983) tact and generosity maxims, which were only investigated, were followed in the dramatis personae's dialogues in the play *King and I*. By the same token, the findings of Jameel and Sameer (2021) exhibited that Richard Nixon's and George W. Bush's political speeches adhered to Leech's politeness maxims. Furthermore, Santoso et al. (2020) examined the kinds of politeness maxims utilized by two EFL teachers. The findings showed that the teachers observed nine of Leech's (2014) politeness maxims. Moreover, Mariani et al. (2017) endeavoured Leech's (1983) politeness maxims in Donald Trump's election triumph speech. The results of the study indicated that six maxims were followed by Trump.

Moreover, the findings suggest that Trump deviates from the maxim of generosity by giving a low cost to other's wants; showing offense rather than an advantage to the US House Speaker Pelosi's wants. Trump is extremely furious, threatening and promising to end Pelosi's job as the US Speaker House. This finding could be attributed to Trump's want to convince the people that Pelosi is so bad for them and should be fired from the US House and elect his candidates instead. This has an implication that deviating from this maxim shows that we cannot use threats and wish misfortunes on politicians since people will think negatively about them and will not elect them. This finding is supported by that of Akmal and Candrasari (2019) who argued that most candidates endeavoured to humiliate their opponents. In addition, this finding is in line with that of Ogayi and Osondu (2021) who found that the characters in Akachi Ezeigbo's novel *Roses and Bullets* show a low value to others' wants and seek their own benefit. Furthermore, the finding of the current research is ascertained by the findings of El-Falaky (2019), who studied Culpepper's (1996) impoliteness between two Egyptian presidential candidates, who revealed that both use different strategies of impoliteness to misrepresent each other political reputation and threaten each other. Therefore, due to this deviation, a huge gap between Trump and his rivals was formed. This is assured by the findings of Chen et al. (2019) who analyzed Trump's discourse, claiming Trump aims to emphasize distinctions between himself and his rivals.

Nevertheless, the finding of the generosity maxim is not in harmony with that of Mariani et al. (2017) who found that Trump observes this maxim by benefiting others; offering a chance for the US people. Besides, the finding of this maxim is contrary to those of Hasan et al. (2021) who argued the dramatis personae in the play *King and I* are polite and show a high cost to other's wants, and Leyang and Xiaoting (2021) who found the same in the play *Teahouse*. Similarly, the finding of this maxim is not compatible with that of Jameel and Sameer (2021) who found that Richard Nixen is polite with his opponent George W. Bush, and tries not to permit the separation of his nation.

Moreover, the findings show that Trump deviates from the maxim of tact by giving a high value to the speaker's wants and increasing the imposition on others. Trump orders President Biden to prevent immigrants from entering the US, envisaging Trump is in the right position to give orders to others. Although Trump thinks that his orders will not be fulfilled, he just tries to warn the US people of the danger of allowing immigrants into the US. This finding could be related to the reason that Trump favours his own wants at the expense of others to achieve his own intentions. This has an implication that deviating from this maxim reveals that we cannot utilize impositions and prefer our wants to others' because people will have a negative idea about politicians who impose their own persuasions and prefer their own wants. This finding agrees with studies conducted by (Akmal & Candrasari, 2019; Ewurum & Chukwu, 2018; Lustyantie & Dewi, 2019; Ogayi & Osondu, 2021) that displayed the speakers give a high cost to their wants at the expense of others. However, the finding of this maxim is not in harmony with some studies (Hasan et al., 2021; Jameel & Sameer, 2021; Leyang & Xiaoting, 2021; Mariani et al., 2017; Santoso et al., 2020) that showed the speakers give a low value to their wants and cause no impositions on others. For

instance, Jameel and Sameer (2021) argued that Richard Nixen and George W. Bush mitigated their requests when talking with their supporters hoping they would benefit their audience. Likewise, Mariani et al. (2017) claimed that Trump observes this maxim by giving a low value to his wants to benefit others since Trump aims to unite the US.

