Language Related Research
E-ISSN: 2383-0816
https://lrr.modares.ac.ir
https://doi.org/10.29252/LRR.15.5.9

Tarbiat Modares University

Vol. 15, No. 5
pp. 225-255
November & December 2024

Received: 24 October 2023
Received in revised form: 17 December 2023
Accepted: 27 December 2023

Pragmatic Deviation of Searle's Felicity Conditions of Illocutionary Speech Acts in Trump's Political Speeches

Muhammad Hamza[1]* & *Nur Nordin*[2]

Abstract

Reviewing related literature shows deviation from Searle's felicity conditions has not been given attention. The present paper aims to investigate pragmatic deviation from Searle's (1969) felicity conditions of illocutionary speech acts in the previous president of the US, Donald Trump's political language. A qualitative method is used to gather and examine the data. The instrument consists of three oral documents which are chosen purposefully: (1) Trump's discourse to a group of his supporters in Illinois state, (2) Trump's meeting with Broadcasters MacCallum and Baier on Fox News Channel, and (3) Trump's interview with Broadcaster Cooper on CNN Channel. The paper uses a discourse analysis method to study these documents. Findings reveal that Searle's conditions (propositional content, preparatory, sincerity, essential) are deviated from in Trump's political speeches: (1) Representative acts by making false claims without providing any evidence, (2) commissive acts by committing himself to do a future action, but Trump fails to fulfill it, (3) directive acts by ordering Joe Biden's administration to prevent immigrants from entering the US, but Trump's order cannot be done, (4) expressive acts by jokingly apologizing to his wife because he does not do anything wrong that pushes him to make an apology to her and thus has no real intention to do this act, and (5) declarative acts by declaring they are going to end Pelosi's career politically, but she is not done. It is also found that deviation from these conditions happens as a means of persuading, influencing, threatening, mocking, and attacking others.

Keywords: Trump, pragmatic deviation, felicity conditions, illocutionary speech acts, context

[1] Corresponding Author: PhD Candidate University Utara Malaysia; *Email*: *muhammadhussain@alkadhum-col.edu.iq* ; ORCID ID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9033-4658
[2] PhD University Utara, Malaysia; *Email*: *nurrasyidah@uum.edu.my* ;
ORCID ID: https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7954-0250

[DOI: 10.48311/LRR.15.5.225]

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) 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 take into account 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 concerning 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, such as stylistic or aesthetic reasons. Those speakers usually deviate from the rules that are agreed upon. Thus, a great focus has been given to dealing with this breakdown in the use of language (Derakhshan, et al., 2023; Derakhshan & Shakki, 2021; Derakhshan & Shakki, 2023; Dianita & Sofyan, 2023; Hadiati, 2019; Hamza, et al., 2022; Hamza & Nordin, 2023; Hamza & Nordin, 2024; Ojukwu & Osuchukwu, 2019; Rahmani, 2023; Shakki et al., 2021). In contrast to the standard, Ren and Yu (as cited in Hamza & Abbood, 2020, p. 5) point out that deviation is a set of linguistic choices out of the extent of a generally acceptable alternative. Wales (2011) argues that when not following the standards, speakers break the norms resulting in the presence of deviation (or deviance). Similarly, Crystal (1995) states that deviance is demonstrated in making unpermitted sentences or utterances because of non-compliance with what is agreed upon.

Deviation is diversely categorized; it could be triggered linguistically or pragmatically. First, Leech (1969) defines linguistic deviation as a set of inexact features of a linguistic act. It is composed of various kinds: lexical, grammatical, and semantic deviation. Several studies have been conducted to examine linguistic deviation and other types of deviation in literature (Hamza & Abbood, 2020; Hussaina, et al., 2020; Mansoor & Salman, 2020). Moreover, Ren and Yu (2013) studied deviation of language in advertising and Dyakiv et al. (2021) explored communicative deviations in political interviews in Germany and Ukraine.

[DOI: 10.48311/LRR.15.5.225]

Second, Leech (2008) presents a pragmatic deviation and defines it as an unsuitable pragmatic performance. There is a relatively small body of literature that is concerned with pragmatic deviation found in literary works (Castiglione, 2013; Zidane, 2017).

Indeed, pragmatic standards are crucial for 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; Searle's (1969) felicity conditions of illocutionary speech acts.

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, 2019; Pollack, 2017; Sclafani, 2018; Shakki, 2022; Shakki et al., 2023) for using different strategies that diverge from pragmatic rules. For example, Pollack (2017) depicts Trump as a unique U.S. president 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 Searle's felicity conditions of illocutionary acts.

[DOI: 10.48311/LRR.15.5.225]

Speech act theory, first outlined in Austin (1962) and expanded by Searle (1969), begins from the conception that individuals can use language to do things–i.e., doing an utterance is possible to create a perceptible alter in the world. Within the speech act theory, certain conditions, namely "felicity conditions" must be matched for the appropriate production of speech acts. Austin argues that the utterance is achieved successfully if some circumstances are adhered to. However, if one of these conditions is infringed, the act will be infelicitous or unhappy. Searle (1969, p. 38) argues that these conditions create the activity of speech acts. Searle suggests four rules; propositional content, preparatory, sincerity, and essential conditions. Vanderveken (2001) believes that these rules of the appropriateness of an illocutionary speech act are the rules that are to be satisfied so that the speaker(s) can successfully achieve that act. Vanderveken (2001) adds that a talker may produce incorrect assumptions. Also, s\he can convey tendencies that they do not have. Therefore, success in performing the illocutionary acts could be defective; they could falsely and unfavorably promise the hearer or they could produce a dishonest promise that is not intended to preserve.

