

South Dakota State University

Open PRAIRIE: Open Public Research Access Institutional Repository and Information Exchange

Electronic Theses and Dissertations

2019

Make the Inaugural Great Again: A Rhetorical Analysis of Donald J. Trump's Inaugural Address

Danielle F. Dickerson
South Dakota State University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://openprairie.sdstate.edu/etd>



Part of the [American Politics Commons](#), [Social Influence and Political Communication Commons](#), [Social Media Commons](#), and the [Speech and Rhetorical Studies Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Dickerson, Danielle F., "Make the Inaugural Great Again: A Rhetorical Analysis of Donald J. Trump's Inaugural Address" (2019). *Electronic Theses and Dissertations*. 3166.
<https://openprairie.sdstate.edu/etd/3166>

This Thesis - Open Access is brought to you for free and open access by Open PRAIRIE: Open Public Research Access Institutional Repository and Information Exchange. It has been accepted for inclusion in Electronic Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Open PRAIRIE: Open Public Research Access Institutional Repository and Information Exchange. For more information, please contact michael.biondo@sdstate.edu.

MAKE THE INAUGURAL GREAT AGAIN:
A RHETORICAL ANALYSIS OF DONALD J. TRUMP'S INAUGURAL ADDRESS

BY
DANIELLE F. DICKERSON

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the

Master of Arts

Major in Communication Studies and Journalism

Specialization in Communication Studies

South Dakota State University

2019

MAKE THE INAUGURAL GREAT AGAIN:
A RHETORICAL ANALYSIS OF PRESIDENT DONALD J. TRUMP'S INAUGURAL
ADDRESS

DANIELLE F. DICKERSON

This thesis is approved as a creditable and independent investigation by a candidate for the Master of Arts degree and is acceptable for meeting the thesis requirements for this degree. Acceptance of this does not imply that the conclusions reached by the candidate are necessarily the conclusions of the major department.

Rebecca A. Kuehl, Ph.D.
Thesis Advisor

Date

Lyle Olson, Ed.D.
Director, School of Communication and Journalism

Date

Dean, Graduate School

Date

This thesis is dedicated to my family; Dave, Jana and Mikayla. My father, who always encouraged my love of politics and history from the time I can remember. My mom, whose love has no limits, and to my sister, whose light never dims. Love you, always.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

To the individuals I call family, thanks can never be enough. Mom- Words cannot describe the appreciation I have for you during this process. As you know, my grit and spirit wore at times, and you were always there with encouragement and love. You are my biggest fan and best friend; thank you from the bottom of my heart. Dad- You knew my love for knowledge from the very beginning. Your love of literature, history and education is truly what shaped me as a scholar, and for that I have the deepest gratitude. To Nan, Papa and A.J.- You never once questioned my decision to head back to South Dakota. Your love for me is so pure and beautiful; thank you for the strength you bring to this world. Thank you for the safe place that is your farm; it is what made me who I am today. To my family in La Jolla- Thank you for the paradise to go to during the freezing spring semesters. To Nicole and Betty- Your love, encouragement, and hospitality is beyond wonderful.

Courtland- You were my way of escape throughout this process. Our conversations about philosophy, Trump, and Twitter shaped many of the questions and revelations this thesis was shaped by.

Shala and Rikki- I know I could not have gotten through this process without you. We did it, ladies! We also should personally write thank you letters to the Wild Hare, O'Hare's, and *The Bachelor* producers for getting us through this.

To the incredible faculty here at SDSU- You truly have shaped who I am as a person and as a scholar. Specifically, to my advisor Dr. Becky Kuehl- This thesis would not have been possible without you. You pushed me beyond what I thought I could do. Thanks for never letting me get too wrapped up in the process. To Dr. Josh Westwick-

You have known me through the good and bad times of my collegiate career. You never judged and always encouraged. Thank you for your kind devotion. To Dr. Karla Hunter- You always had encouraging words for this project and for me personally. You are a true light in the department.

Finally, thank you to the Roosevelts- You were always there for me with kind chirps and cuddles. Thank you to Titos and Lacroix- You were a girl's best friend at times. To the study stations on Spotify- You kept me focused on the task at hand. To the Joe Rogan podcast- You provided a much-needed escape. To my record player- Thanks for having California Dreamin' by the Mamas and Papas and Raspberry Beret by Prince on repeat.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....	viii
CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION TO DONALD J. TRUMP’S INAUGURAL ADDRESS.....	
1	1
History of the Inaugural Address.....	3
Statement of the Problem.....	5
Background of the Problem.....	7
Definitions.....	11
Research Questions.....	13
CHAPTER TWO: HISTORICAL CONTEXT SURROUNDING DONALD J. TRUMP’S INAUGURAL.....	
15	15
Rhetor: Donald J. Trump through Rhetoric, Tweets, and Politics.....	15
Audiences for Donald J. Trump’s Presidential Inaugural.....	21
Subject/Purpose: The Rhetorical Presidency and Presidential Inaugural Rhetoric.....	28
CHAPTER THREE: THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVES TO STUDY DONALD J. TRUMP’S INAUGURAL.....	
34	34
Ideographic Criticism.....	35
Theory of Dramatism.....	40
The Bully Pulpit.....	45
Inaugural Address Expectations.....	50
Justification of Trump’s Inaugural as the Text for Rhetorical Analysis.....	53

CHAPTER FOUR: RHETORICAL ANALYSIS OF DONALD J. TRUMP'S INAUGURAL ADDRESS.....	56
Trump's Use of Ideographs in the Inaugural.....	56
Pentadic Criticism of Trump's Inaugural.....	66
Trump's Appeals to the Bully Pulpit.....	76
Trump's Deviation from Inaugural Address Expectations.....	80
CHAPTER FIVE: CONCLUSION AND DISCUSSION.....	91
Review of Research Questions.....	91
Implications for Rhetorical Theory and Communication Studies.....	97
Implications for Politics and the Inaugural Address.....	103
Limitations.....	106
Suggestions for Future Research.....	108
Summary.....	109
REFERENCES.....	111

ABSTRACT

MAKE THE INAUGURAL GREAT AGAIN:

A RHETORICAL ANALYSIS OF DONALD J. TRUMP'S INAUGURAL ADDRESS

DANIELLE F. DICKERSON

2019

In this thesis, I utilized three distinct theories (ideographs, dramatism, and the bully pulpit) to rhetorically analyze and assess President Trump's 2017 inaugural address. Ultimately, I analyzed whether Trump deviated from Campbell and Jamieson's (1985) presidential inaugural expectations. While the presidential inaugural address was the only text analyzed, implications were drawn from Trump's rhetoric leading up to and within the inaugural. This thesis also analyzed Trump's rhetoric through social media, specifically Twitter, and looked at the context surrounding the inaugural. I suggest, through my research, that Trump does deviate from the traditional framework of the inaugural address, and ultimately modernized the inaugural through his language. The analysis provided insight into who Donald J. Trump is as a rhetor and the modern use of each theoretical lens.

CHAPTER ONE:

INTRODUCTION TO DONALD J. TRUMP'S INAUGURAL ADDRESS

When considering the inaugural address, one might think of the newly elected president giving a speech that discusses how a contentious election no longer matters, and how the country is not about one party versus another, but one unified entity. One might even think the president might discuss how hope is on the horizon. Ericson (1997) explained these historic traditions have remained present in the presidential inaugural address. The inaugural's function is to gather political features of the American culture and connect to the audience through those means, and not for a president to set their own policy agenda (Ericson, 1997). However, in our modern age of media, this connection now includes tweets to communicate, as evident in U.S. President Donald J. Trump's inaugural and continuing communication efforts with the American people (Kreis, 2017). The inaugural in fact may look and feel different, given this President's preference for Twitter and lack of preference for press conferences and formal speeches (Kreis, 2017). Thus, other aspects of the inaugural may also function differently.

This is also because viewership looks different. More people tuned into the cultural context surrounding the inaugural than people who actually attended the inaugural (Qui, 2017). Trump is also the most followed president on social media at the time of his inaugural, with 26.1 million followers on his personal account (Kreis, 2017). This study explored what the presidential inaugural looks like in our modern society and how it has changed and/or shifted from generic norms established through past presidential inaugurals. This study enters the scholarly conversation about the rhetoric within the inaugural and the surrounding context of the presidential inaugural address.

However, this study looked to past scholarship to further understand the present and future communication about the presidential inaugural address.

This study is not about just the inaugural as a speech act or single text. It is also about how Americans now view and communicate with the modern presidency and the surrounding context of the presidential inaugural. For instance, the larger question is what is being communicated to the public from the office of the president. Some argue it is hurting the public expectancy gap, in other words how people feel the president should act in office (Waterman, Silva & Smith, 2014). Voters are much less invested and were upset by the contentious nature of the 2016 U.S. presidential election (Taylor, 2016). In fact, the 2016 election had more negative advertisements than both the 2008 and 2012 presidential elections (Taylor, 2016). This created negative exigency in the country right before and after the election of the new president. The inaugural address took place during a time of turmoil and distrust in government. For instance, just 24 hours after Trump's inauguration, millions of people all over the country chose to gather to protest Trump, at the 2017 Women's March (Qui, 2017). Therefore, this study analyzed context surrounding the inaugural as well as the text itself, being Trump's inaugural address.

I utilized close textual analysis (Leff, 1986) to rhetorically analyze Trump's inaugural, to understand to what extent Trump's rhetoric deviates from the established tenets of the inaugural address provided by Campbell and Jamieson (1985). My goal ultimately was to see how, if at all, Trump has modernized the inaugural. I explored the rhetorical strategies used by Trump in the presidential inaugural through the use of three critical perspectives: ideographic criticism (McGee, 1980), the dramatism/pentadic criticism (Burke, 1945), and the bully pulpit (Edwards, 2003; Gelderman, 1997). More

specifically, I explored how Trump might constitute particular political cultures and audiences through McGee's (1980) ideographic criticism then I analyzed the motive of the inaugural through using Burke's dramatistic pentad (Burke, 1945) and finally I analyzed how Trump used his new-found position as president through the bully pulpit (Edwards, 2003). Within the first chapter I will provide a history of the inaugural, the statement and then background of the problem. I will then conclude the chapter with definitions and research questions.

History of the Inaugural Address

The presidential inaugural address, and further, the communication styles that are significant to the address, have remained consistent throughout history (Campbell & Jamieson, 1985). The inaugural address has been a part of the American identity since the beginning of the U.S. presidency (Shaw, 2017). The communication style of the address has shifted over time (Stuckey, 2010). However, the emphasis of the address itself is still a speech every president gives at the beginning of his term (Campbell & Jamieson, 1985; Korzi, 2004; Shaw, 2017). It is important to understand the history, so we can fully grasp when changes are made to the generic norms of the address.

The presidential inaugural address is an iconic speech of American culture (Korzi, 2004). Presidents typically use this opportune occasion to commemorate the country's past and to look towards its future (Korzi, 2004). The president is trying to set a tone for their time in office (Sigelman, 1996). Presidents are all unique rhetors; however, throughout history, they have still remained consistent in their language and purpose within the inaugural address (Gelderman, 1997). Thus, scholars might begin to question, why is the inaugural address still in existence? Is it even a necessary speech in the age of

social media? The function of the inaugural is to understand the culture surrounding the country and the presidential response to it (Ericson, 1997). Even though the incoming president is stepping into a role of supreme responsibility, he still must connect to the American people (Korzi, 2004). The exploration of historic rhetorical themes therefore continues to be significant to study in understanding the U.S. presidency, American political culture, and rhetorical norms of the presidential inaugural address.

In the origination of the genre, most addresses were scripted, had large amounts of humility, outlined the president's goals and asked for God's blessing (Sigelman, 1996). This structure of the inaugural was outlined in President Barack Obama's address (Frank, 2011). Those who have studied Obama's tenure as president have made clear arguments about the modernization of his presidency (Souza, 2017; O'Brian, 2017). For instance, even his increasing use of technology made him a very different president. Obama has had a bigger impact than almost any president in history (O'Brian, 2017). Yet, this modernizing impact did not translate to his rhetorical language in his inaugural addresses.

In President Obama's inaugural addresses, many historical themes as used by past presidents were present. In fact, Obama chose to take a route derived in humility and theology (Frank, 2011). His inaugural responded to a recurring rhetorical situation of the expectations of presidential inaugurals (Frank, 2011). The president should express to the members of the audience that they have a common identity: their humanity (Ericson, 1997). Further, Ericson (1997) explained, the people who voted for the president want to know he is working for them, and Obama met this particular exigence in his inaugural address. Understanding the history of the presidential inaugural is essential to grasp the importance of this study within rhetorical studies, and the communication discipline. I

will now explore the statement of the problem and its significance to communication studies in the next section.

Statement of the Problem

The 2016 presidential campaign was a time of deep cultural and political significance in the United States. From the use of social media sites such as Facebook and Twitter to get messages across to voters, to the deep divide between the conservative right and liberal left (Terrill, 2017), the 2016 election was a significant cultural and political moment to many U.S. citizens. Trump, as the Republican presidential nominee, was also a unique and controversial candidate (Appel, 2018). The 2016 election also had many contested exigencies, in regard to the Russian investigation that was ran by Robert Mueller (Drury & Kuehl, 2018). This investigation highlights the potential that 2016 campaign was tampered with by Russia, as of September 2018 no conclusion has been made, however, the investigation itself dampens the legitimacy of Trump's campaign (Oprysko, 2018). There were also other issues that existed with Trump as a candidate.

While Trump's personal wealth was indeed unique, his lack of political experience became an anomaly (Hall, Goldstein & Ingram, 2016). Throughout the campaign, Trump would deploy tweets to promote his agenda (Kreis, 2017). He was successful at reaching large audiences while simultaneously connecting to them, ultimately allowing the audience to feel close to him (Kreis, 2017). However, it is important to note that 53% of ads in the 2016 presidential campaign had a negative connotation compared to the next highest election in 2012 at 48% (Ordway & Wihbey, 2016). Trump became a candidate during a time of negative politics and political shifting

of the country (Kreis, 2017). Further, (Kreis, 2017) outlined, that Trump potentially added to the divisiveness during this time.

Both presidential candidates used Twitter, but they did so differently. It was clear that Democratic presidential nominee, Hillary Clinton, was employing her staff to construct her tweets, while Trump was mostly writing his own tweets through his personal account (Kreis, 2017). The exigencies surrounding the campaign created turmoil and divisiveness throughout the country. Even before the presidential election, there was already an upturn of divisive approval towards politics (Taylor, 2016). People overall were becoming more and more divided into separate echo chambers (Jamieson & Cappella, 2008). Echo chambers are when people tend to only gather news from sources they ultimately already agree with (Jamieson & Cappella, 2008). Two-thirds of consistently voting conservatives and half of consistently voting liberals stated their close friends shared their political opinions (Taylor, 2016). This mindset was integrated by both liberals and conservatives in the 2016 U.S. presidential election.

Liberals explained they would prefer to live in cities, while conservatives were more subject to live in rural areas or small towns (Taylor, 2016). The 2016 election had unprecedented amounts of communication about politics circulating through social media sites such as Twitter and Facebook. On both sides of the political spectrum supporters circulated posts and opinion pieces that were equivalent to their political beliefs. The disparities in Twitter universes by political belief are considered to be echo chambers (Jamieson & Cappella, 2008) where social media users would only see posts that agreed with them politically (Drury & Kuehl, 2018). Trump's communication was not the sole cause of the political divisiveness in the United States. It was happening before Trump

ran for office and was elected president (Appel, 2018). Yet, it is important to understand how Trump capitalized on this divisiveness.

Although Trump alone did not cause the divided U.S. political culture, he also did not help the divisiveness happening in the United States, either. Specifically, in his inaugural, Trump's language choices were not unifying and deviated from the traditional nature of the address (Trump, 2017). For instance, he had very little unifying language like Sigelman (1996) outlined as an important factor in the presidential inaugural. He used language that continued the acrimonious culture in our nation (Trump, 2017), not only setting one party against another, but alluding to the divide between the government and its citizens.

In fact, only 19% of people in 2016 alluded that they trust the government (Taylor, 2016). Overall, the faith towards government and the political divisiveness between citizens of the United States made a hostile environment leading up to the inaugural (Taylor, 2016; Terrill, 2017). The language Trump used during the inaugural address did not help this issue (Appel, 2018). Next, in the background of the problem, I address how Trump's background combined with the modernization of the inaugural shaped the context surrounding Trump's inauguration, as well as the inaugural address itself.

Background of the Problem

In this section, I explored how the rhetorical presidency and the use of social media have shifted the inaugural address specifically, in terms of the audience's expectations of the address. The use of social media by Trump's team in coordination with the inaugural was specifically significant to the context and text of Trump's

inaugural address. I then turn to the overall modernization of the inaugural, to show how the context surrounding Trump's inaugural has consequences for his rhetorical choices and strategies in the inaugural address itself.

The rhetorical genre of presidential rhetoric is a classic area for critical scholars to study (Stuckey, 2010). The rhetorical presidency itself was introduced by Tulis (1987). The theory described that presidents regularly appeal over the heads of Congress, directly to the American people at large to gather support for their public policies (Tulis, 1987). However, even with the historic nature of the genre, this study will focus on analyzing how, if at all, presidential rhetoric through the inaugural has modernized, or deviated, from expected rhetorical norms of the presidential inaugural (Campbell and Jamieson, 1985). Understanding how Trump has been perceived as a rhetor is critical for the importance of this study and was explored more in depth in the next chapter. Many scholars have pointed out the negative aspects of who Trump is as a candidate and rhetor (Hall et al., 2016; New York Times, 2017; Kreis, 2017). Several news articles pejoratively described Trump's hands, his negative remarks about females, his Twitter account, and even his appearance (Hall et al., 2016; New York Times, 2017; Kreis, 2017; Harvard, 2017). In fact, Appel (2018) stated that Trump's campaign communication style was a rhetorical phenomenon. Trump did not follow any of the established campaign norms (Appel, 2018). Yet, how did Trump get to his place in the spotlight of modern politics?

Citizens and the media are at a divide. Waterman, Silva and Smith (2014) described this phenomenon as the expectations gap between citizens and the media. They addressed the notion that public expectations for increased media coverage about the

president are increasing and lead to higher standards for each successive president to be more transparent (Waterman, et al., 2014). Citizens want four basic principles to be addressed in media coverage about presidential leadership: sound crisis judgment, foreign policy experience, strong ethics, and cooperation with Congress (Waterman, et al., 2014). The news media, or the fourth estate, has been a traditional check on the three branches of government, to hold those branches of government accountable for their actions (Whitten Woodring, 2012). The fourth estate allows for the news media to stay independent of the government and keep it responsive and responsible and treating citizens respectfully (Whitten Woodring, 2012). Then Trump entered the picture. Trump has found his niche by scapegoating the media and spreading the “fake news” phenomenon (Rhea, 2018; Terrill, 2016). More and more people are getting their news through social media and Twitter and chose to get their news through echo chambers of news that relates to their political identity (Kreis, 2017; Ott, 2017). People still want to get news; however, how they do so has shifted during the tenure of President Trump.

Potentially, the media have changed their coverage in such a way to engage citizens more to focus on Trump’s larger political agenda. Trump succeeded in shaping the election agenda (Rhea, 2018). Media coverage of Trump overwhelmingly outperformed media coverage of Clinton in the 2016 presidential campaign season (Taylor, 2016). Overall, Clinton’s media coverage focused on her scandals, while Trump’s media coverage focused on his core issues (Taylor, 2016). In contrast, Trump focused on getting out his message out through Twitter (Ott, 2017). It is important to understand the background of what citizens were looking for in a president, and how the media and scholars (Ott, 2017; Rhea, 2018; Taylor, 2016) have covered Trump up until

now. Since the confluence of the rhetorical presidency, Trump, and social media through the inaugural address may ultimately contribute to the potential modernization of the presidential inaugural address, especially in comparison to rhetorical expectations about the presidential inaugural (Campbell and Jamieson, 1985). Furthermore, the modernization of the inaugural also connects to Trump's language.

“We Will Make America Strong Again. We Will Make America Wealthy Again. We Will Make America Proud Again. We Will Make America Safe Again. And, Yes Together We Will Make America Great Again” (Trump, 2017, p. 6). These words were uttered similarly in many of Trump's campaign stump speeches (Edwards, 2018). However, these exact words were stated in Trump's (2017) inaugural to address the larger audience of the American people, and not just his voting base. Thus, this phenomenon of bringing campaign rhetoric into the inaugural address begs the question, is bringing in campaign rhetoric into the inaugural address a normal, expected, rhetorical choice? In this study, through comparing Trump's (2017) inaugural address to the standards of the presidential inaugural established by Campbell and Jamieson (1985), I was able to connect to this question.

As explained above, the inaugural is a historically significant and important speech each president must give (Campbell and Jamieson, 1985; Korzi, 2004). However, our modern times may have shifted the rhetorical norms of the presidential inaugural address. Now I will provide the key definitions of terms that are present throughout this study.

Definitions

In this section, I describe the essential definitions used in this study. This scholarship is guided by operationalizing the theoretical lenses through which I rhetorically analyze Trump's (2017) inaugural address. The definitions to be included are rhetorical criticism, generic criticism, and the inaugural address. I also include two definitions of Twitter and define political cultures. I also provide definitions and explanations of each theoretical lens: the pentad, the bully pulpit, and ideographs.

Rhetorical criticism is the "investigation and evaluation of rhetorical acts and artifacts for the purpose of understanding rhetorical processes" (Foss, 1989, p. 5). I define the inaugural address as an example of generic rhetorical criticism. Generic criticism, outlined by Foss (1989), explained that a scholar should discover and outline commonalities in rhetorical patterns, across recurring rhetorical situations. Foss (1989) continued, "Generic criticism is rooted in the assumption that certain types of situations provoke similar needs and expectations among audiences" (p. 111). Campbell and Jamieson (1990) created the genre of the presidential inaugural address in rhetorical scholarship. The definition of an inaugural address is the "unification of the nation and the veneration of traditional values as the most fundamental element" (Campbell & Jamieson, 1990, p. 10).

