English Education Journal

The Comparison Between Evaluative Stance of Donald Trump and Hillary Clinton Realized in the Campaign Speeches of the United States Presidential Election 2016

Aris Novi✉, Sri Wuli Fitriati, Djoko Sutopo

Universitas Negeri Semarang, Indonesia

Article Info	Abstract

The aim of the study was to compare and explain the appraisal resource of Donald Trump and Hillary Clinton realized in the campaign speeches of the United States Presidential Election 2016. This study is discourse analysis conducted by employing appraisal framework (Martin and White, 2005). It is focused on analyzing the appraising items of engagement utilized by the speakers in their first and last speech. The results show that in both speeches Trump produced 704 appraising items, while Hillary discovered 300 appraising items. Besides, it was also discussed that the engagement used contains more disclaim, such utilization by Trump was a medium to deliver his political agendas. While the existence of contrary position in Hillary's speeches indicated her effort to clarify, even counter-strike all issues she dealt with. The similarities of appraising items utilized by the speakers were relied on both speeches, in the first speech, all features of engagement were deployed in the same configuration, while in the last speech, it happened only on disclaim and proclaim. Meanwhile, the differences of appraising items used were found in entertain and attribute in the last speech. In relation to the pedagogical implication, the study suggests that the English teaching and learning that adopts appraisal resource contextualized in hortatory text is an appropriate technique, the students are engaged to experience the relevant English language skills effectively and be able to produce text properly.

✉Correspondence Address:
Kampus Pascasarjana Unnes, Jl. Kelud Utara III Semarang
5023 Indonesia
E-mail: arisnovi32@gmail.com

INTRODUCTION

Communication is the activity of using language that is motivated by the purpose of transactional and interpersonal meaning. In the same way, Brown (2000, p. 5) argues that language is a system consisting vocal, written, or gestural symbol that enable people to communicate intelligibly with one another. As human, it is nearly impossible to spend time without communication, since such activity is used for not only exchanging information, but also serving to establish and maintain social solidarity. Furthermore, most communication occurs either in spoken or written text. Text as the basis of communication deals with communicative meaningful event formed in any passages of spoken or written that forms a unified whole, and it is in contrast to summary or paraphrase. In this case, Thornbury (2005, p. 19) states that a good text is self-contained, well-formed, hang together (cohesive), make sense (coherence), have a clear communicative purpose, recognizable text types, and appropriate to their context of use. Moreover, according to Halliday (1994, p. 13) stated that language is structured to make three main kinds of meaning; ideational, interpersonal, and textual meaning. This study is concerned with the interpersonal meaning in terms of appraisal that utilized in campaign speeches of Donald Trump and Hillary Clinton in the United States presidential election 2016. Appraisal is a study dealing with the evaluation of attitudes that are negotiated in text, the strength of feeling involved, and the ways of values are sourced and readers aligned. This system involves three elements of negotiation attitude in discourse semantic; attitude, engagement, and graduation. Attitude deals with evaluating things, people's character and their feeling. Such evaluation can be more or less intense, that is they may be more or less amplified (Martin and Rose, 2007, p. 26). Engagement deals with the ways in which resources such as projection, modality, polarity, concession and various comment adverbials position the speaker/writer engages with respect to the value position being advanced and with

respect to potential responses to that value position-by quoting or reporting, acknowledging a possibility, deny, countering, affirming and so on (Martin and White, 2005, p. 36). While graduation encompasses resources which strengthen or weaken attitude, resource for "adjusting the volume" of items (Martin and Rose, 2003, p. 41). In this way, the present study is focused on analysing the realization of engagement produced by the speakers in their campaign speeches. Further, due to the fact that such speeches are the actualization of hortatory text (exposition) in which it is dealing with persuading the audience or listeners that something should or not be the case, the researcher assumes that there would be various evaluative expressions of engagement utilized by the speakers to achieve their political agendas.

A number of researchers have examined the existence of engagement in various fields of object study, for instance, Mesa and Chang (2010; see also Lin, 2008; and Hidayati, 2017) analysed the use of engagement in two classes of mathematic teaching and learning, they report that the language used by the instructors indicate different usage of engagement, moreover, such linguistic technique is also applied to facilitate dialogic possibilities that can influence students' performance. In dealing with the study of engagement in the written text, Hadidi and Bagheri (2012; see also Mei, 2006; 2007; Pascual and Unger, 2010; Ansarin and Tarlani-Aliabdi, 2011; Tian, 2013; Miller et. al., 2014; Yang and Xiaojuan, 2015; Mori, 2017; Yuliana and Gandana, 2018) conducted a study concerning with the engagement found in the English literature (prose fiction) and the News (news articles), they inform that both genres dominantly use the four subsystems of engagement, those texts tend to use more dialogic expansion for various purposes.