Some researchers have conducted studies to examine Austin's and Searle's speech act theory with an emphasis on locutionary, illocutionary, and perlocutionary acts (Akinkurolere, 2020; Dylgjerii, 2017; Khalid & Amin, 2019; Hashim, 2015) while some on illocutionary ones; they discussed various illocutionary speech acts (Al-Sulaimaan & Khoshaba; Azizah & Alpiah, 2018; Gusthini, et al., 2018; Larasati, 2020; Loko, 2018; Mufiah & Rahman, 2019; Ramanathan, et al., 2020; Raza, et al., 2021). Also, another group of researchers has focused their works on discussing numerous speech acts (refusals, apologies, and requests) in the instructions (Derakhshan & Shakki, 2020; Derakhshan & Shakki, 2021; Derakhshan & Shakki, 2023; Elasfar, et al., 2023; Farrag, 2022; Shakki et al., 2020). In addition, some scholars like Dianita and Sofyan (2023), Hadiati (2019), and Ojukwu and Osuchukwu (2019) examined illocutionary acts and took a further step. They investigated Searle's felicity conditions of speech acts and showed how they are met to be felicitous. Hadiati (2019) claims that pragmatic researchers have focused on speech acts for many years. However, merely limited studies have been conducted regarding the felicity conditions. Pragmatic investigators are typically concerned about the organization of the speech acts and some of them discuss these conditions. In pragmatic research, these conditions are crucial because they attempt to give an adequate clarification of what is uttered that is not possible to be clarified by utilizing truth-conditional

[DOI: 10.48311/LRR.15.5.225]

semantics. Therefore, Hadiati (2019) recommended conducting thorough studies to attain a better comprehension of these conditions by collecting and analyzing numerous language data. Agreeing with Hadiati (2019), the researchers thoroughly reviewing related literature have found that deviation from Searle's felicity conditions has been given little attention. Therefore, the present study attempts to fill this gap and show how these conditions are deviated from in Trump's political speeches. The objective of the paper is to discover the types of Searle's (1969) felicity conditions of speech acts that are deviated from in Trump's political speeches to fill the gap in this less studied area. The researchers will try to answer the following research question:

What types of Searle's (1969) felicity conditions of speech acts are deviated from in Trump's political speeches?

2. Literature Review

2.1. Speech act theory

Austin (1969) believes that in endeavoring to convey themselves, not merely do individuals make well-formed phrases and sentences, but they accomplish actions by uttering words. These are known as speech acts which include numerous tags like thanking, apologizing, complimenting, inviting, promising, or requesting, which are related to the talker's intended messages. Austin (1962) suggests three main acts when saying something; locutionary (the form of utterances), illocutionary (the function of utterances), and perlocutionary (the effect of utterances) which are considered stages of investigation that conceive the meaning of an utterance.

Austin presents a group of conditions that performatives (illocutionary acts) must follow to be happy or felicitous. They are known as 'felicity conditions'. Austin suggests that performatives are not 'true' or 'false', but it is possible to go unhappy. Then, Austin catalogs all the situations in which the performatives are possible to be unsuccessful' 'unhappy', 'infelicitous', or 'inappropriate' (Levinson, 1983).

Searle (1969) develops Austin's speech act theory and offers a new 'speech act' claiming "that speaking a language is engaging in a rule-governed form of behavior. To put it more briskly, talking is performing acts according to rules" (p.

[DOI: 10.48311/LRR.15.5.225]

22). Then Searle (1976) subdivides illocutionary speech acts into some classes by choosing three important aspects of illocutionary acts: "illocutionary point, direction of fit, and expressed psychological state" (p. 1) which make the foundation of a classification of the essential categories of illocutions. There are five main types of illocutionary acts: representatives (or assertives), directives, commissives, expressives, and declarations.

1. Representatives. The illocutionary point of this category is that the addresser commits himself\herself to the truthfulness that is expressed in the propositions. (Searle, 1976). For example, when the speaker asserts, claims, concludes, reports, or states, s\he signifies the world as they believe it is, hence they make their words match the world (Huang, 2007; Yule, 1996).

2. Directives. The illocutionary point of this class is that when the addresser tries to make the listener perform something (Searle, 1976). For illustration, when the speaker orders, requests, advises, questions, and commands, s\he expresses his\her want for the listener to perform something for them (Huang, 2007). Also, when s\he uses this class, they try to create a world that matches the words by the listener (Yule, 1996).

3. Commissives. The illocutionary point of this category is that when the addresser is committed to performing something in the future. For instance, when the speaker promises, refuses, threatens, and offers something, s\he commits themselves to do it (Huang, 2007). Also, when s\he uses this class, they try to create a world that matches the words by the speaker (Yule, 1996).

4. Expressives. "The illocutionary point of this class is to express the psychological state specified in the sincerity condition about a state of affairs specified in the propositional content" (Searle, 1976, p. 12). Typical verbs of this category are thanks, congratulations, apologies, condolences, and welcomes. Also, this category does not have a fit direction; the world does not fit the words nor do the words fit the world, but the proposition's truth is implicitly assumed (Searle, 1976).

5. Declarations. The illocutionary point of this category is that when the addresser performs an act of this class, s\he changes the world (Searle, 1975). Besides, the speaker needs to possess a specific recognized part in a definite situation so that s\he can achieve a declarative act properly. To illustrate, when the speaker declares combat, banishes someone, fires someone from work, or

[DOI: 10.48311/LRR.15.5.225]

nominates candidates, s/he can change the world. Also, this class has double fits of direction; the speaker makes the world fit the words and the words fit the world (Huang, 2007).

Searle (1969) criticizes Austin's felicity conditions and claims that these conditions mutually make the illocutionary force of the speech act and not merely ways in which the illocutionary act is felicitous or infelicitous. To rephrase this, these conditions refer to "the constitutive rules—rules that create the activity itself—of speech acts" (p. 38). Therefore, when one speaks, s\he performs speech acts as stated in these rules. Sbisa (2009) and Sadock (2006) mention that Searle follows Austin by proposing to study these conditions that should be met to have the act appropriately and non-defectively fulfilled. For each condition on the appropriately performed act, Searle suggests a rule to the impact that the illocutionary force indicating devices must merely be pronounced to have these conditions fulfilled. The fulfillment of them and the talker's utilization of linguistic tools that designate the connected illocutionary force, due to ordinary language conditions, make the taker perform the illocutionary impact; to interact with the force of what is uttered to the listener.

Searle's felicity conditions on the illocutionary speech acts are essential and satisfactory conditions for them to be performed. These conditions are: (1) essential conditions mean when the speaker performs the act, s\he has the intention that what s\he utters is counted as a recognizable act and the speaker's intention will be identified by the listener (Huang, 2007), (2) propositional content conditions determine what type of propositional content the speech act is to take, (3) preparatory conditions identify the prerequisites of context, particularly concerning the talker's and the listener's knowledge and elective situations, and (4) sincerity conditions govern the kind of psychological state of the talker that the speech act expresses (Sbisa, 2009).