In addition, the findings exhibit that Trump deviates from the maxim of approbation by giving a low cost to others' qualities and insulting them by showing disrespect for them. Trump insulted the governor of Illinois, Pritzker for the numerous causalities due to the COVID-19 disease that happened during his period. Making degrading remarks about Pritzker, Trump tries to ruin his image and persuades people not to re-elect him and instead vote for his candidate. Deviating from this maxim implies that we cannot make use of insults and degraded remarks about others since people will be pessimistic about politicians who disrespect others and are disrespected. This finding is supported by the studies done by (Akmal & Candrasari, 2019; Ewurum & Chukwu, 2018; Ogayi & Osondu, 2021) who argued that the individuals tried to show each other's bad qualities, insulted, humiliated, and censured each other. Besides, the finding of this maxim is in line with those of Abdelkawy (2019) and Koike et al. (2022) who conducted a study on Culpeper's (2011) and Bousfield's (2008) impoliteness models, and found that direct insults were exchangeable between the persons. Nonetheless, the finding of this maxim is not in agreement with those of Atmowardoyo et al. (2018), Hikmahwati et al. (2021), Jameel and Sameer (2021), Leyang and Xiaoting (2021), Mariani et al. (2017), and Santoso et al. (2020) who found that the speakers are polite by praising others and showing mutual respect. For instance, Mariani et al. (2017) claimed that Trump observes this maxim when praising his opponent, Hilary Clinton.

Furthermore, the findings uncover that Trump deviates from the maxim of modesty by boasting and giving a high value to his own qualities. Trump believes he is the best US president in history and the US was great during his time. This finding is due to the fact that Trump endeavours to show his period as a US president is incomparable and better than any US president's to create a perfect image in the minds of the US audience to vote for his Congress candidates and ignore Biden's. This has an implication that deviating from this maxim reveals that we cannot boast our own qualities at the expense of others because of the negative thoughts the people will have about the demeanours of politicians. This finding concurs with those of Akmal and Candrasari (2019), Lustyantie and Dewi (2019), and Ogayi and Osondu (2021) who claimed that the speakers strongly praised themselves by showing their own unique characteristics. However, the results of this maxim do not agree with those of Atmowardoyo et al. (2018), Hikmahwati et al. (2021), Jameel and Sameer (2021), Leyang and Xiaoting (2021), and Mariani et al. (2017) who found that the speakers humbled themselves to show modesty. For instance, Mariani et al. (2017) found that Trump observes this maxim when talking to his opponent Hilary Clinton to show humbleness. In addition, Jameel and Sameer (2021) argued that Richard Nixon and George W. Bush lessened self-praise and showed humility when talking to the audience.

Besides, the findings unveil that Trump deviates from the maxim of the obligation of S to O by giving a low value to the speaker's obligation to others. Trump refuses to apologize to Judge Ginsburg as he believes that it is a matter of reciprocated criticisms between him and her. The reason for not apologizing is that Trump does not like to confess his misconduct with others as he does not want to assume full accountability and release the judge from blame. The deviation from this maxim implies that we cannot deny our mistakes towards others since people will feel gloomy about the politicians who insist on their positions creating a stressful mood. The finding of this maxim is not in line with the study conducted by Santoso et al. (2020) who found that the speaker gave a high value to others; apology and thankfulness statements are produced by the teacher and his student.

Additionally, the findings show that Trump deviates from the obligation of O to S maxim by giving

a high cost to others' obligation to the speaker who demands apologies from others. Trump demands Judge Ginsburg's apology for what she said about him despite Trump's severe criticism of her. Trump expresses no care about the Judge and wants her to apologize to him for slamming him because he does not want to shoulder the blame for the criticism he made. Trump feels that she is wrong and has to be blamed not him as he is the victim of severe unjustified criticisms and therefore, he is vindicated. This has an implication that deviating from this maxim shows that we cannot demand others to apologize or thank us for what we do for them since people will think negatively about the politicians who blame others and deny any responsibility for what happened. This finding goes against that of Santoso et al. (2020) who argued that others gave a low cost to the speaker's obligation; the student apologized to the teacher for being late and the teacher responded to the student's apology by increasing the student's fault.