I define Twitter in two distinct ways; first I chose to define Twitter in its actuality, and then secondly, define the social media conglomerate to include a lens that reflects Trump's use of the site. The Twitter website states: "Twitter is what's happening in the world and what people are talking about right now" (Twitter, 2018). Also, "the defining characteristics of Twitter [are] simplicity, impulsiveness, and non-inclusivity" (Ott, 2017,

p. 1). This definition is chosen to conceptualize and connect with the language and discourse used by Trump in his inaugural address.

Next, I look to the American political culture in terms of the function of the inaugural address. Ericson (1997) stated: “The function of the inaugural address is precisely to express those cultural features of American politics” (p. 728). I find it important to understand the political cultures of the United States in order to address where the inaugural fits in addressing different audiences.

I look to McGee (1980) to define an ideograph. He stated the ideograph exists in a rhetorical context, and politically uses language in a way that captures, creates, or reinforces certain ideological positions (McGee, 1980). The ideograph is a way of understanding specific political discourses and then ultimately being able to relate those discourses to more abstract concepts of political ideology. For example, <liberty> is an ideograph because it serves as an ideological “short-cut” in U.S. political culture, resonating with an audience’s beliefs in what the United States should stand for in terms of political freedom, individual rights, and so on. Determining the ideographs that are used by a particular group can often help identify that group's underlying ideology (Condit and Lucaites, 1993). An ideograph can be the link between rhetoric and ideology (McGee, 1980). The theory of dramatism (in conjunction with the method of pentadic criticism) is the rhetorical technique for analyzing language as a mode of action, in which specialized classifications (such as act, agent, scene, etc.) are recognized individually with particular ends and insights in understanding a rhetor’s rhetorical motive (Birdsell, 1987; Burke, 1945; Korzi, 2008). The theory of dramatism has five tenets (to be described in detail in chapter three): act, scene, agent, agency, and purpose (Burke,

1945). As outlined, the theory of dramatism creates a framework to analyze the persuasive resources of the speech in question, in hopes of uncovering a rhetor's motive(s) (Burke, 1945; 1978).

In addition to the presidential inaugural, ideographic criticism and dramatism, I will also rely on the theoretical perspective of the bully pulpit to guide my rhetorical analysis in chapter four. Kuehl (2012) and Mervin (1995) both described the bully pulpit as a guiding theoretical lens for many researchers. The bully pulpit describes a rhetorical situation, a public office, or position of authority that provides those who hold the position to be listened to, regardless of the matter (Mervin, 1995). The bully pulpit approaches the analysis of presidential rhetoric through how it is framed by public opinion (Kuehl, 2012; Mervin, 1995). The bully pulpit allows the president great freedom to say what he wants, or create policy or agendas, because of the position he holds. This is especially important when the president is unable to advance his agenda through traditional means, through Congress. Instead, the president "goes public," speaking directly to the people through the bully pulpit (Edwards, 2003). I used these different theoretical perspectives and definitions to guide this study, I now turn to the research questions.

Research Questions

The research questions I framed this study through are as follows:

RQ1: How, if at all, does President Trump use ideographs in his inaugural to define and reinforce his audiences' political culture(s)?

RQ2: How, if at all, does President Trump use the different elements of the pentad to establish his motive(s)?

RQ3: How, if at all, does President Trump use the bully pulpit within his inaugural address?

RQ4: How, if at all, does President Trump's inaugural address deviate from Campbell and Jamieson's (1985) generic norms of presidential inaugural rhetoric?

These research questions guided the rhetorical analysis in chapter four and further, guided the implications of the study in chapter five. While politics and media are important contextual elements of the study, Trump's rhetorical choices and strategies within his inaugural address are the central focus of this study in contributing to the communication studies discipline. The next chapter outlines the historical context for the study.

CHAPTER TWO: HISTORICAL CONTEXT SURROUNDING DONALD J. TRUMP'S INAUGURAL

In rhetorical studies, the rhetorical presidency (Stuckey, 2010) and the presidential inaugural are two historically significant areas of analysis (Campbell & Jamieson, 1990). The uprising of the use of anti-establishment rhetoric that our current president uses creates an even larger cultural and scholarly significance for his presidential inaugural (Terrill, 2017; Edwards, 2018). Trump's tweets, unique politics, and individualized rhetorical style make him a great candidate and rhetor to study (Kreis, 2017; Ott, 2017). Understanding the audience in attendance at the inaugural is also a critical area of analysis when considering the historical context. However, who was attending events surrounding the inaugural may create an even larger significance for the study. Finally, the subject of the rhetorical presidency and the purpose of the presidential inaugural create historic significance for this study.

Rhetor: Donald J. Trump through Rhetoric, Tweets, and Politics

Donald J. Trump has been a figure in mainstream U.S. popular culture for some time (Holloway, 2016). However, it has been only recently that he has become an even larger figure in mainstream politics (Edwards, 2018). Articles that have analyzed Trump through a political lens have looked at his campaign discourse, his tweets, and now have started to analyze his presidential rhetoric (Kreis, 2017; Holloway, 2016; Roberts, 2015; Edwards, 2018). The literature I focus on followed a similar structure. First, I looked at Trump's rhetoric in multiple facets, then his use of Twitter, his time in politics, and the messages surrounding his political persona. These rhetorical choices aid the significance of the study to understand the context surrounding Trump's inaugural that makes such a

difference when studying this speech as a rhetorical artifact. This ultimately highlights the uniqueness and potential modernization of Trump's inaugural address, giving insight into his communication strategies.

Donald Trump's rhetoric. As scholarship has continued to come out about Trump, unique is a word many scholars have used (Appel, 2018; Edwards, 2018; Roberts, 2015). In fact, Trump's style of rhetoric is unique to him as a rhetor (Roberts, 2015). Yet, this does not occur without consequence. Appel (2018) explained that Trump has broken through boundaries that have been outlined in what previously was considered acceptable presidential discourse. His innovative delivery helps make him unique (Terrill, 2017). In regard to foreign policy, Trump utilized his campaign to focus on a variety of metaphors to highlight his issues with immigration (Edwards, 2018; Lionberger, 2017). Trump's rhetorical inimitability is also what makes him a significant rhetor to study.

Those who have analyzed Trump's rhetoric have characterized him as forceful and aggressive (Holloway, 2016). Scholars have analyzed his language and dictated that it is not always "politically correct" (Holloway, 2016). Some may not agree with Trump's rhetoric, yet, it is difficult to deny that Trump has a distinctive rhetorical style (Roberts, 2015). Trump's attempt to connect to his audience is presented without regard towards use of ethical language (Terrill, 2017). Civil ethics for Trump is not a part of who he is as a rhetor (Terrill, 2017). In fact, almost without exception, problematic events or rhetorical exigencies were simply black and white for Trump, as he claimed himself to be the sole fixer of the problems that face the United States (Appel, 2018). The campaign leading up to the inaugural is where most scholars have focused their studies of Trump's rhetoric (Appel, 2018; Edwards, 2018). The campaign was crucial for building Trump as a rhetor.

In fact, Trump's candidacy was built on ignoring politically correct language, especially when it comes to race (Terrill, 2017). To expand, Trump does not recognize the civic burdens of many people in the United States (Terrill, 2017). Trump has continued to attack women, stating his Presidential opponent Hillary Clinton was "such a nasty woman" (Montgomery, 2017). Further, the attacks on Clinton were character based. These attacks sank his campaign discourse to deep levels of slandering that ultimately put him on a level that was unprecedented in presidential campaign history (Appel, 2018). In the presidential campaign, Trump continued to gather support from the public by making strong and precarious statements, causing political opposition from both mainstream political parties (Roberts, 2015). Thus, as scholars have already described, Trump has deviated from the historical precedent of political and presidential campaign rhetoric.

Considering the discursive relationship to Trump's base of Republican voters, it seems clear that his main rhetorical appeal is not so much in terms of argument and evidence, but through fear and emotional appeals (Appel, 2018). He creates the ideal in his political discourse of what he knows, that he is an expert dealmaker, and continues that persona when talking about foreign policy (Edwards, 2018). Trump has disengaged from the decorum of presidential rhetoric and the normal rules for presidential engagement (Appel, 2018). In fact, as Appel (2018) described, Trump simply does not have the respect or civility to fit in with presidential norms. Even his use of Twitter as a presidential discourse platform is rhetorically unique to him.

Donald Trump and Twitter. The 2016 election included unprecedented amounts of communication within politics, particularly focusing on new media. This communication happened through social media outlets such as Facebook and Twitter,

which guided the discursive space for supporters of both political parties and heightened the circulation of like-minded posts and opinion pieces as an echo chamber for voters (Jamieson & Cappella, 2008; Sanders, 2016). Trump tweeted and, was retweeted, by his inaugural account: "My use of social media is not presidential; it is modern day Presidential, make America great Again" (The Inaugural Twitter, 2017). Trump used Twitter as an instrument of strategy to employ power politics and to disseminate his own political discourse (Kreis, 2017). Trump's communication style is typically informal, direct, and provoking, and he utilized this style to promote his agenda (Kreis, 2017). Trump is able to employ a positive self-presentation with his use of Twitter. For instance, he is the most prevalent example of a president using Twitter to his advantage, to disseminate his ideologies (Kreis, 2017). Appel (2018) explained that while his tweets have been controversial, they continue to be Trump's primary method of communication with the American people.

Trump's tweets are a cultural phenomenon, with his most favorited tweet getting 615,000 likes on Twitter. However, it is the content that is unique to the rhetor. That same tweet contained language calling the North Korean dictator, Kim Jung Un, "short and fat" (Keith, 2017). It is his personality on Twitter which continues to drive the national conversation. Trump's most re-tweeted tweet was a video of his stunt wrestling with the WWE. The video had 494,000 re-tweets (Twitter, 2017). Trump's Department of Homeland Security adviser, Thomas Bossert, has spoken highly of the president's twitter. "I'm pretty proud of the president for developing a Twitter and a social media platform where he can talk directly to the American people" (Keith, 2017). Ott (2017) explained

that Trump's campaign was boosted by the mainstream media's coverage of everything he said on Twitter.

Twitter is just one tool that President Trump uses. He has many signatures within his rhetoric, such as 'Make America Great Again,' and his gestural enactments (Hall et al., 2016). Regarding his catchphrase, he even incorporated it into his inaugural address. Trump (2017) stated: "And, Yes Together We Will Make America Great Again." (p. 6). Overall, Trump's tweets and catchphrases help make up the rhetorical signatures of Trump's style and persona as president. These signatures, in fact, lead to his uniqueness in politics (Keith, 2017; Ott, 2017). Whether the uniqueness lies in his business background or his off the cuff opinions, it is certain that politics have shaped the rise of Trump as a candidate and now president.

Donald Trump and politics. As a billionaire businessman, Trump's political background prior to 2015, when he began his presidential campaign, solely consisted of Trump being an outspoken advocate and contributor to politicians, typically within the Democratic party (Holloway, 2016). Trump used the media, shocking rhetoric, and comedic appearances over the course of the Republican primary season (Edwards, 2018; Hall et al., 2016; Ott, 2017). He built momentum in a variety of ways throughout the campaign (Edwards, 2018; Hall et al., 2016). Scholarship on Trump's politics has only just scratched the surface, as scholars have only begun to study rhetoric based on the 2016 election (Drury & Kuehl, 2018).

Trump's political style serves him well. Within our society, which is oriented around visual media and is focused on celebrity-driven politics, Trump's gestures have propelled him into the spotlight (Hall et al., 2016). He has continued to remain in the

spotlight and has continued his political climb while also keeping his political signatures, such as his gestures and rhetorical style. Hall et al. (2016) suggested that Trump's political style, while unconventional, receives attention. The attention does not harm but helps his candidacy because the public finds him entertaining. As entertaining as he may seem, Trump created a rhetorical safety net for his base. In fact, Appel (2018) described that he successfully played on the anxieties of working people, pointing out that politicians failed to keep their factory jobs from going abroad.

Those who have been identified as the forgotten working class are a focus point for Trump's rhetorical style (Montgomery, 2017). Trump is also patriotic, pro-law and order, and anti-establishment. When partnered with his unique ability to rally individuals, his politics are successful (Montgomery, 2017). Trump coined himself as an aggressive, eccentric, and successful businessman to garner support given the disarray of the current state of U.S. politics (Appel, 2018). During a campaign speech in 2016, Trump even assessed the government, and described that a government must do everything to defend its citizens (Terrill, 2017). Thus, he established a rapport with those who have been left out of mainstream politics.

Trump has focused politically on an "America first" ideology when it comes to foreign policy (Edwards, 2018). Throughout the 2016 campaign, he made many promises. Contextually, it is important to focus on the campaign, as it was his first introduction to politics. Edwards (2018) explained that Trump continued to pledge that regaining control of U.S. foreign relations would be a primary component of his presidency. Foreign policy was another tool for Trump to help guide his supporters to adopt an American first foreign policy, stating he would "Make America Great Again"

(Edwards, 2018, Terrill, 2017). This created a space for his visions to be seen by the American people.

The analysis of Trump's campaign rhetoric by scholars like Terrill (2017) and Edwards (2018) create a space for distinct rhetorical conceptualizations of Trump. Thus, it is critical to continue the rhetorical study of Trump as a rhetor, especially now in his role as president. Throughout the small portion of the politics section, I have reviewed scholarship that described Trump's rhetorical style and his unique ability to communicate, and how his rhetoric is different from other previous presidents and presidential campaign norms (Edwards, 2018; Hall et al., 2016; Montgomery, 2017; Terrill 2017). The larger impact of understanding Trump as a rhetor speaks to this scholarship about Trump's rhetorical and political styles. I now address Trump's inauguration audience, which is a vital component to the historical context when considering Trump's inaugural address.

Audiences for Donald J. Trump's Presidential Inaugural

The presidential inaugural is a time to connect with the people who elected the new President, to try and unite the people who did not vote for the new President (Campbell & Jamieson, 1990). Trump was incredibly divisive within his campaign (Appel, 2018). This rhetorical task of his presidential inaugural was therefore all the more important. Also, the audience is one the most critical parts of the presidential inaugural (Campbell & Jamieson, 1985). Thus, in order to answer the research questions presented in Chapter One, it is critical to understand who Donald Trump's audiences are, and how, if at all, does he persuade them to unite or continue to stay divided?

Immediate audience. An inaugural address audience has thematic similarities throughout history and over time. As explained in Chapter One, through an inaugural address, the incoming president must seek to connect with his audience by articulating his deep-seated cultural beliefs while reassuring his fellow citizens that he is indeed their new president (Ericson, 1997). In Trump's case, the audience may have been physically there, but they were not the focus of the President-elect's speech on January 20th, 2017 (Trump, 2017). The immediate audience for Trump's inaugural address was located within the national mall in Washington D.C. (Weprin, 2017). The immediate audience itself is not the focal point of this inaugural audience. In fact, the continued controversy surrounding the size of the audience made a larger impact (Klein, 2017). Individuals representing the White House claimed after the address, that the crowd was the largest in history (Qui, 2017). In preparation for the inaugural, about 28,000-law enforcement officers were called in, and event organizers were expecting about 800,000 attendees (Qui, 2017). Overall, the expectation for the inaugural audience was much different than reality.

While the inaugural was historic itself, it was the days and weeks after the inaugural that news surrounding the size of the audience became important. President Trump's press secretary Sean Spicer and many other conservative-leaning networks continually coined the inaugural audience as one of the largest in history (Weprin, 2017). Sean Spicer stated in a press conference that it was the largest audience to ever witness an inauguration, both in person and around the globe (ABC Australia, 2017). Qui's (2017) article claimed the actual attendance was somewhere around 250,000-600,000 people. In contrast, President Obama's inauguration crowd sizes ranged much higher, at 1.8 million

and 1 million people respectively (Qui, 2017). While who was in attendance created controversy around the inaugural audience, who happened to be absent was also a factor in the historical context surrounding the inaugural.

Ultimately the immediate audience wants to feel that the country is going to become unified by the new president. There is a tradition built by past president that a larger purpose the inaugural is unifying the immediate audience (Campbell & Jamieson, 1985). Thus, the immediate audience that is outlined here is missing that unification factor.

Historically, celebrity supporters of the presidential campaign are in attendance (Klein, 2017). According to CNN, the celebrities who attended President Obama's inaugural ranged from longtime supporter Oprah Winfrey, to actor Kerry Washington, to director Spike Lee, among many other big Hollywood names (Klein, 2017). Celebrities have become more active in endorsing candidates for political office. In 2008, Winfrey endorsed President Obama for the nomination; this was the first time she endorsed a candidate during her public career (Kuehl, 2010). Yet, oddly, celebrity presence was not a large part of Trump's immediate audience at his inaugural. There is a norm of a celebrity presence at the inaugural; celebrities in attendance remain an integral part of the inauguration's context when it comes to audience (Klein, 2017). However, there was a distinctive backlash that aligned itself with Trump's inauguration as well: The Women's March.

Around the country in cities large and small, there were women's marches held to protest Trump and give homage to women everywhere (Stein, Hendrix, & Hauslohner, 2017). The sizes of the women's marches around the country showed they were largely

supported by women across the United States. Attendance in New York City was more than 400,000; the Phoenix march estimated that some 20,000 people attended, with Chicago estimating 250,000 were in attendance (Klein, 2017). In direct contrast with the inaugural audience, officials stated that as many as half a million people participated in the Women's March in Washington D.C. (Stein et al., 2017). In comparison, the numbers for the immediate audience for the inaugural were again about 250,000 to 600,000 (Qui, 2017). Many women stated they were inspired to attend the march because of Trump's sexist language and lewd remarks towards women (Stein et al., 2017). Thus, I argue that in addition to the immediate inaugural audience, the absent audiences must also be considered when analyzing the historical context of the inaugural. I next turn to the target audience, which is important for Trump in our millennial age.

Target audience. Modern technology allows for many people to be able to watch a speech as significant as the inaugural address. Therefore, Trump's target audience goes beyond just the American people. The day of the address, about 31 million people in the United States tuned in to the presidential inauguration (ABC Australia, 2017). Then after the fact, according to ABC News (2017), their YouTube of Trump's inauguration speech is at around 3.9 million views. The White House (2017) version on YouTube had 662,000 views. These numbers are up to date as of August 2018. There were also about a dozen other versions of the inaugural address posted to YouTube after the address. Thus, it is not just U.S. citizens who have seen Trump's inaugural address.

While those numbers seem large, in comparison to previous first inaugurals, they are fairly average. President Obama's first inaugural in 2009 had a viewership of 37.8 million people (ABC Australia, 2017). In comparison, Ronald Reagan's inaugural

reached 41.8 million people who tuned in on television that day (ABC Australia, 2017). TV viewership for the inauguration was 30.6 million people, down from just under 38 million viewers in 2009 with Obama (Weprin, 2017). Still, those ratings were good enough to top the inauguration viewership of Bill Clinton and both George W. Bush and George H.W. Bush (Weprin, 2017). While the numerical data is strong there is no data on exactly who the type of individuals are who are tune into the inaugural. In fact, it is important to understand inaugural addresses constantly try to connect to large audience (Vigil, 2013). Thus, it is impossible to only target the American people to limit the scope.

In fact, the inaugural Twitter account of President Trump still currently has 128,000 followers even over a year after the address itself (Trump Inaugural Twitter, 2017). The official inaugural account produced 286 tweets during the time it was active from December 8th, 2016 to January 22nd, 2017 (Trump Inaugural Twitter, 2017). Numbers ranged from 1,000 to 84,000 likes on individual tweets and re-tweets. Thus, the reach of the Trump's 2017 inauguration could have reached a target audience larger than previous presidents, when considering social media reach. There were protests in London, Manila and Tokyo. There were celebrations in Moscow, and expressions of anger, joy and congratulations on social media across the world (Washington Post, 2017). For example, President George W. Bush's inaugural did not have a Twitter account; he focused on the audience at hand (Vigil, 2013). The President's target audience (explained in next section) was reached in a more unique way than just television viewership. The significance of this study is to understand that the target audience reaches past just who 'tuned in' on television on the day of the inaugural. I now turn to Trump's created audience.

Created audience. Created audiences are a term used within rhetoric and was first described by Charland (1987). Audiences do not exist outside of rhetoric but are addressed *through* rhetoric; they live within rhetoric itself (Charland, 1987). Trump, too, had the ability to create his own audience. Throughout the campaign, the individuals who supported Trump and then ultimately voted for him propelled him into the White House (Appel, 2018). Within the campaign setting and leading up to the inaugural, Trump was incredibly successful in reaching large audiences and being seen as close to the people (Kreis, 2017). I ultimately found through the analysis that it was the type of language he used, or his rhetorical choices and strategies, which allowed him to rally people who felt the same way. The primary audience created through Trump's inaugural were his campaign followers, people who were previously left out of politics (Hall et al., 2016). This allowed him to shape and therefore create his audience.

To create this audience, he used negative or "othering" language to blame the Obama administration and the "fake news" mainstream media, while positioning himself to be viewed positively (Kreis, 2017; Rhea, 2018). He also created the allusion to a larger audience by referring continuously to his "yuuge" number of supporters (Appel, 2018). He portrayed himself as the valued representative of the people, creating supporters who would follow him, and legitimize his run for the presidency (Kreis, 2017). Trump used the divisive political landscape to shape the target audience into what he needed them to be, going into his inaugural address.

Trump targeted the citizens who have been traditionally left out of politics and created a role for them as his supporters (Appel, 2018). Specifically, there was massive appeal among impoverished white Americans who were concerned with gun ownership,

and who felt they were previously denied most forms of political agency (Hall et al., 2016). Trump crafted a discursive space where his overwhelmingly white audience felt safe (Terrill, 2017). Trump used a variety of metaphors to construct his America first agenda on immigration (Edwards, 2018; Lionberger, 2017) which aligned with his created audience.