Searle (1969, pp. 66-7) states that each kind of illocutionary speech act contains a group of requirements that are essential for the success and felicitousness of those acts. For illustration, the conditions of some kinds of illocutionary acts (which are the focus of the current paper) are presented in Table 1.

[DOI: 10.48311/LRR.15.5.225]

Table 1

The Rules of Some Illocutionary Speech According to Searle (1969, 1979, 1985)

Illocutionary Speech Act	Propositional Content Condition	Preparatory Condition	Sincerity Condition	Essential Condition
Apology	Past A done by S.	A harms S and S believes A harms S.	S regrets A that S did to H.	Deems as an utterance of guilt and regret by S for A.
State, claim	Any proposition p is true in a world when the state of affairs that it represents exists in that world.	1. S has proof (details, causes) for the truthfulness of the proposition. 2. It is unclear to both S and H that H is aware of the proposition.	S believes p.	Deems as a responsibility to the outcome that the proposition signifies a real state of affairs.
Promise	Future A of H.	H wants S to do the promised act.	S tends to do the promised act.	S assumes to do the promised act.
Order	Future A of H.	S has to have more power than H.	S wants the ordered act done.	The expression is deemed as a try to make H do A due to S's higher power than H.
Declare	PC of declaratives must represent something that happens at the moment of declaration.	S is truly able to carry out the action of declaring and H knows that H can carry out the declaration of his utterance.	S has a certainty that the proposition is accurate and can carry out the act of declaring. S has intentions to perform the act of declaration to make a change.	

Note/ A=Act, S=Speaker, H=Hearer

Vanderveken (2001, p. 47) believes that a talker could produce untrue implicit assumptions. Also, s\he could convey tendencies that s\he does not possess. Therefore, s\he can perform a successful utterance, but it is defective. S\he can incorrectly produce a promise that does not benefit the listener. Also, s\he could produce an untruthful promise that s\he has no intention to preserve. In situations like this, s\he performs a defective illocutionary act. Logically speaking, s\he can perform that act non-defectively in a situation when s\he is successful in performing it and fulfills its felicity conditions in that situation. Agreeing with Vanderveken (2001), Birner (2013, p. 184) points out that any speech act can be unhappy when a

[DOI: 10.48311/LRR.15.5.225]

speaker breaks the conditions that govern the speech acts which are intrinsically connected with the context of what is uttered, and therefore they are intrinsically pragmatic; the conditions for using these acts are dependent on the appropriateness of context.

2.2. Previous Studies

A relatively small body of literature that is related to pragmatic deviation has been 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 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 endeavored to reveal the influence of pragmatic deviation on 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 to display the characters' viewpoints and to decorate the author's style. Thus, it becomes a stylistic tool for mirroring 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.

Akinkurolere (2020) conducted a study on political language to investigate the

[DOI: 10.48311/LRR.15.5.225]

importance of the context in conveying a pragmatic sense by using Austin's (1962) speech act theory. The data were qualitatively collected from Nigerian President Umaru Yar'Adua's political speeches from (2008-2009). Akinkurolere analyzed Austin's three levels: locutionary, illocutionary, and perlocutionary acts. The results of the research show that context is vital in understanding and interpreting speech acts whose application to political language grows a better comprehension of this field. Therefore, as recommended by the researcher, more research is needed to explore speech acts in political areas.

Dylgjerii (2017) investigated the kinds of illocutionary speech act theory in Albanian PM Edi Rama's political discourse after the voting in 2013. The data, which were taken from his first speech to the Albanians, were qualitatively gathered and examined. The findings of this short study reveal the PM used commissive speech acts more than assertive and expressive ones as commitments to do several forthcoming acts. Likewise, Khalid and Amin (2019) examined the kinds of illocutionary acts in the political discourse of Ricardo Rodriguez, head of UNAMI in Erbil (15\8\2018), and Kurdistan Iraqi PM Nechirvan Barzani (3\8\2018) on the annual ceremony to the Yazidi victims who were killed in 2014 by Daesh (an illegal force). Also, a qualitative method was utilized in this study. The results show that Barzani and Richard used all illocutionary acts with much emphasis on assertive ones due to the sad situations that oblige them to produce emotional and motivational utterances.

Similar to Dylgjerii (2017) and Khalid and Amin (2019), Hashim (2015) explored the sorts of illocutionary acts in the political language by John Kerry during the US elections in 2004 and President W. Bush's Opening Speech about the economy and middle-class families in 2001. Also, a qualitative approach was utilized in this study. The researcher argues that both Kerry and Bush used illocutionary speech acts. Commissive ones were given more attention than others by Kerry to commit himself to future actions while Bush focused on assertive acts more than others because of the true value of his propositions and showing emotional feelings towards others. Identically, Azizah and Alpiah (2018) and Mufiah and Rahman (2019) did similar studies to investigate the different kinds of illocutionary speech acts in Trump's inaugural speech in 2016 and also his inaugural one in 2017 respectively. The results of the study by Azizah and Alpiah show that the representatives are the most used because Trump always tries to represent his informative and helpful nature, followed by expressive, declarative,

[DOI: 10.48311/LRR.15.5.225]

commissive, and directive acts successively. Almost similar to them, Mufiah and Rahman's findings show that the representatives are also the most used, followed by directive, declarative, commissive, and expressive acts successively. Along the same lines, Purwadi (2021) examined the various types of illocutionary acts in former PM Julia E. Gillard's political speeches. The same approach was utilized to gather and examine the textual information. Also, findings show that representative acts were the most used because Gillard always tried to represent her informative nature and talk about herself. Then commissives came in second place followed by directive, expressive, and declarative acts successively. By the same token, Gusthini et al. (2018) analyzed the speech acts of Donald Trump's and Hillary Clinton's political language in their trace to be the US president. The data were gathered and examined qualitatively. The researchers found that Trump and Clinton employed the illocutionary act as a powerful tool with categorizations of commissive, expressive, and representative. Furthermore, they used power to convince the people to elect them and make voters trust them as good future presidents.

The studies discussed above follow the same approaches; qualitative, almost similar aims; discussing the types of illocutionary acts, attempting to uncover which are the ones used the most and the reasons behind their uses and with little variations in conclusions. However, all these studies did not discuss or refer to Austin's or Searle's felicity conditions of the speech acts that can be appropriate or inappropriate, but only showed numerous illocutionary acts and compared them to each other. However, there are very few studies (Dianita & Sofyan, 2023; Hadiati, 2019; Ojukwu & Osuchukwu, 2019) that refer to Searle's felicity conditions. These are discussed below.

