Dirasat: Human and Social Sciences, Volume 53, No. 9, 2026, 11065

Deanship of Scientific Research

The Use of Impoliteness in Donald Trump's Speeches During His Second Presidency

Manal Hisham Al-Smadi[1]*, Murad Al Kayed[1], Wajed Al Ahmad[1], Mohammad Al-Ajalein[2]

[1] Department of English Language and Literature, Al-Balqa Applied University, Ajloun, Jordan

[2] Department of English Language and Literature, Amman Arab University, Amman, Jordan

Received: 9/3/2025
Revised: 16/3/2025
Accepted: 10/4/2025
Published online: 29/6/2026

* *Corresponding author:*
manalsmadi@bau.edu.jo

Citation: Al-Smadi, M. H., Al Kayed, M., Al Ahmad, W., & Al-Ajalein, M. (2026). The Use of Impoliteness in Donald Trump's Speeches During His Second Presidency. *Dirasat: Human and Social Sciences*, *53*(9), 11065.
https://doi.org/10.35516/Hum.2026.11065

© 2026 DSR Publishers/ The University of Jordan.

This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY-NC) license https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/

Abstract

Objectives: This study investigates the impoliteness strategies used by Donald Trump in speeches during his second presidency of the United States. It aims to analyze the function of these strategies based on Culpeper's (1996) impoliteness framework, with a focus on two of Trump's speeches.

Methods: A quantitative analysis was conducted to measure the frequency of impoliteness strategies in the speeches. The strategies were categorized according to Culpeper's (1996) model, while a qualitative analysis was employed to explore the functions of these strategies.

Results: The findings reveal that the most frequently used impoliteness strategy in Trump's speeches is Positive impoliteness, accounting for 43% of instances. Negative impoliteness is the second most common, followed by Bald on record (19.7%). The least used strategy was sarcasm or mocking impoliteness, at 4.3%. Regarding the function of these strategies, Coercive impoliteness was the most frequently employed, as identified by Culpeper (2011).

Conclusions: The study highlights how Trump's strategic use of impoliteness in his speeches underscores the assertion of power and control, reinforcing his authoritative political stance.

Keywords: Impoliteness, Impoliteness Functions, Political Speech.

استخدام استراتيجيات عدم التأدُّب في خطابات دونالد ترامب خلال فترة رئاسته الثانية

منال الصمادي[1]*، مراد الكايد[1]، وجد الأحمد[1]، محمد العجالين[2]

[1] اللغة الإنجليزيَّة وآدابها، جامعة البلقاء التطبيقيَّة، عجلون، الأردن

[2] اللغة الإنجليزيَّة وآدابها، جامعة عمان العربيَّة، عمان، الأردن

ملخّص

الأهداف: تهدف هذه الدراسة إلى معرفة استراتيجيات عدم التأدُّب التي استخدمها دونالد ترامب في خطاباته في رئاسته الثانية للولايات المتحدة الأمريكيَّة، وتوضيح وظيفة استخدام هذه الاستراتيجيات، استنادًا إلى استراتيجيَّة عد التأدب التي وضعها كولبيبر (1996).

المنهجيَّة: تتبع الدراسة التحليل النوعي والكمي من أجل الإجابة عن سؤالها الرئيسين. في التحليل الكمي يجد الباحث استراتيجيات عدم التأدُّب المستخدمة في خطابات ترامب، وقد اتبع هذا التحليل تعريف هذه الاستراتيجيات الذي اقترحه كولبيبر (1996). ويجري استخدام التحليل النوعي من أجل تحديد وظيفة استراتيجيات عدم التأدُّب التي يستخدمها ترامب، بالاعتماد على كولبيبر (2011).

النتائج: بيَّنت الدراسة أن أكثر استراتيجيات عدم التأدُّب استخدامًا لدى الرئيس ترامب، بنسبة أكبر 43٪، هي استراتيجية عدم التأدُّب الإيجابيَّة، في حين أن عدم التأدُّب السلبي هي ثاني أكثر استراتيجيَّة شيوعًا، تليها عدم التأدُّب المباشر، التي تمثل 19.7٪ من جميع حالات عدم التأدُّب، وكانت النسبة الأدنى 4.3٪ هي السخرية أو الوقاحة الساخرة. أما في ما يتعلق بوظيفة استراتيجيات عدم التأدُّب فقد وجدت الدراسة أن استخدام ترامب للوقاحة يتبع وظائف عدم التأدُّب الثلاث التي حدَّدها كلبيبر (2011) ووجدت أن الأكثر استخدامًا هي وظيفة الوقاحة القسرية.