In this regard, although there are various studies done on engagement, little research has been done to compare and explain the engagement produced by famous public speakers in the campaign speeches. Therefore, the researcher considers that is worth to conduct the current study, it is expected that this study could

portray the way Donald Trump and Hillary Clinton adopt various evaluative expressions into their speeches.

Moreover, there are four taxonomies of engagement used to identify the particular dialogistic positioning associated with given meaning and towards describing what is at stake when one meaning rather than another is utilized (Martin and White, 2005, p. 97);

a. Disclaim focuses on the textual voice positions itself as at odds with, or rejecting, some contrary position:
   1) (deny) negation *(You don't need to give up potatoes to lose weight)*.
   2) (counter) concession/counter expectation *(Even though she ate potatoes most days he still lost weight)*.

b. Proclaim deals with representing the proposition as highly warrantable (compelling, valid, plausible, well-founded, generally agreed, reliable, etc.), the textual voice sets itself against, suppresses or rules out alternative positions:
   1) (concur) *naturally…, of course…, obviously…, admittedly…* etc.; some types of 'rhetorical' or 'leading' question
   2) (pronounce) *I contend…, the truth of the matter is…, there can be no doubt that …* etc.
   3) (Endorse) X *has demonstrated that …; As X has shown …* etc.

c. Entertain is used to present the proposition as grounded in its own contingent, individual subjectivity, the authorial voice represents the proposition as but one of a range of alternative positions;
   1) i*t seems, the evidence suggests, apparently, I hear*
   2) *perhaps, probably, maybe, it's possible, in my view, I suspect that, I believe that, probably, it's almost certain that…, may/will/must;* some types of 'rhetorical' or 'expository' question.

d. Attribute concerns with representing proposition as grounded in the subjectivity of an external voice, the textual voice represents the proposition as but one of a range of possible positions;
   1) (acknowledge) X *said.., X believes…, according to X, in X's view.*

2) (distance) X *claims that, it's rumored that.*

METHODS

The present study is discourse analysis conducted by employing appraisal framework proposed by Martin and White (2005), the analysis works on disclosure the engagement of Donald Trump and Hillary Clinton realized in the United States Presidential election 2016; the similiarities and differences of engagement manifested as well as identify the pedagogical implication of the study on English teaching and learning. The data in this study comprises the speakers' first and last campaign speech, such data are considered since could depict overall issues during the campaign rally. In case of procedure of analyzing tha data, the words identified as appraising items of engagement will be bolded and underlined, such adoption is to simplify the readers in idenfying the evauative expressions used by the speakers.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS

After analysing the text of campaign speeches, the appraising items of engagement used by Donald Trump is displayed in the table as follows;

Table 1. The Appraising Items Utilized in the Campaign Speeches of Donald Trump

Engagement	The First Speech		The Last Speech	
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
Disclaim	240	54	129	50
Proclaim	69	15	35	14
Entertain	111	25	81	32
Attribute	29	6	10	4
TOTAL	449	100	255	100

The above table informs that there are 449 appraising items of engagement distributed in the first speech. In this phase, disclaim with 240 (54%) items belongs to be dominant feature adopted by the speaker. In the second place is entertain with 111 (25%) items. In the third place is proclaim with 69 (15%) items. Meanwhile, attribute with 29 (6%) items follows in the fourth place.

In the last campaign speech, the speaker produced 255 appraising items. The most frequent feature utilized by the speaker is disclaim with 129 (50%) items. In the second place is entertain with 81 (32%) items, in the third place is proclaim with 35 (14%) items, and the last most frequent feature appears in the last speech is attribute with 10 (4%) items.

In dealing with the appraising items of engagement deployed by Hillary Clinton, it is presented in the table below;

Table 2. The Appraising Items Utilized in the Campaign Speeches of Hillary Clinton

Engagement	The First Speech		The Last Speech	
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
Disclaim	113	51	32	41
Proclaim	26	12	15	19
Entertain	74	33	16	20
Attribute	8	4	16	20
TOTAL	221	100	79	100

The above table reports that there are 221 appraising items found in the first speech, such data consist of disclaim with 113 (51%) items as the frequent feature applied by the speaker. In the second place is entertain with 74 (33%) items. Meanwhile, proclaim with 26 (12%) items and attribute with 8 (4%) items become the third and fourth place most frequent feature applied by the speaker.

