

President Rodrigo Roa Duterte's Political Speeches: A Critical Discourse Analysis

Roxan Rubic-Remorosa,Phd

St. John Paul II College Of Davao Davao City,Philippines
Corresponding Author: Roxan Rubic-Remorosa

Abstract: Politics is a struggle for power in order to put specific political, economic and social ideas into practice that is crucially played by language. The general purpose of this qualitative study employing critical discourse analysis was to examine the political speeches in terms of linguistic features, rhetorical strategies and uncovering the issues behind these discourses of President Rodrigo Roa Duterte. The corpora comprised of thirty political speeches that were retrieved in an online archive and hard copies that were furnished in the office of the President. Findings revealed that the linguistic features are personal pronouns that show inclusivity and exclusivity. Passivity, transitivity and the dominating verb tenses and aspects are also evident. The use of loaded, dramatic, and stereotyping adjectives, adverbs and nouns are central to the construction of an event, the use of non-hedged adverbs position a contention as being incontrovertible 'fact', presupposition, rhetorical questions, ellipsis and Intertextuality were also utilized. The recurring issues in his political speeches are centered on socio-economic, legal and political but War on Drugs, Criminality, Graft and Corruption are highlighted. The President who is the highest official of the land is expected to lead the country in a crusade to alleviate the condition of the constituents and to provide fast solution to these prevailing issues and problems.

Keywords: *President Rodrigo Roa Duterte, political speeches, critical discourse analysis, Philippines*

Date of Submission: 23-07-2018

Date of acceptance: 10-08-2018

I. INTRODUCTION

Politics is a face-off for power in order to put specific political, economic and social ideas into practice. In this manner, language plays an indispensable job, for every political action is prepared, accompanied, influenced and depicted by language.

The examination of varied rhetorical sources in prior studies makes declarations and definitions difficult to ascribe across all presidents as well as presidencies. In fact, most studies use and examine executive rhetoric pointed at many different sources from Congress, to the president's party, to the public, to special audiences (Powell, 1999). Use of presidents' innumerable addresses to varied audiences makes discovering trends and developments, as well as generalization and proposition of a "modern" or "traditional" era difficult because most small addresses are meshed specifically to a certain audience with a very specific message intended. Studies sampling all genres of presidential rhetoric, although providing new delicate shadings of understanding to the discipline, may produce distorted findings because of these "audience-specific" or "policy-specific" addresses. This becomes a predicament when scholars attempt to use these varied sample studies to not only classify different periods in presidential history, but also to attempt to define the origins of presidential rhetoric and the contemporary presidency (Ellis, 1998).

Moreover, Hacker (1996) also explains that it could be said that all forms of power for political leaders, whether pharaohs, kings, or presidents, have rooted from arguments grounded in language that legitimize the axiom of the governing and guarantees the consent of the governed, political leaders may give special attention to language as a gizmo of power. Presidents cannot be considered different in this respect as language and rhetoric is undoubtedly the tool by which they conduct the business and perform the duties of the office. Because of his position and his elevated echelon, everything that the president says, whether written or publicly delivered holds a substance that in itself is power. A message from the president is given almost unparalleled importance in contrast to other communications. Speeches and addresses of any sort should therefore be read as statements of presidential power and they are all attempts to assert the power of the presidency in some way either through policy proposal, attempts to move public opinion through appeals to the people, or direct address to specific audiences (Chimbarange, Takavarasha, & Kombe, 2014).

Additionally, it is evident that political speeches are a type of discourse which is characterized by specific attributes. However, it has been found out that due to the pressure of media and its effort to catch the attention of their consumers the traditional view of political speeches has been changing and is now nearer to the

everyday informal speech. Political speeches should therefore be not only interesting but also entertaining so as to be enticing to media holders who have the privilege of what would be presented and how (Brno, 2011).

Critical discourse analysis (CDA) has been of interest to many researchers in linguistics, language studies, and other social science disciplines in the past twenty years (Chouliaraki & Fairclough, 1999). This interest has led to a large number of studies analyzing oral and written texts particularly in the fields of politics and mass media. These studies have displayed how language, power and ideology are closely related. They have also shown that language use is far from being neutral. However, it has been observed that most of these studies have focused on written texts such as newspapers and institutional documents (Castelline, Inez-Guillem, Robles, & Tracy, 2011). Further, the researcher has noticed that analyses of oral texts, particularly in political speeches as a discourse, have been rarely studied by CDA researchers. Thus, Wang (2010) calls for more attention to CDA studies since they can help explore the relationship between language, ideology, and power. Therefore, the present study is concerned with investigating an aspect of discourse that has not received adequate attention within the Philippine political discourse. It examines oral texts specifically political speeches of the current President of the Republic of the Philippines, President Rodrigo R. Duterte from a critical discourse analysis perspective.

It is with these scenarios that I was motivated to pursue this study. Furthermore, the absence of a research study in the national and locale setting has prompted more the researcher to conduct this investigation. Moreover, the analysis of the results would provide useful information for the speech and oral communication classes as well as in academic writing pedagogy. Additionally, through Critical Discourse Analysis, this study brought understanding on the discourse of politics as well as power and dominance. Finally, there is an urgent need to pursue this research because the Philippines is now facing a great change in administrative reform, thus it is in the realm to listen to the core messages of the current president and understand his plans as well as visions to uplift the life of every constituent, and the country as a whole.

Research Questions

1. What are the linguistic features in the political speeches of President Rodrigo Roa Duterte?
2. What are the underlying social issues and ideologies presented in the political speeches?

Theoretical Lens

This study was anchored on the critical discourse analytical theory. Van Dijk (1998) opined that for Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) studies, it is the way social power abuse, dominance and inequality are enacted, reproduced and resisted by text and talk in the social and political context. He identifies some of the dominant notions in CDA: a power, dominance, inequality, hegemony, ideology, class, gender, race, discrimination, among others which he labels as macro level of analysis. However, he posits that micro-level of social order involves language use, discourse, verbal interaction and communication. CDA, thus, tries to bridge the 'gap' between the two micro and macro approaches.

Fairclough (2003), on the other hand, classifies the various approaches of CDA into those that include a detailed analysis of a text and approaches that do not involve a detailed text. According to Fairclough and Wodak (1997), CDA addresses social problems. They posit that CDA regards: power relations as being discursive; discourse as constituting society and culture; discourse as doing ideological work; discourse as history, making reference to culture, society and ideology in historical terms; that the link between text and society is mediated; that CDA is interpretative and explanatory; and discourse as a form of social action.

Van Dijk (1998) asserts that CDA concentrates on the abuse of power especially on dominance, examining how power in discourse is abused by controlling people's beliefs and actions to suit the interests of dominant groups as against the interest of the powerless or the will others. According to him, social power is the result of access to and control of resources such as force, money, status, fame, knowledge and information. In the exercise of these powers, dominant groups through text and talk, may either directly or indirectly coerce, influence, control or even abuse the minds of people through persuasion and manipulation.

Text and talk control people's minds, and, therefore, discourse may also indirectly influence people's actions through persuasion and manipulation. This means that those groups who control most influential discourse also have more chances to control the minds and actions of others. Such powers of dominant groups may be integrated in laws, rules, norms, habits and even a quite general consensus leading to 'hegemony' (Gramsci, 1971, cited in van Dijk, 1998). In other words, van Dijk (1998) emphasized that it is not so much directly the social and political economy, but rather the symbolic economy of language and discourse that controls the minds of political actors and hence their actions. At a general level, such a statement may be interesting but does not allow much description and explanation. Once however, if there is a recourse to a detailed and sophisticated discourse analysis, then there is a spell out of the relations between subtle properties of text and talk and the various dimensions of the political context, the political process and the political system at large.

This theoretical framework is considered suitable and appropriate because the present study seeks to establish how power, ideology, context control and mind control manifest through the various linguistic choices of the current Philippine president that he has made in his political speeches.

Furthermore, this study is also reinforced by the proposition of Woods (2006) on the discourse of politics which stated that it uses persuasive linguistic techniques. This crafting of language, political sloganizing and political entities have long sought to encapsulate themselves in words and mottos, painstakingly whittled down to capture the central message that underpins their affiliation.