الخلاصة: كشفت الدراسة عن أن الاستخدام المتزايد للوقاحة وعدم التأدُّب لتحقيق هذا الهدف كان واضحًا في عينة الدراسة لتأكيد قوة المتحدث وسيطرته.

الكلمات الدالَّة: استراتيجيات عدم التأدُّب، وظائف عدم التأدُّب، الخطاب السياسي.

1. Introduction

Language works as a system of rules that govern how symbols are combined and used to convey meaning. These rules, which coordinate the development of coherent and systematic linguistic structures, comprise grammar, syntax, and semantics. As a result, people are able to share ideas and information. Nevertheless, people must be conscious of a language's inherent capacity to reflect and uphold social hierarchies and power disparities when they use it. As Gary B. Palmer emphasizes, using language appropriately becomes crucial to advancing social inclusion and equity (Sharifian, 2015). The development of courteous speech, in which the principles of politeness play a crucial role, lies at the heart of this ethos of linguistic responsibility. As a fundamental linguistic concept, politeness denotes a communication style that respects and takes into account the interlocutor.

Since Brown and Levinson first proposed politeness theory, the concept of politeness and impoliteness has been one of the most contentious topics and has been characterized in a variety of ways. According to Brown and Levinson's (1987) theory, which is founded on Goffman's face notion and Grice's maxims, any behavior that aims to shield the addressee's face is considered polite; consequently, any behavior that targets the addressee's face is considered impolite. The face notion is at the heart of the majority of subsequent definitions of impoliteness. According to Culpeper, impoliteness involves "...communicative strategies designed to attack face, and thereby cause social conflict and disharmony" (Culpeper & Wichmann, 2003: 1546).

Labels including "rudeness," "incivility," and "impoliteness" have been used to identify the use of offensive language output (e.g., Culpeper, 1996). According to Culpeper and Hardaker (2017), these descriptors all refer to disrespectful speech output that is directed at a target and has unpleasant emotional ramifications for either the speaker or both. The idea of conversational "politeness strategies" was first introduced by a highly influential study conducted by Brown and Levinson (1987). Its goal was to preserve conversational cooperation by avoiding the use of speech output that would harm an interlocutor's "face" in each dominant communicative context. However, the conceptualization of offensive speech output as a collection of tactics intended to intentionally harm the output's target in order to cause him or her to lose face will be the main emphasis of the next study. Although Brown and Levinson's original framework served as inspiration for this type of impoliteness study, it is also a distinct area (Austin, 1987, 1990; Culpeper, 1996, 2011, 2016).

In relation to the subject of impoliteness, it is important to note that the five strategies of impoliteness—withholding politeness, sarcasm or mock politeness, positive impoliteness, negative impoliteness, and bald on-record impoliteness—offer useful insights into the different ways impoliteness can manifest itself in social interactions (Culpeper et al., 2017). Furthermore, there are three purposes—or, as he called them, functions—for impoliteness tactics: affective, coercive, and entertaining (Culpeper, 2011).

2. Literature review

Since some discourses display deliberate face-threatening behaviors (FTAs) in a more aggressive and unrestrained manner, impoliteness should be treated as a unique and separate phenomenon. Impoliteness tactics are still being used in political discourse and have recently been extensively studied in politeness research. Impoliteness is used rhetorically in political argumentation to control others, offend them, and project a harsh exterior (Ardila, 2019). It is seen as a component of communication objectives to influence and increase the number of voters. According to García (2014), however, the impoliteness approach emerged when the occasion provided the opportunity to demonstrate verbal resources and mechanisms.

The general rule in a win-lose political debate is rudeness. When rudeness is used on the last day of the debate, it occurs more frequently (Alemi & Latifi, 2019; Neshkovska, 2020). Similarly, Harris (2001) highlighted that a community of practice that embraces and expects the existence of impoliteness as a purposeful FTA in order to develop confrontational processes toward their opponents is directly linked to political discourse. Because the politeness strategy lacks a mitigating language approach, the analysis should be separated from it.

The complex implications of impoliteness tactics in political speeches have been the subject of numerous studies. For

example, Khurniawan (2017) conducted a study that examined Donald Trump's use of rudeness tactics during the Grand Old Party (GOP) debate. Moreover, Cahyono (2018) carried out additional research examining Donald Trump's use of rudeness on Twitter. Further, Muazzaro & Dewanti (2020) studied the impoliteness used by Trump during his speech at the "Conservative Political Action Conference." Using Culpeper's (1996) theory of impoliteness techniques, these studies identified four categories that Donald Trump frequently employed, namely: bald on-record impoliteness, positive impoliteness, negative impoliteness, and sarcasm or mock politeness. There was no "withhold politeness" technique in these earlier studies.