Hadiati (2019) investigated the felicity conditions (propositional, preparatory, sincerity, and essential) of illocutionary speech acts in Banyumasan (a dialect of standard Javanese in Indonesia) everyday speech. The researcher conducted this study by utilizing a qualitative approach. The results of this paper show the realization of Banyumasan felicity conditions found in declarations, directives, expressive, commissives, and representatives. The speakers observe the felicity conditions of the speech acts and therefore their utterances are felicitous. Similar to Hadiati (2019), Ojukwu and Osuchukwu (2019) analyzed South African Leader Nelson Mandela's speeches as far as Searle's (1969) four felicity conditions and whether his speeches obeyed them. The same approach was followed. The same

[DOI: 10.48311/LRR.15.5.225]

results were found: Mandela followed all Searle's felicity conditions and his speeches were appropriate and not defective. Identically, Dianita and Sofyan (2023) analyzed the felicity conditions of illocutionary speech acts in *Knives Out* Film. Similar to Hadiati (2019) and Ojukwu and Osuchukwu (2019), Dianita and Sofyan (2023) followed the same approach and argued that the actors observe the felicity conditions of speech acts in their speeches. However, these studies do not go deeper and analyze deviant examples of Searle's felicity conditions; they only show how individuals adhere to these conditions and fulfill the speech acts. This shows a dearth in this less explored area as claimed by Hadiati (2019). Therefore, the current thesis tries to fill this gap and shows how Searle's felicity conditions are deviated from in Trump's political speeches.

3. Methodology

The present paper adopts a descriptive qualitative method since the researchers collect the data from words and sentences. 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 Dörnyei (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 Searle's (1969) theory of speech act and felicity conditions.

3.1. 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

[DOI: 10.48311/LRR.15.5.225]

consists of three oral documents: (1) Trump's interview with CNN Channel reporter, Anderson Cooper in the Republican Presidential Town Hall in front of people. This happened in Milwaukee on 3\29\2016 to talk about the candidacy for the 2017 US president, (2) Trump's meeting with Broadcasters Martha MacCallum and Bret Baier on Fox News Channel in front of the people who were given an opportunity to ask him some questions directly. This happened in Scranton on 6th March 2020 to talk about different issues, and (3) Trump's discourse to a group of his supporters in Illinois state on 25th June 2022 in support of candidate Congressperson Mary Miller to be reelected and Darren Bailey to be elected as the governor of Illinois.

3.2. 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 the present paper is in the form of oral documents (preexisting data as mentioned above) that were 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)

[DOI: 10.48311/LRR.15.5.225]

they transcribe the data, and (5) they put the data of the documents in Microsoft Office Word documents to be coded.

3.3. Data Analysis Procedures

The researchers adopt a qualitative discourse analysis method to analyze Trump's deviant speeches. 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 conducted a pragmatic study on several extracts of Trump's political speeches by following Searle's (1969) speech act theory and felicity conditions to address the question of the paper. The researchers follow the following procedures: (1) arranging the data on the computer, (2) reading and re-reading the transcribed documents until immersion, (3) coding the data, (4) applying a discourse analysis method to study the textual information, (5) analyzing some Trump's political quotations, and (6) showing the findings, discussions, and conclusions.

4. Findings

This section explores Trump's political speeches according to a discourse analysis method to answer the research questions. The section presents the findings by analyzing Trump's political speeches according to Searle's (1969) speech act theory and felicity conditions. To saturate the data analysis, three oral documents were chosen to answer the third research question. These are (1) Trump's discourse to a group of his supporters in Illinois state, (2) Trump's meeting with Broadcasters Martha MacCallum and Bret Baier on Fox News Channel, and (3) Trump's interview with CNN Channel reporter, Anderson Cooper. The third research question reads: What types of Searle's (1969) felicity conditions of speech acts are deviated from in Trump's political speeches?

[DOI: 10.48311/LRR.15.5.225]

4.1. Theme 1-Felicity Conditions of Speech Acts of Representatives

Text (1): Trump: "The election was rigged and stolen and now our country is being systematically destroyed." (Trump, 2022, 27:22)

Context: after announcing the results of the election in which Trump lost in favour of Joe Biden in 2020, Trump stated that the election was a fraud. Despite the investigation of Trump's claim showing no evidence that there was fraud in the election (Eggers et al., 2021), he has been continuing his accusation since the announcement of the results of the election in 2020 till now. As a result of this, the US is ruined as he claims.

Following Searle's perspective, Trump deviates from the felicity conditions of the speech act of claiming by claiming that the 2020 presidential election was a fraud and stolen without providing any evidence. Trump's utterance is defective and non-performative due to the deviation from the felicity conditions; the propositional content of this speech act requires that the expressed proposition is true and exists in that world. Here, Trump's utterance is not true and there is no evidence for his claim that the election was stolen. Moreover, the preparatory conditions require that the talker has to have the power to give proof or details for the truth of the stated proposition. Trump does not provide any evidence that there is fraud in the election and is not in the position to do that. In addition, the sincerity condition requires that the talker has committed himself to a belief in the truthfulness of the stated proposition. Searle (1985) argues that when one makes a claim, not only do they convey a belief but they oblige themselves to its truthfulness; to the existence of a fact. Here, what is claimed does not exist and therefore Trump does not commit himself to the truth of his claim. Besides, the essential condition involves that the speaker's proposition represents a real condition of affairs. However, Trump's claim does not represent that condition and is not genuine information. In falsely performing this kind of speech act, the claimer's words do not make the words fit the world. Therefore, the appropriate conditions of this act are defective and not satisfied as Trump falsely claims about the presidential election without any evidence. Deviating from these conditions, Trump gives high value to his interest over others, attacks those who supervise the election, persuades the people of the US that he should have been the president, and urges his supporters to incite riots.