II. METHODOLOGY

This research which utilized Critical Discourse Analysis of President Duterte's political speeches is a descriptive qualitative method. The corpora of the study included all the political speeches of President Rodrigo R. Duterte from his political talks made at different political forums such as state of the nation address, inaugural speeches, ASEAN chairmanship acceptance speech, manifestoes, international conferences, state visits, among others, all of which were included in this study. It involved 30 oral texts that were retrieved in an online archive and the furnished hard copies from the Office of the President but were focused mainly on the linguistic features, rhetorical strategies and content of the corpora. Every oral text was examined methodically using Fairclough's (2003) and van Dijk (1998) frameworks in macro as well as micro levels and the analyses of prevailing ideologies in the oral texts. These political speeches were rendered from June 30, 2016 to December 31, 2016 in his first six months in office as the head of state.

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The political speeches covered in this study were from the official furnished copies of the thirty presidential speeches. The corpora were from President Rodrigo R. Duterte's political talks made at different political forums such as state of the nation address, inaugural speech, ASEAN chairmanship acceptance speech, manifestoes, international conferences and state visits from June 30, 2016 until December 31, 2016.

The linguistic features used in President Duterte's Political Speeches have been ordered for pedagogical purposes and to allow analysts to move from the more micro elements of lexico grammar, through discourse semantics, register and genre. This allows the mapping of texts onto the notions of language, and the extra-linguistic levels of context and ideology. The results diagrammatically represent the ways that these criteria relate to linguistic and extra linguistic elements of systemic functional linguistics theory (Eggs, 1994).

This aspect of the frame considers the way in which pronouns may be used in the text, whether they are inclusive (our, us, we, etc.) or exclusive (they, their, them, he, she, it, you, your etc.). It also considers how the reader and other participants are positioned as allies or in-group members with the author, thus assuming shared knowledge, beliefs and values, or how readers and other participants are marginalised as 'outsiders' with different beliefs and agendas. Pronouns are central to the way individuals and groups are named and so are always political in the way they inscribe power relations (Wodak & Meyer, 2001). Some extracts like:

I sense a problem deeper and more serious than any of those mentioned or all of them put together.

- PSI

*I've been to Indonesia to talk with President Widodo. I just came back from Malaysia and **we** have agreed and **our** people are talking now.*

-PS20

With these, the first person is used the most. For example, the use of the first person pronoun "we" is to shorten the distance between the speaker and the audience, regardless of their disparity in age, social status and professions etc., it may include both the speaker and the listener into the same arena, and thus make the audience feel close to the speaker and his points (Wang, 2010).

Moreover, Meyer (2002) asserts that the categories like deixis and pronouns can be the object of the analysis in any linguistic method, but he proclaims that "they are crucial for Critical Discourse Analysis. Explicitly or implicitly CDA makes use of a concept of the so-called linguistic surface. Many critical discourse analysts claim that the use of pronouns in political discourse is significant and manipulative, since it generates political stands (Fowler and Kress, 1979; Fairclough 1989; Wilson 1990; Chilton and Schäffner 2002 & van Dijk 2002).

Additionally, Pronouns, especially the first person plural (we, us, our) can be used to induce interpreters to conceptualize group identity, coalitions and parties and the like, either as insiders or as outsiders. Social indexicals arise from social structure and power relations, and not just from personal distance (Chilton and Schäffner, 2002).

There is a need of examining each of these pronouns of the President's discourse fragments to see the prevailing forms and to interpret them. The pronouns that were searched for are all the personal pronouns,

possessives and reflexives. Although the main focus is on the first person, plural pronoun *we*, because the aim is to examine closely the relation between pronoun deictics and the identity performance.

Another linguistic features that are present in the Presidential speeches are about transitivity and passivity. Wodak & Meyer (2001) elaborated that Transformations of active constructions into passive forms can be motivated by the desire to elide agency and therefore systematically background responsibility for actions in some instances or to foreground responsibility in others. The manipulation of agency transparency serves to construct a world of various responsibilities, and power. The present perfect is used to by removing the agent, the use of a particular grammatical form is given an unquestionable, universal function, in spite of its context of use and the political dimensions raised.

Eggs (1994) emphasized that it is important to note that to assume that such a basic transitivity shift as passivisation or activation would lead to a complete shift in the understanding of the reader would be an over-simplification and patronising to the reader. However, the construction is effected through a layering of strata of representations and the claim for relevance of this aspect of the frame is as one of these myriad strata.

The ideational function is represented in text by these. Wang (2010) explicated that it is a basic semantic system, which construes the world of experience into a manageable set of process types. Material process is a process of “doing”. The process is usually indicated by a verb expressing an action, either concrete or abstract. There are usually two participants in the process: Actor and Goal. Actor is comparable to the Subject and Goal is comparable to the Object and both of them are usually realized by noun phrases. For example:

*...that I **was elected** to the presidency to serve the entire country. –PS1*

*In the area of environment, the military **is directed** to intensify its support.. –PS2*

*To immediately **stop violence** on the ground, **restore peace** in the communities and **provide enabling environment** conducive to the resumption of the peace talks... –PS2*

When the participants both exist, the clause can be either in active voice or in passive voice. It appeals to the audience's inner heart to connect the political beliefs, ambitions with their expectation, hope in a clear and emphasized way. In this way, the audience's emotion of promotion and willingness to devotion is aroused and strengthened. As an inaugural address for the 16th President of the Republic of the Philippines, it must fulfill the traditionally and ritually required functions: to state facts of the domestic or worldwide situations or problems objectively and the relevant policies forcefully, to conduct reasoning related to the relationship between traditional beliefs such as freedom, democracy, justice, equality, principles and Filipino dreams as well as citizens' participation, responsibilities, sacrifice and the needed reforms in economy, health, or other sectors (Yumin, 2007).

Furthermore, another linguistic feature that is found in President Duterte's political speeches is in tenses and aspects of verb. Tense is the time of a clause. Halliday (1994) points out that primary tense means past, present or future at the moment of speaking and it is the time relative to “now”.

In addition, Wodak & Meyer (2001) accentuated that it relates to the way in which tense and aspect are used to construct ‘understanding’ about events. For example, the use of the present simple tense constructs an event as reality or fact; the use of the present perfect simple constructs a past event as being of relevance at the moment; the past simple tense can represent a past event as no longer being important or relevant. The effect of tense choices can be demonstrated by converting the past simple tenses to present perfect and vice versa and noting the different semantic effects. As in the following extracts:

I order the National Police Commission (NAPOLCOM) to hasten the conduct of investigation and adjudication of administrative cases against police officers...

–PS2

It certainly took an immense amount of effort and compromise as Member States shared their commitment...

–PS4

...the Republic of the Philippines **will honor** treaties and international obligations.

–PS1

I have acquired that sense of... 10 years of doing trial work. –PS9

It is therefore important to understand that choices made in terms of tense and aspect are not merely concerned with the time frame of an action or process but also impact clearly on the representation of that action or process as true, relevant or significant. On the basis of these tenses found in the corpora, we can see that the tense of simple present is most frequently used in the speeches as well as Simple past and Simple future. The use of present perfect is slightly less than simple future. It is natural that simple present tense is dominating tense with top priority since the addresses are to present the domestic and world wide situations ranging from political, economic and cultural fields at present. The use of the tense facilitates the creation of a close relationship between the president and his audience and the easy identification and acceptance of the validity of the assertions contained in the speaking (Chilton 1985; Fairclough 1989 & Van Dijk 1991).

Simple future tense is primarily used to show the planned or expected things in the future. The tense helps the president to lay out his or his government's following reforms or steps taken in his term to foster the build up of the country and the corresponding change or results of these measures in the future. In this way, the government's objectives are shown and at the same time, the audience's confidence is built by the prospect of the beauty and prosperity of the future life. It will be a natural result that the Filipino people will follow the government's direction and guidance in the next six years and thus the addresses' goal of seeking support is achieved (Egging 1994).

Further, Simple past and present perfect tenses are used to refer to the actions or things in the past. Their function lies in that the 16th President of the Republic usually state the achievements in the founding of the country or in the last term of the previous administration or recall the positive or negative experiences in the past as basis or incentive of his following actions. By this means, his respect for the past is displayed and it can also make his plans reasoning and fully grounded (Yumin, 2007 & Wang 2010).