Another recent study conducted by Panggabean (2023) examined Trump and Clinton's use of rudeness during the presidential debate. The findings of this study indicated that negative politeness was the second most common tactic, mostly employed by Trump, while positive impoliteness was most frequently employed, particularly by Clinton. A YouTube video and a transcription script from a website devoted to the third U.S. Presidential Debate served as the major sources of the data (Blake, 2016). The data were categorized into the relevant categories, interpreted, and contrasted between the speech acts and facial expressions. Following that, a descriptive analysis of the data was conducted using the topic category definition (Heigham & Croker, 2019). This study emphasized how Donald Trump and Hillary Clinton used positive impoliteness as a defensive communication tactic and negative impoliteness as an attacking tactic during the third U.S. presidential debate.

The distinct research objectives and data sources of the present study make it different. The speeches selected for this research were Donald Trump's speech to his supporters on the eve of his inauguration and his inaugural speech in 2025, with special attention paid to Donald Trump's impolite comments during his speech to people in attendance. This study aims to accomplish the following two goals using Culpeper's model of impoliteness:

1. What are the impoliteness strategies used by Donald Trump in his speeches?
2. What are the functions of impoliteness strategies used by Donald Trump?

2.1 Framework

Understanding the concept of face is crucial for analyzing politeness and rudeness in different communicative situations. Brown and Levinson (1987) maintain that everyone has a desired public identity or self-image, which is known as face. To lessen Face-Threatening Acts (FTAs), they propose four categories of politeness strategies: bald on-record, positive politeness, negative politeness, and off-record. On the other hand, Culpeper (1996) explores the concept of impoliteness, which involves communication strategies that threaten or damage someone's face. Impoliteness leads to social discord or conflict, unlike politeness, which seeks to maintain social harmony. Thus, impoliteness acts as a violation of politeness norms, aiming to destroy someone's public image.

Culpeper (1996) distinguished five categories of rudeness strategies: sarcasm or mock politeness, withhold politeness, positive impoliteness, negative impoliteness, and bald on-record impoliteness. Culpeper (2011) stated that the impolite use of language serves a certain purpose, and he clarifies three main functions for impoliteness strategies as follows:

Affective impoliteness: Aggression or an angry reaction to frustration or provocation. In order to place blame on the recipient, the interlocutor in this situation transfers their unfavorable emotions toward them.

Coercive impoliteness: Indicates that the impoliteness serves the purpose of making oneself appear superior in order to exert control and influence over the recipient.

Entertaining impoliteness: Provides laughter for the audience at the expense of wounding people or groups (victims) throughout the performance.

3. Methodology

This part of the research explains the reasons for choosing the study sample and its sources and also describes the framework used to analyze the data in a way that serves the research purposes. The data for this study were taken from two speeches by President Trump. The first is Donald Trump's speech to his supporters on the eve of his inauguration; the second is Donald Trump's inaugural speech on Monday, January 20, 2025, as the 47th U.S. president. The two speeches

were taken from the online website https://www.rev.com/blog/transcript-category/donald-trump-transcripts, where both are provided as video recordings and written transcripts. The first speech lasted 58 minutes and 43 seconds, and the second lasted 30 minutes and 29 seconds. The speeches consisted of 11,742 words in total, with 8,839 words in the first speech and 2,903 words in the second.

The rationale for selecting these speeches lies in their direct relevance to Trump's rhetorical strategies, which contributed to his successful presidential campaign. As these speeches are the first delivered by Donald Trump after officially announcing his victory as President of the United States, they may clarify the approach he intended to follow in his new presidency and his method of presenting the issues that concerned him most. Due to the small size of the corpus, the researcher counts the occurrences of each impoliteness strategy in the speeches to calculate their frequencies and determine the percentage of each type. First, the researcher counts the number of utterances employing impoliteness strategies to find the total number of instances. Then, to calculate the percentages of each impoliteness strategy, the researcher categorizes every utterance according to the type of impoliteness it represents.

This study employs both qualitative and quantitative methods to address the two main research questions. In the quantitative analysis, the researcher identifies the frequencies of the most frequently used impoliteness strategies in Trump's speeches. This analysis follows the definition of impoliteness strategies proposed by Culpeper (1996), which is clarified as follows:

1) Bald On-Record Impoliteness

The act that puts someone's face in danger is conveyed quite clearly. Bald on-record impoliteness is used when there are numerous faces at risk, with the intention of attacking the recipient's face using impolite language, in contrast to Brown and Levinson's framework, where the minimal face is at stake and the interlocutor's goal is not to attack the recipient's face (Arendholz, 2013).