[DOI: 10.48311/LRR.15.5.225]

4.2. Theme 2-Felicity Conditions of Speech Acts of Commissives

Text (2): MacCallum: "…you say you're going to protect them, but your administration is also fighting Obamacare and the courts. So how do you promise people that you're going to protect them based on that?" (Trump, 2020, 02:22)

Trump: "We want to terminate Obamacare because it's bad…if we can get the House, you'll have the best healthcare, health insurance anywhere on the planet…we have to get the House, we have to obviously keep the White House." (Trump, 2020, 02:40)

Context: In an interview with Fox News in 2020 before the election, Trump is asked about Obamacare (that was "signed into law by President Barack Obama in 2010, the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act—generally known as the Affordable Care Act or ACA—is responsible for the most sweeping reforms of the United States' healthcare system" (Davis & Hall, 2022, para. 1)) and how he will deal with this issue in the US. Trump criticizes this law and promises to end this issue replacing it with a new perfect one when he is reelected as the president of the US.

From Searle's viewpoint, Trump deviates from the felicity conditions of the speech act of promising by committing himself to do a future action for his people; endorsing a new law of healthcare instead of Obamacare (illocutionary point), and putting himself under obligation to do this act (mode of achievement). Trump's utterance is defective and non-performative due to the deviation from the felicity conditions; the propositional condition mirrors the circumstance that the utterance content should be related to a forthcoming incident and this incident will be the speaker's act. Trump promised the audience that he would end the Obamacare law and replace it with a new one if he won the race for the white house, but he did not win. In addition, the preparatory condition requires that when one promises to do something, the incident will have an advantageous outcome for the listener, and it will not occur by itself. Here, Trump promises a new healthcare law that is in the interest of his people and will approve it when winning the election. However, he did not replace this law with a new one during his presidency and is not capable of carrying out this action since he lost the election. Furthermore, the sincerity condition is needed when one promises to do something, s/he truly has intentions to fulfill the forthcoming act. Trump cannot genuinely promise that he will replace Obamacare and endorse a new one if he already knows that he is not reelected. Moreover, the essential condition involves

[DOI: 10.48311/LRR.15.5.225]

that the speaker commits himself to the obligation of fulfilling the forthcoming act. Here, Trump does not do the action. Therefore, the felicity conditions of this speech act (promising) are defective and not satisfied because he lost the election and Obamacare is still there and so, his promise is not achieved. As far as the direction of fit is concerned, in which using a commissive act makes the world suit the utterance, Trump does not make the world suit his utterance; the world does not fit his intention. Deviating from the felicity conditions, Trump wants to push the people of the US to reelect him in his second race for the white house.

4.3. Theme 3-Felicity Conditions of Speech Acts of Directives

Text (3): 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." (Trump, 2022, 34:45)

Context: During his presidency, Trump ordered severe decrees to stop receiving immigrants. He is against bringing them to the US and therefore, he made a lot of talks with the countries that facilitate the entrance of their citizens to the US. He threatened them with severe measures and taxes. However, after his period, he still wants others to put an end to this as if he is still in his position.

According to Searle, Trump deviates from the felicity conditions of the speech act of ordering by indirectly ordering Joe Biden's administration to prevent immigrants from entering the US. Trump's utterance is defective in the sense that the conditions are not met to make it performative. The speech act of order necessitates a propositional condition that the talker presupposes the hearer will do it as stated in the utterance and, in this situation, the utterance does not fit this condition since the situation does not permit this utterance to happen; Joe Biden's administration will not follow this order. Besides, the speech act of order involves a preparatory condition that the talker has authority over the hearer. Trump is not the president of the US and has no right or power to order the current president of the US, Joe Biden. In addition, the speech act of order needs a sincerity condition that the talker wishes the hearer to do the action as stated in the utterance. However, Trump knows that his actions will not be done as it is against the law and Biden does not follow Trump's orders as Trump is no longer the US president. Finally, the speech act of order requires an essential condition that the talker's utterance is considered as an endeavour to make the hearer do the act because of

[DOI: 10.48311/LRR.15.5.225]

his authority. Here, Trump is not in this position to get it done. Regarding the direction of fit of its illocutionary force, Trump uses the speech act to make the world suit his utterance by Biden, but Trump fails. Therefore, taking the context of the utterance into account, the speech act of order is unsatisfied and defective. Doing so, Trump attempts to influence the crowd to make them believe that this is not just immigration, but an invasion that should be stopped. Furthermore, Trump thinks he is better than the current president of the US and worth being in the position to give orders to others and have them done, but in fact, his words are given no attention.

4.4. Theme 4-Felicity Conditions of Speech Acts of Expressives

Text (4): Cooper: "But you don't know any specific examples that you've apologized, ever." (Cooper, 2016, 45:50)

Trump: "Yes, I mean — apologized — I apologized to my mother years ago for using foul language." (Trump, 2016, 45:54) (Laughing)

Trump: "I apologize to my wife for not being presidential on occasion. She's always saying Darling, be more presidential." (Trump, 2016, 46:00)

Context: Interviewer Cooper and Trump are talking about Trump's apologies and Cooper asks him about the last time he apologized. He answers him unless you did the wrong thing, you must apologize. The interviewer again asks him to provide an example of an apology he did. Evasively, Trump answers him jokingly that he apologizes to his mom and his wife.

In consonance with Searle's viewpoint, Trump deviates from the felicity conditions of the speech act of apologizing because he does not do anything wrong that pushes him to make an apology to his wife and thus has no real intention to do this act. Trump's utterance is defective and non-performative due to the deviation from the felicity conditions; the propositional content of this speech act involves that the apologizer believes he did something bad to the hearer before apologizing as mentioned in the utterance, and in this situation, he did not offend or hurt his wife and thus his apology to his wife is no more than a joke. Besides, the felicity conditions of apologizing require a preparatory condition that the apologizer is certain that he harms the listener and must be responsible for the thing about which the regret is expressed and the proposition is true. Here, the proposition is not true

[DOI: 10.48311/LRR.15.5.225]

and he has no accountability for not being a president at a certain time. Therefore, his apology to his wife is not intended to be so at all. Furthermore, the sincerity condition of this act means that the talker is sincere in regretting his act, but here Trump is not sincere in his act at all. Moreover, the essential condition of this act requires that the speaker expresses his psychological state to the listener and counts as an expression of regret at the illocutionary point. Here, Trump does not truly apologize to his wife since he is jokingly uttering the act of apologizing. Regarding the direction of fit, generally, no word-to-world direction of fit in expressive speech acts exists. The truthfulness of the proposition stated in an expressive act is implicitly assumed (Searle, 1976). So, what is presupposed here is that nothing wrong is done and the act of apologizing is not fulfilled properly. Therefore, in this situation, the felicity conditions of apologizing are defective and not satisfied. The reason Trump deviates from these conditions is that he wants to show that he does not apologize to anyone for silly reasons and mocks those who demand apologies from him.