More of the linguistic features are the use of loaded, dramatic, and stereotyping adjectives, adverbs and nouns that are central to the construction of an event or a person, whether or not that construction is evaluating its object positively or negatively. Also the use of non-hedged adverbs, such as surely, obviously, clearly and so on, position a contention as being incontrovertible 'fact'. The use here of overgeneralisation and overstatement is worthy of note. All-inclusive expressions (all, every, none, etc.) are rarely accurate, but can be used to construct a generalising, stereotyping or oversimplifying evaluation. Other comment adjuncts expressing the authors attitude to the whole proposition, such as 'constantly', 'totally', 'entirely', 'absolutely', 'wholly', 'utterly', etc. fulfil the same purpose. Below are the extracts:

*It is part of the **deep** intelligence that we have gathered.* -PS2

*But the thing I can really promise you is the there will be no corruption. **Absolutely.***

-PS23

*In the sight of the Filipino people, you are **all** generals.* -PS11

***Historically**, it's quite a short period of time.* -PS20

The concept of evaluation is useful here. Hunston and Thompson (2000) define evaluation as 'the broad cover term for the expression of the speaker or writer's attitude or stance towards, viewpoint on, or feelings about the entities or propositions that he or she is talking about'. Evaluation can further be divided into two main categories, inscribed and evoked (Martin 2000). In the inscribed category the evaluation is carried by a specific lexical item, overtly displaying the attitudinal judgement of the text producer such as excellent and terrible. Ivanič (1997) notes that through the process of nominalisation '...writers identify themselves with those who engage in such knowledge compacting, objectifying and capturing practices' and so can represent themselves as 'intellectual' or those who use 'reasoned thought'.

In addition to inscribed evaluation, it is also important to consider what Martin (2000) terms evoked evaluation. This type of evaluation uses superficially neutral ideational choices but which have the potential to evoke judgmental responses, in those who share a particular set of ideological values. These evoked evaluations, in themselves do not denote the text producer's attitude to the content overtly, but leave the value judgement to the reader/listener. However, they are mechanisms through which evaluation is covertly constructed. In comparison to tourism texts (de Freitas 2000) the terms natural and sunny operate at a experiential level yet do help to construct a positive image and in food promotional text terms such as natural, and organic operate in a similar way. Negative evaluation can also be constructed by terms such as suspected asylum seeker. Such mechanisms can be seen as powerful devices in a hegemonic view of language construction in the role they play in projecting a notion of 'common sense'.

Moreover, Metaphor is more than just a literary device because it plays a fundamental part in the way people represent social reality. Wodak & Meyer (2001) pronounced that the use of metaphor is central in the way it positions what is described and the reader's relationship to this. This is starkly seen in the description of individuals or the personification of entities, like Saddam Hussein is a 'monster', Margaret Thatcher was the 'Iron Lady' etc. It is also significant to realise that the metaphor and its alternative congruent or literal form do not express exactly the same meaning, indeed the purpose of metaphor is functional in that it serves to construe a differently foregrounded meaning than its alternatives. With the following extracts:

*My God! **If you are a user, you are a pusher.*** -PS12

*For I see these **ills as mere symptoms of a virulent social disease that creeps and cuts into the moral fiber of Philippine society.*** -PS1

Metaphors are neither better nor worse than their congruent counterparts and they are simply performing different functions. It is significant to note that metaphors need not only be lexical but can be grammatical as well (Halliday 1985), whereby the meaning is expressed 'through a lexico-grammatical form which originally evolved to express a different kind of meaning' (Thompson 1996).

One clear example of grammatical metaphor is nominalization, or presenting as a noun or noun phrase something that could be presented with other parts of speech, like his understanding as opposed to what he

understood. This has the effect of making a text more 'lexically dense', a feature commonly noted with 'written' texts. Characteristic of this are more 'packed' texts, texts that are more information heavy, can make these texts appear more prestigious, academic, and serious. It can construct an argument as significant and well thought through. Ivanič (1997) notes that through the process of nominalisation '...writers identify themselves with those who engage in such knowledge compacting, objectifying and capturing practices' and so can represent themselves as 'intellectual' or those who use 'reasoned thought'.

Traditionally, metaphor has been considered as a property of words, a linguistic trope, which belongs to the domain of literature and bears rhetoric and artistic effects. This traditional view was challenged by the Cognitive Metaphor Theory which considers metaphor not only as poetic ornament, belonging merely to language, but as a cognitive phenomenon. Humans organize their concepts through means such as the metaphor, which maps concepts from one source domain to a target one. "The target domain is the domain that we try to understand through the use of the source domain" (Kövecses, 2010).

Fairclough (1992) recommends that as a part of a practical methodology of CDA, the analysis should be organized under four headings which are: Vocabulary, grammar, cohesion and text structure. As to the metaphor it falls under the category of vocabulary, where words are analyzed to examine their ideological or political significance. Apparently metaphors not only affect the human cognition and the organization of knowledge, but they seem to play a central role in the construction of social and political realities (Lakoff & Johnson 1980). "It is evident that such a perspective on metaphor as a conceptually significant, even central, cognitive mechanism matches the research interests of CDA to a large extent. As a consequence, a continuous stream of cognitively orientated CDA analyses of metaphor has been published over the past decades" (Musolff, 2012).

Each of the speeches was analyzed to see the use of the metaphoric scenarios. In this way, it reached to results regarding the common metaphoric scenarios and see whether they help in constructing political and social realities which are free of disputes and more pacific. At the same time shared metaphoric scenarios can contribute to a less ethnically marked political discourse and to positioning the politicians themselves closer to each-other. This metaphor is a crucial one when referring to the political discourse, specifically to the one which regards the foreign policy or international relationships. Lakoff (1991) defines this metaphoric scenario as such: "A state is conceptualized as a person, engaging in social relations within a world community. Its land-mass is its home. It lives in a neighborhood, and has neighbors, friends and enemies. States are seen as having inherent dispositions: they can be peaceful or aggressive, responsible or irresponsible, industrious or lazy".

Additionally, Presuppositions help to represent constructions as convincing realities and there are a number of lexico-grammatical means by which this can be achieved like in the corpora, the use of negative questions and tags which presuppose a certain answer, as such in the following:

*"Why **don't** you just arrest them and place everywhere?" Where do I get the money? You don't move around in this planet without money.* -PS9

I am not, I was not, I was not elected President of what? UN? -PS10

If that is not a war against drug, then what is it? -PS25

The samples above are also Rhetorical questions, which pre-suppose the answer implied by the questioner in open questions or in the case of closed (wh-) questions provide the questioner with the opportunity to answer their own question, the question they have framed and therefore presuppose the self-response as 'true' (Egins 1994).

In addition, the use of factive verbs, adjectives and adverbs, verbs that presuppose their grammatical complements, adjectives and adverbs that describe entities and processes they presuppose, and therefore represent them as facts, such as:

***You know**, I was very strict in Davao, and so relatively, made it safe for everybody. So much so, that without pulling my chair, we came the premier,*

we became the premier city of the Philippines. -PS20

*I note that since the establishment of ASEAN in 1967, several key economic agreements **have facilitated** regional economic integration of natural persons and mutual recognition, arrangement of certain professions.*

-PS4

Factive verbs have been noted in Hoey (2000) as a form of embedded evaluation; the use of change of state verbs which presuppose the factuality of a previous state transform, turn into, become, and so on.

Another feature is the use of invalid causal links presupposing that if one fact is true then the next is also true:

While the ASEAN's FTAs with Australia, New Zealand, China, Japan, India and Korea are mutually beneficial, signifying ASEAN's ability to carry its way in the area of economic partnership. -PS4

Ellipsis is another cohesive device found in the political discourse of the president. It is deleting of some words in an utterance. They are unsaid yet they are understood like in this extract:

*It was written anonymous but of recently I found out...
I forgot the name but somebody really wrote it.*

-PS14

So what's the...? You have a binding agreement and there is no sanction for a violation.

-PS18

The expressions above have shown occurrences which proceeding parts are deleted represented by the series of dots. In this instance, the president has based the meaning from the context. The determiner "the" as in the phrase structure rule, a determiner is followed by a noun (Murcia & Freeman, 1999).

In addition, in the President's Inaugural Address, he used a form of intertextual representation to represent the other author's point of view in his speech and eventually express his thought as his own:

To borrow the language of F. Sionil Jose, "we have become our own worst enemies". And we must have the courage and the will to change ourselves. **-PS1**

The conversationalising of a text is a form of interdiscursivity, which goes beyond the ways in which texts borrow from, steal from and interpenetrate each other, to the ways in which genres and discourses do this. Examples of interdiscursivity can be seen in the way in which the discourse of business has penetrated the discourse of higher education (Fairclough 1993), with the perception of students being addressed more explicitly as customers and the attendant implications of this managerialist discourse, the value for money and accountability being positively associated with this change, and the changing perception of teachers as being in need of scrutiny (Smyth 1995, Hargreaves 1994) being the negative aspect. In the same way, the presentation of advertising copy in a conversational style serves to imply a close social relationship between the copywriter and the reader, which does not exist.