2) Positive impoliteness

By refusing to grant his wish, this tactic attacks the recipient's positive face. According to Capone and Mey (2016), positive impoliteness is demonstrated by insulting another person, refusing to find common ground with the recipient, selecting unpleasant or unwanted subjects to discuss, using irrelevant code, acting ignorantly in a conversation with others, waiting for arguments, using ambiguous and private language, and using taboo words.

3) Negative impoliteness

Negative impoliteness is meant to target the recipient's negative face want, as opposed to positive impoliteness. For instance, frightening the recipient for his behavior that the other person perceives as damaging, such speaking impolitely, making fun of, not treating another person with respect, and encroaching on their personal space (Culpeper et al., 2017).

4) Sarcasm or mock politeness

This tactic is misleading since, despite the outward appearance of kindness and respect, it really aims to express the opposite idea. Brown and Levinson's politeness tactics are used to execute sarcasm or fake politeness (Mohammed & Abbas, 2015).

5) Withhold Politeness

As the recipient expects politeness, yet this tactic falls lacking. For instance, it could be seen purposeful rudeness to not express gratitude to others for what they have given (Bączkowska, 2017).

To answer the second question, qualitative analysis is employed in order to determine the function of impoliteness strategies used by Trump, relying on Culpeper's (2011) three main functions of using impoliteness strategies:

The first function is Affective Impoliteness, which is aggression, or an angry reaction to frustration or provocation. In this case, the interlocutor blames the recipient by transferring their unfavorable emotions onto them. As a result, the situation between the speaker and the listener turns unpleasant or antagonistic (Bączkowska, 2017).

The second function is Coercive Impoliteness: in this case impoliteness serves the purpose of making oneself appear superior in order to exert control and influence over the recipient. When the interlocutor is from a higher and more powerful

social level than the recipient, coercive impoliteness results. It can happen when the interlocutor is on par with the recipient to acquire social power, even though it typically happens when there is a power disparity (Mohammed & Abbas, 2015).

The last function is Entertaining Impoliteness: where rudeness is different from the others since it provides laughter for the audience at the expense of wounding people or groups (victims) throughout the performance. It frequently requires taking advantage of the victim for fun, but, as the victim may or may not be aware of the harm done to them (Kadhum & Abbas, 2021). As a result, this research looks at broader contextual elements rather than just evaluating individual utterance.

4. Results and discussions

4.1. Impoliteness Strategies Used by Trump

This study analyzed the impoliteness strategies used in Trump's speech as President of the United States for the second time. To achieve this goal, the study analyzed the two speeches of the President after the official announcement of his victory in the presidential elections. The analysis of impoliteness strategies use classified according to their frequencies and percentage.

The results of the first research question: What are the impoliteness strategies used by Donald Trump in his speech?

Table1. The frequencies percentages of impoliteness strategies used by Donald Trump in his speeches

Type of impoliteness	Frequencies	Percentages
Bald on record	18	19.7%
Positive impoliteness	39	43%
Negative impoliteness	30	33%
Sarcasm or Mocking impoliteness	4	4.3%
Withhold Politeness	0	0%
Total	91	100%

Table 1 illustrates that positive impoliteness is the most frequently impoliteness strategy used by the president Trump, with the highest percentage 43%. The second most frequently used strategy is negative impoliteness at 33%. The president appears to have used direct incivility in a number of instances as in Bald on record with 19.7% of the total impoliteness cases. Sarcasm or Mocking impoliteness was the least in percentage at 4.3%, While there was no example of the latter strategy Withhold Politeness being used. This may be related to the fact that withhold politeness typically occurs in discussion rather than speeches.

4.1.1Bald on record

In his first two speeches as the president of America Donald Trump used direct impoliteness (Bald on record) by clearly referring to the person or entity he wanted to hurt or embarrass. He directly attacks the hearers face in 18 examples to mention some of them:

The following example taken from Donald Trump speech to his supporters on Sunday evening the 19th of January.

"*We don't want to give our business to China. We don't want to give our business to other people*"

The speaker directly attacked the recipient's face, making it clear that he did not wish to give any one, and he directly mentioned China in particular, any material investment work, or business. Without beating around the bush, he showed his unwillingness to deal with China, which is considered a direct and explicit attack on this country and everyone who has a positive view of China.