Moreover, the findings reveal that Trump deviates from the maxim of agreement by giving a low value to others' opinions. Trump does not soften his contradiction to those who support the idea of giving rights to transgender women to participate in women's sports and criticizes them for making such decisions. This might be due to the fact that Trump attempts to gain the voters' voices as the majority of the US is against the idea of transgender women participating in women's sports. This has an implication that deviating from this maxim shows that we should not contradict and criticize others since people will have negative perspectives about politicians who do not soften their disagreements with others. The finding of this maxim is in accordance with the studies done by Ewurum and Chukwu (2018), Lustyantie and Dewi (2019), and Ogayi and Osondu (2021) who found that the speakers did not follow this maxim by giving a low value to others' opinions and maximizing disagreement between each other. For example, Lustyantie and Dewi (2019) argued that the speakers in *Anak Durhaka* Talk sometimes disagreed with each other by refusing suggestions. However, the finding of this maxim contradicts some studies done by Atmowardoyo et al. (2018), Hikmahwati et al. (2021), Jameel and Sameer (2021), Leyang and Xiaoting (2021), Mariani et al. (2017), and Santoso et al. (2020) who argued that the speakers tried to reach a mutual agreement and avoid any kind of contradiction when they engaged in a dialogue. For instance, Atmowardoyo et al. (2018) and Santoso et al. (2020) revealed that the teacher agreed with the student so as to provide a high cost to the student's opinion. Mariani et al. (2017) claimed that Trump observes this maxim by mitigating contradiction with the audience. Similarly, Jameel and Sameer (2021) found that Richard Nixon moderated contradictions with the audience to unite the country. In the same vein, Hikmahwati et al. (2021) showed that the characters of *Akeelah and the B*ee film observe this maxim by trying to be on the same page in spite of their dispute to form a relaxed mood between them.

Furthermore, the findings display that Trump deviates from the maxim of opinion reticence by giving a high cost to his opinion; expressing himself strongly, in such a way that his opinion matters more than anyone else. Not only does Trump reject the results of the election, but he believes that if he kept silent and stayed at home, the harassment would cease at once. This may be because Trump attempted to influence the public and convince them that the election was stolen and he was the victim of the corrupted election and presidential harassment to invoke wrath among his supporters, and therefore riots erupted. Deviating from this maxim implies that we cannot be opinionated since the public will think negatively about opinionated politicians who try to impose their own views on others. This finding does not square with that of Santoso et al. (2020) who pointed out that this maxim is observed when the teacher mitigated the force of her opinion by using the hedged phrase "I think" when talking to her student.

In addition, the findings unveil that Trump deviates from the maxim of sympathy by giving a low value to others' feelings and showing antipathy toward them. Trump tries to express his hatred towards the ten impeachers who caused harm to him and shows the people the consequences of the wrongdoings of the impeachers. Deviating from this maxim has an implication that we cannot reveal the feelings of antipathy

and gloat toward others because people will have bad ideas about politicians who show no feelings toward others. The finding of this maxim is ascertained by those of Ewurum and Chukwu (2018), Lustyantie and Dewi (2019), and Ogayi and Osondu (2021) who argued that this maxim is not observed by showing high antipathy and low sympathy for others' feelings. However, the finding of this maxim is not compatible with those of Atmowardoyo et al. (2018), Hikmahwati et al. (2021), Jameel and Sameer (2021), Leyang and Xiaoting (2021), Mariani et al. (2017), and Santoso et al. (2020) who mentioned that this maxim is observed by showing sympathy and reducing antipathy among the persons. For instance, Mariani et al. (2017) found that Trump observed this maxim when showing sympathy for his opponent Hilary Clinton who was defeated in the election. Correspondingly, the findings of Hikmahwati et al. (2021) showed that the characters of *Akeelah and the B*ee film observed this maxim by lessening antipathy and increasing sympathy in order to avoid conflicts and friction between them.

Besides, the findings show that Trump deviates from the maxim of feeling reticence by giving a high value to his own feelings. Grumbling about the situation in the US, Trump depicts the US as a weak nation that begs to get oil, surrenders to Afghanistan, and permits Russia to ruin Ukraine and kill persons. In fact, Trump attempts to vent his own feelings by making the crowd sympathetic to him and showing his own great achievements during his administration in comparison with Biden's. Consequently, the people will be influenced and convinced that Trump's candidates are the best choices and should be elected. Deviating from this maxim implies that we cannot express our bad feelings toward others since the audience will negatively think about politicians who grumble about certain events. The finding of this maxim does not conform with that of Santoso et al. (2020) who pointed out that this maxim is observed when the teacher gave a low cost to her feeling despite her sickness. In addition, the finding of this maxim is in line with the study done by Chen et al. (2019) who analyzed Trump's discourse, arguing that Trump is smart at attracting electors' feelings.

5.2 Limitations of the Study

Each work has limitations and the current paper is not an exception. Firstly, the sample of the present study is restricted to two oral documents; an interview and a speech. Thus, the findings of the present paper are not to be generalized to other Trump's political interviews and speeches. However, the purpose of the current qualitative study is not to generalize the results rather it aims to comprehend a specific phenomenon deeply. Secondly, the current research uses a qualitative method, and therefore, the findings are susceptible to the researchers' biases. Still, the researchers are aware of the biases and subjectivity that are part of qualitative inquiry and follow systematic procedures from the beginning to the end to assure the trustworthiness of the research.