4.5. Theme 5-Felicity Conditions of Speech Acts of Declaratives

Text (5): Trump: "… We are going to end Nancy Pelosi. She's crazy. We're going to end her political career once and for all." (Trump, 2022, 2:30)

Context: Trump is talking to the crowd about the candidates whom he supports to be elected in November 2022. He also talks about Nancy Pelosi, the Speaker of the US House of Representatives, and calls the crowd to end her politically by voting for his candidates.

From Searle's standpoint, Trump deviates from the felicity conditions of the speech act of declaring because his utterance does not change the world. Trump's utterance is defective and non-performative due to the deviation from the felicity conditions; the propositional content condition of this speech act requires successfully performing the act of declaring assurances that the propositional content resembles the world at the time of declaring. If Trump successfully and felicitously performs the act of declaring that they are going to end Pelosi politically, then she is politically ended. However, her political career is not ended even if Trump's candidates win the election. The preparatory condition of declaring involves that the talker in power creates a state of affairs stated in the propositional content by uttering in force. Here, Trump is not in a position that

[DOI: 10.48311/LRR.15.5.225]

enables him to change the world and end her political career; he is not the president or the judge of the US Supreme Court to do so. The sincerity condition of this act requires that the talker has a belief that the proposition is true and can carry out the act of declaring. Here, the proposition is not true because Trump cannot end her career politically, and therefore, he is not sincere in his declaration. Regarding the essential condition of this act, the speaker has intentions to perform the act to make a change. Trump has no real intention to make the illocutionary point and thus no change can be made. Regarding the direction of fit, the act of declaring has a double direction of fit, both world-to-word and word-to-world (Searle, 1979). Here, Neither Trump's words fit the world; he cannot end her career nor the world fits his words; she is and will be a politician regardless of his words that make no sense. So, the felicity conditions of declaring are defective as argued by Searle (2007), the speech act of declaring is not done when infelicitously said. The reason for deviating from these conditions is that Trump tries to urge the people of the US to vote for his candidates and not to vote for Pelosi. Also, he implicitly threatens her that when winning the election, she will not have any political position in the new government. In addition, his utterance shows his buried hatred for her.

5. Discussion

The findings show that Searle's (1969) felicity conditions of illocutionary speech acts deviated from Trump's political speeches. This is in line with Searle's (1969) and Vanderveken's (2001) claim that these conditions can be defective in several situations. The findings of the first theme revealed that Trump deviates from the felicity conditions of representative speech acts by making false claims without providing any evidence that the 2020 presidential election was fraud and stolen. This deviation occurs because Trump attempts to give high value to his interest over others, attack those who supervised the election, persuade the people of the US that he should have been the president, and urges his supporters to incite riots. This implies that deviating from these conditions shows that we cannot use false claims and lies because people will negatively think about politicians and go on a rampage. This theme was found in the studies of Dianita and Sofyan (2023) Hadiati (2019), and Ojukwu and Osuchukwu (2019), which showed that the felicity conditions of representative speech acts are followed. For example, Dianita and Sofyan (2023), who pragmatically analyzed the felicity conditions of speech acts in *Knives Out*

[DOI: 10.48311/LRR.15.5.225]

Film, argued that the actors respect the felicity conditions and perform the act happily by being truthful to each other. Hadiati (2019), who examined the felicity conditions of the speech acts in Banyumasan (a dialect of standard Javanese in Indonesia) everyday speech, argued that the speakers give sincere information when talking to the hearers. In addition, Ojukwu and Osuchukwu (2019) claimed that South African Leader Nelson Mandela was honest in his description of himself as a good politician, and thus the felicity conditions of this act are observed. Moreover, Setiawan et al. (2021) argue that Trump employs language to persuade the audience to follow his targets.

The findings of the second theme suggested that Trump deviates from the felicity conditions of commissive speech acts by committing himself to a forthcoming action that is endorsing a new law of healthcare, but he failed to fulfill it as he did not win the 2020 presidential election. Deviating from the felicity conditions, Trump wants to push the US people to reelect him in his second race for the white house. This deviation implies that we should not promise people something we cannot do because they will lose trust in us and damage our mutual relationship. This theme was found in the studies that were conducted by Dianita and Sofyan (2023) Hadiati (2019), and Ojukwu and Osuchukwu (2019) who found that the felicity conditions of commissive speech acts are respected. For illustration, Dianita and Sofyan (2023) claimed that the actors observe the felicity conditions by fulfilling the act of warning. Correspondingly, Hadiati (2019) argued that the speakers adhere to the felicity conditions of the speech act of promising which is successfully and non-defectively achieved. In addition, Ojukwu and Osuchukwu (2019) found that Nelson Mandela achieved the promises he made to his people.

The findings of the third theme uncovered that Trump deviates from the felicity conditions of directive speech acts by ordering Joe Biden's administration to prevent immigrants from entering the US. Trump knows that his actions will not be done as it is against the law and Biden does not follow Trump's orders as Trump is no longer the US president. This deviation emerges because Trump attempts to influence the crowd to make them believe that this is not just immigration, but an invasion that should be stopped. Furthermore, Trump thinks he is better than the current president of the US and worth being in the position to give orders to others and have them done. This has an implication that deviating from these conditions shows that we cannot order others as we are not in that

[DOI: 10.48311/LRR.15.5.225]

power to do so because people will have negative judgments about others. This theme was found in the researches of Dianita and Sofyan (2023) Hadiati (2019), and Ojukwu and Osuchukwu (2019), which found that the felicity conditions of directive speech acts are followed. For instance, Hadiati (2019) maintained that the felicity conditions of the speech act of commanding are observed as the action was done by the hearer. Moreover, Ojukwu and Osuchukwu (2019) found that Mandela's advice to the government was taken and, thus the act was achieved appropriately.