The speaker shows Bald on record of impoliteness use of language, by mentioning the explicit name of the countries and people he does not like or does not want to deal with, as in the following: After introducing Elon Musk to his supporters, Trump start talking about Musk's genius and his invention of the rocket and how it rises and falls with all professionalism.

"*But he went out to Pennsylvania after that. He landed that rocket. Nobody had ever seen, by the way, China can't do it, Russia can't do it or come close. It would be 10 years before they can do it"*

Here, the speaker pointed out that Russia and China could not make such an invention. Rather, he emphasized that it would take at least ten years to reach this level of invention. The speaker attacked both countries and mentioned them by name, highlighting their inability to obtain such inventions or the proprietary power.

In the same president speech to his fans, the president tends to explicitly utilize the name of the previous president Biden and linked it to a negative action, which is consuming energy, meaning wasting it:

"*And we're going to end the Biden War on American energy and unleash our energy resources"*

In this example, the speaker promises his followers that he will do the best for the state, and he attacks the former president's face immediately. Trump mentions the name of the former president, Biden, demonstrating a direct attack on him and attributing to him negative actions and characteristics, including what Trump called a war on American energy. According to Culpeper's impoliteness theory (1996), this is a rude way to speak, involving outright disrespectful language that attacks the listener directly.

4.1.2. Positive impoliteness

The speeches studied included a number of instances of using positive impoliteness strategy, and as the statistical analysis showed, there were 30 instances of positive impoliteness to illustrate some of them in this part. Using this strategy involves using ambiguous and confidential language.

"*But I'm glad to report that the first hostages have just been released and who knows what's going to happen*"

In this part of the speech, Donald recalls his achievements and talks about his role in achieving a ceasefire and that a number of displaced people will return home today. His use of this word shows his self-confidence, which is reflected in his comparison with other decision-makers who have not achieved what he has achieved. He also ends his sentence with the question " *who knows what's going to happen?"* It is ambiguous and carries two contradictory meanings. That is, who knows that we may escalate things later and make them worse or that we may be the reason for resolving this dispute or this war. In both cases, this phrase threatens the listener's positive face, leaving him in a state of discomfort and anxiety, or at the very least, leaving him confused as he tries to understand what the speaker will do next, or what did he exactly mean.

In an attempt to convince followers and listeners of his speech, the speaker used many times the strategy of rejecting any similarity between his new presidency and previous helpless or useless administrations and decisions. It is clear that he is attempting to demonstrate his power and dominance in the following utterance, as how he is the one who makes influential decisions. He also described himself as having done more important work before assuming the presidency than others had done while he was president.

"*We've achieved more without being president than they've achieved in four years with being president"*

This demonstrated a categorical and clear rejection of any similarities between him and the former presidents.

Since this strategy also includes the use of rude words, Trump has recorded other examples of the use of this strategy. On the day of his swearing-in to assume the presidency for the second time Donald Trump use taboo word in describing the decision of giving the Panama Canal to the Panama country as he said.

"Including the Panama Canal, which has foolishly been given to the country of Panama after the United States."

In this case, the speaker uses the offensive word "foolishly" in his official speech after the oath, and despite the presence of a large number of officials and former presidents, he referred to this act with obscene words without taking into account the

place where he was delivering the speech or the audience who were listening to him. He thus attacked all the listeners and attendees and caused them discomfort. There are many similar examples indicating the use of taboo words in the data, all of which are classified as positive impoliteness strategies. To mention some of them:

"

*get radical left woke ideologies the **hel**l out of our military and out of our government, and we are going to make America great again"*

*"---------gangs being emptied right through that **ugly** open border"*

*"--------**stupid** people allowed for them to have"*

Mentioning such forbidden and offensive words and phrases in the ears of everyone to describe certain people or actions that the speaker did not like is considered a way to embarrass and annoy the recipients.

4.1.3 Negative impoliteness

The application of techniques intended to harm the addressee's negative facial desires, such as frightening them into thinking that something bad will happen to them.

"*By the **way, I have to tell you, we had great support from every gun group, including the NRA "***

The speaker here wanted to show his strength and superiority in obtaining weapons as a kind of threat or intimidation to the listeners who try to disobey or irritate him, especially since he indicated this after talking about the actions his son had carried out, and that he had been summoned to Congress several times. This strategy caused fear in those who thought of intercepting the speaker and demonstrated the speaker's superiority over those who heard him.

In several occasions during his speech, the president uses the first-person pronoun (I) to separate himself from a negative action, and attach the negative value to the other.

"I was saved by God to make America great again"

In this part of the speech, the speaker tried to show his superiority over others and his ability to rebuild America after the sabotage caused by the previous ones.