In the last speech, it shows that there are 79 appraising items proportionally distributed in all features. In this phase, disclaim with 32 (41%) belongs to the most dominant feature utilized by Hillary. Following in the second place is entertain and attribute with 16 (20%) items in each of which. In the third place is proclaim with 15 (19%) items.

In terms of similarities of engagement used by the speakers, it could be displayed in the following table;

Table 3. The Similarities of Engagement Utilized in the First Campaign Speech

Engagement				
Speaker	The Most Dominant Feature utilized	The Second Most Dominant Feature utilized	The Third Most Dominant Feature utilized	The Fourth Most Dominant Feature utilized
Donald Trump	Disclaim (240 items or 54%)	Entertain (111 items or 25%)	Proclaim (69 items or 15%)	Attribute (29 item or 6%)
Hillary Clinton	Disclaim (113 items or 51%)	Entertain (74 items or 33%)	Proclaim (26 items or 12%)	Attribute (8 items or 4%)

In the first campaign speech of Donald Trump and Hillary Clinton, they produce all features of engagement in the same configuration. Disclaim dominates the utilization of engagement in the speeches; Trump with 240 (54%) items while Hillary with 113 (51%) items. Following in the second place is entertain; Trump with 111 (25%) items whereas Hillary with 74 (33%) items. In the third place is proclaim; Trump with 69 (15%) items and Hillary with 26 (12%) items. The least frequent feature used by the speakers is attribute; Trump with 29 (6%) items and Hillary with 8 (4%) items. Furthermore, the similarities of engagement found in the last speech, it could be shown in the following table;

Table 4. The Similarities of Engagement Utilized in the Last Campaign Speech

Engagement		
Speaker	The Most Dominant Feature utilized	The Third Most Dominant Feature utilized
Donald Trump	Disclaim (129 items or 50%)	Proclaim (35 items or 14%)
Hillary Clinton	Disclaim (32 items or 41%)	Proclaim (15 items or 19%)

Relating to the last speech, the similarities happens only on disclaim and proclaim. Disclaim in this case is still dominantly utilized by both speakers; Trump with 129 (50%) items whereas Hillary with 32 (41%) items. Further,

proclaim is also used in the same configuration in which it is used as the third place most frequent feature; Trump with 35 (14%) items and Hillary with 15 (19%) items.

In the light above, it is identified that disclaim significantly utilized by the speakers in their speeches, this feature seems to play vital role as medium to create positive image in group and negative outgroup (Van Dijk, 2005). In this way, such intensions are natural phenomena for politicians to achieve their political interests. On the contrary, the differences of engagement found in the speeches could be displayed in the table as follows;

Table 5. The Differences of Engagement Utilized in the Last Campaign Speech

Engagement		
Speaker	The Second Most Dominant Feature Utilized	The Fourth Most Dominant Feature Utilized
Donald Trump	Entertain (81 items or 32%)	Attribute (10 items or 4%)
Hillary Clinton	Entertain (16 items or 20%) & Attribute (16 items or 20%)	-

As stated earlier that in the last campaign speech of Donald Trump and Hillary Clinton, the similarities of engagement occur in disclaim and proclaim, meaning that the rest features used by the speakers are different, the above table shows that the differences feature used by the speakers are in terms of entertain and attribute. As the second most significantly used by the speakers, entertain with 81 (32%) items conveyed by Trump whereas it is entertain and attribute with 16 (20%) items each of which are applied by Hillary Clinton. In this respect, such adoption could be construed that Hillary tends to provide balance alternative viewpoints or propositions in both individual subjectivity and external voice. Additionally, since entertain and attribute in campaign speech of Hillary Clinton are employed in the same number, it then

implies that attribute with 10 (4%) items belongs to the least feature applied by Trump.