This 'masquerade' (Hyatt 1994) of friendship, a shared communication with a trusted confidant, an individual projected as someone you can believe in, who wouldn't lie to you, who has your best interests at heart, can predispose the text receiver to believe what the text producer is communicating.

The underlying issues and ideologies presented in the Political Speeches of the 16th President of the Republic of the Philippines. In the Inaugural Address, State of the Nation Address and other domestic as well as international political gatherings serve as the best avenues of the Philippine president to present and to inform the public about the existing socio-economic, political problems and ideologies. Through these speeches, the president is given the opportunity to present to the Filipinos and International communities the plans that he envisions as the head of the state. The recurring issues and ideologies are War on Drugs, Criminality, Graft and Corruption, Social Justice, Internal Security Threats & Terrorism, Global Warming & Climate Change, Federal System, Peace Process, Infrastructure, Worsening Traffic Situation, Dispute in West Philippine Sea, Education, Health Services, Protecting Women's Rights and Human Rights, Honoring Treaties and International obligations, Independent Foreign Policy, and Being a Leftist.

Within a text, it can be revealing to note any comment regarding individuals who may be projected as less socially valued, as a result of these issues, in order to legitimize the assertions of those who hold power, or to identify any pejorative or stereotyping presentation or labelling of such people as being a 'normal', naturalised and commonly-shared viewpoint. In the extracts below:

It's not about 'yung infra infra. Every year may infra talaga 'yan. That's the source of corruption. Sabi ko: Hulaan ko. I will do away with corruption. It will be a clean government. Then and now, I will state to you publicly. There will be no corruption in my government.

-PS9

With this, my administration shall be sensitive to the State's obligations to promote, and protect, fulfill the human rights of our citizens, especially the poor, the marginalized and the vulnerable and social justice will be pursued, even as the rule of law shall at all times prevail.

-PS2

Politics pertains to the process of struggling for power. According to Bayram (2010), it is a struggle for power in order to put certain political, economic and social ideas into practice. In this process, language plays a crucial role, for every political action is prepared, accompanied, influenced and played by language. It is one of the vital tools that politicians use in order to shape the political thoughts of the electorates with the aim of selling their ideologies to them.

Chimbarange, Takavarasha, and Kombe (2014) are of the view that the main purpose of politicians is to persuade their audience of the validity of their political claims. The ensuing political influence flows from the employment of resources that shape the beliefs and behavior of others. The above implies that politicians make efforts to convince the electorates to discard their political ideologies and hold on to theirs.

Political speech could be defined as a speech associated with either struggle for power or maintenance/control of it. It is diverse because it encompasses the different forms of speeches that the

politicians deliver at political forums. One of the popular political speeches is presidential inaugural speech. It is a speech that is often presented shortly after swearing in or taking oath of office by newly elected president. The aim is not to seek for the electorates' votes but to appreciate and inform them of the direction of the new government and its plans. In such speech, the president persuades not for vote but to make the electorate to build hope in the administration ushered in.

Language in this context can be seen as an embodiment of ideologies than an instrument of persuasion; a tool for controlling powers rather than a tool for acquiring powers. CDA considers discourse as socially constructive, which means that the way the politicians talk will influence and lead not only the way simple people talk. Indeed the political discourses will also shape the reality. Wodak and Meyer (2009) & Link (1983) when arguing that "discourse is an institutionalized way of talking that regulates and reinforces actions and thereby exerts power."

Discourses are not inscrutable or hermetic entities. They form a concatenation with one another and are mostly inter-textually connected. Hence discourses are supra-individual. "Discourses exert power because they transport knowledge on which collective and individual consciousness feeds. This knowledge is the basis for individual and collective, discursive and non-discursive action, which in turn shapes reality" (Wodak and Meyer, 2009).

On the basis of interpretation, Fairclough (1997) mentions two dimensions of utterance. First, surface of utterance, which studies the processes by which interpreters convert strings of sounds or marks on paper into recognizable words, phrases and sentences. Second, meaning of utterance, which assigns meaning to the constituent parts of an utterance that may correspond to sentences or to semantic propositions. The third level of interpretation discusses local coherence of the text, which establishes meaning connections between utterances, therefore, producing coherent interpretations of pairs and sequences of them. This level in fact focuses on the connective values of formal features of text. He states "it has a partially 'internal' character compared with the others, in that it is a matter of the values formal features have in connecting together parts of text". Cohesion in text can either involve vocabulary links between sentences- repetition of words or use of relative words. It can also involve connectors that mark various temporal, spatial and logical relationships between sentences.

CDA is not only the study of the structures of language and text but is the study of people, institutions and organizations. The main premise in this approach is that the relation between form and content is not arbitrary; this relation is recognized by cultural, social and political constraints (Aghagolzadeh & Bahrami-Khorshid, 2009).

The presidential discourses are focused on foreign or even international affairs and therefore it may be expected that also the audience is spreading beyond the borders of the Philippines. The speeches for the international audience were selected with respect to the relative importance that particular countries play in the independent foreign policy and with the aim to choose countries from various continents. Moreover, extraordinary in the fact that the mutual arrangement of the presidents of these countries.

Therefore, it is evident from what has been described here that the majority of the speeches is primarily dedicated for some formal occasions and for the listeners who correspond to them. On the other hand, this does not mean that also the broader audience should not be taken into consideration. As speeches are often broadcasted by various media and the transcripts of all of these particular speeches are easily available on the Internet, the politicians usually remember well that they are speaking especially for this broader audience and with this idea in the mind they are aspiring to improve their popularity. The work thus tries to trace formal and informal features of these presidential speeches.

Imperative to consider the three stages of CDA as determined by Fairclough (1989) to result in a comprehensive understanding of such important speeches representing the country's policy. In fact, these stages are reflected in the "three dimensional method of discourse analysis", introduced by Fairclough (1995), namely: Description stage, which is related to the formal properties of the text. Interpretation stage, which is concerned with the relationship between texts and interaction. Explanation stage, which is concerned with the relationship between interaction and social context.

The politician shows the power which he actually possesses and which he wants to exhibit according to the particular situation and the audience before he is standing up. It is significant that the nature of the political, economical and social hierarchies together with the relations of elites influence the exhibited power. In other words, power exemplifies the form of external boundaries for the discipline which is marked as cultural pragmatics. These external boundaries parallel the internal ones which are exemplified by performance background representation (Alexander, 2005).

It is evident that political speeches are a type of discourse which is characterized by specific features. However, it has been found out that due to the pressure of media and its effort to catch the attention of their consumers the traditional view of political speeches has been changing and is now nearer to the everyday, colloquial speech. Political speeches should therefore be not only interesting but also entertaining so as to be

attractive to media holders who have the privilege of what would be presented and how. Such approach may also make political speeches to be more persuasive. Persuasion is namely among the main purposes of political speeches. Through persuasion politicians influence others and gain their attention or even win their sympathy. Mixing of the entertaining and persuasive elements is among the main features of political speeches. How this works in everyday practice tries to investigate the practical part of this thesis.

Since the election of former Davao City Mayor Rodrigo Duterte as the Philippine President in a landslide victory on 9 May 2016, the regional and international media have highlighted his outrageous remarks on various sensitive topics. For instance he backed the extra judicial killings of drug dealers, alleged that journalists were killed because they were corrupt and called Philippine bishops critical of him "sons of whores", among other crude comments. None of these remarks have dented his domestic support. But they have attracted international attention and provided a negative one dimensional view of the 71 year old new leader.

He is the first Philippine President who is not from the traditional land owning elite, which has dominated the critical centres of power in the capital Manila since independence. His base is in Davao City in the traditionally neglected Southern Philippines and he claimed that he will continue to stay in Davao, commuting daily by commercial aircraft, until he is comfortable in Manila. To stress this point, he was in Davao when he was officially proclaimed by a joint session of the Philippine Congress on 30 May as the winner of the election and the next President. His election signals a shift away from Manila centred politics and an effort to reach out to hitherto marginalised sectors of Philippine society. His speeches and public comments are in English rather than Tagalog, the lingua franca of Greater Manila, which has been promoted throughout the archipelago as the national language. He has emphasised his links with Mindanao and several of his cabinet appointments hail from the region.