The findings of the fourth theme revealed that Trump deviates from the felicity conditions of expressive speech acts by jokingly apologizing to his wife because he did not do anything wrong that pushes him to make an apology to her and thus has no real intention to do this act. The reason Trump deviates from these conditions is that he does not apologize to anyone for silly reasons and mocks those who demand apologies from him. This has an implication that deviating from these conditions reveals that we cannot deceitfully apologize to others because people will think negatively about others who make false apologies, and also this widens the gap between politicians. This theme was found in the studies of Dianita and Sofyan (2023) Hadiati (2019), and Ojukwu and Osuchukwu (2019), which found that the felicity conditions of expressive speech acts are not deviated from. For explanation, Dianita and Sofyan (2023) found that the felicity conditions of the speech act of condolence are observed since the actors express them sincerely. Besides, Hadiati (2019) argued that speakers truly compliment the goods and they truly mean it based on the situation. Besides, the results of Ojukwu and Osuchukwu's study (2019) showed that Mandela was honest in expressing his thankfulness to people and happiness to his companions.

The findings of the fifth theme showed that Trump deviates from the felicity conditions of declarative speech acts by declaring they are going to end Pelosi's career politically, she is not done. Neither Trump's words fit the world; he cannot end her career nor the world fits his words; she is and will be a politician regardless of his words that make no sense. The reason for deviating from these conditions is that Trump tries to urge the people of the US to vote for his candidates and not to vote for Pelosi. Also, he implicitly threatens her that when winning the election, she will not have any political position in the new government. In addition, his utterance shows his buried hatred for her. This deviation implies that we cannot make use of unfulfilled declarations because

[DOI: 10.48311/LRR.15.5.225]

people will think negatively about others who declare to do something, but they cannot do it. This theme was found in the study that was done by Hadiati (2019) who found that the felicity conditions of declarative speech acts are observed when the speaker changes the world via his utterance.

5.1. 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 three oral documents. Thus, the findings of the present paper are not to be generalized to all of Trump's political interviews and speeches or other politicians. 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 a pragmatic deviation of Searle's felicity conditions of illocutionary speech acts in numerous situations and apply them 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 this pragmatic deviation of these conditions is employed in these direct methods. Moreover, the researchers found a lack of thorough studies of Searle's felicity conditions and how they are followed or deviated from as the major focus of the current literature is on the illocutionary speech acts. Therefore, further research needs to be done on these issues in different contexts in general and political discourse in particular to see how Searle's conditions are deviated, what happens if they are defective, and why.

6. Conclusion

It is concluded that Searle's (1969) felicity conditions (propositional content, preparatory, sincerity, essential) of illocutionary speech acts are deviated from in Trump's political speeches: (1) representative speech acts by making false claims

[DOI: 10.48311/LRR.15.5.225]

without providing any evidence, (2) commissive speech acts by committing himself to do a future action, but Trump fails to fulfill it, (3) directive speech acts by ordering Joe Biden's administration to prevent immigrants from entering the US, but Trump's order cannot be done, (4) expressive speech acts by jokingly apologizing to his wife because he does not do anything wrong that pushes him to make an apology to her and thus has no real intention to do this act, and (5) declarative speech acts by declaring they are going to end Pelosi politically, she is not done.

It is also found that deviation from these conditions happened due to the following: (1) giving high value to Trump's interest over others, attacking those who supervised the election, persuading the people of the US that Trump should have been the president, and urging his supporters to incite a riot, (2) pushing the US people to reelect him in his second race for the white house, (3) influencing the crowd to make them believe of his views, (4) withholding apologies and mocks those who demand apologies from him, and (5) threatening others.

[DOI: 10.48311/LRR.15.5.225]

References

Akinkurolere, S. (2020). Exploring the significance of context in meaning: Speech act features of performative political speeches of President Umaru Musa Yar'Adua. *Athens Journal of Humanities & Arts, 7*(1), 63–84.

Al-Sulaimaan, M. & Khoshaba, L. (2016). Speech act as a basis of understanding dialogue coherence with reference to English-Arabic translation. International *Journal of Social Sciences & Humanities, 1*(1), 68–98.

Austin, J. (1962). How to do things with words. Clarendon Press.

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.

Birner. B. (2013). *Introduction to pragmatics*. Wiley-Blackwell.

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

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.

Davis, E. & Hall, M. (2022, June. 19). The affordable care act or Obamacare. Very well health. Retrieved August 7, 2023, from https://www.verywellhealth.com/the-affordable-care-act-what-is-it-1738452.

Derakhshan, A., & Shakki, F. (2020). The effect of implicit vs. explicit metapragmatic instruction on the Iranian intermediate EFL learners' pragmatic comprehension of apology and refusal. *Journal of Language Research*, *12*(35), 151–175.

Derakhshan, A., & Shakki, F. (2021). A meta-analytic study of instructed second

[DOI: 10.48311/LRR.15.5.225]

language pragmatics: A case of the speech act of request. *Journal of Research in Applied Linguistics, 12*(1), 15–32. https://doi.org/10.22055/RALS.2021.16722.

Derakhshan, A, Eslami, Z. R., & Shakki, F. (2023). Comparing compliments in Face-to-Face vs. online interactions among Iranian speakers of Persian. *Pragmatics and Society*. https://doi.org/10.1075/ps.22102.der

Derakhshan, A., & Shakki, F. (2023). *Instructed second language pragmatics for the speech acts of request, apology, and refusal: A meta-analysis*. Springer.

Dianita, & Sofyan, R. (2023). Felicity conditions in speech act from the "Knives Out" movie: A pragmatic study. *English Journal Literacy Utama, 1*(1), 775–785.

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

Dyakiv, K., Korolyov, I., & Yaremko, M. (2021). Communicative deviations of respondents in political video interviews in Ukrainian and German. *Amazonia Investiga, 10*(43), 189–199.

Dylgjerii, A. (2017). Analysis of speech acts in political speeches. *European Journal of Social Sciences Studies, 2*(2), p. 19–26.

Eggers, A., Garro, G., & Grimmer, G. (2021). No evidence for systematic voter fraud: A guide to statistical claims about the 2020 election. *PNAS, 118*(45), 1–7.

Elasfar, M., Mustafa, H., Pathan, M., & Imani, A. (2022). Speech acts of apology and request by Arab postgraduates with Malaysian supervisors. *Arab World English Journal, 14*(1), 428–448. https://dx.doi.org/10.24093/awej/vol14no1.27.

Farrag, N. M. (2022). Saudi politeness: Request and apology in the context of study and work at King Abdulaziz University: A pragmatic study. *Arab World English Journal, 13*(1), 300–312. https://dx.doi.org/10.24093/awej/vol13no1.19.