During the 2016 campaign and shortly after the inaugural, voters were repositioned. Voters in 2016 were positioned not as participants but as spectators who received political information in sound bites, leading to political inefficacy (Anderson, 2018). Instead of saying he was *for* something or a particular policy position, Trump, in fact, created an identity for his audience that was negative, or *against* the status quo. His rhetoric about “draining the swamp” reinforced this message. Trump’s unconventional political style received attention that helped him gain viewership and audiences that helped his candidacy, because the public absorbed him as entertainment (Edwards, 2018; Hall et al., 2016). Again, audiences are constituted as subjects through a process which identifies them, through constitutive rhetoric (Charland, 1987). Trump’s created audience supported him all the way to the White House. Finally, I will address Trump’s agent of change.

The agent of change. For President Trump, the agent of change in considering the contextual audience, is himself. In fact, it is Trump alone who he praises (Appel, 2018; Rhea, 2018). Within both the campaign and inaugural, he focused on creating a negative “other” and a positive self (Smith, 2018; Terrill, 2017). He positioned himself as the hero, and that it would be he alone who could make America great again, since Congress and the past administration could not (Rhea, 2018). He pledged greater control

over borders and stated that he would gain control of U.S. foreign relations (Edwards, 2018). McDonough (2018) explained that Trump himself pledged to the audience of spectators, not voters who would be able to make any political changes. By Trump making himself the agent of change, the rhetoric he used was posed as “us” and “them” on a variety of political issues. “America” and the “other” (Lionberger, 2017). I will now provide the historical context of this study, within the subject/purpose section, highlighting the rhetorical presidency and presidential inaugural rhetoric.

Subject/Purpose: The Rhetorical Presidency and Presidential Inaugural Rhetoric

The historical context of the rhetorical presidency and presidential inauguration rhetoric is key to understanding the impact of this inaugural address in the communication discipline. Understanding who Trump is as a rhetor through his politics and Twitter use created an understanding of how he established his audiences. With the controversy of who attended the inaugural, while creating an audience of spectators, this allowed him to be the agent of change. Given these factors, the study will enter the scholarly conversation within the rhetorical presidency and specifically, the presidential inaugural.

The larger subject of the rhetorical presidency has been an important framework for rhetorical analysis. Tulis’ (1987) landmark work, entitled *The Rhetorical Presidency*, introduced the term. Tulis (1987) traced the evolution of presidential rhetoric as a tool for communication and presidential governance. To provide clarity, presidents utilize the office as a medium to convey their message, through both their writing and speeches (Medhurst, 1996). Zarefsky (2004) noted that the president’s political stance and his

international impact can be defined by the president's situation as well as how he constructs his rhetorical presidency.

Language is essential to the presidency. The president's words are typically designed to reach multiple audiences (Mutz & Stuckey, 1992). For instance, some audiences include Congress, the public, federal bureaucracies, adversaries, and allies. Mutz and Stuckey (1992) continued that the president's language should aim to inspire or mobilize, to either condemn or comfort. In fact, the modern media has allowed the power of presidential language to expand in the rhetorical presidency (Stuckey, 2010). Presidential rhetoric is a source for institutional power in the modern presidency (Campbell & Jamieson, 1990). The president can speak on whatever topic they so choose to a large national audience because of the media, whenever and wherever they see fit (Stuckey, 2010). Ultimately, presidential power goes further.

The president can attempt to shape opinions of citizens and evoke a response from the public within the rhetorical presidency (Zarefsky, 2004). Presidential rhetoric allows presidents to utilize their position to help shape public policy and public opinion (Medhurst, 1996). Presidential rhetoric and presidential power rely on the president's ability to persuade, and further, their ability to command their audiences through language (Zarefsky, 2004). Over time, the president has become the nation's storyteller. He connects with stories about who we are as a nation. We take not only our policies but our national self-identity as Americans from the president's rhetoric (Mutz & Stuckey, 1992). The president's position and their ability to use language in that position through the rhetorical presidency are important factors to consider when assessing a president's ability to persuade the public, among other audiences.

Scholars have also analyzed the similarities of presidential rhetoric over time (Hamlin, 1973). There is room for improvement in scholarship within the field. Stuckey (2010) described that one way to advance the study of the rhetorical presidency is to examine the implicit assumptions of a president, and to understand what they mean for the institution and its rhetorical practices. Thus, understanding how, if at all, Trump modernized the rhetorical presidency, and specifically the inaugural, is an important contribution to the communication discipline.

Inaugural rhetoric is a subset of the rhetorical presidency genre (Campbell & Jamieson, 1985). Campbell and Jamieson (1985) defined the inaugural as a genre within rhetoric and pointed out the recurring patterns that have continually existed. The inauguration of a new president should feel like a fresh start to the country; it is a new legacy and a new era (Korzi, 2004). An inaugural address has been a historic speech, which has followed tradition. Potentially in Trump's case, this may be different, and thus this study is substantial in determining how, if at all, Trump may change our established knowledge about this recurring presidential speech tradition.

Past scholars have addressed the presidential inaugural and its contribution to presidential rhetoric (Campbell & Jamieson, 1985; Korzi, 2004; Sigelman, 1996). These scholars have outlined the major themes and recurring patterns within a presidential inaugural address. Briefly, the inaugural should be a unification of the country and should be distinct from the candidate's campaign (Sigelman, 1996). The evidence addressed shows the historic themes within the presidential inauguration. Thus, this study sought to analyze if President Trump's inaugural rhetoric deviates, or does not, from the

established tenets of presidential inaugural scholarship (Campbell and Jamieson, 1985; 1990).

Sigelman (1996) explained, that over the past two centuries, presidents used the purpose of the inaugural to create unification and veneration of the country; they have increasingly used the address as an instrument of government. Korzi (2004) outlined the three types of inaugural addresses presidents typically use: constitutional, party, and plebiscitary. First, a constitutional style is where presidents see themselves as officers of the Constitution (Korzi, 2004). In such a speech, the president focuses on the Constitution, so there is a minimal relation to the people in the address. Second, the party style inherently creates a role for the president as he ties himself to the will of the people, through the expression of his political party (Korzi, 2004). Finally, the plebiscitary style is where presidents eschew affiliation with a party and the persona of a constitutional officer. Instead, presidents align themselves with the political system as tied to the people (Korzi, 2004). Most modern presidents try to connect with the people.

Tying oneself to the people does not mean that a president is constrained within one of the three inaugural types (Korzi, 2004). Understanding the themes and continued tenets that have showed up in many presidential inaugurals is what created the genre overall (Campbell and Jamieson, 1985; Korzi, 2004). In fact, Campbell and Jamieson's (1985) work described the established tenets that should remain consistent in a presidential inaugural address. These are outlined fully in chapter three.

The main justification for the continued purpose of the inaugural address is an opportunity for presidents to yield the power of language for the first time (Sigelman, 1996). Frank (2011) suggested that Obama's inaugural address established his symbolic

signature as president and marked his right of passage from his candidacy to the presidency. The inaugural is a speech all presidents must give, and thus the speech style has certain expectations that come with it (Campbell & Jamieson, 1985; 1990).

There still remain enduring and permanent themes throughout the history of the presidential inaugural address (Campbell & Jamieson, 1985; Ericson, 1997). Frank (2011) explained the inaugural is a response to the uniquely distinct rhetorical situation (Bitzer, 1968). As with any significant speech, the inaugural is influenced and shaped by many factors of a given rhetorical situation (Bitzer, 1968). However, some fundamental elements remain. In fact, Sigelman (1996), Ericson (1997), and Korzi (2004) all found themes that appeared in multiple inaugural addresses, warranting the existence of a rhetorical genre (Campbell and Jamieson, 1985; 1990). Yet, some unique factors surround the subject of this particular study of Trump's (2017) inaugural address. While I established above how Trump has a unique rhetorical style (Appel, 2018; Edwards, 2018), this does not mean his inaugural language is necessarily unique, which is why I propose my study to explore the speech in connection to established rhetorical norms within the genre.

Social media is not new to the presidency. In fact, political communication in the 21st century has utilized the internet to supplement the use of traditional media (Sousa & Ivanova, 2012). Trump took this a step further. He directed the national conversation about what news should look like (Rhea, 2018). Trump also propelled the national fascination with "fake news," through his consistent use of Twitter and social media (Rhea, 2018). Rhea (2018) explained that the idea of fake news not only discredits traditional news media; it also sets a presidential agenda by highlighting the news Trump

wants to be covered. President Trump does so almost exclusively through Twitter (Ott, 2017). Understanding how Americans and Trump feel about the media is critical in this study.

In a 2016 Gallup poll, only 32% of Americans believe that the media is accurate (Rhea, 2018). Trump's cynicism towards the media and his tweets spouting the spread of "fake news" have helped define Trump's current historical context. By discrediting the media, he adeptly set his nationalist agenda (Kreis, 2017). He continues to employ self-positive presentation and refers to the "other" as negative or dangerous (Kreis, 2017). By analyzing Trump's (2017) presidential inaugural address, I was able to determine how, he responded to the elements of the historical context through comparing his rhetorical choices to the established and historic rhetorical genre of the presidential inaugural (Campbell & Jamieson, 1985). I now turn to chapter three, where I outline and justify the theoretical lenses I chose in order to conduct the rhetorical criticism in chapter four.

CHAPTER THREE: THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVES TO STUDY DONALD J. TRUMP'S INAUGURAL

I analyzed Trump's (2017) inaugural through the rhetorical method of close textual analysis (Leff, 1986). This means reading the text in its full entirety and finding themes. I then utilized the theoretical frameworks of the ideographic criticism, pentad, and the bully pulpit, to assess, if, and how, Trump's (2017) inaugural has modernized the genre, when compared to Campbell and Jamieson's (1985) study of the rhetorical guidelines for presidential inaugurals. I accessed the full text as a transcript from the American Presidency Project (<https://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/documents/inaugural-address-14>) that had broken down the text into paragraphs. Foss (1989) outlined the basic overarching purpose of rhetorical criticism: to investigate and analyze the inaugural text (rhetorical artifact) using the critical perspectives I selected (ideographs, pentad, and bully pulpit). I systematically looked at the text through each lens of rhetorical theory to conduct my rhetorical analysis in chapter four.

Ultimately, the analysis is a generic criticism, because I compared Trump's inaugural address to Campbell and Jamieson's (1985) framework of presidential inaugurals, in order to determine how, if at all, President Trump's inaugural differed from the rhetorical norms of the genre. I then used the theoretical perspectives of ideographs (McGee, 1980), dramatism and the pentad (Burke, 1945), and the bully pulpit (Edwards, 2003), to analyze how, in terms of rhetorical strategies, Trump's inaugural might differ from Campbell and Jamieson's (1985) established expectations for presidential inaugurals.

In this chapter, I explain each theoretical lens I used for my rhetorical analysis of Trump's inaugural address in chapter four. Ideographic Criticism (McGee, 1980) Burke's pentad (Burke, 1945), the bully pulpit (Edwards, 2003), are all frameworks that have been historically significant for rhetorical scholars in order to analyze presidential addresses (Birdsell, 1987; Gaonkar, 1990). Each theoretical lens was chosen because of its fit with Trump's inaugural address as well as the significance of the lens in established rhetorical scholarship and within the communication discipline.

Each lens, when applied, strengthened my scholarship's impact when analyzing Trump's inaugural address, each in an exclusive way. I chose ideographic criticism (McGee, 1980) to understand the ideographs Trump used to define and/or establish his audience's ideology and political cultures. The theory of dramatism (Burke, 1945) was chosen because of its use in understanding President Trump's rhetorical motive behind the inaugural address. Finally, the bully pulpit (Edwards, 2003) was used to understand how Trump expended his newly imparted position as president to directly persuade the public. All three lenses came together to better understand Trump's modernization of the inaugural, through the exploration of how his speech differed from the established tenets of the presidential inaugural address (Campbell and Jamieson, 1985; 1990). To begin to understand the theoretical lenses, I start with ideographic criticism, then justify its use in this study.

Ideographic Criticism

Ideographic criticism is a way of assessing political discourse that is specific and unique to the speaker or rhetor; it attempts to relate that rhetoric back to abstract concepts of political ideology (McGee, 1980). An ideographic analysis is how one can identify a

group's ideology (Condit & Lucaites 1993; Gess, 1999). Thus, an ideograph is the link between rhetoric and ideology (McGee, 1980). Ideology is the beliefs or doctrines that guide an individual group or even a social movement (Condit & Lucaites, 1993).

Ideographic criticism allowed me to understand how Trump utilized ideographs within his inaugural. I ultimately used ideographic criticism to understand how Trump was able to link rhetoric and ideology, and then fathom the consequences of those rhetorical choices. It is important to remember the inaugural is a speech that typically unites the American people, rather than divides them (Campbell & Jamieson, 1990). Therefore, the analysis of Trump's language through his use of ideographs and how does he politically unite or divide his audience is imperative to this theoretical lens.

There are key factors throughout McGee's (1980) article theorizing ideographs. Understanding how to identify ideographs is essential to producing scholarship that will advance public understanding of the connections between rhetoric and ideology, especially in presidential and political rhetoric. The factors are but are not limited to the following: ideographs are empirically evident, are ordinary terms used in political ways, and are slogan-like terms that define culture(s) (McGee, 1980; Gess, 1999). I explain each of these factors in turn, to better explain how a rhetorical analysis using ideographic criticism works.

First, ideographs are real or empirically evident. McGee (1980) noted that if mass consciousness exists, it must be experienced and manifested in the language which communicates about it. For Trump, this could exist in his created ideographs within his campaign and follow through into his inaugural. It is also important to note that ideographs are not predetermined in society or groups; rather, they are used to exert

social control by shaping political consciousness (Stuckey & Ritter, 2007). Therefore, even with their political incorporation, ideographs are always bound to culture. However, to be effective, ideographs must relate to the audience and be presented in a reasonable manner to be recognized and thus persuasive (Condit & Lucaites, 1993). President Kennedy used the terms <public> and <private> as ideographs to help warrant power and dismiss certain forms of political expression as unreasonable (Lee, 2005). <Private> encompassed employment, and housing, whereas, the <public> is the place of mediation between <private> values and state action (Lee, 2005). This example pointed out that ideographs are in fact real, and empirically evident to audiences.

Next, ideographs are ordinary terms used in political ways (McGee, 1980). An ideograph only truly exists in political discourse. For example, the term <rule of law> is not a term used in common discourse, yet it is common in national level political discourse, and therefore is an ideograph (McGee, 1980). Ideographs often represent the social and political thought of a group (Gess, 1999). As part of our public political discourse, <liberty> means much more than its definition; for example: Give me <liberty> or give me death (Gess, 1999). This ideograph is a common term but has entangled political meanings that speak to American identity and freedoms associated with it.

Third, ideographs are slogan-like terms that symbolize ideological commitment, and they are terms that define culture(s). McGee (1980) and Condit and Lucaites (1993) outlined that ideographs are terms that are action-oriented; they can be used as a call to action for a group to rally behind. Thus, when a scholar wishes to define a difference between two communities, they can do so by comparing ideographs since they are

definitions of the political union of each community (McGee, 1980). Krueger (2009) concluded that President Obama's use of <hope> was rhetorically effective in the 2008 campaign for the presidency; it created a clear connection between the implied ideology and Obama's voters. Obama used <hope> to gain commitment to him, to his campaign, and to what he felt that represented (Krueger, 2009). Understanding what ideographs were used in Trump's (2017) inaugural allowed me to make further claims about how Trump defined his audience(s) or communities and the culture(s) they represent.

Overall, Gaonkar (1990) explained that McGee's pragmatic view of rhetoric creates the agency for scholars to facilitate meaningful change in the world. In this regard, most scholars who have used ideographic criticism in their work concur that ideographs are related to some notion of group ideology (Condit & Lucaites, 1993). This is why it is critical to understand what ideographs Trump (2017) used to address his audience in the inaugural.

For McGee (1980), an ideographic analysis is a way for a scholar to understand a group's ideology, or in this case, how Trump constructs his audiences' ideology or ideologies through particular ideographs. Ideographs are important to understanding a speaker or rhetor's audience, and how the speaker is trying to persuade mass consciousness, or a larger public (McGee, 1980). Therefore, a key concept of ideographic criticism is utilizing ideographs to identify what a group's mass consciousness is (Gaonkar, 1990). The notion of ideology is essential to the understanding of social and political rhetoric and their dynamics. Thus, ideographic criticism provides the scholar with the ability to uncover and fully explain larger meta-narratives that are found in certain specific societal and cultural contexts (Condit & Lucaites, 1993). Theoretically, I

found ideographic criticism as an appropriate lens to assess Trump's choice of ideographs and the communities or cultures they create.

Justification for use of ideographic criticism. Though using McGee (1980)'s ideographic criticism as a final theoretical lens for rhetorical analysis, I gained a better understanding of different group or community ideologies and cultures connected to those ideographs used by Trump. Trump relied on using ideographs throughout his campaign (Lionberger, 2017). For example, Trump used the ideographs of <refugees> and <terrorists> to create negative connotations and discourse surrounding the Syrian refugee crisis, all while creating fear in his audiences (Lionberger, 2017). Therefore, the thought was that if ideographs were utilized within his presidential campaign, they may be evident within Trump's (2017) inaugural address as well.

Ideographs were especially important to identify to address my research question about how Trump's speech varies from the established genre of the presidential inaugural, since this speech is typically given by the president to unite a divided American electorate (Campbell & Jamieson, 1985). Ideographs are a great tool to use to understand group ideology (Gess, 1999). So, it is important to understand rhetorically what ideographs he uses, and if he uses them in a similar way to his campaign, where he understood how to connect to his base (Lionberger, 2017). Therefore, this theoretical perspective helped to understand, how does Trump (2017) address his base of supporters from the campaign, and how might he attempt to unite a larger audience of American citizens?

In this study, the lens of ideographic criticism allowed for the explanation of presidential discourse in relation to Trump's audiences. Condit and Lucaites (1993)

explained ideographic criticism and identified how a rhetor can construct particular ideologies, or communities, for the audience to identify with. The use of ideographs is a compelling choice within political discourse to affect and engage the audience (Musolff, 2004). Trump relied on polarizing language throughout his political career, and especially his campaign (Lionberger, 2017), including focusing heavily on his base of supporters. I predict he will do the same in his inaugural address. Next, I turn to the theoretical lens of dramatism (Burke, 1945).

Theory of Dramatism

According to Kenneth Burke, to analyze rhetoric is essentially to analyze human existence (Beasley, 2001). Therefore, rhetoric is the use of language to form attitudes and to influence action (Bizzell & Herzberg, 2001). The dramatistic system created by Burke unifies poetry and rhetoric into an analytical framework. Dramatism is defined as a “technique of analysis of language and thought as basically modes of action, rather than means of conveying information” (Burke, 1945, p. 685). Using the theory of dramatism will allow me to assign meaning to Trump's speech text according to my analysis of his use of motives and action within the inaugural.

In a reiteration of the dramatistic theory, Burke (1978) explained why the theory was entitled ‘dramatism.’ For Burke (1978), the theory of dramatism sees language as primarily a mode of action rather than a mode of knowledge. This means giving substance to create the action to an audience rather than simply filling a knowledge gap in the audience. Basically, all symbol use is rhetoric, and all rhetoric is persuasion (Burke, 1978). Keeping within that concept of action, Burke (1978) added that the pentad is the methodological tool to determine rhetorical action in a text. The pentad guides the

rhetorical scholar to know what questions to ask to determine the components of the human drama at play in a text. Another key term for Burke is motive; he defines this as what moves the person to act in a certain way (Burke, 1945). Further, within the dramatistic system, a scholar can study rhetoric and language and compare statements and motives by examining how said motives connect to the dramatic elements of the act, scene, agent, agency, and purpose (Bizzell & Herzberg, 2001). Dramatism allows scholars to assign meaning to portions of language from a particular rhetorical act, or in this case, Trump's (2017) inaugural address.

Burke (1945) outlined that the pentadic terms exist for the author to utilize in whatever interpretation they find best fits their text. Thus, the inclusion of the five terms creates a common ground of analysis that allows rhetors to use each of the terms through ratios (Burke, 1945). This means that by using two of the elements together, the narrative changes between the elements of the pentad (Burke, 1978). It is important to understand ratios within the dramatistic pentad.

Burke (1945) stated that any two elements can be analyzed in relation to one another, to create a ratio. When combining the two terms, they can produce a separate meaning from one term or a new meaning when analyzed together as a ratio (Burke, 1945). Thus, Hamlin and Nichols (1973) explained that a strategy for utilizing the pentad is created when a rhetor selects certain symbols over others in their text for discussing a rhetorical situation. Any one aspect of the pentad can and/or does impact and control another. For example, a scene can affect an act (scene-act). An act can also affect the scene (act-scene). For President Trump's inaugural, this application will focus on context (scene) and language in the speech (act). I also used the other elements of the pentad, in

relation to one another, to determine which of the elements is most dominant, to determine Trump's motive(s).

To apply the theory of dramatism, each term must address certain concepts in order to align with the theory (Burke, 1945). An act should name what took place (Burke, 1945). The act in this analysis is to make America great again. A scene should explain the background of the act and the situation in which it occurred (Burke, 1945). The scene here is the unique context surrounding the inaugural where I address the surrounding exigencies within the country at the time of the inaugural, as already explained in Chapter Two. Burke (1945) delineated that what person or kind of person performed the act is the agent, and in this case, it is President Trump. The agency addresses what means or instruments were used (Burke, 1945). In the Chapter Two, I addressed that Trump uses Twitter and divisive language as the agency in his rhetorical act. Finally, the purpose is any phrase that refers to the function fulfilled by the rhetorical act (Burke, 1945). The purpose of Trump's inaugural is the ultimate rhetorical goal of a presidential inaugural, which is typically to unite a divided electorate (Campbell & Jamieson, 1990). However, by utilizing this theory and the other theoretical lenses, I was able to determine how Trump's purpose deviated from this rhetorical norm.

Simply put, for Burke (1985), rhetoric is action. Burke (1985) pointed out that dramatism is a technique used by scholars to analyze the mode of action within language. A scholar should find what specific terms are utilized and point out ends and insights for each concept utilized in the speech act. For instance, a scholar can study and compare statements about motives by examining how they treat each of the dramatic elements in the pentad. Thus, it is a way for the scholar to analyze descriptions of the human behavior

of the rhetor (Bizzell & Herzberg, 2001). Dramatism stresses the rhetorical action present within a rhetorical act and the factors surrounding it, in terms of the larger context.