Former President Fidel Ramos, who served from 1992 to 1998, was an early supporter of Duterte and has been influential in pushing pragmatic policy choices. Ramos' influence is positive as his tenure was marked by an economic transformation in the Philippines as well as a significant outreach to the NPA and Muslim rebel movements. Ramos appointees now holding Cabinet posts include peace process adviser Jesus Dureza, who held this post under Ramos. Because of Duterte's unwillingness to accommodate the preference of the Manila political elite for business as usual, his Cabinet includes more nominees with close personal ties to the President and who hail from Davao and the surrounding Cotabato region. Duterte's priorities are domestic. Law and order, anti-corruption and crushing the drug problem are at the top of his agenda. He aims to devolve power from the central government to the provinces. By working out of Davao so far, Duterte is symbolically reminding Manila politicians that a political revolution is underway. He intends to shift to a federal-parliamentary system and the constitution will have to be revised (Phil.Daily Inquirer,2016).

Sustained economic growth and ensure that its impact is equitable to all Filipinos. This is the goal of the Duterte administration through its 10-point economic agenda presented before some 300 delegates of the two-day business consultation dialogue dubbed "Sulong Pilipinas: Hakbang Tungo sa Kaunlaran (Philippines Onwards: A Step Towards Progress,2016).

The administration proposed an eight-point agenda but realized the need to focus also on the Reproductive Health Law, or RH Law, and on science, technology and the arts. On top of the list is to "continue and maintain current macroeconomic policies, including fiscal, monetary and trade policies."

President Rodrigo Duterte vowed to sustain the current Aquino government's economic policies to ensure the continued expansion of the economy, which in the first quarter of 2016 posted the highest growth in Asia at 6.9 percent. Another focus is to "institute progressive tax reform and more effective tax collection, indexing taxes to inflation."

The administration also targets to further increase the country's competitiveness and ease in doing business. This effort will draw upon successful models used to attract business to local cities and pursue the relaxation of Constitutional restrictions on foreign ownership, except as regards land ownership, in order to attract foreign direct investment (FDI)," a statement by the economic managers said.

Investment on infrastructure is also targeted to remain strong at the current five percent of gross domestic product (GDP) or higher at around six percent of total domestic output, with the help of public-private partnership (PPP). "We will invest in building the infrastructure necessary to make us a 21st century economy: from modernizing our ports to improving our logistical spine to ensuring reliable and cheap power for all the islands," Dominguez said.

The government eyes to implement not just major PPP projects but more small and medium-sized projects, particularly in the countryside to ensure a more inclusive growth, citing that this will provide more job opportunities for more people. The focus on the provinces is among the 10-point economic agenda to "promote rural and value chain development towards increasing agricultural and rural enterprises productivity and rural tourism."

I, as a researcher, as I was able to conduct a one-on-one interview with President Rodrigo Roa Duterte, I was able to gain some insights based on his responses on my few questions. First, he explained that he doesn't

prepare speeches. He just read the theme and know what political gathering is he going to attend and then present his impromptu speech to the audience. He sometimes drafts and make some short bullets because he has already learned that as a prosecutor and cover all the issues needed. As much as possible, he is honest in what he says to the public. This is really Public service and focus on it.

For President Duterte, he does not have specific style in presenting his political speeches. It is just natural for him to do the public service and he is always ready to entertain questions to the public. He is already trained to do so because he worked as a prosecutor for several years and a government official for a long time.

Fundamentally, he said "I am a left...but I am a socialist!". He knows the needs, wants and lacks of the Filipino people that is why he is willing to do his best to address these concerns. The Filipinos are already tired of TRAPO (Traditional Politicians). President Duterte is really different from all the presidentiables, aside from he is the first Mindanaon President, he has good political background and the Filipinos find him credible because of what he has done in his city, Davao which is actions speak louder than words.

Indeed, many Filipinos find him as not a statesman because he acts and speaks like an ordinary citizen of the country. He often deviates from what a President of the Republic should behave especially with his use of the gutter language that is also misinterpreted by his many critics.

When I asked President Duterte about issues and ideologies that are presented in his speeches, he highlighted about economy, law and order, rebellion, peace talks with the Communist, and lifting the ceasefire because at that time he lifted the ceasefire to the CPP-NPA. He is very much concern with his policemen who were filed with criminal cases especially those who were culprits in the Korean National murder.

I was able to ask him about the challenges that he has encountered as the 16th President of the Republic and he answered about the prevalence of drug addiction, Narcopolitics, Police skalawags, terrorism and the ongoing peace talks. He was so serious in addressing with these problems and he in fact cited some historical aspects in pursuing peace in Mindanao. He again gave his sentiments to the American's colonization in the Philippines. He elaborated also the pains and sufferings of the Moro people.

The last question that I asked him was about his message to the Filipino people. He then straightforwardly answered "Unity among the Filipinos in Luzon, Visayas, and Mindanao whether Moro, MNLF, MILF...there is a rocky road ahead". He also stated about the rising nationalism of the Filipinos in his current administration. As a Filipino, I could feel his sincerity as well as urgency in changing the systems in the society and willing to do major reforms in our land.

Implication for Practice

Based on the Critical Discourse Analysis framework, I can summarize the features of President Rodrigo Roa Duterte's speeches as follows: First, he used more simple words and short sentences instead of difficult ones. His language is easy and colloquial. Thus, it can easily shorten the distance between him and the audience. Second, from transitivity analysis, I can see a process of doing, has been used most in his speeches. That is related to his first days of presidency. From this process, the President showed us what the government has achieved, what they are doing and what they will do. And also I can see that with applying transitivity, his speeches are trying to arouse the Filipino people's confidence toward the president and his government in his upcoming six years of office.

Moreover, modality refers to a speaker's attitudes towards or opinion about the truth of a proposition expressed by a sentence. Through the analysis of modality, I was able to find that President Duterte made his audience more easily to understand and accept his political speeches by means of modal verbs, tense and first person pronouns. Another role of modal verbs, especially the frequent use of will and can in president's political speeches can persuade the audience to have faith in the government's ability about the difficulties as well as challenges that the Philippines is struggling and may confront in the future.

Additionally, the President also used simple present tense to present the domestic and world wide situations ranging from political, economic and cultural issues. And then depending on simple future tense, he laid out his following reforms and steps taken in his term. In this way, the government's objectives are shown and at the same time, the audience's confidence is built. Furthermore, by using first person pronouns, he successfully shortened the distance between him and the audience. So it can help him persuade the public to accept and support his policies.

Also in this study, it gives significant role to personal pronouns such as 'we' to make sense of intimacy with the audience as well as follow a common objective. The tense can be another factor that signalizes president's political speeches. Because it refers to present, past and future events as well as activities that demonstrate government's objectives and at the same time display the world wide situations that extend from political, cultural, and economic aspects.

The use of pronouns in political discourse goes beyond substitution of a noun in traditional grammar to self-emphasis, self-responsibility, inclusiveness, solidarity and unity of purpose among others. The pronouns that our political leader used is to refer to himself or his audience that can be a significant part of the message.

“We” is used to create shared sense of responsibility and group cohesion. It means that the speaker and the audience belong to the same team, have the same mission/ objectives, or show solidarity. The study has revealed that the content of the addresses consisted of appreciations, criticisms, exposition of ideological plans as to the direction of the new government and subtle denouncement of the past government.

Revealed in the analysis are the determination of the new government to strengthen foreign relations and policies, strengthen democracy, fight corruption and economic insecurity, and improve all the sectors of the country.

Critical Discourse Analysis can explore the relationships among language, ideology and power. It provides a new idea and method to analyze public addresses. So it is worth for us to pay more attention. The critical impetus of CDA is certainly the legacy of enlightenment. Critique regularly aims at revealing structures of power and unmasking ideologies. Power is another concept which is central for CDA, as it often analyses the language use if those in power, who are responsible for the existence of inequalities (Skillington, 2003; Van Dijk 1998 & Breeze 2011). Typically, CDA researchers are interested in the way discourse reproduces social domination. Power is thus exercised with intention but it is not individual intention. The political speeches of the President focuses on what is accepted knowledge about how to exercise power. One way of doing this is by threatening like what he has presented in his war on drugs, criminality, terrorism and corruption. Power is about relations of difference, and particularly about the effects of differences in social structures.