The researchers, built on the limitations and findings of the current paper, recommend more studies on impoliteness in numerous situations and apply it to several discourses; literary texts, political speeches, media, and everyday conversations. In addition, further studies need to be conducted on other methods such as structured interviews and observations in various fields to see how impoliteness is employed in these direct methods. Moreover, the researchers found a lack of research on Leech's (2014) reframed model of impoliteness principle which is the scope of the current paper. Therefore, further research needs to be done on this new model in different contexts to see how Leech's ten impoliteness maxims are used and what functions they achieve.

6.0 Conclusion

It is found that Trump deviates from Leech's (2014) ten maxims of politeness principle; (1) the maxim of generosity by giving a low cost to other's wants; showing offense rather than an advantage to others' wants,

(2) the maxim of tact by giving a high value to the speaker's wants and increasing the imposition on others, (3) the maxim of approbation by giving a low cost to others' qualities and insulting others by showing disrespect for them, (4) the maxim of modesty by boasting and giving a high value to his own qualities, (5) the maxim of obligation of S to O by giving a low value to the speaker's obligation to others, (6) the maxim of obligation of O to S by giving a high cost to others' obligation to the speaker who demands something from others, (7) the maxim of agreement by giving a low value to others' opinions and disagreeing with them, (8) the maxim of opinion reticence by giving a high cost to his opinion; expressing himself strongly, in such a way that his opinion matters more than anyone else, (9) the maxim of sympathy by giving a low value to others' feelings and showing antipathy toward them, and (10) the maxim of feeling reticence by giving a high value to his own feelings.

Moreover, the findings revealed that Trump deviates from the maxims of politeness to achieve different purposes; (1) the maxim of generosity when Trump attempts to convince the people that his opponents are so bad for them and should be fired from their position and elect his candidates who will make America great again as he claims, (2) the maxim of tact when Trump tries to influence the crowd to make them believe that this is not just immigration, but an invasion that should be stopped, (3) the maxim of approbation when Trump endeavours to ruin others' image and persuade people not to re-elect them and instead vote for his candidates who will save the city as Trump claims, (4) the maxim of modesty when Trump seeks to show his period as a US president is incomparable and better than any US president's to create a perfect image in the minds of the US audience to vote for his Congress candidates and ignore Biden's, (5) the maxim of obligation of S to O when Trump does not like to confess his misconduct with others as he does not want to assume full accountability and release others from blame, (6) the maxim of obligation of O to S when Trump feels that others are wrong and have to be blamed not him because he is the victim of severe unjustified criticisms and therefore, he is vindicated, (7) the maxim of agreement when Trump attempts to gain the voters' voices as the majority of the US is against the idea of transgender women participating in women's sports, (8) the maxim of opinion reticence when Trump attempts to influence the public that the election was stolen to invoke wrath among his supporters, and therefore riots erupted, (9) the maxim of sympathy when Trump tries to express his hatred towards the ten impeachers who caused harm to him and shows the people the consequences of the wrongdoings of the impeachers, and (10) the maxim of feeling reticence when Trump endeavours to vent his own feelings to make them sympathetic to him and influence and convince the people that Trump's candidates are the best choices and should be elected.

Acknowledgments: We express our deep gratitude to Dr. Lina Lafta Jassim for her invaluable comments that critically augmented this paper.

Funding: This research received no external funding.

Conflicts of Interest: The authors declare no conflict of interest.

Disclaimer Statement: This work is part of a dissertation entitled: "Pragmatic Deviation in Trump's Political Speeches," submitted to Universiti Utara Malaysia (UUM) for the award of a Doctor of Philosophy degree in Linguistics. This paper is a part of chapter four of the dissertation which discusses the first objective of the study.

Biographies

Muhammad Hussain Hamza is a PhD candidate at Universiti Utara Malaysia of School of Languages, Civilisation and Philosophy. His major interest is pragmatics, discourse analysis, and political discourse. He has published numerous papers in local, international, and Scopus-refereed journals.

Dr. Nur Rasyidah Mohd Nordin obtained her PhD in English Language Studies from Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia (UKM). Currently she is a Senior Lecturer at the School of Languages, Civilisation & Philosophy, in Universiti Utara Malaysia (UUM), where she teaches postgraduate courses in Applied Linguistics. She has published chapters in books and journals indexed in Scopus and WOS. She has also presented papers in international seminars and conferences where she has delivered a few sessions as a Keynote speaker and panelist.