Through analyzing the rhetorical action in a text, the pentad gives the rhetorical scholar the ability to analyze the rhetor's view of reality through rhetoric (Hamlin & Nichols, 1973). Thus, dramatism is not merely a perspective or metaphor in which to examine reality. It allows for a literal statement about humans using symbols and the nature of that reality for the rhetor (Foss, 1989). However, it is essential for scholars to look at how other rhetorical scholars have used the pentad in order to frame the texts they chose (Hamlin and Nichols, 1973).

Burke's theory of dramatism, as used to study speeches within the field of rhetoric, and the larger discipline of communication studies, has been essential (Stuckey, 2010). There is a rich tradition of using Burke's theory of dramatism to specifically analyze presidential speeches (Birdsell, 1987; Kaylor, 2011; Kohen, 2008). Burke also outlined the pentad to be ambiguous, allowing scholars freedom in their work to determine the relations of each component (Birdsell, 1987). As noted in Chapter Two, no scholar has studied Trump's (2017) inaugural address using any theoretical lens. I will now use past scholarship to justify my choice for using Burke's theory of dramatism.

Justification for the use of Burke's theory of dramatism. In past Burkean scholarship about presidential rhetoric, scholars addressed the purpose of their study as I did above (Birdsell, 1987; Kaylor, 2011; Kohen, 2008). Each author framed the concepts of the pentad to best serve their analysis. For instance, Birdsell (1987) focused on the benefit of the ambiguity of the pentad throughout his article. Through this lens, Birdsell (1987) explained that the pentad served to illuminate Ronald Reagan's speech. Yet, when

Kaylor (2011) analyzed Mitt Romney's "Faith in America" speech, he looked at Burke's philosophy to provide insight that created a useful framework to highlight the rhetorical variables that were entailed within the speech act. While in a different area of analysis, Kaylor (2011) used four pentadic areas to compare John F. Kennedy's and Romney's addresses about faith in America. Kohen (2008) used Burke's theory of dramatism to rely upon ethical philosophy in order to review George W. Bush's stem cell addresses. Each of these scholars use the Burkean resources in their own way.

For Birdsell (1987), the Burkean pentad helped to isolate Reagan's persuasive resources within the Lebanon and Grenada addresses. Reagan's policy was dramatically consistent under a scenic interpretation of the speech text (Birdsell, 1987). Finally, Reagan based the Soviet Union in agency and the United States as an act, establishing a formal difference between the two nations (Birdsell, 1987). This a prime example of how a rhetorical scholar can use the resources of the pentad to understand the rhetor's motives within a speech. Through the analysis of the text and understanding of Burke's pentad, Kaylor (2011) concluded that there was a substantial shift in conceptualizing faith between the Kennedy's and Romney's speeches. In the analysis, the shift is in both tone and purpose. Kaylor (2011) even suggested that the rhetorical expectations of presidential candidates, in general, had shifted over time.

Kaylor (2011) outlined Burke's dramatism as an essential method to assist the critic in conducting an exploration and assessment of the nature of the act and then the motives of the agent. For Kohen (2008), he found that when examining George W. Bush's arguments, the Burkean tools of cluster and agon were the best fit for analysis. Through this frame, the assumption could be made that Bush's stem cell addresses were

lacking in ethical strength. Kohen (2008) justified the lack of ethics from Bush through the pentadic framework. Kohen (2008) then expanded their assumptions and proved George W. Bush's stem cell addresses showed presidential elitism toward people of privilege. Rhetoric, for it to be a critical inquiry, requires a Burkean view (Charland, 1987). The theory of dramatism is a key method to understanding a speaker's rhetorical choices.

It is critical to note once again, the only similarities between the described texts, are they each analyze a presidential text through Burke's (1945) dramatistic framework. The theory is applicable in a variety of contexts, and each author framed the concepts to fit the text they chose. Burke's pentad is historically significant and a sound method for analyzing Trump's (2017) inaugural address. To complement and enrich this pentadic criticism of Trump's inaugural, I add other theories relevant to the text to address my research questions and understand the overarching purpose of Trump's address. I now turn to the bully pulpit, which is an established concept within communication studies and political science scholarship about presidential rhetoric, to enrich my analysis of Trump's rhetoric in his inaugural.

The Bully Pulpit

The history of the bully pulpit is intertwined with American presidential history. Theodore Roosevelt was the first President to define the White House as the "bully pulpit" (Edwards, 2003). Roosevelt found that when he was not able to persuade Congress, he took his ideas directly to the people of the United States through his speeches (Gelderman, 1997). However, it was not until Woodrow Wilson took office in 1913 that the shaping of the bully pulpit took place. Wilson, in fact, was the first

president to speak directly to Congress and also to the American people since President John Adams was in office (Gelderman, 1997). The bully pulpit describes the necessary ways the president must lead and speak to the American people in order to win over the public on different policy issues. Edwards (2003) explained that presidents know that without the public's support, they will lack the power to persuade Congress, which is why the bully pulpit is important to the rhetorical presidency.

The rhetorical presidency, as defined in Chapter Two, is the idea that the presidency itself has rhetorical force or power, in defining the presidential agenda, policies, and how a president chooses to communicate with the public (Campbell & Jamieson, 1990). As research about the rhetorical presidency has expanded, scholars and commentators have routinely referred to the White House as the bully pulpit (Edwards, 2003). In fact, the bully pulpit is a unique and imposing positional podium that is only available to the president (Mervin, 1995). Thus, it is assumed that a rhetorically skilled presidential leader can employ the bully pulpit to influence the public and create political capital (Edwards, 2003). In fact, rhetoric is a central feature of the presidency. The presidency begins with the inaugural address, where Americans encounter their new president for the first time in the context of a speech (Shaw, 2017). Therefore, speech is a key tool of presidential governance. For at least the last century, presidents have utilized the bully pulpit to shift and change their status and constitutional authority (Shaw, 2017). The use of the bully pulpit is a key tool for presidents to persuade the American people, especially if they are finding difficulties in reaching Congress or the Supreme Court to move their presidential agenda forward.

There are many consequences of the bully pulpit on broader public influence, including on the American people, regarding a president's policy agenda. Presidents often use the "bully pulpit" to create particular roles for citizens, or their target audiences, what rhetorical scholars call constitutive rhetoric (Charland, 1987; Kuehl, 2012). The president must be able to speak to the people of the United States in a way they can understand. The president must establish rapport with citizens and command their trust (Mervin, 1995). Rhetorically savvy presidents choose to adapt their speeches to specific audiences, and thus are able to transform the citizens in their immediate audience to become agents of change who readily support specific policies which the president favors (Campbell & Jamieson, 1990). Thus, as a direct communicator to the American people, the ability to utilize the bully pulpit is essential for the President.

In addition to persuading citizens, the bully pulpit is a great tool for policy. To master the political system in the United States and to ensure the president's priorities in public policy are met, the weapon most readily available is the bully pulpit (Mervin, 1995). In fact, in court decisions from the low courts to the Supreme Court, presidential speech has impacted decision processes (Shaw, 2017). This occurred in a challenge to the President Obama Administration's executive action on immigration. A Texas district court invoked multiple presidential statements when trying to reach the conclusion that the challenged program likely represented a rule change that was substantive (Shaw, 2017). Presidential statements played a similar role in a constitutional challenge to the military's "Don't Ask Don't Tell" policy (Shaw, 2017). In order to have a successful policy agenda, the president must master the bully pulpit.

The impact of *not* utilizing the bully pulpit correctly also can affect the rhetorical presidency and the office of the president. Edwards (2003) stated that Clinton failed to communicate his accomplishments in the 1994 election. Clinton stated, "The role of the presidency is the message; I got caught up in the parliamentary aspect of the presidency; I missed the bully pulpit function of leadership, which is so critical" (Edwards, 2003, p. 7). The inability or unwillingness of a president to fully encapsulate the bully pulpit when necessary is bound to be a crippling liability in any modern presidency (Mervin, 1995). Indeed, in the century since Teddy Roosevelt, presidents have often found the public unresponsive to issues that are most pertinent to the White House agenda (Edwards, 2003). Thus, as I will point out next, this gives an advantage to presidents who *are* able to master the bully pulpit.

In contrast to Clinton's example, both Wilson and FDR were great examples of utilizing the bully pulpit to their advantage. In fact, Wilson argued that the only national voice is the voice of the president (Edwards, 2003). Congress truly only represents fragments of the nation which tend to be partisan (Gelderman, 1997). FDR understood that great presidents must indeed also be great teachers (Gelderman, 1997). He employed this tactic when explaining the policy to the American people throughout his presidency, and especially through his fireside chats (Gelderman, 1997; Houck, 2002). FDR was masterful in his fireside chats of being able to project both strength and meekness, combining intimacy and declamation, connecting to the public (Houck, 2002; Lim, 2003). It is essential that the president establishes a rapport with the American people and this requires trust. The main weapon available to the president to create that direct

trust is the bully pulpit (Mervin, 1995). I will now justify my use of the bully pulpit through examples of past scholarship.

Justification for use of the bully pulpit. Scholars have utilized the bully pulpit in order to understand how presidents use the position of the presidency and the power of the White House either to their advantage or have underutilized the position (Kuehl, 2012; Shaw, 2017). In fact, a president who understands how to go beyond Congress and utilize the people to influence policy makes a president powerful and modern (Gelderman, 1997). For instance, Kuehl (2012) outlined that both Reagan and Bush were able to negotiate the bully pulpit during their presidential terms. Shaw (2017) explained that presidents have also used the bully pulpit in order to influence court decisions.

Presidents utilizing influence outside of the executive branch is key to the bully pulpit (Edwards, 2003). To be more specific, Reagan and Bush were able to not only bolster public opinion about education reform, they were also able to create an audience that valued fiscal responsibility in education reform (Kuehl, 2012). Thus, both presidents used the bully pulpit in order to shape public understandings of education policy. Within the courts, multiple decisions on President Trump's "travel ban" executive order featured extensive reliance on Trump's presidential statements (Shaw, 2017). Shaw (2017) outlined the different times the bully pulpit was utilized within a court system where presidential power is technically limited. However, the bully pulpit and the impact of the office of the president have continued to impact the courts and court cases involving presidents throughout history (Shaw, 2017).

I chose to analyze Trump's (2017) inaugural using the lens of the bully pulpit since he is already using the status of the bully pulpit in his own unique way. For

instance, Trump's use of Twitter as a way to communicate to the American people about what is on his mind is a unique, direct connection to the American people (Kreis, 2017). Shaw (2017) explained that Twitter is President Trump's preferred mode of communication. This direct communication to the American people via social media is in stark contrast to more conventional ways of communicating as the president, such as FDR's fireside chats and Kennedy and Reagan's use of television (Edwards, 2003). Edwards (2003) suggested that presidents such as FDR, Kennedy, and Reagan used the media to their advantage, whereas Trump continually refers to the media as "fake news", which explains his emphasis of using Twitter (Rhea, 2018). The implications of a Twitter presidency are important to future scholarship (Shaw, 2017). During the rhetorical analysis of Trump's inaugural address, the bully pulpit was a key theoretical lens as most likely no other president has utilized the bully pulpit in such a unique way. I next turn to the final theoretical lens of ideographic criticism and explain how I applied it to Trump's (2017) inaugural address. I outline the inaugural address expectations in the next section.

Inaugural Address Expectations

Campbell and Jamieson (1985) outlined in their work *Inaugurating the Presidency* the key tenets that make the presidential inaugural address a distinct rhetorical genre. They outline the qualities that make the presidential inaugural an example of epideictic discourse and frame the characteristics of the inaugural. The first four characteristics addressed the goals of the inaugural while the fifth tenet provides insight into the stylistic means used to achieve those goals (Vigil, 2013). This framework provides an understanding of common themes to create more specificity in presumed

content that is the inaugural (Vigil, 2013). I explored each tenet in turn, supplementing their scholarship with updated analyses of presidential inaugurals that support the tenets.

First, presidential inaugurals should unify the audiences from the people who witness and ratify the ceremony (Campbell & Jamieson, 1985). In President George W. Bush's first inaugural address, he combines the theme of "the American mission" and civic virtue to attempt to build unity when he explained the sometimes-unsteady American promise that everyone belongs here, that everyone deserves a chance at success (Vigil, 2013). Throughout his address, this theme is largely present in Bush's inaugural (Vigil, 2013). Finding if Trump unifies his audience was key to understanding if he addressed the following key tenets from Campbell and Jamieson (1985).

Next, the address should rehearse shared values drawn from the past (Campbell & Jamieson, 1985). In President Obama's inaugural, he focused on the universal value of a God-given promise of equality and an assumption of religious pluralism that connects with the Christian values of the United States (Frank, 2011). He connected to past myths and used that transforming framework to address the larger American heritage, which is truly a religious and racial patchwork rather than a white, Christian monolith (Frank, 2011). While Obama's language may have not been directly what all citizens wanted to hear, he outlined and connected to shared values and ideologies from the past.

During the inaugural, the president should outline the political principles that will guide the new administration (Campbell & Jamieson, 1985). Even though inaugural addresses are typically not as policy-driven as other types of presidential discourse, U.S. presidents must presumably still address their plans to guide the nation (Beasley, 2001). Further, Beasley (2001) explained, the inaugural itself demands policies to be outlined;

party divisions need to be healed, some level of nonpartisanship must be addressed, and international audiences and exigences must be spoken to as well.

The inaugural address should demonstrate that the newly elected president appreciates the requirements and limitations of executive power (Campbell & Jamieson, 1985). Therefore, the inaugural address should demonstrate rhetorically that the president can function as a leader within the established limits of executive power provided by the Constitution and can perform the public and symbolic role of president for American citizens (Ericson, 1997). President George W. Bush's first inaugural spoke directly to this tenet. He stated that he was humbled and honored to be there, where so many past American leaders had been before and where many will follow; he used this language to demonstrate his place in history (Vigil, 2013). Bush established humility with his audience and used this to quell fears of misuse of power; he also relied on the appeal to popular support and references to a supreme being (Vigil, 2013). This summarizes the tenets that should address the presidents' goals and motives.

Finally, the address should achieve these tenets through means appropriate to epideictic discourse, i.e., while urging contemplation rather than action from the audience (Campbell and Jamieson, 1985). The president should focus on the present moment while incorporating past and future and praising the institution of the office of the presidency, the executive branch, and the constitutional government (Campbell & Jamieson, 1985). To do this, Obama narrated about the American journey; he addressed how it did not begin with a uniform or unitary set of religious principles but evolved out of a patchwork of different beliefs just like it does now (Frank, 2011). This encompasses past and future. Like many presidents before him, Obama addressed religious freedom and praised the

institutions set up by the founding fathers for allowing such freedoms (Beasley, 2001; Frank, 2011). Each element provided by Campbell and Jamieson (1985) can be utilized rhetorically in a unique or consistent way when compared to past presidents.

These elements account for the recurrent variables any inaugural address could possess. These tenets also explain the special functions of this particular speech and illuminate the power of those inaugural addresses which should be considered eloquent. It is important to understand this framework as it is what was used in this study in order to determine how, Trump's inaugural is different than previous inaugurals in terms of expectations of presidential inaugurals. I used the following theoretical lenses of dramatism (Burke, 1945), bully pulpit (Edwards, 2003), and ideographs (McGee, 1980) to aid my understanding of *how*, regarding the rhetor's rhetorical choices, the inaugural differed from these established norms of the presidential inaugural (Campbell and Jamieson, 1985). I will now justify my choice of text used for the analysis.

Justification of Trump's Inaugural as the Text for Rhetorical Analysis

Trump is an especially well-known yet divisive public figure and rhetor, especially now that he is President of the United States (Appel, 2018). Trump is a unique individual and rhetor in comparing him to previous presidential candidates and presidents (Hall, et al., 2016; Kreis, 2017). There is also an importance for a study to address the rhetorical motives (Burke, 1945) behind a president's first speech in office.

Understanding and analyzing Trump's inaugural address through a rhetorical criticism is a solid academic contribution to the discipline of communication studies. Many scholars have chosen to study inaugural addresses (Frank, 2011; Vigil, 2013). There were many texts to choose from in a rhetorical study, and many texts could have

been chosen to study President Trump. I chose Trump's inaugural address because researchers have found the significance of the introductory speech of a presidency to be the most historically significant and rhetorically rich (Frank, 2011). In fact, the presidency itself begins with the inaugural address (Campbell & Jamieson, 1985). Shaw (2017) noted that the first time the American people encounter their new president as the president is in the context of the inaugural speech. Thus, studying the first speech of such a unique and polarizing president as Trump is a significant choice for a rhetorical analysis.

I argue throughout, that Trump's (2017) inaugural address sets his tone for his presidency. As the study moved forward, I argued the importance of this tone as compared to generic standards of the presidential inaugural (Campbell & Jamieson, 1990). As the presidency has modernized, so has the power of presidential rhetoric (Gelderman, 1997). Campbell and Jamieson (1990) addressed the modern ability of presidents to speak when, where, and on whatever topic they so choose within the most prestigious national office, through coverage of electronic media. The modern rhetorical presidency is all about speaking directly to the people (Gelderman, 1997). Add social media and Trump's reliance on Twitter to this modernization of the use of media by the president, and this potential modernization of the inaugural makes this study all the more critical to the communication studies discipline.

The inaugural text is grounded in a specific historical context (Stuckey, 2010). A rhetorical analysis of a presidential inaugural is a key piece of scholarship (Frank, 2011; Vigil, 2013). With the uniqueness of Trump as president, the inaugural provided an opportunity to analyze his speech as compared to previous, established rhetorical tenets

about the presidential inaugural (Campbell and Jamieson, 1985). This analysis has implications for Trump as a presidential rhetor and will contribute to scholarship on the inaugural in communication studies, but also political science. I now move to the fourth chapter of this study, the rhetorical analysis.

CHAPTER FOUR: RHETORICAL ANALYSIS OF DONALD J. TRUMP'S INAUGURAL ADDRESS

President Donald J. Trump's speech opened with his connection to voters and used language about unification. He discussed the joining together of citizens and rebuilding of the country (Trump, 2017, p. 2). Yet, the language quickly shifted. For instance, Trump used campaign phrases such as the corrupt system, gangs and drugs, and eradicating radical Islamic terrorism (Trump, 2017, p. 17). This is in stark contrast to past presidents, as the goal of the inaugural is to unify, connect to the people, and discuss traditions (Sigelman, 1996; Frank, 2011). In the previous chapter, I outlined the rhetorical use of each theoretical lens to be applied to a presidential speech. Throughout this chapter, I analyzed President Trump's inaugural address through the theoretical lenses of ideographic criticism (McGee, 1980), pentadic criticism (Burke, 1945), the bully pulpit, and inaugural address expectations (Campbell and Jamieson, 1985). I begin my rhetorical analysis with Trump's use of ideographs within the inaugural address.

Trump's Use of Ideographs in the Inaugural

Within this section, I pinpoint the ideographs Trump used throughout the inaugural address. As described in chapter three, the use of ideographs can aid in the identification of a group's political ideology (Condit & Lucaites, 1993; McGee, 1980). Further, the ideographic factors are empirically evident, are ordinary terms used in political ways, and are slogan-like terms that define culture(s) (McGee, 1980; Gess, 1999). I assess within this section what ideographs are used by Trump, how he uses those particular ideographs, and then further if those ideographs provide a rhetorical link to his audience. Ultimately, ideographic criticism provides a better understanding of

Trump's rhetorical language choices specifically as they relate to his audience. I outline three prominent ideographs found within Trump's inaugural: <America First>, <Nationalism>, and <Make America Great Again>. While other ideographs were used in the inaugural, these three ideographs were connected with Trump's base audience and the language that followed Trump from his campaign rhetoric. I begin the ideographic analysis with the <America First> ideograph.

<America First> ideograph. This ideograph within the inaugural is a continuation of Trump's campaign language. This ideograph means not prioritizing other countries, in regard to industry, military, or finances. Trump expanded, "We will seek friendship and goodwill with the nations of the world, but we do so with the understanding that it is the right of all nations to put their own interests first" (Trump, 2017, p. 17). The origination of <America First> started as a presidential slogan but gained traction in the 1930's as it began to be used by extremist, far-right groups and those who were self-styled American fascist groups (Churchwell, 2018). Then in the 1940's, the America First Committee was formed, and it attracted many far-right groups that had already affiliated themselves with the idea (Churchwell, 2018). Churchwell (2018) noted that the group's platforms during this time had connections to Nazism happening in Europe, which included anti-immigrant undertones as well as anti-Semitism and pro white culture.

Within the inaugural, Trump utilized an <America First> tone to his language. For instance, Trump (2017) stated: "When America is united, America is totally unstoppable" (Trump, 2017 p. 3). Then he expands, "In America, we understand that a nation is only living as long as it is striving" (Trump, 2017, p. 19). This tone connects

directly to the language within Trump's campaign. He focuses his language on the base of Americans he connects with and utilizes similar language from his campaign. In an interview with the New York Times in 2016, Trump stated: "I'm not isolationist, but I am America First" (Sraders, 2018). Trump outlined in his campaign and in his inaugural that he will bring back American working-class and factory jobs and quit spending American money on foreign interests.

Trump also used the <America First> ideograph specifically within the inaugural. Trump outlined, "From this day forward, a new vision will govern our land" (Trump, 2017, p. 14). He continued, "From this moment on, it's going to be America First" (Trump, 2017, p. 14). While these lines allude to the ideals of <America First> already presented, Trump is specific on what this means in terms of his political ideology. He explained, "Every decision on trade, on taxes, on immigration, on foreign affairs, will be made to benefit American workers and American families" (Trump, 2017, p. 14). This statement is where the true connection with his base audience is made. Trump makes this connection by pandering to his base audience interests, such as finances and security.