The constant unity of language and other social matters ensures that language is entwined in social power in a number of ways: language indexes and expresses power, and is involved where there is contention over and a challenge to power. Power does not necessarily derive from language, but language can be used to challenge power, to subvert it, to alter distributions of power in the short and the long term (Fairclough, 2004). Language provides a finely articulated vehicle for establishing differences in power in hierarchical social structures.

The study helped to elaborate how Critical Discourse Analysis is useful in disclosing the discursive nature of much contemporary social and political change as emphasized by Wodak and Meyer (1996). Particularly the language of the President that is scrutinized as a site of power, of struggle and also as a site where language is often apparently transplanted.

This study has a number of limitations which should be considered. Firstly, the researcher limited herself to only thirty political speeches delivered by the president. In fact, the researchers left behind many other speeches deserving much attention and academic scrutiny. Besides, the researcher selected only two viable questions to lay down the main discursive findings pertaining to the speeches. I do not call on other strategies which do undoubtedly deserve investigation and which can put forward claims with paramount importance about these speeches. Further, the main theme of this paper is oriented towards linguistic purposes other than the political ones. Hence, this study is never meant to make political claims.

Implication for Further Research

Throughout the research process, many questions arose which are not part of the original questions as geared in this study. Therefore, there are several topics for research that I found potential for exploration.

Among the other characteristics of this speech may be named a relatively high proportion of short sentences. Although the use of simple sentences and compound or complex sentences is not the matter of interest of this research, it may be stated here that such methods facilitates to build an effect of drama and the change in anticipation. This suggestion gains more credibility if we take into the consideration the fact that the speech was delivered in spoken form and therefore the change of the pitch of the voice may intensify the attention of the audience. As the corpus of this paper consists just of the transcripts of the speeches, this feature, however, is not taken into consideration during the analysis and comparison.

Furthermore, there is a need to do research on rhetorical strategies, the use of Gutter language of the President, intertextual representations, and other stylistic devices used by the president in a larger scale of corpora. Moreover, future researchers may explore on pragma-linguistic analysis and lexico-semantic areas of President Duterte's speeches focusing on his one year service as the head of state.

Having studied the speeches delivered by President Duterte, I also recommend the following for further research: Reinvestigating other speeches of the President, coaching with the Critical Discourse Analysis themes. Many studies dealing with such speeches emphasize their layouts and political underlying roles without determining the linguistic clue enabling him persuade other political leaders to adopt his opinions and political solutions. Further, reinvestigating other kinds of texts and speeches in his native language, shielded with the Critical Discourse Analysis and Political Discourse Analysis. Another is conducting a study indicating whether President Duterte follows the same strategies in all kinds of his speeches like in national, social, etc. speeches. Lastly, applying the other political discourse strategies such as evasion, euphemism, and rhetoric on President Duterte's speeches.

Concluding Remarks

With the research questions laid out, I was able to have the chance to critically examine the political speeches of the 16th President of the Republic of the Philippines. It was not an easy undertaking. I had struggles from finding appropriate framework for analysis to retrieving the thirty political speeches since at that time when I had my proposal defense, it was just his first two months in office. It had led me to strenuous efforts of finding ways to furnish copies of his speeches or addresses and a gatekeeper had helped me to hand in personally my letter of request to the Office of the President. It took me few months for their affirmative response and had caused me cramming to transcribe and do data analysis.

This study is a product of immense knowledge and the wisdom shared by my teachers and adviser. The perseverance and determination contributed a lot in surpassing the arduous journey towards the completion of this reasearch.

Indeed, this is a treasured achievement in any PhD journey. This manuscript will always be a relic in my academic endeavors. The learnings have always been meant to be cherished especially the chance of having a one-on-one interview with President Rodrigo Roa Duterte. This study has also inspired me to do my roles as a Filipino citizen and be also a catalyst for change in my own simple ways as a contribution to the total reform of the land as spearheaded by the 16th President of this country. Truly, change has finally come.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I greatly owe this craft to the administration of St. John Paul II College of Davao for the opportunity and financial support. I am also indebted to the superb professor and adviser, Dr. Riceli C. Mendoza, PDAL classmates and my family for the inspiration and motivation.

REFERENCES

- [1]. Academic Research Guide (2013). *Analysing qualitative data*. London: Routledge.
- [2]. Aghagolzadeh & Bahrami-Khorshid (2009). The power of discourse and the discourse of power: Pursuing peace through discourse intervention. *International Journal of Peace Studies*. 3 (9) 20-29.
- [3]. Alexander, C. (2005). Cultural Pragmatics: Social Performance between Ritual and Strategy. *Sociological Theory* 22.4: 527-573. *American Sociological Association*. Web. JSTOR Archive.
- [4]. Ary, E. (2002). *Qualitative data analysis*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publication.
- [5]. Barton S. & Hamilton T. (1998). *Modernity and ambivalence*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- [6]. Batstone, D. (1995). *Advances in discourse approaches*. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- [7]. Bayram, F. (2010). Ideology and political discourse: a critical discourse analysis of erdogan's political speech. *ARECLS*, 7(4), 23-40.
- [8]. Beard, A. (2000). *The language of politics*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- [9]. Berg, T. (1998). *Research methods in primary care*. Oxon : Radcliffe Medical Press.
- [10]. Blommaert, V. (2011). Critical discourse analysis: scrutinizing ideologically –driven discourses. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*. 16(7) 25-31.
- [11]. Breeze, R. (2011). Critical discourse analysis and its critic. *International Pragmatics Association*. (Pragmatics 21:4.493-525, 2011)
- [12]. Brno, T. (2011). *Discourse analysis*. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press.
- [13]. Blommaert, A. (2002). *Social psychology and discourse*. Oxford, UK : Wiley - Blackwell .
- [14]. Borgstrom, B. (2003). Power structure and political speech. 313-327. *Royal Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland*. Web. JSTOR Archive.
- [15]. Bowen, R. (2009). *Discourse analysis: investigating processes of social construction*. Thousand Oaks, CA : Sage Publication .
- [16]. Caldas-Coulthard, C. (1990). *Texts and practices: readings in critical discourse analysis*. Eds. Carmen Rosa Caldas-Coulthard and Malcolm Coulthard. London: Routledge.
- [17]. Chilton, P. (1985). *Language and the nuclear arms debate: nukespeak today*. London & New York: Continuum.
- [18]. Chilton, P. and Schäffner, C. (2002). *Classroom discourse analysis: A tool for critical reflection*. Cresskill, NJ: Hampton press.
- [19]. Chilton, P. and Schäffner, T. (2002). *Missing links in mainstream cda: modules, blends and the critical instinct*. A New Agenda in (Critical) Discourse Analysis. London: Routledge.
- [20]. Chilton, P. (2004). *Critical social theory*. pp. 55-60. Oxford: Blackwell.
- [21]. Chouliaraki, T. (2005). The constitution of ethnographic texts in social scientific discourse: realist and polyphonic representations interface. *Journal of Applied Linguistics*. 10 (1) 27–46.
- [22]. C'asteline R., Inez-Guillem A., Robles, T. & Tracy S. (2011). *The circular structure of power: politics, identity, and community*. New York: Riverhead Books.