Based on the above findings, it is recognized that the campaign speeches of Donald Trump and Hillary Clinton are replete with the expression of disclaim. In the first speech, such item is deployed by Trump to manage various national and international issues, and highlights the government unpopular policy. Even so, the interesting point in this speech is that there is no evaluative element explicitly addressed to his opponent, Hillary Clinton. This fact tends to be occurred since it is the first speech (presidential announcement speech) in which the political intrigue is at the lowest level. Consider the following instance;
The first speech No. 38
*When Mexico sends its people, they're **not sending** their best.*

Similarly, in the first campaign speech of Hillary Clinton, the finding reveals that there is a prevalent distribution the items of disclaim. Interestingly, the social and economic phenomena have greater portion delivered by the speaker rather than focuses on the political agendas. It could be inferred that through her first speech, she wants to image herself as the candidate who concerns with the real societies' everyday problems. A significant instance is provided below;
The first speech No. 157
*Business leaders who want higher pay for employees, equal pay for women and— and **no discrimination** against the LGBT community either.*

In the last speech, the speakers intentionally use their speech to persuade and convince the voters to vote for them. Donald Trump in this case, by deploying disclaim he presents crucial issues, attacking Hillary with the rhetoric that tend to underestimate her capabilities to deal with the problems of the country. A suitable example is depicted below;
The last speech No. 191
*She's **not gonna** be able to do the job— She's **not gonna** be able to do the job.*

By contrast, the use of disclaim by Hillary Clinton is particularly significant in the topic of her last campaign, election day, economic, and national solidarity. Meaning that such feature

takes least frequent when it is conveyed to evaluate her opponent, it is as shown in the example below;

The last speech No. 7

And I <u>cannot imagine</u> a better way of ending this campaign than having the opportunity to see all² of you and to watch and listen to Lady Gaga.

The situated event of a presidential election requires the politicians or candidates to construct an identity of president-to-be and, therefore, to create a persuasive relationship with the public hoping to have the perlocutionary effect of voting, that is winning their support (Johansson, 2008). In doing so, though proclaim is not the prominent feature involved in the campaign speeches, this feature has also significant function to persuade and influence the voters with providing the proposition that is highly warrantable. In the first campaign speech of Donald Trump, the exploitation of proclaim is to inform the audience various issues with providing the references or supporting data. A significant example is provided below;

The last speech No. 219

<u>Delphi laid off 3,627 workers and moved their jobs to Mexico and other countries.</u>

For Hillary, the deployment of proclaim is used to describe his experience and contribution in public services, as well as remind the audience related to the importance of unity for the country. An appropriate example is presented below;

The last speech No. 92

<u>I do wanna be President for all Americans, not just some, not just the people who support me and vote for me.</u>

Further, based on the finding, it is apparent that the frequency of proclaim utilized by the speakers in the last speech is not greater than that in the first speech. This situation probably happens due to the fact that the speech duration is shorter than that in the first speech. In this phase, the use of proclaim by Donald Trump focuses on managing the issues about national security and economic drawback. In this case, a suitable example is displayed as follows;

The last speech No. 196

<u>Michigan has lost more than 1 in 4 of its manufacturing jobs since NAFTA, a deal signed by Bill Clinton and supported by his lovely wife, Hillary.</u>

In contrast, the distribution of proclaim by Hillary Clinton mainly tells the audience about the importance of national solidarity and unity to develop the country. Besides, she also informs her plan on educational system. It is as indicated in the following example;

The last speech No. 93

<u>I wanna be President for everyone because we all have a role to play in building that better² future for our country and for each of you.</u>

In the study conducted by Ademilokum (2016), it reveals that entertain is technically used by defeated gubernatorial to elicit the sympathy of the public. In this sense, such finding is also relevant to the present study, though Trump is not defeated presidential candidate, he produces such feature to promote his programs and highlight the economic issues. The appropriate instance is depicted as follows;

The first speech No. 221

I'<u>ll</u> bring back our jobs from China, from Mexico, from Japan, from so many places.

Meanwhile, Hillary utilizes the items of entertain to explore many issues by conveying alternative viewpoints. In this case, the economic and financial problems seem to be the main concern of her speech. The following text could be a suitable instance;

The first speech No. 163

I <u>will</u> give new incentives to companies that give their employees a fair¹ share² of the profits their hard work³ earns.

Moreover, by using entertain in the last speech, Trump generally still highlights the same topic as in his first speech, such as; providing jobs, eliminating Islamic radical terrorisms, making America great again, planning to build walls on the border, and so on. The difference proposition in this speech is the topic about the speaker's expectation to win Michigan, the city where he spent his last campaign rally. A suitable instance is presented below;

The last speech No. 87

If we win Michigan, we __will__[1] win this historic election, and then we truly __will__[2] be able to do all of the things we wanna do.