While <America First> has a long history of far-right connections (Churchwell, 2018), it means something more here as a political ideology for connecting with Trump's base. It means that his base or the forgotten working class (Edwards, 2018), will now be placed first in the world of politics, specifically by Trump, now that he has presidential power. The <America First> ideograph itself is a strong statement of political power and policy that ultimately had been used in the campaign (Sraders, 2018) and then transferred into his inaugural language. This is especially atypical in presidential inaugural rhetoric. In fact, Campbell and Jamieson (1985) state that the president should leave the campaign

behind especially if it is divisive and shift the political focus on uniting the country under the new administration. In contrast, the <America First> ideograph was used to help outline the connection with Trump's base audience, by bringing in similar rhetoric from his campaign. The next ideograph, <Nationalism> is utilized within the inaugural to outline Trump's future policies and administration.

<Nationalism> ideograph. Around the globe, the United States is known for its intense national pride (Barrington, 1997). National pride takes many forms, but this section will outline the differences between a patriotic version of national pride and <nationalism> national pride. For example, the national pride that exists from those who have chosen to protest the national anthem in support of police reform being ostracized by many members of the country (Fortin & Haag, 2018). Further, if a company like Nike chooses to support such an anti-patriotic movement, some people even choose to burn their products (Fortin & Haag, 2018) showing extreme intensity of national pride or <Nationalism> from those individuals.

When Trump alludes to <Nationalism > he is connecting to some of those individuals mentioned above. Further, Trump connects to the idea that the United States should always be put first if you support the country (Barrington, 1997), and that one's allegiance as a citizen should always be to the United States. Trump also sees <Nationalism> as a unification of his target audience of supporters, and it's an ideograph that grounds the <America First> ideograph within the speech. In fact, Trump has used <nationalism> in rallies (Baker, 2019), as a supporting term for his rhetoric. Trump does not directly say the word nationalism in the inaugural, but he still appeals to the sentiment and tone of <Nationalism> through his rhetorical choices.

Nationalism is a notion that combines the political idea of territorial self-determination, the cultural idea of the nation as one's primary identity, and a moral idea of justification of action to protect the rights of one nation over another (Barrington, 1997). Yet, the history of nationalism goes much farther. Historically, nationalism has used the economic, political, and cultural spheres as a means to promote the wellbeing and superiority of one nation over that of any other nation. Nationalism as a cultural term has been used to rectify radical political and militaristic movements like Nazism to strong protectionist policies such as isolation (Sraders, 2018). In addition, nationalism goes beyond patriotism. While patriotism connects with one's love for their country, nationalism connects with a sense of superiority of that country (Barrington, 1997). Now what does <nationalism> mean as an ideograph?

<Nationalism> is present as an ideograph within Trump's inaugural because of his rhetorical appeals that go beyond simple patriotism. The language within the inaugural also directly connects to the language used when Trump promoted nationalism as a positive term. For example, Trump stated: "We must protect our borders from the ravages of other countries making our products, stealing our companies, and destroying our jobs. Protection will lead to great prosperity and strength" (Trump, 2017, p. 15). This statement in the inaugural directly connects to the definition of nationalism presented above. He is calling for a militarized isolation and strong policies against other countries. This is very similar language to a later speech given in Houston as he promoted the term nationalism, where he stated, "For years, you watched as your leaders apologized for America, they apologized. Now you have a president who is standing up for America" (Baker, 2019). Here in this speech, he is augmenting the language in the inaugural, saying

he will stand up for America and protect America by not backing down as other leaders have (Trump, 2017, p. 11). As an ideograph it creates a statement of American strength and corresponds with the specific campaign ideograph of <America First>.

The rhetoric that outlines policies within Trump's speech also utilizes the <nationalism> ideograph. For example, Trump outlined, "At the bedrock of our politics will be a total allegiance to the United States of America, and through our loyalty to our country we will rediscover our loyalty to each other" (Trump, 2017, p. 15). This is a prime example of the difference between nationalism and patriotism. Trump is alluding to a culture of loyalty i.e. nationalism versus just speaking about the love for America i.e. patriotism. <Nationalism> is another key way to adhere to his base target audience. Specifically, Trump (2017) stated, "We will bring back our jobs. We will bring back our borders. We will bring back our wealth" (p. 15). By focusing on national pride through strategic parallelism, he is therefore focusing on the American people and American industry, rather than on foreign policies or jobs. However, this statement goes beyond just love for country, he is saying that we must isolate our borders in order to bring back jobs or wealth this is justifying the need for isolating the United States, a direct connection to the nationalism definitions by Barrington (1997) and Sraders (2018).

Another key component of <Nationalism> is isolationism and protectionism (Barrington, 1997). Trump explained, that the borders will be better protected, and more jobs will be created (Trump, 2017, p. 15). This statement is a continuation of Trump's language about the evils of the past and other countries stealing our strength and prosperity. In essence, Trump is scapegoating other countries to account for the loss of jobs, borders, wealth, and dreams of U.S. citizens. This connects to <nationalism> as

Trump is using his rhetoric to prove America must be protected and prioritized, a major connector of <nationalism>, while also uniting his base under this ideology. Trump used this tactic further when he stated, “We've made other countries rich while the wealth, strength, and confidence of our country has dissipated over the horizon (Trump, 2017, p. 11).” Barrington (1997) stated that promotion of your nation’s culture is a key factor of <nationalism> ideology.

<Nationalism> seeks to promote the home country’s language and culture at the expense of other nations (Sraders, 2018). Within the inaugural, Trump promoted that the United States will put its own interests first and not waste resources on other nations (Trump, 2017, p. 11). He stated, “For many decades, we've enriched foreign industry at the expense of American industry, subsidized the armies of other countries while allowing for the very sad depletion of our military” (Trump, 2017, p. 11). <Nationalism> creates loyalty to one’s own country and independence from other nation states (Barrington, 1997). Trump utilizes this tactic in the inaugural, when he stated, there must be total allegiance to the United States of America (Trump, 2017, p. 18). Again, it is important to understand patriotism is not <nationalism>, <nationalism> is more than just the pride of the state, but the actions that occur due to the thought of superiority of a nation (Barrington, 1997). Thus, <nationalism> is about action and takes on the identity of an ideograph used to unite and then motivate an audience, and in this case towards American loyalty. Again, <Nationalism> and <America First> use similar tactics within the inaugural. However, Trump used <America First> to promote strength to bring back prosperity to a forgotten electorate who were the base of his presidential campaign. In contrast, <nationalism> as an ideograph is used to outline Trump’s policy choices of

isolationism and protectionism. The two ideographs connect together through the <Make America Great Again> ideograph.

<Make America Great Again> ideograph. This ideograph refers specifically to Trump's rhetorical creation and his audience. <Make America Great Again>, or <MAGA>, was powerful in the inaugural because of the society/culture that Trump created beginning in his campaign and then continuing into the inaugural address. This ideograph connects the other ideographs of <America First> and <nationalism> used throughout the president's inaugural address.

The slogan of <MAGA> itself was not entirely original. Ronald Reagan and George H.W. Bush had used "Let's Make America Great Again" in their 1980 campaign (Tumulty, 2017). Yet, it was Trump who literally and figuratively trademarked the slogan. Throughout the campaign, Trump became a champion for the forgotten individuals in politics (Edwards, 2018). Thus, <Make America Great Again> connected to how Trump was going to save the manufacturing industry, add jobs, and protect citizens. Trump explained to the Washington Post, "that being a great president has to do with being a great cheerleader for the country, and we're going to show the people as we build up our military (Tumulty, 2017)." This ideograph connected Trump to the people, and he used it faithfully within the inaugural.

It is important to note that Trump never directly shows what specifically great is. This the rhetorical strategy of negation. Trump outlined in the inaugural that he will bring industry jobs back and build up American power (Trump, 2017, p. 11). Yet, there is no direct outline of what the end goal is. In essence, the rhetorical strategy Trump uses to

prove what “great” is to negate the current state and that it is not great currently. Then to prove what is great, Trump outlined that he will do the opposite.

A key rhetorical tactic Trump used is showing that America is currently “not great” and that it needs him to repair it. Trump stated, “One by one, the factories shuttered and left our shores, with not even a thought about the millions upon millions of American workers left behind (Trump, 2017, p. 5).” Similar language was used in his 2016 campaign as he explained that past foreign policy lead to America’s current state of despair (Edwards, 2018). <Make America Great Again>, as an ideograph, functions in part to assume that the United States is in a problematic state of affairs, and Trump must come in to solve the problematic condition of the United States. Ultimately, this shows that <MAGA> was created to show that America is not great currently.

Another way Trump tries to show his audience that America is not great, is through pointing out the current safety issues regarding terrorism that exist in the United States. Both within his campaign and inaugural, he villainized Islam as an existential threat, and that those who practice the religion are evil. Therefore, to <Make America Great Again>, we must do something about radical Islam. In order to do so, he stated, “We will reinforce old alliances and unite the civilized world against Radical Islamic Terrorism, which we will eradicate completely from the face of the Earth” (Trump, 2017 p. 17). He makes a strong case throughout the inaugural that it is those outside of American borders who weaken the country.

Trump (2017) showed that immigrants coming into the U.S. cause a safety issue. Trump stated, “We must protect our borders from the ravages of other countries...” (p. 15). He is utilizing the rhetorical language here similar to below where he villainizes the

government. He villainized the “other” as Islamic terrorists and immigrants. To prove <MAGA>, Trump has to show America is not great currently, in this case, the safety of the country is at risk because of terrorism and immigration. Therefore, we must eliminate those potential safety issues completely. This rhetorical strategy is powerful, because people are much more willing to consider nationalist or isolationist policies if there is a fear for safety (Barrington, 1997). This is exactly how Trump is connecting to his audience and uniting them under <MAGA>.

<MAGA> is about how Trump alone will solve the aforementioned problems with the United States. In fact, Trump stated, “I will fight for you with every breath in my body, and I will never, ever let you down. America will start winning again, winning like never before” (Trump, 2017, p. 15). He also shows that he alone will solve the problems, because he demonizes the Washington government as elitist. He stated, “For too long, a small group in our Nation's Capital has reaped the rewards of Government while the people have borne the cost” (Trump, 2017, p. 5). By demonizing the government and showing that he can solve America’s problems, Trump unites his audience under the <MAGA> ideograph.

While there are clear winners in the <MAGA> ideology, it leaves many to question, who are the losers? Trump points to some of these losers in the inaugural (Trump, 2017, p. 3). These individuals are the Washington politicians and the establishment that makes up the swamp Trump wants to drain. Yet, with the policies that make up <MAGA> other countries also become losers. If America becomes an isolated state then the countries that are current partners with America, they lose that interest and power.

Trump is able to connect to his target audience through ideographs that connect to American political right-wing ideologies. Trump's use of these ideographs makes a strong connection to the base of individuals who supported him within his campaign. Trump's base felt forgotten, and it was Trump who used his rhetorical power to blame others and put them first. He shows this in multiple occasions, specifically, "The forgotten men and women of our country will be forgotten no longer. Everyone is listening to you now" (Trump, 2017, p. 7). In fact, Trump rhetorically does an excellent job of using ideographs in his inaugural to continue with his popular campaign language that supports those who supported him.

The three ideographs used by Trump are similar yet rhetorically serve distinct purposes for Trump. <America First> originated in his campaign language and continued in the inaugural to prove that American interests are essential, and this is used as a rallying cry for people to see hope for their country and to unite his base of supporters from the campaign. <Nationalism> takes this one step further, showing that in order to put America first we must utilize a nationalist agenda, such as isolationism and loyalty to the United States, in terms of policy choices. Finally, <Make America Great Again> connects the two ideographs to show what the evils or problems have been, and that there is a way to solve American problems, through putting Trump in charge and no longer prioritizing other nations in U.S. policy choices. I now turn to the next theoretical lens, Kenneth Burke's (1945) theory of dramatism, for a pentadic criticism of the inaugural address.

Pentadic Criticism of Trump's Inaugural

Using Burke's (1945) theory of dramatism allows me to assign meaning to

Trump's speech text according to my analysis of his use of motives and action within the inaugural (Hamlin & Nichols, 1973). Through analyzing the rhetorical action in a text, the pentad gives the critic the ability to analyze Trump's view of reality through his rhetoric. I analyze each component of the pentad, including act, scene, agent, agency and purpose to conceptualize Trump's rhetorical action and underlying rhetorical motive in the inaugural. I also used an analysis of the ratios of these components that occur in the inaugural, to determine which element of the pentad is most important to Trump and therefore shows his underlying rhetorical motive, in terms of what is most important in the address.

Act. An act should name what took place (Burke, 1945). The act here is to "Make America Great Again," and what MAGA means for Trump in the inaugural address. Trump begins the inaugural by using traditional inaugural language by thanking past presidents and fellow Americans (Trump, 2017, p. 1). However, the language quickly shifts to populism and action, whereas the language in the inaugural should be centered around contemplation rather than action (Campbell & Jamieson, 1985). Yet, in the beginning of the inaugural the language used infers action. Specifically, "Together, we will determine the course of America and the world for many, many years to come. We will face challenges, we will confront hardships, but we will get the job done (Trump, 2017, p. 2)." The action here in the inaugural is to change America to what Trump and his base refer to as "great".

Throughout the inaugural, Trump is establishing his rhetorical motive, to connect to his base of supporters. Since the act is to put America first, he is clearly establishing his motive. For example, he stated, "we the citizens of America, are now joined in a

great national effort to rebuild our country and restore its promise for all of our people (Trump, 2017, p. 2).” He is explaining here that the act that is taking place is the shift to becoming the America that Trump and therefore his base believe is the best America, one that is anti-immigrant and focused on American prosperity by rebuilding industry. By establishing the act as “Make America Great Again,” the inaugural becomes more than just trying to unify the country and having people contemplate what is to come. The inaugural in this case is establishing a course of action for America to embark on. Thus, when Trump (2017) stated, “Together, we will determine the course of America and the world for years to come” (p. 2), he is establishing the role for America as he wishes to see it. He also is alluding to the concept of American exceptionalism that comes through in MAGA and throughout the inaugural. This theme was well outlined in the <MAGA> ideograph, uniting his supporters around the problem of America’s lack of exceptionalism and though the act, or solution, of <MAGA>, through Trump as the conduit for American exceptionalism.

Scene. The second element of the pentad is the scene. A scene should explain the background of the act and the situation in which it occurred (Burke, 1945). The scene in Trump’s speech is the unique context surrounding the inaugural. I first outlined Trump’s unique context within Chapter Two. The context is framed by the political turmoil the campaign produced, as well as the anti-establishment language continually used by President Trump. The scene itself can be described as anti-establishment, anti-government, and anti-foreign policy.

The anti-establishment scene is set first by the language, thanking past presidents and saying it was a momentous occasion. Trump stated, “Chief Justice Roberts, President

Carter, President Clinton, President Bush, President Obama, fellow Americans, and people of the world: Thank you” (Trump, 2017, p. 1). However, right after Trump used this language, he ironically went right into tearing down the establishment of Washington. He outlined, “Today’s ceremony, however, has very special meaning. Because today we are not merely transferring power from one Administration to another, or from party to another, but we are transferring power from Washington, D.C. and giving it back to you, the American people” (Trump, 2017, p. 2). Trump created an anti-establishment tone by bypassing the traditions of the inaugural early in the speech and moving into the role of his administration. He deviated from the traditions of the inaugural. Additionally, he used the rhetorical strategy of antithesis. By putting down the establishment, he is building up his base, as he calls the American people in this speech. This sets the scene for the other “anti” aspects of the inaugural, being anti-government and anti-foreign policy.

The language in Trump’s campaign was also echoed through the scene of the inaugural through creating an anti-government scene. He set the scene clearly when he said, “Washington flourished – but the people did not share in its wealth. Politicians prospered – but the jobs left, and the factories closed (Trump 2017, p. 5).” Therefore, if the act of the inaugural is to “Make America Great Again,” then the scene or the background of the act (Burke, 1945) must establish that America is not already great, and that it has been made unprosperous by others. Trump establishes those “others” as Washington, D.C. politicians and past administrations. In fact, Trump’s campaign even flourished on the idea he was not a Washington politician (Edwards, 2018). Trump stated, “What truly matters is not which party controls our Government, but whether our

Government is controlled by the people” (Trump, 2017, p. 7). Trump is not a traditional politician, nor controlled by any party, but is rather a man of the people, and will be the solution to America’s woes by being anti-government.

Finally, Trump has very strong anti-foreign policy language throughout the inaugural address, setting the policy scene for his Administration. This is a strong way to make other countries the antagonist while simultaneously making America the protagonist in the story of world progress and global leadership. He explained, “For many decades, we’ve enriched foreign industry at the expense of American industry, subsidized the armies of other countries while allowing for the very sad depletion of our military” (Trump, 2017, p. 11). This is a prime example of taking an anti-foreign policy stance, but also building up the idea that he will <MAGA>. Trump then continued, “We do not seek to impose our way of life on anyone, but rather to let it shine as an example—we will shine—for everyone to follow” (Trump, 2017, p. 17). Not only does this have an isolationist policy tone, but it also builds up the idea of American exceptionalism, a concept directly derived from his campaign (Edwards, 2018). America will lead, but only as a shining example for other countries to follow.

Trump’s creation of the scene in the inaugural used anti-establishment, anti-government, and anti-foreign policy rhetoric. He used this rhetoric to prove that American ideals should be put first, which was the slogan for his campaign and the act in analyzing this rhetorical act. Therefore, having the American people as the agents, is another way to reinforce <MAGA>.

Agent. Within the pentad, what person or kind of person performed the act is the agent (Burke, 1945). Thus, if <MAGA> is the act, then “the people” are the agents who

perform that particular act. Trump's continued appeals to populism within the inaugural create the agent of the people. Also, within the inaugural address, Trump rarely referred solely to himself, except through unifying language, saying "we" and including the American citizens.

It is the populist appeals that connect back to his base that create an agent role for the people. A perfect example of this is the conclusion of the inaugural, where Trump stated, "And whether a child is born in the urban sprawl of Detroit or the windswept plains of Nebraska, they look up at the same night sky, they fill their heart with the same dreams, and they are infused with the breath of life by the same almighty Creator" (Trump, 2017, p. 22). Trump used populist language here, that all people matter and are equal, which gives strength to the same people that he is creating as the agent and in full reality is his base of supporters.

By establishing those appeals to the people, he empowers them in order to create them as the agent. To further make this point, he stated, "Every decision on trade, on taxes, on immigration, on foreign affairs, will be made to benefit American workers and American families" (Trump, 2017, p. 14). Here he is referencing the decisions will be for the people, not about Trump, but through Trump. Trump established throughout the inaugural that it is the American people who will now have the power in America, thus it is they who are achieving the act to <MAGA>.

Trump created himself as the figurehead for this larger "social movement," as it is the people who are "taking back" the government, yet he rarely refers to himself. By not referring to himself and using inclusive language he is able to connect back to his base and transform the agent as the people. When he discussed how politics will change, it

establishes that connection. For example, Trump said: “At the bedrock of our politics will be a total allegiance to the United States of America, and through our loyalty to our country, we will rediscover our loyalty to each other” (Trump, 2017, p. 18). He is putting himself on the same level of the people and establishing equality. By doing so, he gives more power to the people as the agent, that without their loyalty to America, change cannot occur. Even though he establishes the agents as the people, it is he who is providing the agency within the inaugural.

Agency. The agency addresses what means or instruments were used to create the rhetorical act (Burke, 1945). Therefore, Trump is in fact the agency. In Chapter Two, I addressed that Trump used Twitter and divisive language as the agency in much of his campaign and presidential rhetoric. Within the inaugural text itself, the language centers around “America First” and capturing the idea that the American system will go from “failing” to prospering, now that Trump is president.

The language in the inaugural is centered around <MAGA>. Trump uses his position to create himself as the agency, that it is only through him that <MAGA> can be accomplished. Trump stated, “We will get our people off of welfare and back to work – rebuilding our country with American hands and American labor” (Trump, 2017, p. 16). This is an example of language used to create action towards rebuilding the nation based on the ideologies and values Trump wants to put first. As the agency, Trump places blame on past administrations, and that only through his agency will hope to be restored. For example, he explained: “I will fight for you with every breath in my body, and I will never, ever let you down. America will start winning again, winning like never before” (Trump, 2017, p. 15). Trump shows here that he is the savior figure that

will bring back prosperity to the United States. The language he used to prove that he is the agency compares directly to his campaign rhetoric.

Throughout his campaign, Trump repeatedly discussed isolationism and protectionism (Edwards, 2018). In the inaugural, there was a parallel to this language, such as uniting the civilized world against Radical Islamic Terrorism, which we will eradicate completely from the face of the Earth (Trump, 2017, p. 17). Here, he is directly connecting to protectionism. Yet, Trump also relies heavily on an “America First” strategy to set himself apart; he did this first in the large Republican field of the campaign (Edwards, 2018), and then to further connect to his base and create himself as the agency. In the inaugural, he stated, “We, assembled here today, are issuing a new decree to be heard in every city, in every foreign capital, and in every hall of power. From this day forward, a new vision will govern our land. From this this day forward, it's going to be only America first (Trump, 2017, p. 14). He is using his position as president, combined with isolationist rhetoric, to create that it is his vision alone that will save America.

Clearly, Trump is trying to appeal to American exceptionalism. Trump is using his language, his agency, here to reinforce that traditional American values should be followed and valued. In fact, he is trying to use agency to foster an America First ideology. As the agency, Trump puts blame on the past administrations and establishment government for the downfall of America. He then promotes an isolationist agenda to prove that the only way to truly achieve greatness must be through him, as the figurehead for a populist movement of the forgotten electorate.

Purpose. The final element of the pentad for analysis is the purpose. The

purpose is any phrase that refers to the function fulfilled by the rhetorical act (Burke, 1945). I have found by analyzing the inaugural that most of the language used by Trump tends to lean towards unification. However, it only unifies the American people if the audience member agrees with certain ideologies and viewpoints. This is the purpose of the speech, targeting and unifying his base of supporters, which are his true target audience for this speech, which serves as an extension of his campaign rhetoric.

Trump's purpose in the inaugural truly had no purpose of unification. The rhetorical style from Trump took his persona of the salesman and business tactics and applied them to politics. There are multiple components to his businessman persona. For instance, there is a continual rotating door in the Trump White House. The goal for Trump is not to necessarily presidential but instead he wants to be that salesman, aiding to him being a divisive political figure. Ultimately, this rhetorical style and persona of the businessman/salesman is someone who divides rather than unifies the whole of the American people.