- [23]. Chimbarange, A., Kombe, F. & Takavarasha, P. (2014). A critical discourse analysis of president mugabe's 2002 address to the world. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*. 3(9)50-89.
- [24]. Chouliaraki, L. & Fairclough, N. (1999). *Discourse in late modernity*. Edinburgh, UK: Edinburgh University Press.
- [25]. Clarke, S. (2006) . *Basics of qualitative research: theory, procedures and techniques*. London: Sage Publication.
- [26]. Creswell, J.W. (1998). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: choosing among five approaches*. Retrieved from <https://goo.gl/uZ1WOP>.
- [27]. Creswell, J.W. (2012). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: choosing among five approaches* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publication.
- [28]. Creswell, J.W. (2013). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: choosing among five approaches* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publication.
- [29]. Curtin, F. & Fossey, S. (2007) . *Narrative analysis*. Newbury Park, California : Sage Publication.
- [30]. Cockcroft, S. & Cockcroft, T. (1992). *Discourse and cognition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- [31]. Corbin, S. & Strauss T. (2008). *Interpretive ethnography: ethnographic practices for the 21st century*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publication.
- [32]. Crystal, D. (1992). *Methods of text and discourse analysis*. London: Sage Publication.
- [33]. Crystal, D. (1994) .*Critical discourse analysis*. London: Longman.
- [34]. de Freitas, K. (2000). *Introducing systemic functional grammar of english*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- [35]. Desker, T. (2016). *Conversation in second language acquisition: talking to learn*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- [36]. De Wet, J.C. (2010). *The art of persuasive communication : a process*. Claremont: Juta & Company Ltd.
- [37]. Decrop, M. (2004). *The persuasion handbook: developments in theory and practice*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- [38]. Dictionary.com (2017). *Political speeches*. Retrieved from: <http://www.dictionary.com>.
- [39]. Dillard, J., Pfau, S. & O'Keefe, T. (2002). *Persuasion: theory and research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publication.
- [40]. Dontcheva-Navrátilová, T. (2010) .*Language as ideology*. London and New York: Routledge.
- [41]. Eggins, V. (1994) . Manifestations of nommo: afrocentric analysis of president barack obama. *Journal of Black Studies*, 42(5), 737-750.
- [42]. Ellis, H. (1998) .*Discursive Psychology*. London: Sage Publication.
- [43]. The Encyclopedia Britannica, (2016). President Rodrigo Roa Duterte. 18(10)90-95. Chicago, IL: *Encyclopedia Britannica*.
- [44]. Ezejideak, R. & Ugwu, T. (2007) . *Realities and relationships: soundings in social construction*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- [45]. Fowler, R. (1991). *Language and control*. London: Routledge.
- [46]. Fowler, R. (2002) .*Language in the news: discourse and ideology in the press*. London and New York: Routledge.
- [47]. Fraenkel, R. and Wallen, J. (2006) .*Interviews, in n. gilbert (ed.), researching social life*. London: Sage Publication.
- [48]. Fairclough, N. (1989). *Discourse and social change*. Cambridge, UK: Policy Press.
- [49]. Fairclough, N. (1995). *Critical discourse analysis*. London: Longman.
- [50]. Fairclough, N. (1995). *Discourse across disciplines: discourse analyzing in researching social change*. *AILA Review*, 12, 3-17.
- [51]. Fairclough, N. and Wodak, R. (Ed.). (1997) . *Discourse as social interaction: discourse studies: a multidisciplinary introduction*. London: Routledge.
- [52]. Fairclough, N. (1987). *Political discourse in the media: an analytical framework Approaches to media discourse*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- [53]. Fairclough, N. L. (1989). *Conversationalisation of public discourse and the authority of the consumer. The authority of the consumer*. London: Routledge.
- [54]. Fairclough, N. L. (1992). *Critical discourse analysis: papers in the critical study of language*. London: Longman.
- [55]. Fairclough, N. L. (1996). *Critical language awareness*. London: Longman.
- [56]. Fairclough, N. L. (1997) .*Political discourse in the media: an analytical framework Approaches to media discourse*. Oxford: Blackwell
- [57]. Fairclough, N. (2000). *New labour, new language?*. London: Routledge.
- [58]. Freire, E. (1972). *Time and the other: how anthropology makes its object*. New York: Columbia University Press.

- [59]. Fairclough, N. (Ed.). (1992). *Critical language awareness*. London: Longman
- [60]. Farahmandpur, S. & McLaren, T. (2001). *Consumer culture and postmodernism*. London: Sage Publication.
- [61]. Foucault, S. (1980). *A theory of cognitive dissonance*. New York: Row, Peterson & Co.
- [62]. Fairclough, N. (1989). *Language and power*. London: Longman
- [63]. Fairclough, N. (1993). *Language and power*. Longman, UK.
- [64]. Fairclough, N. (1995) & Lemke T. (1995). *Critical discourse analysis: the critical study of language*. United Kingdom: Longman.
- [65]. Fairclough, N. (1997) .*New labor, new language*. London and New York: Routledge.
- [66]. Fairclough, N. (2002). *Language and power*. 3rd ed. New York: Longman.
- [67]. Fairclough, N. (2003). *Analysing discourse: textual analysis for social research*. London and New York: Routledge .
- [68]. Fairclough, N. (2004) .*Semiosis, ideology and mediation*. Philadelphia. John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- [69]. Fowler, T. and Kress, S. (1979). *Language form and Language function*. USA: MIT Press.
- [70]. Frankel, D. & Wallen, P. (2006).*Majority-minority relations* (4th ed.) Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- [71]. Gramsci, A. (1971). *Selections from the prison notebooks*. London: Lawrence and Wishart.
- [72]. Gee, P. (1990). *Social linguistics and literacies* (2nd edition). London: Falmer Press .
- [73]. Hacker, T. (1996) .*Changing teachers, changing times: teachers' work and culture in the postmodern age*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- [74]. Halliday, M.A.K. (1994). *Systematic theory*. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.
- [75]. Halliday, M. A. K. (1994). *Linguistic function and literary style: an inquiry into the language of William Golding's The Inheritors, in linguistic studies of text and discourse*. Peking: Peking University Press.
- [76]. Hancock, T. (1998). *Changing teachers, changing times: teachers' work and culture in the postmodern age*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- [77]. Hoey, M. (2000) . *Persuasive rhetoric in linguistics: a stylistic study of some features of the language of Noam Chomsky*. England: Oxford University Press.
- [78]. Huckin, T. (1997). *Critical discourse analysis in functional approaches to written text: classroom applications*. Washington, DC: USA. Sage Publications.
- [79]. Hunston S. and Thompson L. (2000) .*Pedagogy of the oppressed*. Harmondsworth: Penguin Publication.
- [80]. Halliday, M. (1985). *Introduction: who needs identity*. London, UK: Sage Publication.
- [81]. Halliday, M. A. K., & Hassan, R. (2003). *Cohesion in English*. London: Longman.
- [82]. Handbook of Discourse Analysis (2002) . *Handbook of discourse analysis : Discourse analysis in society*. London: Academic Press.
- [83]. Hargreaves, K. (1994). *Social semiotics*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- [84]. Hyatt, M. (1994). *Social identity and social cognition: historical background and current trends*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell.
- [85]. Ivanič, R. (1997) *Writing and identity*. London: Cambridge University Press.
- [86]. Kövecses, N. (2010). *Discourse analysis: Investigating processes of social construction*. Thousand Oaks, CA : Sage Publication .
- [87]. Kress, G. (1985). *Linguistic processes in sociocultural practices*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- [88]. Kvale T. (2006) .*Language and social relations*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- [89]. Lakoff, G. (1991) . *Hedges: a study in meaning criteria and the logic and fuzzy concepts*. California, U.S.A. Reidel Publishing Company.
- [90]. Laurinaitytė, S. (2011) .*Hegemony and socialist strategy*. London: Verso.
- [91]. Lincoln S. and Guba T. (1985) .*Analyzing multimodal interaction: a methodological framework*. London: Routledge.
- [92]. Locke, T. (2004). *Critical discourse analysis*. London: Continuum
- [93]. Luke, A. (1997). *Constructing critical literacies: teaching and learning textual practice*. St. Leonards, NSW: Allen and Unwin.
- [94]. Lemke, T. (1995). *Critical discourse analysis: the critical study of language*. United Kingdom: Longman.
- [95]. Lakoff, M. & Johnson, T. (1980) .The power of discourse and the discourse of power: pursuing peace through discourse intervention . *International Journal of Peace Studies*. 5(10)32-49.
- [96]. Lincoln, T. and Guba, S. (1985). *Qualitative research*. London: Sage Publication.
- [97]. Link, S. (1983). *Critical discourse analysis: theory and interdisciplinary*. New York, Palgrave Mcmillan.
- [98]. Martin, T. (2000). *A critical discourse analysis of a political speech*. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company.