Authorship and Level of Contribution

Muhammad Hussain Hamza is the lead researcher. He wrote the dissertation from which the paper was made. Dr. Nur Rasyidah Mohd Nordin is the supervisor of the above-mentioned dissertation. She helped in the writing of the manuscript.

References

Abdelkawy, H. (2019). Impoliteness in Arab Talk Shows: A case study of insult in The Opposite Direction. *Journal of College Arts, 2*(50), 71-98.

Akmal, M. & Candrasari, R. (2019). Language politeness in political communication: analysis of Leech's politeness principal on the Aceh governor candidate Debate in 2017. *Proceedings of the 1st Workshop on Multidisciplinary and Its Applications Part*[1] (1-8). https://eudl.eu/doi/10.4108/eai.20-1-2018.2282435

Alemi, M. & Latifi, A. (2019). The realization of impoliteness in arguments between the democrats and republicans over the government shutdown issue in the US. *Russian Journal of Linguistics, 23*(1), 83-97.

Azizah, A. & Alpiah, D. (2018). An analysis of illocutionary acts performed in Donald Trump's victory speech in the United States election 2016. *Professional Journal of English Education, 1*(3), 241-248.

Atmowardoyo, H., Weda, S., & Nashruddin (2018). Politeness principle and its implication in EFL classroom in Indonesia. *XLinguae, 11*(4), 99-112.

Bowen, G. (2005). Preparing a qualitative research-based dissertation: Lessons learned. *The Qualitative Report*, *10*(2), 208-222.

Castiglione, D. (2013). The channel of (mis)communication: Semantic and pragmatic deviances in two poems by Geoffrey Hill and Susan Howe. *PALA 2013 Proceedings online* (1-17). Pala. https://www.pala.ac.uk/uploads/2/5/1/0/25105678/castiglione_2013.pdf

Chen, X., Yan, Y., & Hu, J. (2019). A corpus-based study of Hillary Clinton's and Donald Trump's linguistic styles. *International Journal of English Linguistics, 9*(3), 13-22.

Colaco, L., Vijayarajoo, A., & Lin, T. (2021). The use of impoliteness strategies in online feedback relating to a general election in media. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences, 11*(9), 107-121.

Creswell, J. (2007). *Qualitative inquiry & research design choosing among five approaches*. SAGE Publications, Inc.

Creswell, J. (2012). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research*. Pearson.

Crystal, D. (1995). The Cambridge encyclopedia of the English language, Cambridge University Press.

Dornyei, Z. (2007). *Research methods in applied linguistics*. Oxford University Press.

El-Falaky, M. (2019). Impoliteness in Egyptian political campaign discourse: A pragmatic analysis of Mousa-Aboulfotouh presidential debate. *International Journal of Language and Literature, 7*(1), 92-102.

Ewurum, R. & Chukwu, E. (2021). Violations of politeness maxims in language of agitation in select Nollywood eco-films in English. *Journal of Languages, Linguistics and Literary Studies, 10*(4), 64-74.

Gusthini, M., Sobarna, C. and Amalia, R. (2018). A pragmatic study of speech as an instrument of power: analysis of the 2016 USA presidential debate. *Studies in English Language and Education, 5*(1), 97-113.

Hamza, M. and Abbood, H. (2020). Polysyndeton in Shakespeare's Othello: A case of grammatical deviation, *International Journal of Innovation, Creativity and Change, 11*(3), 104-114.

Hamza, M. Hadi, H., and Ali, M. (2022). A pragmatic study of circumlocution in Former Iraqi PM Al-Maliki's political interviews. *Res Militaris, 2*(2), 5550–5565.

Hasan, B., Maca, S., & Moelier, D. (2021). The politeness principle actualization in Rodger and Hammerstein's Drama King and I (a politeness study). *Journal of Linguistics, Literature & Education, 1*(1), 21-32.

Hashim, S. (2015). Speech acts in political speeches. *Journal of Modern Education Review, 5*(7), 699-706.

Herring, S. C. (2004). Computer-mediated discourse analysis: An approach to researching online behavior. In S. Barab, R. Kling, & J. Gray (Eds.). *Designing for virtual communities in the service of learning* (pp. 338-376). Cambridge University Press.

Hikmahwati, E., Utomo, D., & Evenddy, S. (2021). The investigation of politeness principles and strategies used in Akeelah and the Bee movie. *Jurnal Bahasa dan Sastra, 13*(1), 1-7.