Trump's language in the inaugural centers around unification of his base, to persuade them rhetorically to <MAGA,> and to follow the ideals of America First. Trump stated, "We are one nation – and their pain is our pain. Their dreams are our dreams; and their success will be our success. We share one heart, one home, and one glorious destiny" (Trump, 2017, p.10). Here he is directly connecting to his base, using populism rhetoric to show that for people to be successful, once again the United States must follow an America First strategy. This is explained further by Trump when he noted, "We will follow two simple rules: Buy American and hire American" (Trump, 2017, p. 16). Further, Trump argued that the only way for America to prosper again is

to put America first. Burke (1945) pointed out that dramatism is a technique used by scholars to analyze the mode of action within language. It becomes clear in this analysis that the purpose corresponds with the rhetorical motive, or underlying motive of his inaugural address and the driving element of the pentad in analyzing his rhetoric from this theoretical lens.

Overall, the pentad shows how Trump is able to achieve his purpose of unifying his base, through the rhetorical act of <MAGA.> Trump himself becomes the agency in which the agent, his base of supporters, are able to complete the act. Trump describes an anti-government, anti-establishment, and anti-foreign policy scene in order to frame these arguments to the American people. I outlined in chapter three that for President Trump's inaugural, the application will focus on context (scene) and language in the speech (act). However, I found through the analysis of the pentadic ratios, that the essence of the pentad is the ratio of scene-agency, which is critical for connecting to Trump's target audience in the purpose. Further, according to Burke's (1945) theory of ratios, any one aspect of the pentad can and/or does impact and control another.

Trump showed his audience that America has problems through the setting of the scene. He blamed the establishment, the government, and the history of non-isolationist foreign policy for the problems with America that create the need for <MAGA,> which is his rhetorical act. Given this rhetorical need, Trump is able to put himself in a hero or savior position. He argued that by putting <America First,> he will save factory jobs and the economy, and he will truly bring back the American dream for his forgotten base of supporters (Edwards, 2018). This is how Trump is able to create the purpose of the speech, to connect directly to his base. By negatively constructing the scene and

providing hope to his supporters through his agency, he ultimately achieves his purpose. I now analyze how Trump's position in the bully pulpit also impacts the connection to the American people through the inaugural address.

Trump's Appeals to the Bully Pulpit

As explained in chapter three, the theoretical lens of the bully pulpit describes the ways the president must lead and speak to the American people in order to win over the public, typically to gain support on policy issues but also to simply gain support (Mervin, 1995). For instance, politically savvy presidents know that without the public's support, they will lack the power to persuade Congress (Edwards, 2003). The bully pulpit creates support with the American people and is therefore crucial to a successful rhetorical presidency. I analyze how, if at all, Trump is able to use the bully pulpit in his inaugural address to gather support from the American people for his policies.

In chapter three, I explained that the bully pulpit began with President Wilson. Wilson in turn argued that the only national voice is that of the president (Edwards, 2003). I found the entirety of the inaugural address to have an anti-government tone. I found that throughout the inaugural, the only voice that comes through is Trump's voice; he does not address his team nor his advisors, and the only time he takes time to address Congress is when he is criticizing them. He stated that politicians were prospering while factory doors were closing and incomes declined (Trump, 2017, p. 5). It is clear the president is choosing to use the bully pulpit to his advantage and using the tactic of "going public" (Edwards, 2003) in order to speak directly to his audience, rather than navigating policy or structural changes through Congress.

Clearly, Trump spoke directly to the American people throughout the inaugural. However, the American people Trump addresses seem to be a specific audience that is similar to his campaign audience. In the first paragraph of the inaugural, this connection between the inaugural audience and the campaign audience begins, Trump discussed the country can be rebuilt, together, and for the people (Trump, 2017, p. 1). When he explained that the country has to be rebuilt, he specifically used the examples of factories and infrastructure. Then when he stated, “all our people,” this is a direct connection to his base, the forgotten electorate (Edwards, 2018). While on the surface the speech is a connection to the “American people,” it really doubles as an appeal to his supporters, especially when considering the examples used to illustrate his policy agenda.

He spoke directly to these individuals who supported his campaign and now, to Trump, represent the “American people” at large. These people are the forgotten, the blue-collar, largely white Americans in rural America (Edwards, 2018). Trump (2017) stated, “But for too many of our citizens, a different reality exists: . . . rusted-out factories scattered like tombstones across the landscape of our nation; an education system, flush with cash, but which leaves our young and beautiful students deprived of knowledge; and the crime and gangs and drugs that have stolen too many lives and robbed our country of so much unrealized potential” (Trump, 2017, p. 12). Here, Trump utilized a key tactic of the bully pulpit: establishing rapport with citizens and commanding their trust (Mervin, 1995). The citizens he is connecting with here feel there are no longer jobs or opportunities for them, which is a similar talking point to what Trump used in his campaign (Edwards, 2018). By showing his support for the people and putting the blame

on the system of education and a lack of factory jobs, he is able to gain rapport and trust with his supporters, in that he is empathetic to their problems.

There are times within the inaugural when it feels as if Trump is assuming a position that he has already created a rapport with U.S. citizens, and that there in fact is already a populist movement that has been established. As president, he is now using the bully pulpit to solidify that voice of the people, based on this populist movement of his supporters. This movement began and grew during his campaign rallies, where thousands of people lined up to see Trump speak (Appel, 2018). The language that was central to the campaign was also referenced in the inaugural address: “the forgotten men and women of our country will be forgotten no longer” (Trump, 2017, p. 3). Then, Trump (2017) continued, “You came by the tens of millions to become part of a historic movement the likes of which the world has never seen before. At the center of this movement is a crucial conviction: that a nation exists to serve its citizens” (p. 8). The “movement” and the audience who is addressed here are those who backed Trump during the campaign. The historical movement alludes to the campaign and the Trump brand of populism.

It is the bully pulpit and its position that allows the president great freedom to say what he wants, simply because of the position he holds (Mervin, 1995). In fact, the true check on the bully pulpit’s power is how public opinion views the president’s rhetoric. At the time of the inaugural, Trump had continued to silence those who did not agree with him, including the media, calling them “fake news” (Rhea, 2018). Thus, the president used his language in the inaugural to continue to reinforce the “us” versus “them” dichotomy and polarization of the U.S. electorate. For example, “We’ve defended other

nation's borders while refusing to defend our own; and spent trillions of dollars overseas while America's infrastructure turns into disrepair and decay" (Trump, 2017, p. 11).

Trump used the power of the bully pulpit with the scene of the inaugural to outline the key ideas of his policy agenda, whether the descriptions of America's problems may be entirely accurate or not. Throughout the inaugural, Trump appealed to the American public to reinforce the ties with his base, to further strengthen his power in the office of the presidency.

While Trump used the bully pulpit in order to connect with his base, he also used his position as president in order to outline policies that he would implement. The significant policies in his speech include: infrastructure policy, economic policy and national defense spending. It is important that Trump garners support from his base, to ultimately gain similar support for these policies.

Trump outlined that people were losing jobs and having to get on welfare (Trump, 2017, p. 16). Yet, shortly after he connected this argument with building bridges and infrastructure, and ultimately putting people back to work. He used his platform of the presidency in the inaugural to connect to those people and provide what he outlined as a solution to their problems, tactfully outlining support for his own policies. Trump also uses fear mongering by stating people are unsafe and uneducated (Trump, 2017, p. 12). When he connected to that fear in the audience, he then stated that borders must be protected, and America must be put first once again (Trump, 2017, p. 15). Thus, Trump is able to connect once again to a policy platform while using his position to connect to his base.

Overall, within the inaugural, Trump used the position of the bully pulpit to his advantage. He spoke directly to the people consistently throughout the speech, although it is a specific group of “people” to whom he speaks: his base of supporters. Also, within the 2016 campaign rhetoric and leading up to the inaugural through Trump’s Twitter account, he built his target audience (Appel, 2018). His rhetorical tone was to target specific citizens and came across as anti-government. Then, ultimately by connecting to the target audience he is able to garner support for his administration’s policies. Next, I analyze the inaugural address expectations and how if at all, Trump deviated from those expectations.

Trump’s Deviation from Inaugural Address Expectations

Outlining the generic expectations of the presidential inaugural address is a useful tool to highlight the recurring patterns that scholars have identified within the presidential inaugural over time, across all of the different presidents who have given this speech (Campbell and Jamieson, 1985). Campbell and Jamieson’s (1985) framework provides an understanding of recurring themes in the presidential inaugural address, in order to understand the specific content that occurs within each president’s distinctive inaugural address (Vigil, 2013). Campbell and Jamieson (1985) summarized the expectations of the presidential inaugural address through identifying the following five themes that tend to recur over time in this type of presidential speech: 1) unifying the audience, 2) rehearsing shared values from the past, 3) outlining the political principles that will guide the new administration, 4) demonstrating that the president appreciates the requirements and limitation of executive power, and 5) urging contemplation rather than action from the audience. Past presidents have maintained these expectations; thus, these requirements

are a standard method of analyzing an inaugural address (Beasley, 2001). Using these five tenets of expectations of the inaugural address, I analyze how, if at all, these themes occur within Trump's (2017) inaugural address, or if he departs from these standard components of presidential rhetoric.

Unifying the audience. Campbell and Jamieson (1985) state that presidential inaugurals should unify the audiences from both the people who witness and ratify the ceremony. Throughout his address, this theme is present in George W. Bush's inaugural (Vigil, 2013). For instance, Bush focuses on helping the audience to relate to the values and purpose of the American mission and thereby create consubstantiality as a people by having a common purpose and duty (Vigil, 2013). Therefore, finding if and how Trump unifies his audience will be key to understanding if he addresses this particular theme that is expected of successful presidential inaugural speeches.

Trump uses an appeal to the American people within the introduction to the speech. In fact, within the second paragraph of the address, Trump discussed the citizens of the United States. He stated, that the citizens of America now need to focus on rebuilding the country (Trump, 2017, p. 2). Trump then stated more specifically, that "Power will be transferred to the American people" (Trump, 2017, p. 3). Yet, this unifying language is limited to "we" and "our". Both of these unifying terms are centered around an "America First" theme that is dominant throughout the inaugural, and presumed that the United States has a lot of problems that need to be solved. Through connecting the unifying language to the campaign theme of "America First," in regard to foreign policy (Edwards, 2018), he is connecting to his base of supporters who feel forgotten by mainstream U.S. political culture. While "we the citizens" does seem to be

an inclusive term, it refers to only U.S. citizens, and not to others who might be listening to this speech, including immigrants, world leaders, and so forth.

Trump uses a similar inclusive tactic within his campaign stump speeches (Terrill, 2017). To attempt to unite the American people, Trump stated, that we are one nation and the dreams of some should be the dreams of all (Trump, 2017, p. 25). This line connects within the base described and alludes to the idea of manifest destiny, or the idea that white Americans were divinely ordained to settle the entire continent of North America (Olson & Mendoza, 2015). As Appel (2018) described, everything is a quick fix for Trump, so going back to a time of manifest destiny, or America First, will therefore fix the United States' problems.

After such a contentious election, the people in the United States needed reinforcement that the country would once again be unified. There in fact is no mention of the election at all in the inaugural. The audience should expect explicit appeals for unity; this is most common in inaugural addresses that follow a divisive campaign or contested electoral outcome (Campbell & Jamieson, 1985). Trump stated, "It is time to remember that old wisdom our soldiers will never forget: that whether we are black or brown or white, we all bleed the same red blood of patriots, we all enjoy the same glorious freedoms, and we all salute the same great American Flag" (Trump, 2017, p. 6). While this line is beautifully written and connects to many facets of what it means to be an American, the rest of the unification language centers around an America First ideology and references his campaign rhetoric, which does not enforce the meaning of this well-constructed verse. This statement does not go far enough to unify the country, especially given the contentiousness of the election.

Overall, the inaugural language attempts to unify, but is only truly successful at unifying the audience who was already behind Trump and his campaign. This language is only reserved for citizens who believe in the America that aligns with manifest destiny and leaves out a large portion of the audience listening to the inaugural. This language echoes his campaign, that no challenge can match the heart and fight and spirit of America (Trump, 2017, p. 20); additionally, the rhetoric is all about a quick fix (Appel, 2018). Those who are left out are non-citizens, world leaders, immigrants, and those who felt connected to past administrations' foreign policy. He directly isolates these individuals when he connects to his base through the appeal to his populist movement.

Rehearse shared values from the past. Second, Trump began his inaugural addressing Supreme Court Chief Justice Roberts, past presidents, fellow Americans, and people of the world (Trump, 2017, p. 1). This directly connected with this tenet of an expectation of inaugural addresses as the past is conserved by honoring past Presidents (Campbell and Jamieson, 1985). However, the connection to shared values ends here.

While Trump does thank past presidents, he then goes on to blame past administrations for the current ills of American society (Trump, 2017, p. 3). Campbell and Jamieson (1985) explain that the past is conserved by reaffirming the wisdom of past policies. Trump provided no acknowledgment or thanks to past policies or past administrations. Despite this rhetorical norm of acknowledging shared values and discussing the wisdom of past policies, Trump does not directly lay out policy procedures yet does point to conceptions that were echoed from his campaign speeches. Trump simply stated, "America will start winning again, winning like never before" (Trump,

2017, p. 15). While this is not an appeal to a specific policy, it is in fact an appeal to American exceptionalism (Terrill, 2017), a principle he relied on within his campaign.

Using shared values of the United States, such as the religion of Christianity, can be a significant way to use the past to solidify present values in the inaugural (Beasley, 2001). In President Obama's inaugural, the focus was on the universal value of a God-given promise of equality and an assumption of religious pluralism that connects with the Christian values of the United States (Frank, 2011). While Trump does quote the Bible, "How good and pleasant it is when God's people live together in unity" (Trump, 2017, p. 20) this is one of the only times Christian values are addressed. This was a missed opportunity for Trump to be able to connect to a majority of people, especially his supporters, through addressing Christian values.

Yet, in multiple instances, Trump does directly connect to some shared, past values, such as American exceptionalism and the American dream. This occurs when he states that our country will thrive and prosper again (Trump, 2017 p. 20). He even concludes the speech with this concept, when Trump stated, "We will make America great again" (Trump, 2017, p. 26). Trump is creating the assumption that there were better ideals in the past. These past ideals come from the American dream or American exceptionalism. When he stated, "We will get our people off of welfare and back to work, rebuilding our country with American hands and American labor" (Trump, 2017, p. 16), he is connecting to the America and the people who were previously prosperous and fulfilled the American dream. He argued that those past values of hard work and labor will allow America to prosper once again.

Political principles guiding the new administration. Campbell and Jamieson's (1985) third tenet is that inaugurals should lay out the political principles that will be present in the new administration. Yet, these principles should be developed in predictable ways. Beasley (2001) echoed this sentiment by explaining that even though the inaugural is not typically policy driven, presidents should still outline their plans for how they will guide the nation.

Trump continued his ideals for American exceptionalism and transferring power to the people as an outline to guide his inaugural and an attempt to follow this tenet. For example, he stated "We will bring back our jobs. We will bring back our borders. We will bring back our wealth. And we will bring back our dreams" (Trump, 2017, p. 15). While each of these short statements has an appeal to policy and is a strategic use of parallelism, as an entire line he is trying to connect non-sequitur arguments and policies.

Throughout the inaugural, Trump directly appeals to rebuilding infrastructure, a key campaign promise. Trump explained that the United States has "Spent trillions of dollars overseas while America's infrastructure has fallen into disrepair and decay" (Trump, 2017, p. 11). While trying to identify infrastructure as a key need, he also ostracizes the past policy of American aid. This is a strong appeal to <nationalism,> a tone and ideology present throughout the inaugural. Trump continued, "We will build new roads, and highways, and bridges, and airports, and tunnels, and railways all across our wonderful nation" (Trump, 2017, p. 16). Focusing on infrastructure would be a priority in the new administration, instead of giving American dollars and aid to other countries.

Finally, there is an attempt to provide clarity to policy. Trump stated that to rebuild America people have to get back to work and off government assistance” (Trump, 2017, p. 16). He continued, that Americans should buy American products and use American labor forces (Trump, 2017, p. 16). This language contained a solution to the appeals to policy presented earlier in the inaugural. However, this does come at a price. When Trump stated, American hands and American labor it is another call to an America first ideology, as it feels anti-immigrant, and that the only policy solution can be solved through American workers.

Overall, Trump addressed this tenet when he outlined the need to build infrastructure and rebuild America. While Trump does address his plans for policy, the specifics of how to do so fall short, but this is typical for an inaugural address (Beasley, 2001). The policies he chooses to address in the inaugural also connect with the <MAGA> concept. Trump successfully argued that America has issues (national security, infrastructure disrepair, and welfare use), but only through Trump and his solutions can America truly be great once again, to resolve those issues.

Appreciation for the requirements and limitations of executive power. Within this fourth tenet, the president should demonstrate a rhetorical ability to function as a leader (Ericson, 1997). Yet in the tenet, it is critical to align with the limits of executive power previously established to perform presidential duties and provide a symbolic role for American citizens (Ericson, 1997). Within past inaugurals, presidents have achieved this tenet by humbly acknowledging their deficiencies and accepting the burden of the office (Beasley, 2001). For example, presidents might invoke God’s blessings as an appeal to humility in holding the office of President of the United States (Campbell &

Jamieson, 1985). Finally, this tenet is truly achieved through a president's use of humility; they should provide continued elements of humility within the inaugural address (Campbell & Jamieson, 1985; Beasley, 2001). Trump briefly met this tenet in the inaugural.

As stated above, a new president can acknowledge his deficiencies by humbly invoking God. Trump (2017) addressed the Bible relatively late in the speech, when he stated, "We are protected by God" (p. 18). However, in comparison to past inaugural addresses, this is a brief way of invoking religious authority and offering presidential humility.

Trump also does not address the limitations he will face in the office. Instead, he chooses to blame the past inefficiencies of the country on current and past politicians. Trump (2017) stated, "We will no longer accept politicians who are no talk and no action- constantly complaining but never doing anything about it" (Trump, 2017, p. 19). While this line addresses the political structure, it is done so in a negative tone rather than a humble one, scapegoating politicians in general.

Trump does invoke some rhetorical appeals to humility. He addressed the citizens of the United States and even used inclusive language such as "we the citizens" (Trump, 2017, p. 1). In fact, it is the covenant between the nation and the executive that is the true essence of democracy (Campbell & Jamieson, 1985). Surprisingly, the first time Trump addressed himself was, "The oath of office I take today is an oath of allegiance to all Americans" (Trump, 2017, p. 10). This is a strong tactic of providing a partnership between the executive and the nation. This statement is also a connection to the populist rhetoric of his campaign and is a strong example of an appeal to humility, especially

given Trump's personal history and track record as a rhetor who is anything but humble, as discussed in Chapter Two.

Urging contemplation rather than action. This final tenet describes how the president rhetorically invokes the audience. The president should speak to the audience in an epideictic tone, since the inaugural address is a speech of praise, and typically is a speech that praises the nation (Campbell & Jamieson, 1985). In fact, the president should focus on the current moment while simultaneously incorporating the past and the future (Campbell & Jamieson, 1985). Also, within this tenet, the inaugural address should praise the institution of the presidential office, as well as the executive branch, and constitutional government (Campbell & Jamieson, 1985).

At times, Trump did urge contemplation from the audience. He stated, "Your voice, your hopes, and your dreams will define our American destiny. And your courage and goodness and love will forever guide us along the way" (Trump, 2017, p. 24). Here, he asked his audience to connect to their own personal hopes and dreams, something that is continually American (American dream, manifest destiny, etc.). He also spoke directly to the audience here with language that provides that connection between personal hopes and the hopes of our nation.

Beyond this example of contemplative language, however, is the fact that Trump uses the term action in the speech itself. Trump (2017) stated, "The time for empty talk is over...now arrives the hour of action" (p. 19). This statement connects to the pentadic analysis that the American people are the agents, they are the individuals that can provide the action that Trump described. Therefore, he goes beyond just urging contemplation

from his audience, to asking them to take action toward rebuilding the nation to what Trump sees as progress.

As previously explained, Trump continues to appeal to a populist base of U.S. citizens, and this base does not include immigrants. For instance, Trump (2017) outlined, “At the center of this movement is a crucial conviction: that a nation exists to serve its citizens” (Trump, 2017, p. 8). He could have appealed to a broader audience, using different language such as “American people” or the more unifying “citizens of the world” as Obama did (Frank, 2011). While Trump does continue to connect to the nation, he does so by focusing on an America First ideology throughout the inaugural, and therefore, primarily U.S. citizens are crucial to putting America first.

Overall, Trump (2017) addressed each expectation of inaugural addresses differently. While Trump did have some unifying language, that language was laced with values of American exceptionalism and manifest destiny. While these shared values were clearly addressed, the acknowledgment of past administrations and references to the Christian religion were not as prevalent as past inaugurals. Trump did acknowledge a policy platform without ever addressing how the policy will be enacted, which is typical of an inaugural address (Beasley, 2001). Finally, Trump’s (2017) overall tone emphasized action instead of contemplation. Therefore, when looking at whether or not the inaugural as a whole deviated from Campbell and Jamieson’s (1985) tenets, there is strong enough evidence presented that while addressing some aspects of the tenets, Trump deviated from them much more than past inaugural addresses.

Within this rhetorical analysis chapter, I used each theoretical lens to explore Trump’s rhetorical choices in his inaugural address. I explored the ideographs used by

Trump to connect to his base, and how he created a political culture based in isolationism, division, and exclusion of certain people in the United States. Then, through the theory of dramatism from Burke (1945) and the use of pentadic criticism, I was able to establish Trump's rhetorical motive within the inaugural. Using the bully pulpit, I found that Trump used his position as president to connect rhetorically with his base, directly "going public" (Mervin, 1995) while blaming and scapegoating politicians for America's problems. Trump utilized the bully pulpit and its power to his advantage throughout the inaugural. Finally, in considering the rhetorical norms and expectations of the presidential inaugural, I was able to outline how Trump's language did at times deviate from the tenets established by Campbell and Jamieson (1985).