- [99]. Murcia, C. & Freeman, D. (1999). *The grammar book*. Cambridge University Press.
- [100]. Musolff, S. (2012). *The postmodern condition*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- [101]. Martin, R. (2000). *Division and rejection: from the personification of the gulf conflict to the demonisation of saddam hussein*. *Discourse & Society* 6(1): 49-79.
- [102]. Meyer, S. (2002). *Pragmatics: an introduction*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- [103]. Miles, M. and Huberman, A. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis*. Thousand Oaks, Sage Publication.
- [104]. Mirzaee, S. and Hamidi, H. (2012). Critical discourse analysis and fairclough's Model. *ELT Voices – India*, 2(5) 32-33
- [105]. Nanyang Technological University (2016). A study of kennedy's writing style from words of his inaugural speech. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*. 17(3)324-325.
- [106]. Palermino, A. (1999). *Critical language awareness*. New York: Basic Books.
- [107]. Patton, S. (2002). *An introduction to critical discourse analysis in education*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- [108]. Philippine Daily Inquirer (2016). *President of the republic*. July 1, 2016 issue.
- [109]. Popham, K. (1993). *Critical discourses on teacher development* / edited by John Smyth. London & New York : Cassell Publication.
- [110]. Powell, J. (1999). Actions speak as loud as words: a multimodal analysis of boys' talk in the classroom. *English in Education Journal*. 4(2)66 - 82.
- [111]. Perrewé, E. (2007). *Language, semantics and ideology*. London: Macmillan.
- [112]. *Philippines Onwards: A Step Towards Progress (2016)*. Philippine Daily Inquirer, July 12, 2016 Issue.
- [113]. Phillips R. & Pugh T. (2007) . *Discourse analytic research: repertoires and readings of texts in action*. London: Routledge.
- [114]. QSR International (2010). *Research interviewing: context and narrative*. Cambridge, MA : Harvard University Press.
- [115]. Reissman, S. (1993). *Advances in content analysis*. Beverly Hills/London: Sage Publication.
- [116]. Rojo, L. and Van Dijk, T.(1997). *Strategies of discourse comprehension*. London: Academic Press.
- [117]. Rahimi, T. & Riasati, A. (2011). A critical discourse analysis of the debates between republicans and democrats over the continuation of war in iraq. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 22(3): 182-200.
- [118]. Rodgers, R. (2005). *Social psychology and discourse*. Oxford, UK : Wiley - Blackwell.
- [119]. Schram, J. (1993). *Course in general linguistics*. London: Peter Owen Publishing.
- [120]. Skillington, T. (2003). Politics and the struggle to define: a discourse analysis of the framing strategies of competing actors in a new participatory forum. *The British Journal of Sociology*. Blackwell Publishing on behalf of The London School of Economics and Political Sciences.
- [121]. Skillington, T. (2006). Whose text? whose context?. *Discourse and Society* 8(2)165-166
- [122]. Smyth, R. (1995). *Rethinking methods in psychology*. London: Sage Publication.
- [123]. Sauer ,T. (1996). *The handbook of discourse analysis*. Oxford, UK : Blackwell .
- [124]. Schaffer, C. (1996). Editorial: political speeches and discourse analysis. *Sociolinguistics Journal* 5(2)3-10.
- [125]. Schäffner , C. (1996). Zur bedeutungsdifferenzierung des wortes peace. zeitschrift fur phonetik sprachwissenschaft und kommunikationsforschung. *Applied Linguistics Journal* 5(4) 360-367.
- [126]. Schäffner, C., & Wenden, A. L. (1995). *Language and peace*. Aldershot: Dartmouth Publishing.
- [127]. Schaffner, C. (2004). *Editorial: political speeches and discourse analysis*. *Current Issues in Language & Society*, 3, (3), pp.201-204.
- [128]. Scriven, D. (1991). *The everyday world as problematic: a feminist sociology*. Boston: Northeastern University Press.
- [129]. Schiffen, E. (2008). *Studies in ethnomethodology*. New York: Prentice Hall.
- [130]. Sharndama, T. (2015). *New theories of discourse*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- [131]. Street ,R.(1999). *Why study the media?*. London: Sage Publications.
- [132]. Sheholislami, K. (2001). *Race, discourse and power in france*. Aldershot: Avebury Publishing Company.
- [133]. Silverman, D. (2007) . *Interpreting qualitative data: methods for analysing talk, text and interaction*. London, Sage Publication.
- [134]. Suter, R. (2012). *Discourse analysis: investigating processes of social construction*. Thousand Oaks, CA : Sage Publication .
- [135]. Thompson, K. (2002). *Moral and political discourse: theory and practice in international relations*. Washington, DC: University Press of America.
- [136]. Thompson, G. (1996). *Introducing functional grammar*. Foreign Language Teaching and Research Press, 1(2)78-80.
- [137]. Thorne, D. (2000). *Studies in the theory of ideology*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

- [138]. Trapper-Lomax S. (2008). Action-implicative discourse analysis. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, 14(1–2) 195–215.
- [139]. Tyler, S.A. (1986). *Post-modern Discourse*. London: J. Johnson Publishers.
- [140]. van Dijk, T. (1996). *Racism and the press*. London: Routledge.
- [141]. van Dijk T. (1998). *A handbook of discourse analysis*. London: Academic Press Limited. 4(5)9-11.
- [142]. van Dijk, T. A. (1993). *Macrostructures: an interdisciplinary study of global structures in discourse, interaction, and cognition*. Hillsdale, Erlbaum Publishing.
- [143]. van Dijk, T. A. (2006). *Communicating racism: ethnic prejudice in thought and talk*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- [144]. van Dijk, T. A. (1996). *Discourse, power and access*. In C. R. Caldas-Coulthard and M. Coulthard (eds) *Texts and practices. readings in critical discourse analysis*: 84-104. London:Routledge.
- [145]. van Dijk, T. A., ed. (1985). *Handbook of discourse analysis*. 3(4)11-12. *Discourse and dialogue*. London: Academic Press.
- [146]. van Dijk, T. A. (2003) *Critical discourse analysis: The handbook of discourse analysis*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing
- [147]. van Dijk, T. A. (2006). *Politics, ideology, and discourse: the encyclopedia of language and linguistics*. New York: Pergamon Press.
- [148]. van Dijk, T. A. (1988). *News as discourse*. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- [149]. van Dijk, T. A. (1993). *Principles of critical discourse analysis*. *Discourse and Society*, 4 (2), 249-283. doi.10.1177/0957926593004002006
- [150]. van Dijk, T. A. (1997). *What is political discourse analysis?* Retrieved January 20, 2016, from <http://www.discourses.org>
- [151]. van Dijk, T. A. (2011). *Ideology and discourse*. A multidisciplinary introduction. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.4135/9781446289068.n18>
- [152]. Van Leeuwen, T. V. (2006). *Critical discourse analysis*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- [153]. Waaijman, Q. (2010). *Applied discourse analysis: social and psychological interventions*. London: Sage Publication.
- [154]. Wang, L. (2010). Language feature analysis and translation method of political speeches. *Journal of Peking Printing College* 13(4)75-78
- [155]. Wodak, R. & Meyer, S. (2001). Turning the tables: antisemitic discourse in post-war Austria. *Discourse and Society Journal* 2(1) 47–64.
- [156]. Wodak R. and Meyer, S. (2009) Sprache in der politik – politik in der sprache: analysenzum öffentlichen sprachgebrauch. *Language in Politics – Politics in Language: An Analysis of Public Language Use*. Klagenfurt: Drava. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*. 8(1)10-14
- [157]. Wodak, R. (1987). *The fictions of language and the languages of fiction*. New York: Routledge.
- [158]. Wang, J. (2010). A critical discourse analysis of Barack Obama's speeches. *Journal of language teaching and research*. Lanzhou: Northwest Normal University. 2(8)8-12
- [159]. White, R. (1995). *The ELT curriculum: design, innovation and management*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.
- [160]. Wilson, L. (1990). *Critical discourse analysis as a research tool*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [161]. Wodak, R. (2003). Turning the tables: Anti-semiotic discourse in post-war Austria. *Discourse & Society Journal*. 2(9)65-84.
- [162]. Wodak, R. & Meyer, M. (2001). *Disorders of discourse*. London: Longman.
- [163]. Wodak, R. and Cillia, T. (2006). *Discursive construction of national identity*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- [164]. Wodak, R. and Meyer, M. (1996). *Methods of critical discourse analysis*. London, Sage Publications.
- [165]. Wodak, R. and Meyer, M. (2009). *Methods of text and discourse analysis*. London: Sage Publications.
- [166]. Wodak, R., & Meyer, M. (Eds.). (2008). *Methods of critical discourse analysis* (2nd ed.). London: Sage Publications Ltd.
- [167]. Weiss, L. & Wodak, R. (2003). Narratives across speech events. *Handbook of narrative analysis*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.
- [168]. Woods, H. (2006) *Identity and difference*. London: Sage Publication.
- [169]. Yule, B. (2001). *Promotional culture*. London: Sage Publication.
- [170]. Yumin, C. (2007). An analysis of style features of inaugural speeches given by American presidents based on the fundamental theory of HanLide. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 6(1)3-9.
- [171]. Zarefsky, R. (1986). *The cultural politics of everyday life*. Buckingham: Open University Press.