Furthermore, the exploitation of entertain in the last campaign speech of Hillary Clinton is characterized by profound with promoting her proposals on education, investment, working families, equality before the law, etc. A significant example is shown as follows;

The last speech No. 68

If you believe we __should__ make the biggest[1] investment in new jobs since World War II in infrastructure, advanced manufacturing, clean energy, small business, then you have to vote.

Relating to the last feature of engagement, attribute becomes the least frequent utilized by the speakers. In this case, although such feature takes small portion in the speeches, attribute has also significant function in convincing the people to vote for certain candidates since this feature works on providing supporting information or proposition as a grounded in the subjectivity of external voice. In the first campaign speech of Donald Trump, attribute is deployed to manage his experience with his colleagues, inform his assets, and highlight the recent issues. A significant example is provided below;

The first speech No. 326

Now, Ford __announces__ a few weeks ago that Ford is going to build a $2.5 billion car and truck and parts manufacturing plant in Mexico.

Meanwhile, by using this feature, Hillary tries to
trigger the audience's motivation to realize the truly prosperity of America, it is as indicated in the following example;

The first speech No. 15

He (President Roosevelt) __said__ there's no mystery about what it takes to build a strong[1] and prosperous[2] America: "Equality[3] of opportunity."

Referring to the attribute in the last speech, it is interesting to note that Trump by deploying this feature explicitly attacks the government unpopular policy and his opponent's plans, it is as shown in the following example;

The last speech No. 116

It's just been __announced__ that the residents of Michigan are going to experience a massive double-digit premium hike, like you wouldn't believe.

On the other hand, it is apparent that the exploitation of attribute in the campaign speech of Hillary Clinton is not addressed to her opponent. Here, she focuses on promoting her plans in terms of affordable education, climate change, fairness on economy and law. Consider the following instance;

The last speech No. 70

If you __believe__ we need to do more to support working families with affordable childcare, paid leave, and equal pay[2] for women, then you have to vote.

In short, due to the fact that the speakers tend to apply greater disclaim than other features, it then could be said that such finding reflects the study conducted by Hidayati (2017) where the main figure in the movie emphasizes more on character's denial towards each other's opinion through realization of more disclaim in terms of heterogloss in the screenplay. Besides, Mei's (2007) study revealed that the high and low-rated script writers frequently applied disclaim; counter and proclaim; pronounce, such features were involved to develop the contradictory values into their utterances. By contrast, the result of the present study could also be counter claim the study conducted by Pascual and Unger (2010), their study informed that grant proposals written by Argentinean researchers were characterized by profound expressions of entertain, relying on heteroglossic expansion that engages the alternative positions of other members of the community. Furthermore, Yuliana and Gandana's (2018) study also reported that entertain and attribute were the significant features found in the students' analytical exposition. In this way, entertain was used to provide alternative voices on the issue at hand, while attribute (acknowledge) functioned as a source of external voices without overtly aligning or disaligning their stance. In connection to the present study, the utilization of frequent disclaim by Donald Trump is generally as a medium to make promise, pledges, affirmation and declaration

with the audience (Bull, et. al., 2008). While the existence various items of rejecting or contrary position in the campaign speeches of Hillary Clinton is to mean her effort to clarify, even counter-strike all issues she deals with.

CONCLUSION

Based on the findings and discussions above, Donald Trump utilized 449 appraising items in the first speech and 255 appraising items in the last speech. Meanwhile, Hillary Clinton deployed 221 appraising items in the first speech and 79 appraising items in the last speech. Besides, it is also identified that their speeches were dominated by disclaim, such adoption by Trump is to make promise, pledges, affirmation and declaration with the audience (Bull, et. al., 2008). While the deployment of various items of rejecting or contrary position in the campaign speeches of Hillary is to mean her effort to clarify, even counter-strike all issues she deals with. In dealing with the similarities of engagement used by the speakers, they are identified in all features in the first speech, while in the last speech it is found in disclaim and proclaim. This fact implies that the difference of engagement adopted by the speakers was relied on entertain and attribute in the last speech. In addition, the present study also suggests that the English teaching and learning that adopts appraisal resource contextualized in hortatory text is an appropriate technique, the students are engaged to experience the relevant English language skills effectively and be able to produce text properly.