*"Every radical and foolish executive order of the Biden Administration will be repealed within hours of when **I take** the oath of office."*

The same function of impoliteness is clearly introduced in this utterance. By using the pronoun (I), the speaker directly limited the upcoming positive actions to himself and making a comparison between himself and the previous president to prove his supremacy for the former one. This language use hurting the recipient's negative face and making sure they felt uncomfortable.

4.1.4 Sarcasm or mocking impoliteness

The rudeness of using this strategy involves the speaker appearing polite in his speech but intending to be rude—in other words, appearing to be the exact opposite of what he intends. This is done by using humor or sarcasm to make the listeners laugh at something that may embarrass someone. This strategy was found to be the least used among the impoliteness strategies, and we will mention some of these uses:

They didn't know that I was going to be the president, I guess.

He talked about the TikTok application and how it cannot be used unless it has the approval of the president because he is the one who has the authority to issue the decisions he wants. Then he mentioned that the owners of this application were able to use it previously without the president's permission, but they did not know that Trump would become the next president.

In his use of the previously mentioned utterance, the speaker appears polite and does not hurt anyone with his words, particularly as his speech was followed by grins and laughter from the audience. However, in reality, he is threatening the application's proprietors or anyone who would attempt to use it without the speaker's consent. In the above instance, the speaker indirectly shows his hostility toward anyone who does things that do not serve his interests or achieve profits for him and his country.

To illustrate the use of this strategy, we mention another incident in which the speaker describes the forbidden as good people or portrays the criminals in a positive light.

The only good thing about it is they make our criminals look like really nice people.

After the speaker discusses his objection and absolute rejection of opening the borders with neighboring countries, he emphasizes that this measure makes the United States full of criminals coming from abroad. He then explains that these criminals appear very normal and natural but later commit brutal crimes. As a kind of contempt and to show his rejection of such a decision—namely, opening the borders—he mentions sarcastically that foreign criminals are doing a good job of making domestic criminals look like nice people in comparison.

The sample did not show any use of the fourth strategy of impoliteness strategies. This may be attributed to the fact that the study sample revolves around analyzing speeches rather than direct dialogues between two parties. The fourth strategy is considered more obvious and is more commonly used in discussions and dialogues between two participants than in speeches.

4.2 The Function of Impoliteness Strategies Used by Trump

Through qualitative and quantitative analysis, the functions of impoliteness strategies are determined by extracting the function achieved by using the strategy of impoliteness in the two analyzed discourses. The results that answer the second question will be discussed provides with examples in the section that follows:

Table2. The percentages of Impoliteness functions used by Trump

Impoliteness function	Frequencies	Percentages
Affective Impoliteness	17	18.4%
Coercive Impoliteness	58	63.7%
Enjoyment	16	18%
Total	91	100%

The purposes of Trump's impoliteness tactics in his talks are displayed in Table2. The table shows that the most commonly used function in the speeches is Coercive impoliteness, with a percentage of 63.7%, while Affective impoliteness ranks second in usage with 17 times of use in 18.4%, and the Enjoyment function is considered the least frequently used in the speeches of the American president at 18.4%. Given the information shown by the numbers in the table, the first thing that you will notice is the big difference in the frequency of using the first function and the number of times the other two functions are used.

It is observed that the clear and extensive use of impoliteness methods serves the first function more than any other function, and thus the speaker primarily demonstrates his superiority and distinction in many cases of impoliteness. We can also say that the other two functions were used almost the same number of times, meaning that they are equally important to the speaker, as he was more interested in showing his strength and uniqueness than in expressing his anger or making

the listeners laugh and feel entertained. This is due to the fact that the occasions on which the speaker delivered his speeches were occasions of pride and joy for him rather than occasions of anger. After assuming the presidency of the United States and winning the elections, Trump appears to be superior and distinguished from his competitors by assuming the presidency for the second time and obtaining a high percentage of votes. From this, we can confirm that the speaker took advantage of this opportunity to convince his followers that he was the right choice for them and that he was the one who would save them from the previous administrative chaos, a point he emphasized on many occasions in his speeches. In the following part, we will illustrate some examples of the impoliteness functions that the speaker tends to highlight in his speeches:

4.2.1 Affective Impoliteness

In this impoliteness function, the speaker reflects his anger and projects his negative feelings and discomfort onto the listener. The first example we will explain in this function reflects the speaker's anger at the current government and its inability to protect citizens in emergency situations. This example was mentioned in Trump's speech after he referred to the dangers of opening the borders and allowing everyone to enter America, as those coming across the border could include people escaping from prisons, mental hospitals, and other facilities.