Hymes, D. (1972). On communicative competence" In: J.B. Pride & J. Holmes (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics. Selected readings* (pp. 269-293). Penguin.

Ibrahim, A. (2020). A socio-linguistic analysis of impoliteness in political tweets. *International Journal of Innovation, Creativity and Change, 11*(1), 64-79.

Jameel, T & Sameer, I. (2021). Speech acts and politeness in Nixon and Bush's victory speech. *Al-Adab Journal, 2*(138), 13-32.

Johnstone, B. (2018). *Discourse analysis*. Wiley-Blackwell.

Kachru, B. (1992). *The other tongue*. University of Illinois Press.

Leech, G. (1969). *A linguistic guide to English poetry*. Longman Limited Group.

Leech, G. (1983). *Principle of pragmatics*. Routledge.

Leech, G. (2007). Politeness: Is there an East-West divide? *Journal of Politeness Research, 3*(2), 167-206.

Leech, G. (2008). *Language in literature: Style and foregrounding*. Routledge.

Leech, G. (2014). *The pragmatics of politeness*. Oxford University Press.

Leyang, W. & Xiaoting, F. (2021). An analysis of speech acts in Teahouse from the perspective of politeness. *East African Scholars J Edu Humanit Lit*, 4(3), 142-147.

Lustyantie, N. & Dewi, F. (2019). Leech's politeness principle in Lenong Betawi humorous dialogue entitled Anak Durhaka. *Journal of English Education, 7*(2), 133-142.

Naylor, B. (2021 February 9). Article of impeachment cites Trump's 'incitement' of capitol insurrection. *The NBR*. https://www.npr.org/sections/trump-impeachment-effort-live-updates/2021/01/11/955631105/impeachment-resolution-cites-trumps-incitement-of-capitol-insurrection

Mariani, P., Budiarsa, M., & Widiastuti, N. (2019). Politeness principles in "Donald Trump's election victory speech". *Humanis*, *23*(2), 95-100.

Merriam, S. & Tisdell, E. (2016). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation*. Jossey Bass.

Mufiah, N., & Rahman, M. (2018). Speech acts analysis of Donald Trump's speech. *Professional Journal of English Education, 1*(2), 125-132.

Ogayi & Osondu, P. (2020). Violation of politeness maxims as a catalyst for tragedy: A study of Akachi Adimora-Ezeigbo's Roses and Bullets. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science Invention*, *10*(11), 1-12.

Polkinghorne, D. (2005). Language and meaning: Data collection in qualitative research. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 52*(2), 137-145.

Pollack, J. (2017). *Donald Trump and the future of U.S. leadership: Some observations on international order, East Asia, and the Korean Peninsula*. {Paper presentation} in the 5th Korea Research Institute for National Strategy-Brookings Institution Joint Conference on "The Trump Administration in the United States and the Future of East Asia and the Korean Peninsula" https://www.brookings.edu/wp-content/uploads/2017/03/fp_20170208_jonathan_pollack_krins.pdf

Rahman, F. & Weda, S. (2019). Linguistic deviation and the rhetoric figures in Shakespeare's selected plays. *XLinguae, 12*(2), 37-52.

Sclafani, J. (2018). *Talking Donald Trump: A sociolinguistic study of style, metadiscourse, and political identity*. Routledge.

Taylor, S. (2001). *Evaluating and applying discourse analytic research*. In M. Wetherell, S. Taylor, & S. Yates

(Eds.). *Discourse as data: A guide for analysis* (pp. 311-330). SAGE Publications Ltd.

Trump, D. (2020, March 6). *Interview: Bret Baier and Martha MacCallum host a Town Hall with Donald Trump*. [Video]. YouTube. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=cukyV5UGuEE

Trump, D. (2022, June 25). *Donald Trump rally at Illinois 6/25/22 save America rally 25 June 2022*. [Video]. YouTube. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Q_H_D-F9D2k&t=2798s

Vanderstoep, S. and Johnston, D. (2009). *Research methods for everyday life blending qualitative and quantitative approaches*. Jossey- Bass.

Wales, K. (2011). A dictionary of stylistics. Longman.

Yurcaba, J. (2022 February 1). Trump promises to ban transgender women from sports if re-elected. *The NBC News*. https://www.nbcnews.com/nbc-out/out-politics-and-policy/trump-promises-ban-transgender-women-sports-re-elected-rcna14248

Zidane, R. (2017). The exploitation of pragmatic deviation in literary discourse. *Ulakbilge, 5*(11), 507-531.