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.

Hadiati, C. (2019). Felicity conditions of the speech acts in Banyumasan daily conversation. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies, 9*(6), 700–705.

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.

[DOI: 10.48311/LRR.15.5.225]

Hamza, M., Mohammed, H., & Mohammed, M. (2022). A pragmatic study of circumlocution in former Iraqi PM Al-Maliki's political interviews. *Res Militaris, 12*(2), 5550–5565.

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

Hamza, M., & Nordin, N. (2024). Pragmatic deviation of Grice's cooperative principle in Trump's political interview with the CNN news channel. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies, 14*(3), 83–892. https://doi.org/10.17507/tpls.1403.31.

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

Huang, Y. (2007). *Pragmatics*. Oxford University Press.

Hussaina, W., Shaheed, S, & Qahtan, A. (2020). Levels of linguistic deviations in Dickens' Hard Times. *International Journal of Innovation, Creativity and Change, 11*(2), 721–733.

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

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

Khalid B, & Amin N. (2019). A speech act analysis of political speeches on Yazidi massacre. *JAHS, 23*(4), 294–307.

Larasati, D., Arjulayana, and Srikandi, C. (2020). An analysis of the illocutionary acts on Donald Trump's presidential candidacy speech. *Globish (An English-Indonesian journal for English, Education and Culture), 9*(8), 7–13.

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

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

Levinson, S. (1983). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge University Press.

Loko, C. (2018). Analysis of speech acts in Donald Trump's acceptance speech. *Revue Internationale de Linguistique Appliquée, de Littérature et d'Education, 1*(1), 233–248.

[DOI: 10.48311/LRR.15.5.225]

Mansoor, M. & Y. Salman, (2020). Linguistic deviation in literary style: A stylistic analysis. *Cihan University-Erbil Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences, 4*(1), 7–16.

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. (2019). *Speech acts analysis of Donald Trump's speech. Professional Journal of English Education, 1*(2), 125–132.

Ojukwu, C. & Osuchukwu, A. (2019). A pragmatic analysis of selected political speeches of Nelson Mandela. *Journal of the English Scholars' Association of Nigeria, 21*(2), 63–86.

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

Purwadi, D. (2021). Speech acts in Julia Gillard's speeches. *Journal of English Language Teaching of FBS-Unimed, 1*(2), 1–7.

Rahmani, H. (2022). Avoiding sincere apologies among Iranian politicians and its cultural justification: A pragmatic study. *Language Related Research, 13*(2), 85–319.

Ramanathan, R., Paramasivam, S., & Hoon, T. (2020). Discursive strategies and speech acts in political discourse of Najib and Modi. *International Journal of Education, 8*(3), 34–44.

Raza, M., Qayyoum, H., & Sadjiq, A. (2021). A speech act analysis of the speech of Nawaz Sharif ex-prime minister of Pakistan. *Multicultural Education, 7*(3), 259–265.

[DOI: 10.48311/LRR.15.5.225]

Ren, C. and Yu H. (2013). Language deviation in English advertising. *Studies in Literature and Language, 7*(2), 85–89.

Sadock, J. (2006). Speech acts. In L. Horn & G. Ward (Eds.). *The handbook of pragmatics* (pp. 53–73). Blackwell Publishing Ltd.

Sbisa, M. (2009). Speech act theory. In J. Verschueren & J. Ostman (Eds.). *Key notions for pragmatics*. John Benjamins Pub. Co.

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

Searle, J. & Vanderveken, D. (1985). *Foundations of illocutionary logic*. Cambridge University Press.

Searle, J. (1969). *Speech acts: An essay in the philosophy of language*. Cambridge University Press.

Searle, J. (1975). Indirect Speech Acts. In P. Cole, & J. Morgan (Eds.), *Syntax and semantics 3: Speech acts* (pp. 59–82). Academic Press.

Searle, J. (1976). A classification of illocutionary acts. *Language in Society, 5*(1), 1–23.

Searle, J. (1979). *Expression and meaning: Studies in the theory of speech acts*. Cambridge University Press.

Setiawan S, Wulandari I, Fanani A, Arifani Y. (2021). Interpersonal meaning analysis of Donald Trump's remarks on COVID-19 outbreak. *Language Related Research*, 12(5), 361–384.

Shakki, F., Naeini, J., Mazandarani, O., & Derakhshan, A. (2020). Instructed second language English pragmatics in the Iranian context. *Journal of Teaching Language Skills, 39*(1), 201–252. https://doi.org/10.22099/jtls.2020.38481.2886.

Shakki, F., Naeini, J., Mazandarani, O., & Derakhshan, A. (2021). Instructed second language pragmatics for the speech act of apology in an Iranian EFL context: A meta-analysis. *Applied Research on English Language, 10*(3), 77–104.

Shakki, F. (2022). Meta-analysis as an emerging trend to scrutinize the effectiveness of L2 Pragmatics instruction. *Frontiers in Psychology, 13*. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.1016661.

Shakki, F., Naeini, J., Mazandarani, O., & Derakhshan, A. (2023). A meta-analysis on

[DOI: 10.48311/LRR.15.5.225]

the instructed second language pragmatics for the speech acts of apology, request, and refusal in an Iranian EFL context. *Language Related Research, 13*(6), 461–510. https://doi:10.52547/LRR.13.6.15.

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. (2016, March 11). CNN Town Hall with Donald Trump - Milwaukee, WI. [Video]. YouTube. Available at https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Mtv3L5eBVmw.

Trump, D. (2020, March 6). Interview: Bret Baier and Martha MacCallum host a Town Hall with Donald Trump. [Video]. YouTube. Available at 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. Available at https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Q_H_D-F9D2k&t=2798s.

Tsuda, S. (1993). Indirectness in discourse: What does it do in conversation? *Intercultural Communication Studies, 3*(1), 63–74.

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

Vanderveken, D. (2001). Universal grammar and speech act theory. In D. Vanderveken & S. Kubo (Eds.). *Essays in speech act theory* (pp. 25–62). John Benjamins.

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

Yule, G. (1996). *Pragmatics*. Oxford University Press.

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

[DOI: 10.48311/LRR.15.5.225]

About the Authors

Muhammad Hussain Hamza is a PhD Candidate at Universiti Utara Malaysia of the 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, at 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.

[DOI: 10.48311/LRR.15.5.225]