"government that cannot care for its citizens in a time of emergency"

This example reflects the clarity and discomfort about the decisions taken by previous administrations to open the borders and the problems and dire consequences that led to them. In doing so, the speaker conveys a sense of discomfort and anger to his listeners about the decision makers who brought things to these results. He blames them and holds them responsible.

"the top 25, every single one of them is run by a Democrat"

The second example demonstrates how indignation at the wrongdoing of others serves the same function of impoliteness. The speaker in this instance rudely states that a large portion of criminal activity occurs in places that support the Democratic Party. lays the blame squarely on those who oppose it or back the opposition party.

4.2.2 Coercive Impoliteness

The second function is used to highlight superiority and power, as the speaker resorts to Coercive impoliteness to show his control over the listeners and that he is better and more powerful than others. In the following couple examples, the speaker explains that he is better than the former president and that he has power and influence, as he has achieved a lot of progress and success that no one has been able to do before.

"*We won more Hispanic American votes than any Republican has ever gotten before by a lot"*
"we stand on the verge of the four greatest years in American history."

It must be noted here in the second example which is taken from the inauguration speech that Trump delivered in front of many officials, including a number of former American presidents, that with this function he emphasizes his power and shows the disparity in power between him and his listeners. It achieves the goal of inequality in power and the speaker's control over everyone, including former presidents.

Thank you. In recent years, our nation has suffered greatly, but we are going to bring it back and make it great again, greater than ever before

In this utterance, the speaker confirmed that his era would be the best of all previous eras and that he would make America better than it was before. We can say that Trump's use of impoliteness strategies was intended to assert his power

and prove his superiority to his followers. He also aimed to attack everyone who opposed him and to link all the negative actions to his predecessor in the presidency.

4.2.3 Entertaining Impoliteness.

This rudeness differs from the other function of impoliteness since it makes the audience laugh while injuring individuals or groups (victims) throughout the performance. This function is the least performed by the speaker in this study, this may be related to the fact The speaker's goal was to convince the listeners of his strength and ability to improve their lives and living conditions for the better and that he would correct all the mistakes and failures that the United States had reached (as he claimed) in previous years. As a political speech, laughter and entertainment are not considered among its requirements, so the use of laughter and entertainment was the least frequent in the speeches studied.

One of the utterances that make the audience laugh is the following:

"Uncle Sam is having a heart attack down here. Look at him"

Here, the speaker tries to entertain the audience by talking about one of his family members (Uncle Sam). The speaker described him as having a heart attack because he was so happy and pleased with Trump's victory. Then Trump asked everyone to look at Uncle Sam and how he was acting. With the use of this expression, the speaker embarrassed the person he was talking about and attacked his positive face, making him a laughingstock for everyone present.

To discuss this function of the impolite verb, we mention another example of the utterances that Trump made in his speeches. In this example, he talks about the wrestler Hulk Hogan (Hulkster) and welcomes him to the crowd listening to the speech. Then, with sarcasm, the speaker describes the wrestler and says that all he has to do is get up or stand up and they will easily find him.

"The Hulkster. One thing, it's not hard to find him, all he has to do is stand up"

Here, the speaker appears to be mocking the physical appearance of the person he is talking about, that is, he is very large and huge, and that once he stands up, it will be easy to find him among these large crowds.

5. Conclusion

This study aimed to achieve two main goals: to identify the impoliteness strategies used by Trump in his speeches and to examine the impoliteness functions he achieved in these speeches. The results of the analysis of the percentages of impoliteness strategies show that President Trump's most common impoliteness tactic, with the largest percentage (43%), is positive impoliteness, while negative impoliteness is the second most common tactic, followed by bald on-record impoliteness, which accounts for 19.7% of all instances of impoliteness. The lowest percentage, 4.3%, was sarcasm or mock impoliteness; however, there was no illustration of the latter tactic, withholding politeness. Withholding civility typically occurs in discussions rather than speeches, which may explain its absence in the analyzed speeches. This finding contrasts with Muazzaro and Dewanti (2020), who showed that the negative impoliteness strategy was the most used and the positive impoliteness strategy was considered the second. This difference may be attributed to the speaker's increased self-confidence after achieving a second success in the U.S. presidential elections, as he wanted to show his strength and control in the new presidential speeches to convince the listeners of his superiority and distinction over his predecessors.