REFERENCES

Ademilokun, M. (2016). Appraisal of resources in post-election defeat-concession speeches of some gubernatorial candidates in southwestern Nigeria, 2014- 2015. *Journal of Pan African Studies*, *9*(1), 167-188. Retrieved from www.jpanafrican.org/docs/vol9no1/9.1-entry-11-Ademilokun.pdf

Ansarin, A. A., & Tarlani-Aliabdi, H. (2011). Reader engagement in English and Persian applied linguistics articles. *English Language Teaching*, *4*(4),154-164.doi: 10.5539/elt.v4n4p154

Bull, P., Fetzer, A., & Johansson, M. (2008). Prologue: Analyzing the fine details of the political commitment. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology, 27*, 324-332. doi: 10.1177/0261927X08322474

Hadidi, Y., & Mohammad, B. L. (2012). The system of engagement in a sample of prose fiction and the news. *The Journal of Applied Linguistics, 5*(11), 45-63. Retrieved from http://www.sid.ir/En/Journal/View Paper.aspx?ID=499835

Halliday, M.A.K. (1994). *An Introduction to Systemic Functional Grammar.* 2nd edition. New York: Routledge.

Hidayati, N. (2017). Appraisal analysis in freedom writers movie. *eduLite, 2*(1), 317-333. doi: 10.30659/e.2.1.317-333

Lin, L.F. (2008). Interpersonal engagement in graduate-level classroom discourse: Researching gender-related pattern. *Systemic functional linguistics in use. Odense working papers in language and communication*, *29*, 522-546. Retrieved from https://www.sdu.dk/~/media/Files/Om_SDU/Institutter/ISK/Forskningspublikationer/OWPLC/Nr29/Li%20Fen%20Lin.ashx

Martin, J.R., & Rose, D. (2003). *Working with Discourse: Meaning Beyond the Clause*. New York: Continuum.

Martin, J. R., & White, P. R. R. (2005). *The Language of Evaluation; Appraisal in English.* New York; Palgrave Macmillan.

Martin, J.R., & Rose, D. (2007). *Working with Discourse.* London: Continuum.

Mei, W.S. (2006). Creating a contrastive rhetorical stance: Investigating the strategy of problematization in

students' argumentation. *RELC journal*, *37*(3), 329-353. doi: 10.1177/0033688206071316

Mei, W.S. (2007). The use of engagement resources in high-and low-Rated undergraduate geography essays. *Journal of English for academic Purposes*, *6*(3), 254-271. doi:10.1016/j.jeap.2007.09.006.

Mesa, V., & Chang, P. (2010). The language of engagement in two highly interactive undergraduate mathematics classrooms. *Linguistics and Education*, *21*(2), 83-100. doi: 10.1016/j.linged.2010.01.002.

Miller, R.T., Mitchell, T.D., & Pessoa, S. (2014). Valued voices: students' use of engagement in argumentative history writing. *Linguistics and Education*, *28*, 107-120. doi: 10.1016/j.linged.2014.10.002

Mori, M. (2017). Using the appraisal framework to analyse source use in essays: A case study of

Yang, L., & Lv, X. (2015). Reporting evidentials in generic structures of English research articles-from the perspective of engagement in appraisal system. *International Journal of Linguistics and Communication, 3*(1),134-144. doi: 10.15640/ijlc.v3n1a14.

Yuliana, D., & Gandana, I.S.S. (2018). Writers' voice and engagement strategies in students' analytical exposition texts. *Indonesians Journal of Applied Linguistics, 7*(3), 613-620. doi: 10.17509/ijal.v7i3.9812

engagement and dialogism in two undergraduate students' writing. *Functional Linguistics*, *4*(11). doi: 10.1186/s40554-017-0046-4.

Pascual, M., & Unger, L. (2010). Appraisal in the research genres: An analysis of grant proposals by Argentinean researchers. *Journal Revista Signos, 43*(73)*, 261-280.* doi: 10.4067/S071809342010000200004.

Tian, Y. (2013). Engagement in online hotel reviews: A comparative study. *Discourse, Context and Media, 2*(4), 184-191. doi: 10.1016/j.dcm.2013.10.002.

Thornbury, S. (2005). *Beyond the Sentence: Introducing Discourse Analysis.* Oxford: Macmillan Education.

Van Dijk, T. (2005). War rhetoric of the little ally: political implicatures and Aznar's legitimization of the war in Iraq. *Journal of Language and Politics, 4*(1), 65-91. doi: 10.1007/978-1-137-07299-3_8