Overall, I found that Trump (2017) on the surface seemed to utilize the tools from past presidents, such as a connection with Christianity and outlining policy (Frank, 2011). Yet, there was a strong undertone of <MAGA> that transformed the inaugural to a rallying cry for Trump's base of supporters, so that the speech failed to unify the entirety of the American electorate, especially given the contentiousness of the 2016 presidential election. In the next chapter, I discuss the implications of this analysis through answering the research questions, as well as addressing limitations of this study and areas of future research.

CHAPTER FIVE: CONCLUSION AND DISCUSSION

IMPLICATIONS OF THE STUDY OF DONALD J. TRUMP’S INAUGURAL ADDRESS

“To a great degree, a presidency shapes the public character of a nation. A president should unite us and inspire us to follow our better angels” (Romney, 2019, p. 1). In this chapter, I answer each of my research questions. I then discuss the implications this study has for each theoretical framework I used in my analysis, specifically ideographic criticism, the pentad, the bully pulpit, and the genre of the presidential inaugural. Then, I provide a discussion of the broader implications of this study, address the limitations, and posit directions for future studies. Ultimately, this study aimed to unpack the rhetorical consequences of President Trump’s inaugural address and the rhetorical strategies he used to ultimately call his base of supporters to action.

Review of Research Questions

Before discussing the implications of the study, I briefly review and answer each of the research questions first introduced in Chapter One. The research questions begin with considering the rhetorical consequences of Trump’s rhetoric, through applying each theoretical lens to Trump’s inaugural address. Then, I answer how each theoretical lens affects Campbell and Jamieson’s (1985) tenets of the genre of the presidential inaugural. Thus, I use an inductive reasoning method to understand the specifics of the inaugural tactics through the three theoretical perspectives, and then consider the larger influence of this study on the genre of the presidential inaugural.

RQ1. The first research question was: how, if at all, does President Trump use ideographs in his inaugural to define and reinforce his audiences’ political culture(s)?

Ideographs were critical to understanding the political culture Trump created through his audience (Charland, 1987). To define the political culture of his audience, he used a campaign ideograph of <America First> to reinforce and connect back to the base that elected him to the presidency. Trump used the <Nationalism> ideograph to explain what his presidential policies would look like, as well as the ideology that they are grounded in. Then, Trump used the connecting ideograph of <Make America Great Again> (<MAGA>) to define the political culture that guides his base and supports them, while simultaneously outlining how he would fix the country for his base of supporters.

Understanding specific political cultures and how groups iterate their own specific culture is essential to ideographic criticism and the field of rhetoric (Condit & Lucaites, 1993). McGee (1980) outlined that ideographs are important to understanding a speaker or rhetor's audience, and how the speaker is trying to persuade a mass consciousness, or create a larger public identity (Charland, 1987). This is just what Trump did to define his base's political culture of <America First> while combining it with a <Nationalism> ideology. <MAGA> served as the connecting ideograph for his base of supporters and became the "solution" to the woes of a lack of American <Nationalism>. By understanding the ideographs that were used to establish Trump's audience and then how the language was portrayed within the inaugural I was able to conclude that clearly Trump deviated from the norms of the genre of the presidential inaugural. For example, Trump deviated from the established rhetorical strategy of unification.

RQ2. The next research question was: how, if at all, does President Trump use the different elements of the pentad to establish his motive(s)? The pentad was created by Burke (1945) to allow scholars to dissect a speech or rhetorical artifact to ultimately find

the motive behind the artifact. Burke (1945) defined motive as what moves the person to act in a certain way. The motive for Trump's inaugural address was to directly connect to his base. To ultimately establish the motive, it took analyzing each of the five components of the pentad, and then finding what ratio better established Trump's motive.

In each concept of the pentad there was an attempt to connect to Trump's base of supporters. Act is naming what took place in the piece of rhetoric (Burke, 1945). For the act Trump used to "Make America Great Again," and what <MAGA> means for Trump in the inaugural address. A scene should explain the background of the act and the situation in which it occurred (Burke, 1945). The scene in the inaugural address is the unique context surrounding the inaugural. For instance, the inaugural Twitter account, the women's march etc. The agent is the person or kind of person performed the act (Burke, 1945). Therefore, if the act is <MAGA> then the agent is "the people" which I found to be Trump's base. The agency addresses what means or instruments were used to create the rhetorical act (Burke, 1945). The agency of Trump's inaugural was himself, and the agents were his base of supporters from the campaign. Finally, purpose, is any phrase that refers to the function fulfilled by the rhetorical act (Burke, 1945). Then ultimately his purpose was to unify his base, through the rhetorical act of <MAGA>.

In fact, in analyzing the pentadic ratio of agency-scene, I found that Trump is the conduit for rhetorical action. He created a unique inaugural context, with the Twitter account, and the discrepancy of number of individuals in attendance, idealizing himself as more popular. Then as the agency, he showed the audience that he is a sort of savior for the American people, as it is only, he only that can <MAGA>. Then together through (agency-scene) he outlined the motive of the inaugural. Therefore, Trump's rhetorical

motive was to rally his supporters to justify the different policy moves he would eventually make in his presidential administration that were based on a <Nationalism> ideology.

RQ3. The third research question was: how, if at all, does President Trump use the bully pulpit within his inaugural address? It is important to remember the bully pulpit is a unique and imposing position that is only available to the president (Mervin, 1995). Thus, a rhetorically skilled presidential leader can use the bully pulpit to influence the public and create political capital (Edwards, 2003). To Trump's credit, even before the inaugural, he was utilizing components of the bully pulpit to gain trust and interest with his target audience (Lionberger, 2017). The position of the bully pulpit is key to Trump's inaugural rhetoric. In fact, a lot of what Trump said in the inaugural was not typical for presidential rhetoric; however, because of his position within the presidency, his rhetoric had consequences. He also utilized the bully pulpit to achieve the overall purpose to connect to his base and to <MAGA>.

Further, to answer how Trump used the bully pulpit, he used his position with the rhetorical presidency to begin to establish his policy plans for his upcoming administration. He framed this approach as anti-establishment, anti-government, and anti-foreign policy. By making Congress an enemy early on in his speech (Trump, 2017, p. 3) he established his approach to frame his future policies. He framed these "anti-" policies directly through the presidency instead of choosing to work with Congress. He even used these particular tactics currently by declaring a national emergency in order to build a border wall (Baker, 2019).

Finally, Trump has used Twitter as an element of the bully pulpit. This is original to him as president, as I have shown throughout this analysis, that Trump's use of Twitter is unlike any president before him. Tweets from Trump are now considered news (Ott, 2017). As president, he has continued to use Tweets to deploy his thoughts directly to the American people, instead of giving press conferences. Trump's use of Twitter in connection with the inaugural was also another unique way to access the bully pulpit.

RQ4. The final research question was, how, if at all, does President Trump's inaugural address deviate from Campbell and Jamieson's (1985) generic norms of presidential inaugural rhetoric? How Trump addressed each component from Campbell and Jamieson (1985) is critical to answering this research question. The first tenet is presidential inaugurals should unify the audiences from both the people who witness and ratify the ceremony (Campbell & Jamieson, 1985). While the inaugural language attempts to unify it is only successful at unifying the audience who was already behind Trump from his campaign on. This language is only reserved for citizens who believe in the America that aligns with manifest destiny and leaves out a large portion of the audience listening to the inaugural. The next tenet is rehearsed shared values from the past, this is usually in thanking past presidents and acknowledging the wisdom of past policies (Campbell & Jamieson, 1985). While Trump does thank past presidents, he also blamed past administrations for the current ills of American society (Trump, 2017, p. 3). Thus, this tenet is not fully addressed in the inaugural.

The third tenet is that inaugurals should lay out the political principles that will be present in the new administration (Campbell & Jamieson, 1985). Trump addressed this tenet when he outlined the need to build infrastructure and rebuild America. While

Trump does address his plans for policy, the specifics of how to do so fall short, but this is normal for an inaugural address (Beasley, 2001). Appreciation for the requirements and limitation of executive power is the fourth tenet. To enact this norm, a president should demonstrate a rhetorical ability to function as a leader, enact humility, and connect to shared American values (Beasley, 2001; Ericson, 1997). This tenet was glossed over. While slight appeals to humility existed (Trump, 2017, p. 10), Trump also blamed past administrations for the current state of the nation (Trump, 2017, p. 19). Urging contemplation rather than action is the final tenet, and it describes how the president rhetorically invokes the audience. While Trump does continue to connect to the nation, he does so by focusing on an <America First> ideology throughout the inaugural. He primarily focused his language to connect to the U.S. citizens that are a part of his base, which was critical component to establishing <America First>.

Components of the generic norms for the inaugural were addressed. Trump utilized inclusive language on the surface. For instance, “we the citizens” does seem to be an inclusive term; however, it refers to only United States citizens. In fact, Trump does not mention the election at all in the inaugural. The majority of the unification language centered around an <America First> ideology. He also deviated from utilizing Christian values in the speech.

Trump does not directly lay out policy procedures, yet, he does point to conceptions that were echoed from his campaign speeches. The policies he chose to address in the inaugural also connect with the <MAGA> concept. Trump used language connected to action throughout the inaugural; in fact, Trump even used the term action (Trump, 2017, p. 19). Therefore, Trump does deviate generally from the Campbell and

Jamieson's (1985) generic norms of presidential inaugural rhetoric. I now explain the implications of the study and the impact the study has on the various theoretical lenses, and the larger field of rhetoric and discipline of communication studies.

Implications for Rhetorical Theory and Communication Studies

This rhetorical analysis of Trump's inaugural address provided unique insights into the theoretical lenses utilized in the analysis. This research also aids continued significance of studying the presidential inaugural for the discipline of communication studies. I provide the major implications for each theoretical lens and why the study has significance for each theory. Further, I provide potential areas of study for each lens and how the study made an impact for those potential studies. Then, I finalize this section with the implication this scholarship provides to the greater community of rhetoric and communication studies.

Implications for ideographic criticism. The major implication I found for ideographic criticism is the power of language, and the true power of the president's words. Ideographs become powerful because of the language used surrounding that particular ideograph and the person and/or group cultivating that language (Condit & Lucaites, 1993). For instance, <Nationalism> is a term some may identify with, but before Trump, they would not overtly declare allegiance to a <Nationalism> ideology, out of fear of public shaming or the appearance of racism. Trump utilized <Nationalism> and the language surrounding the ideograph to build a political culture of his supporters around the ideology. The language itself can make a larger societal implication towards violence, as seen in Charlottesville (USA Today, 2017). Words have consequences, and Trump's framing of his inaugural through divisive language and ideographs have had

implications for not only further rhetorical or symbolic violence, but actual physical violence. In fact, according to an FBI report hate crimes are up 17 percent since Trump took office (Birnbaum, 2018).

Another implication of ideographic criticism is how powerful ideographs can be in connecting audiences (Condit & Lucaites, 1993). While ideographs could be seen as an older method of rhetorical analysis, since McGee created ideographic criticism in 1980, this study demonstrates that it is still a useful theoretical lens as it helps scholars understand the language that can connect and create a larger societal group or political culture (Condit & Lucaites, 1993). Ideographic criticism aided the analysis as it provided an understanding as to why Trump's supporters tend to support him and will support him no matter what he says. In fact, Trump's approval ratings among his supporters is still high, with 87 percent of Republicans approving of the president (Jones, 2019). Trump's use of powerful ideographs like those he expended in the inaugural makes it very difficult for those who may disagree with Trump to stop supporting him as their support connects with their own political party, culture and ideology. Utilizing ideographic criticism is also a great way for rhetorical scholars to understand a specific group's ideology (McGee, 1980). Therefore, the larger implication for rhetorical theory is the need for the continued understanding and use of ideographic criticism in more recent examples of rhetoric that connects with a political culture or group.

Implications for pentadic criticism and dramatism. There are many scholars in modern rhetoric that would claim using the pentad is simply "cookie cutter" criticism (Condit, 1992). In fact, some might find there are not modern findings to be made from Burke or the pentad (Condit, 1992). However, the pentad was essential to my analysis of

this rhetorical artifact because of its ability to understand how Trump constructed his speech and how each component and rhetorical choice was essential to understanding his underlying rhetorical motive.

One implication of this study is that rhetorical scholars might find value in returning to Burke's theories and methods given the recent turn to propaganda rhetoric and Trump's use of polarizing rhetoric. In fact, we have even seen a resurgence of using Burke to analyze Trump such as in Appel's (2018) criticism of Trump's rhetorical choices. This resurgence of using Burke's scholarship may come from the fact that Burke initially wrote against Hitler's propaganda (Burke, 1961). Utilizing Burke's theories in rhetorical studies might again be relevant as we consider Trump's rhetoric surrounding <Nationalism> and his declaration of a presidential national emergency to go around Congress to get funding for the policies he wants to put in place, such as the border wall (Baker, 2019).

Trump also connects with the American people in less conventional ways than previous presidents. Trump utilized Twitter in his campaigns, up to and including his presidential inaugural (Kreis, 2017), and currently uses Twitter to state his opinions about the state of politics as well as his political positions (Homans, 2018). We saw past President Obama, and presidential candidate Hillary Clinton using social media, but the tone was professional and formal (Kreis, 2017). In contrast, Trump seems to use the Twitter platform as a means to speak about his true opinions and does not pander to unification or typical presidential style (Ott, 2017). Since the inaugural, Trump has engaged in a constant state of campaigning and holding rallies (Homans, 2018). This constant state of campaigning is different from past presidents as they typically used

formal press conferences and statements made by White House staffers. Trump, more than any other previous president, has weakened the boundaries between the President and the people. As noted in chapter four, Trump himself is the agency in accomplishing the rhetorical act of <MAGA,> and this populist rhetorical appeal fits with Burke's (1961) scholarship critiquing this type of <Nationalism> ideology.

Overall, since Trump has reverted back to language and tactics of the past, especially considering his use of <Nationalism,> Burke's theories may provide insight into Trump's rhetorical choices. Trump as a rhetor has implications for the discipline of communication studies, as he is less conventional than past presidents, and the pentad provided insight into how to illuminate these differences.

Implications for the bully pulpit. Studying Trump's rhetoric has implications for future use of the bully pulpit as a theoretical lens (Edwards, 2003) to analyze his future speeches, especially because of his explicitness about being anti-government and anti-establishment. Trump is unequivocal about the role of the presidency when going around the other branches of government, giving more rhetorical power to the presidency through the bully pulpit. Within the inaugural, Trump used the bully pulpit to reference a campaign promise to "drain the swamp." While he referred to the "swamp" in the inaugural as Washington politicians, he still used his platform as president to address this issue (Trump, 2017, p. 3).

Further, Trump continued his inaugural promise of protecting the border (Trump, 2017, p. 15) by declaring a national emergency to fund a border wall. He has used his position within the bully pulpit to advance his own agenda, and I presume he will continue to do so. This unobstructed use of the bully pulpit extends the significance of

this theory and will be an important theoretical tool for the discipline of communication studies, and especially scholars who study the rhetorical presidency and presidential rhetoric, in order to understand this particular president's rhetorical style and choices.

This study is an important addition to the body of literature in rhetoric that uses the bully pulpit. The other rhetorical scholarship that looked at presidential inaugural addresses (Frank, 2011; Korzi, 2004; Birdsell, 1987; Gaonkar, 1990) did not utilize the bully pulpit. I found through my analysis that the theoretical lens of the bully pulpit provided a useful way to assess whether a president is able to connect with those that voted for him and then move to use his position as president effectively (Edwards, 2003). While this study is only one rhetorical analysis of Trump's inaugural address, this study contributes to the significance of analyzing presidential inaugural addresses through the lens of the bully pulpit.

Implications for tenets of the inaugural. Campbell and Jamieson's (1985) generic expectations for analyzing the presidential inaugural are a well-respected way of looking at the standard tenets or norms of presidential inaugural addresses over time (Beasley, 2001). Their previous scholarship allowed me to compare Trump's inaugural address to these standards and make conclusions about how he deviated from the standards established by other presidents without having to do a textual analysis of all of the previous individual presidential inaugural addresses. Therefore, the rhetorical analysis of this inaugural offers a few possible changes to the tenets established by Campbell and Jamieson (1985). Importantly, this study adds to the body of literature in rhetoric that utilizes the tenets to assess the effectiveness of a given presidential inaugural, such as Beasley (2001).

I also found the potential for the tenets to be reevaluated. While Campbell and Jamieson (1985) are the seminal scholars when it comes to the genre of the presidential inaugural, they still theorized this work in 1985. While Campbell and Jamieson (2008) reevaluated their work on the rhetorical presidency recently the inaugural tenets did not change. Building on President Obama's use of social media, Trump has changed the way that the presidency incorporates social media (Ott & Dickinson, 2019). As previously noted in Chapter Two, Trump's inaugural had its own Twitter account; this is another potential implication for the way the language use and rhetorical style of the presidential inaugural has changed with Trump. Rhetorical scholars such as Ott and Dickinson (2019) have already used the rhetorical presidency and rhetorical style to better understand the impact of a president's use of Twitter on public communication. I see this trend continuing, especially with this president and his way of communicating to the public. It may be time to revisit Campbell and Jamieson's (1985) tenets and add or revise the theory to adapt to the changing rhetorical impact of the presidential inaugural of today.

A way to revise the theory of the generic norms of the inaugural could be to rethink the tenets, specifically unification. This analysis showed the limitations of unification in the inaugural. Trump focused on other rhetorical strategies both in the inaugural and in more recent speeches like Helsinki 2018 (The White House, 2018). Given Trump's constant state of campaigning (Homans, 2018) and the continued polarization from both political parties, and the ever-surfacing echo chambers unification could be seen as rhetoric of the past (Waterman, Silva & Smith, 2014). Further, unification may now be only a surface level component of the presidential inaugural and it may no longer be a norm of the address.

Implications for communication studies. In the discipline of communication studies, Trump has become a popular subject of study (Appel, 2018; Edwards 2018; Ott & Dickinson, 2019). Trump continues to be an important and unique figure to study, especially as a rhetor. Presidential rhetoric has been an integral part of the history of rhetorical studies (Campbell & Jamieson, 1990; Beasley, 2001). Thus, Trump as a presidential rhetor is especially important to study. Indeed, because of his uniqueness as a presidential candidate, and now as president, scholars of communication studies should continue to analyze his rhetoric and the consequences of that rhetoric.

The study of the rhetorical presidency within the discipline of communication studies is also still important (Stuckey, 2010). The idea that the rhetorical presidency intersects with the rhetoric of public policy may not be a brand-new idea, but it is still an important one (Asen, 2010). In fact, the study of the rhetorical presidency has led to contributions to scholarship in political science, has added to scholarship about debates on war and poverty, and has sparked interest in areas of theory and criticism in communication studies (Asen, 2010). Thus, the research that has come from this study has the potential to provide insight into a variety of scholarly interest areas in communication studies and beyond.

Implications for Politics and the Inaugural Address

Understanding the implications of this study for politics and the inaugural address is important in applying the findings to broader public discourse, politics, and the presidency. In this section, I explore how Trump's rhetoric has implications for future politicians' use of social media, for how politics and public discourse might potentially shift, and for the future of the presidential inaugural address.

Implications for social media and politics. Twitter is now a large portion of connecting to the people in politics (Ott, 2017; Ott & Dickinson, 2019). The use of Twitter in the election and in the inaugural was a key way Trump was able to speak directly to his base (Edwards, 2018). In fact, presidents utilizing influence outside of the executive branch is key to the bully pulpit (Edwards, 2003). As discussed throughout the previous chapters, Twitter was an essential component to Trump's political success (Ott, 2017). He used Twitter as a main mode of communication with the people and to have greater influence over his target audience (Kreis, 2017). While President Obama did use social media, Trump used it uniquely, to directly speak what is on his mind, regardless of the potential political implications. Social media, such as Twitter and Instagram, have already made an impact on politicians using social media. Current politicians, like Alexandria Ocasio Cortez, Elizabeth Warren, and others, have incorporated Twitter and social media through trying to speak directly to their constituents. Also, many 2020 Democratic candidates have announced their candidacies through social media.

Importantly, Trump's use of Twitter as president does have limitations (Ott & Dickinson, 2019). One limitation includes the frustrations of White House staffers. Historically, the White House has had an official stance or policy, and then Trump has tweeted out something completely different. This disconnect has made the White House have to catch up, navigate, and then explain that difference to the public. Trump's use of social media thus has implications for institutions like the White House and how an administration's staff incorporates communications strategies, given Trump's penchant for Twitter. Only time will tell if Trump is simply a unique presidential rhetor or has set a

new precedent for the rhetorical presidency and communicating with the public directly through social media as the bully pulpit.

Since Trump outlined the need for American isolationism in the inaugural address there then becomes an implication to how foreign entities react to those proposed policies. By outlining and positioning his policies toward isolationism this sets up the potential policies of the administration (Campbell & Jamieson, 1985). There then becomes a potential that foreign powers such as Russia and China could take advantage of America taking an isolated foreign policy stance.

Implications for the inaugural address. Trump deviated from the primary purpose of the presidential inaugural, which is to unify citizens, to connect to the all of the American people, and to outline policy (Ericson, 1997). Trump utilized the inaugural to extend his campaign promises of protectionism, isolationism, and anti-establishment policies, to connect back to his base of supporters. I have outlined throughout the rhetorical analysis in chapter four that Trump's language, and connection to his base, was a unique way to utilize the inaugural and can have implications for future inaugural addresses. While future presidents may return to the original purpose of the inaugural, which is to help the country heal (Campbell & Jamieson, 1985), these future presidents and presidential speech writers must now consider Trump's speech, which deviated from the historical and previously established purpose of the inaugural.