The second goal of this study was to identify the functions achieved by the speaker through his use of impoliteness in his speeches. The results show that the three functions identified by Culpeper (2011) were present in Trump's use of impoliteness, with the most frequently used function being coercive impoliteness. This is attributed to the fact that the increased use of impoliteness to achieve this goal was evident in the study sample, emphasizing the speaker's power and control.

REFERENCES

Alemi, M., & Latifi, A. (2019). The realization of impoliteness in arguments between the Democrats and Republicans over the government shutdown issue in the US. *Russian Journal of Linguistics, 23*(1), 83–97. https://doi.org/10.22363/2312-9182-2019-23-1-83-9

Ardila, J. A. G. (2019). Impoliteness as a rhetorical strategy in Spain's politics. *Journal of Pragmatics, 140,* 160–170. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2018.11.017

Arendholz, J. (2013). *(In)appropriate online behavior: A pragmatic analysis of message board relations* (Vol. 229). John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Bączkowska, A. (Ed.). (2017). *Impoliteness in media discourse* (1st new ed.). Peter Lang GmbH, Internationaler Verlag der Wissenschaften. https://doi.org/10.3726/978-3-653-03511-7

Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage.* Cambridge University Press.

Cahyono, D. (2018). *Impoliteness strategies and power performed by President Donald Trump on Twitter* (Undergraduate thesis). Universitas Islam Negeri Maulana Malik Ibrahim Malang. http://etheses.uin-malang.ac.id/12257/1/14320101.pdf

Capone, A., & Mey, J. L. (Eds.). (2016). *Interdisciplinary studies in pragmatics, culture and society.* Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-12616-6

Culpeper, J. (1996). Towards an anatomy of impoliteness. *Journal of Pragmatics, 25,* 349–367. https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166(95)00014-3

Culpeper, J. (2011a). *Impoliteness: Using language to cause offence.* Cambridge University Press.

Culpeper, J. (2011b). Politeness and impoliteness. In G. Andersen & K. Aijmer (Eds.), *Pragmatics of society* (pp. 391–436). Mouton de Gruyter.

Culpeper, J., & Hardaker, C. (2017). Impoliteness. In J. Culpeper, M. Haugh, & D. Kádár (Eds.), *Palgrave handbook of (im)politeness* (pp. 199–225). Palgrave Macmillan.

Culpeper, J., Haugh, M., & Kádár, D. Z. (Eds.). (2017). *The Palgrave handbook of linguistic (im)politeness.* Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1057/978-1-137-37508-7

Fouad Kadhum, M., & Fadhil Abbas, N. (2021). How impoliteness is portrayed in a school context: The Marva Collins as a case study. *Arab World English Journal, 12*(3), 144–158. https://doi.org/10.24093/awej/vol12no3.10

García, F. F. (2014). Impoliteness, pseudo-politeness, strategic politeness? On the nature of communicative behaviour in electoral debates. *Círculo de Lingüística Aplicada a la Comunicación, 58,* 60–89. https://doi.org/10.5209/rev_CLAC.2014.v58.45470

Harris, S. (2001). Being politically impolite. *Discourse & Society, 12*(4), 451–472.

Khurniawan, R., Wijayanto, A., & Hikmat, M. H. (2017). The impoliteness strategies in Republican Party's debate of Donald Trump (Undergraduate thesis). Universitas Muhammadiyah Surakarta. https://eprints.ums.ac.id/51195/1/ARTICLE%20PUBLICATION.pdf

Mohammed, H. N., & Abbas, N. F. (2015). Pragmatics of impoliteness and rudeness. *American International Journal of Social Science, 4*(6). https://www.researchgate.net/publication/299523367

Muazzaro, V., & Dewanti, A. (2020). Impoliteness strategies in Donald Trump's speech. *Palarch's Journal of Archeology of Egypt/Egyptology, 17*(4).

Neshkovska, S. (2020). Impoliteness on the political stage: The case of the 2019 final Macedonian presidential debate. *Lodz Papers in Pragmatics, 16*(2), 285–304. https://doi.org/10.1515/lpp-2020-0013

Panggabean, H. (2023). "Hillary, you have no idea": Impoliteness strategy in United States presidential debate case Hillary. *Lexeme: Journal of Linguistics and Applied Linguistics, 5*(1). https://doi.org/10.32493/ljlal.v5i1.27044

Sharifian, F. (Ed.). (2015). *The Routledge handbook of language and culture.* Taylor & Francis.

Theresia, A., & Nisa, B. (2024). Impoliteness strategies based on Culpepper's model: A discourse analysis of *A Man Called Otto*. *International Journal of Humanity Studies (IJHS), 8*(1), 67–79. https://doi.org/10.24071/ijhs.v8i1