While it is probably too early to tell if Trump's inaugural is a new shift in the presidential inaugural, with the newly formed importance of social media in politics and the increasing polarization of the U.S. electorate, this deviation from unification may become a new political shift in presidential inaugurals in the future. This shift of focusing

on social media and polarization in American politics is something for all to watch moving forward, especially with different presidents, and for those studying the rhetorical presidency. However, it is critical to understand this shift might just be a strategy that is unique to Trump as a rhetor. For instance, one component of Trump's uniqueness is his continued rallies while assuming the office as president (Homans, 2018). Even during the 2018 midterm elections, when technically campaigning for other Republicans, Trump used the opportunity to discuss his own successes as president (Homans, 2018). This is again a shift away from the rhetorical norms assumed by presidents and how to operate while holding that position, and only time will tell if Trump's rhetorical strategies will shift the future of public discourse and politics.

One implication from this study is that we could see a potential shift in how the inaugural becomes yet another campaign speech, rather than a unification speech as it has always been in the past (Campbell & Jamieson, 1985). Again, one president deviating from the norm is not a change, but an outlier, and thus it will be important to watch and consider how future presidents treat the inaugural. I now address the limitations of the study.

Limitations

This study's purpose was to conduct a rhetorical analysis of President Trump's (2017) inaugural address. The first limitation I found is that I was comparing the single inaugural speech text to Campbell and Jamieson's (1985) established tenets for a successful presidential inaugural, as derived from their previous generic criticism of all presidential inaugurals over time. However, it is important to note I chose this method of analysis because Campbell and Jamieson's (1985; 1990) scholarship already did a lot of

the comparative work with previous presidents. Due to the large scope of already looking to analyze the rhetorical artifact through three theoretical lenses as they compare to the inaugural tenets provided by Campbell and Jamieson (1985), I made the choice to focus on the single rhetorical artifact of Trump's inaugural address.

The text that was chosen for the study is Trump's (2017) inaugural address. Previous scholars have studied presidential inaugural texts as a single rhetorical artifact. These included analyses of presidential inaugurals of Ronald Reagan, George W. Bush, and Barack Obama (Kohen, 2008; Kaylor, 2011; Frank, 2011). Choosing one text is critical because I addressed the historical context (Chapter Two) for studying the text as part of this larger, recurring rhetorical situation (Bitzer, 1968).

There is also a limitation of the chosen lens of the study. Within a rhetorical analysis, the researcher is unable to make claims of effect, which would further allow a reader or the audience to understand why this study was important. The rhetorical methodology, while important and valuable, is unable to gage the opinions and perspectives of the population like a quantitative study could. Using another methodology that would allow the ability to measure for perspectives and opinions, could prove of immense value. However, the chosen lens that I engaged with was an appropriate fit for the rhetorical artifact chosen.

This study is also limited by the amount of time Trump has been in office. I made claims in my analysis about Trump's rhetorical style and his ability to modernize the inaugural, in comparison to the established scholarship on the presidential inaugural (Beasley, 2001; Campbell & Jamieson, 1985; Frank, 2011; Vigil, 2013). These claims could potentially shift as he continues his presidency, and if re-elected in 2020, he could

also potentially make another address to unite the American people after that 2020 election. Further, more current speeches like Trump's 2019 state of the union included more appeals to unification (CNN, 2019). However, because of Trump's past ethos focused on division and polarization detracts from his more current rhetoric to truly unify. My study offered implications in this chapter for Trump's future rhetoric and for the rhetoric of future presidents, but I am constrained by time and context of analyzing Trump's inaugural after the 2016 presidential election.

Finally, there is a potential that there will be an over-saturation of rhetorical scholarship about President Trump. Currently, within special issues such as *Communication Quarterly*, many articles focus on Trump (Appel, 2018; Edwards, 2018; Smith, 2018). If an influx of communication scholarship chooses to analyze Trump, this would make my study less novel. However, I argue that nevertheless, this study is an important contribution to the communication studies discipline, since this study used three theoretical lenses to analyze his inaugural address. I also argue that this study will also be important to communication studies because I provide a further understanding to the connections among ideographic criticism (McGee, 1980), pentadic criticism (Burke, 1985), and the bully pulpit (Edwards, 2003), in considering the rhetorical presidency and the consequences of Trump's rhetoric. I now address suggestions for future research studies, based on the rhetorical analysis and implications of this study.

Suggestions for Future Research

While I previously described the limitation of the potential oversaturation of using Trump as a subject to study in rhetoric, he does have a rich body of speeches that could be studied. Trump's speeches continue to make headlines, such as his recent State

of the Union address in 2019 (CNN, 2019), and his address in Helsinki in 2018 (The White House, 2018), among others. Trump also is a unique subject to study, based on his deviation of from traditional presidential rhetoric that unifies the country, and through his use of Twitter (Edwards, 2018; Ott, 2017). Trump is also an interesting politician that intrigues scholars, given the already numerous studies that have continued to come out since his emergence as a presidential candidate in 2015, such as Asen (2018) and Appel (2018).

Since Trump is still in office, more scholarship can utilize this analysis or the theoretical tenets I chose in this study in order to analyze other speeches given by Trump. A scholar could also look specifically at the most influential inaugural addresses by previous presidents, such as Lincoln, FDR, or Obama, and compare them directly to Trump's (2017) inaugural. Another potential study would be to utilize this rhetorical analysis to then focus more on the impact *after* the inaugural. The scholarship could analyze if Trump had influence to successfully called his base to action, ultimately to find if they participated in the change of <MAGA> that he urged them to take on in the inaugural. Studies ultimately could focus on Trump's uniqueness as a rhetor and his impact on the American political climate, especially in considering the precedent of his rhetoric for future presidents and for U.S. political discourse more broadly.

Summary

In rhetorical scholarship, presidential rhetoric, the rhetorical presidency (Stuckey, 2010), and the presidential inaugural address are historically significant areas of analysis (Campbell & Jamieson, 1990). The use of anti-establishment rhetoric that Trump has continued to use in his speeches creates an even larger cultural significance for the study

of his presidential inaugural (Terrill, 2017; Edwards, 2018). Trump's tweets, unique politics, and individualized rhetorical style make him a great candidate and rhetor to study (Kreis, 2017; Ott, 2017). Social media is not new to the presidency; however, Trump took social media use a step beyond past presidents (Ott, 2017). Trump also propelled the national conversation about the news media with his consistent use of Twitter and social media to call media companies “fake news” (Rhea, 2018). Ultimately, I confirmed through the analysis that Trump provided a unique style of rhetoric to study, especially when comparing him to the rhetorical choices of aforementioned presidential inaugurals through the tenets provided by Campbell and Jamieson (1985).

Understanding and analyzing Trump's inaugural address through a rhetorical analysis is a sound academic contribution to the discipline of communication studies. The distinct nature of Trump as president aided the study of his inaugural address and provided an opportunity to analyze his speech as compared to the established rhetorical tenets about the genre of the presidential inaugural address (Campbell and Jamieson, 1985). This analysis has implications for Trump as a presidential rhetor and will contribute to the scholarship focused on presidential inaugural addresses in communication studies, as well as scholarship about the rhetorical presidency and rhetoric of public policy. However, only time will tell if Trump's approach to the inaugural address is unique only to him. Further, especially as the inaugural genre continues to change, as social media and the polarization of the U.S. electorate become an established part of the context surrounding public discourse and the presidency.

References

- ABC News Australia. (2017, January 22). President Donald Trump's inauguration actually didn't have the biggest audience ever. *ABC News Australia*. Retrieved from <http://www.abc.net.au/news/just-how-big-was-donald-trumps-inauguration-crowd/8201382>
- Anderson, D. (2018). Common sense 2.0. *Society*, 55(1), 3-10. doi:10.1007/s12115-017-0204-z
- Appel, E. (2018). Burlesque, tragedy, and a (potentially) “yuuuge” “breaking of a frame”: Donald Trump’s rhetoric as “early warning”? *Communication Quarterly*, 66(2), 157-175. doi:10.1080/01463373.2018.1439515
- Asen, R. (2010). Introduction: Rhetoric and public policy. *Rhetoric & Public Affairs*, 13(1), 1-5. doi:10.1353/rap.0.0128
- Baker, P. (2019, February 15). Trump declares a national emergency, and provokes a constitutional clash. *The Hill*. Retrieved from <https://thehill.com/policy/national-security/416418-hate-crimes-up-for-third-year-in-a-row>
- Barrington, W. (1997). "Nation" and "nationalism:" The misuse of key concepts in political science. *Political Science and Politics*. 30(4), 712-716. doi:10.2307/420397
- Beasley, V. (2001). The rhetoric of ideological consensus in the United States: American principles and American prose in presidential inaugurals. *Communication Monographs*, 68(2), 169-183. doi:10.1080/03637750128055

- Birdsell, D. S. (1987). Ronald Reagan on Lebanon and Grenada: Flexibility and interpretation in the application of Kenneth Burke's pentad. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 73(3), 267-279. doi:10.1080/00335638709383808
- Bitzer, L. F. (1968). The rhetorical situation. *Philosophy & Rhetoric*, 1(1), 1-14.
- Bizzell, P., & Herzberg, B. (2001). Kenneth Burke introduction. In P. Bizzell & B. Herzberg (2nd Ed.), *The rhetorical tradition: Readings from classical times to the present* (pp. 1295-1297). Boston: Bedford/St. Martins.
- Burke, K. (1945). *A grammar of motives*. New York, NY: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Burke, K. (1961). *The rhetoric of religion: Studies in logology*. Los Angeles, CA: University of California Press.
- Burke, K. (1978). Questions and answers about the pentad. *College Composition and Communication*, 29(4), 330-335. doi:10.2307/357013
- Burke, K. (1985). Dramatism and logology. *Communication Quarterly*, 33(2), 89-93. doi:10.1080/01463378509369584
- Campbell, K. K., & Jamieson, K. H. (1985). Inaugurating the presidency. *Presidential Studies Quarterly*, 15(2), 394-411. doi:10.1080/10417948609372667
- Campbell, K. K., & Jamieson, K. H. (1990). *Deeds done in words: Presidential rhetoric and the genres of governance*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Charland, M. (1987). Constitutive rhetoric: The case of the *peuple québécois*. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 73(2), 133-150. doi:10.1080/00335638709383799
- Condit, C. M. (1992) Post-Burke: Transcending the sub-stance of dramatism. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 78(3), 349-355. doi:10.1080/00335639209384002
- Condit, C. M., & Lucaites, J. L. (1993). Crafting equality: America's Anglo-African word.

The Journal of American History, 32(3), 364.

doi:10.7208/chicago/9780226922485.001.0001

Drury, S. A., & Kuehl, R. A. (2018). Introduction to the special issue on the rhetoric of the 2016 U.S. election. *Communication Quarterly*, 66(2), 111-116.

doi:10.1080/01463373.2018.1441161

Editors, USA TODAY (2017, August 13). *Deadly car attack, violent clashes in*

Charlottesville: What we know now. Retrieved from

<https://www.usatoday.com/story/news/nation/2017/08/13/charlottesville-protests-what-we-know-now/562911001/>

Edwards III, C. (2003). *On deaf ears: The limits of the bully pulpit*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Edwards, J. A. (2018). Make America great again: Donald Trump and redefining the U.S. role in the world. *Communication Quarterly*, 66(2), 176-195.

doi:10.1080/01463373.2018.1438485

Ericson, D. F. (1997). Presidential inaugural addresses and American political culture. *Presidential Studies Quarterly*, 27(4), 727-732. Retrieved from

<http://www.jstor.org/stable/27551797>

Foss, K. (1989). *Rhetorical criticism*. Chicago, IL: Waveland Press Inc.

Frank, D. A. (2011). Obama's rhetorical signature: Cosmopolitan civil religion in the presidential inaugural address, January 20, 2009. *Rhetoric & Public*

Affairs, 14(4), 605-630. doi:10.1353/rap.2011.0044

- Gaonkar, P. D. (1990). Object and method in rhetorical criticism: From Wichelns to Leff and McGee. *Western Journal of Speech Communication*, 54, 290-316. doi: 10.1080/10570319009374344
- Gelderman, C. W. (1997). *All the president's words: The bully pulpit and the creation of the virtual presidency*. New York: Walker.
- Gess, A. D. (1999). *Ideographic criticism: A study in rhetorical-critical approach* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Regent University. Retrieved from https://books.google.com/books/about/Ideographic_Criticism.html?id=Vb8GtwAACA AJ
- Hall, K., Goldstein, D. M., & Ingram, M. B. (2016). The hands of Donald Trump. *HAU: Journal of Ethnographic Theory*, 6(2), 71-100. doi:10.14318/hau6.2.009
- Hamlin, W. J., & Nichols, H. J. (1973). The interest value of rhetorical strategies derived from Kenneth Burke's pentad. *Western Speech*, 37(2), 97-102. doi:10.1080/10570317309373776
- Holloway, C. (2016, February 26). Why Trump persists. *Public Discourse*. Retrieved from <http://www.thepublicdiscourse.com/>
- Homans, C. (2018, April 9). The post-campaign campaign of Donald Trump. *New York Times*. Retrieved from <https://www.nytimes.com/2018/04/09/magazine/donald-trump-rallies-campaigning-president.html>
- Houck, D. W. (2002). *FDR and fear itself: The first inaugural address*. College Station: Texas A & M University Press, College Station.
- Jamieson, K., & Cappella, J. (2008). *Echo chamber: Rush Limbaugh and the conservative media establishment*. Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press.

Jones, J. (2019, January 16). Trump job approval sets new record for polarization.

Gallup. Retrieved from <https://news.gallup.com/poll/245996/trump-job-approval-sets-new-record-polarization.aspx>

Kaylor, B. T. (2011). No Jack Kennedy: Mitt Romney's "Faith in America" speech and the changing religious-political environment. *Communication Studies*, 62(5), 491-507. doi:10.1080/10510974.2011.581734

Keith, T. (2017, December 20). From 'covfefe' to slamming CNN: Trump's year in tweets. *National Public Radio*. Retrieved from <https://www.npr.org/2017/12/20/571617079/a-year-of-the-trump-presidency-in-tweets#kim>

Klein, B. (2017, January 21). Comparing Donald Trump and Barack Obama's inaugural crowd sizes. *CNN*. Retrieved from <https://www.cnn.com/politics/donald-trump-barack-obama-inauguration-crowd-size/index.html>

Kohen, V. (2008, November). *Ethical responsibility?: Appeals to scene, agency, and agent as the denial of ethical choice in Bush's embryonic stem cell addresses*. Paper presented at the National Communication Association Conference.

Korzi, M. J. (2004). The President and the public: Inaugural addresses in American history. *Congress & the Presidency*, 31(1), 21-52. doi:10.1080/07343460409507709

Kreis, R. (2017). The "Tweet politics" of President Trump. *Journal of Language and Politics*, 16(4), 607-618. doi:10.1075/jlp.17032.kre

Kuehl, R. A. (2010). Oprah and Obama: Theorizing celebrity endorsement in U.S. politics. In H.E. Harris, K. R. Moffitt, & C. R. Squires, (Eds.) *The Obama effect:*

Multidisciplinary renderings of the 2008 campaign (pp. 175-189). Albany, N.Y.: SUNY Press.

- Kuehl, R. A. (2012). The rhetorical presidency and “accountability” in education reform: Comparing the presidential rhetoric of Ronald Reagan and George W. Bush. *Southern Communication Journal*, 77(4), 329-348.
doi:10.1080/1041794X.2012.678926.
- Lee, R. (2005). Ideographic criticism. In J. A. Kuypers (Ed.), *The art of rhetorical criticism* (pp. 305-344). Boston, MA: Pearson Publishing, Inc.
- Leff, C. M. (1986). Textual criticism: The legacy of G. P. Mohrmann. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 72, 384. doi: 10.1080/00335638609383783
- Lim, E. T. (2003). The lion and the lamb: De-mythologizing Franklin Roosevelt’s fireside chats. *Rhetoric & Public Affairs*, 6(3), 437-464.
doi:10.1353/rap.2003.0066
- Lionberger, E. (2017). The Syrian refugee crisis: A rhetorical analysis of President Barack Obama, Hillary Clinton, and President Donald J. Trump’s political discourse about Syrian refugees (Master’s thesis). Retrieved from Open Prairie at South Dakota State University. 1179. <http://openprairie.sdstate.edu/etd/1179>
- McGee, M. C. (1980). The “ideograph”: A link between rhetoric and ideology. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 66(1), 1-16. doi:10.1080/00335638009383499
- Medhurst, M. J. (1996). *Beyond the rhetorical presidency*. College Station, TX: Texas A&M University Press.

Mervin, D. (1995). The bully pulpit, II. *Presidential Studies Quarterly*, 25(1), 19–23.

Retrieved from

<https://search.proquest.com/docview/215687620?accountid=28594>

Montgomery, M. (2017). Post-truth politics? Right-wing populism in Europe & USA.

Journal of Language and Politics, 16(4), 619-639. doi:10.1075/jlp.17023.mon

Musolff, A. (2004). *Metaphor and political discourse: Analogical reasoning in debates about Europe*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Mutz, D. C., & Stuckey, M. E. (1992). The President as interpreter-in-chief. *Political Science Quarterly*, 107(3), 562. doi:10.2307/2152463

Olson, J. S., & Mendoza, A. O. (2015). *American economic history: A dictionary and chronology*. Santa Barbara, California: Greenwood.

Oprysko, C. (2018, September 16). Schiff to special counsel targets: 'Anyone who gets indicted by Bob Mueller goes down'. *Politico.com*. Retrieved from <https://www.politico.com/news/trump-russia-scandal>

Ott, B. L. (2017). The age of Twitter: Donald J. Trump and the politics of debasement. *Critical Studies in Media Communication*, 34(1), 59–68. doi:10.1080/15295036.2016.1266686

Ott, B. L., & Dickinson, G. (2019). *The Twitter presidency: Donald Trump and the politics of white rage*. New York, NY: Taylor and Francis Group.

Qui, L. (2017, January 21). Donald Trump had biggest inaugural crowd ever? Metrics don't show it. *PolitiFact*. Retrieved from <http://www.politifact.com/truth-o-meter/statements/2017/jan/21/sean-spicer/trump-had-biggest-inaugural-crowd-ever-metrics-don/>

- Rhea, D. (2018). *Defining fake news according to President Trump*. Paper session presented at Central States Communication Association, Milwaukee, Wisconsin.
- Roberts, P. C. (2015). Donald Trump: An evaluation. *Foreign Policy Journal*. Retrieved from <http://www.foreignpolicyjournal.com/2015/12/26/donald-trump-an-evaluation/>
- Romney, M. (2019, January 1). The president shapes the public character of the nation. Trump's character falls short. *Washington Post*. Retrieved from <https://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/mitt-romney-the-president-shapes-the-public-character-of-the-nation-trumps-character-falls-short/2019/01/01/37a3c8c2-0d1a-11e9-8938>
- Shaw, K. (2017). Beyond the bully pulpit: Presidential speech in the courts. *Texas Law Review*, 96(71), 72-140. doi:10.1022/4044114
- Sigelman, L. (1996). Presidential inaugurals: The modernization of a genre. *Political Communication*, 13(1), 81-92. doi:10.1080/10584609.1996.9963096
- Smith, J. (2018). From the "Ayotte evasion" to rejecting Trump: Senator Kelly Ayotte's post-crisis discourse of renewal. *Communication Quarterly*, 66(2), 117-137. doi: 10.1080/01463373.2018.1438487
- Sousa, A., & Ivanova, A. (2012). Constructing digital rhetorical spaces in Twitter: A case study of @BarackObama. *Topics in Linguistics*, 9(1), 46-55. doi:1088/1044122
- Stein, P., Hendrix, S., & Hauslohner, A. (2017, January 22). Women's marches: More than one million protesters vow to resist President Trump. *Washington Post*. Retrieved from <http://www.washingtonpost.com/local/womens-march-on-washington-a-sea-of-pink-hatted-protesters-vow-to-resist-donald-trump/>

- Stuckey, M. E. (2010). Rethinking the rhetorical presidency and presidential rhetoric. *Review of Communication*, 10(1), 38-52.
doi:10.1080/15358590903248744
- Stuckey, M., & Ritter, J. (2007). George Bush, <human rights>, and American democracy. *Presidential Studies Quarterly*, 37, 646-666. doi:10.1111/j.1741-5705.2007.02618.x
- Taylor, P. (2016). The demographic trends shaping American politics in 2016 and beyond. *Pew Research Center*. Retrieved from <http://www.pewresearch.org/search/?query=inaugural%20address>
- Terrill, T. (2017). The post-racial and post-ethical discourse of Donald J. Trump. *Rhetoric and Public Affairs*, 20(3), 493.
doi:10.14321/rhetpublaffa.20.3.0493
- The White House. (2017, January 20). *The inauguration of the 45th President of the United States* [Video File]. Retrieved from <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=4GNWldTc8VU>
- The White House. (2018, July 16). Remarks by President Trump and President Putin of the Russian Federation in joint press conference. Retrieved from <https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefings-statements/remarks-president-trump-president-putin-russian-federation-joint-press-conference/>
- Trump, D. J. (2017, January 20). The inaugural address. *The White House*. Retrieved from <https://www.whitehouse.gov/inaugural-address>
- Trump Inaugural Twitter. (2017, January 22). @TrumpInaugural [Twitter Account]. Retrieved from <https://twitter.com/trumpinaugural?lang=en>

Tulis, J. (1987). *The rhetorical presidency*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Twitter. (2018). *About Twitter*. Retrieved from <https://about.twitter.com>

Vigil, T. R. (2013). George W. Bush's first three inaugural addresses: Testing the utility of the inaugural genre. *Southern Communication Journal*, 78(5), 427-446.
doi:10.1080/1041794X.2013.847479

Weprin, A. (2017 January 23). Was Trump's inauguration the most streamed of all time? *Politico*. Retrieved from [https://www.politico.com/blogs/on-media/2017/01/trump-inauguration-streaming-audience-234056\](https://www.politico.com/blogs/on-media/2017/01/trump-inauguration-streaming-audience-234056)

Whitten Woodring, J. (2012). Fourth estate or mouthpiece? A formal model of media, protest, and government repression. *Political Communication*, 29(2), 113-136.
doi:10.1080/10584609.2012.671282

Zarefsky, D. (2004). Presidential rhetoric and the power of definition. *Presidential Studies Quarterly*, 34(3), 607-619. doi:10.1111/j.1741-5705.2004.00214.x