PRESUPPOSITION AND CAMPAIGN RHETORIC: A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF TRUMP AND HILLARY'S FIRST CAMPAIGN SPEECH

ADE WINDIANA ARGINA

Indonesia Endowment Fund for Education, Indonesia University of Education, Bandung, Indonesia

ABSTRACT

Considering the language phenomenon and its power in political discourse, this article sought to discover the use of presupposition triggers and its use to construct campaign rhetoric of the first campaign speech delivered by Trump and Hillary (2015) for the US presidential election 2016. Through descriptive qualitative, this study using theory of presupposition triggers proposed by Levinson (1983) and Yule (2010) discovered non-significant difference of frequency of presupposition use by Trump and Hillary; however, significant gap was found in several types of presupposition triggers (i.e. Factive, Pronoun, Temporal Clause, Comparison and Contrast, and Question). Moreover, Implicative and Non-factive were only found in Hillary's speech, not in Trump's speech. This study also employed Critical Discourse Analysis to discover the message of utterances containing presupposition triggers and categorized them based on the components of rhetoric campaign proposed by Medhurst (2005). This analysis found that both campaign speeches delivered by Trump and Hillary met all components (i.e. Agenda-setting, Framing, Character Construction, and Emotional Resonance) by the use of presupposition.

KEYWORDS: *Presupposition, Campaign Rhetoric, US Election, Gender and Presupposition*

Received: Mar 13, 2018; **Accepted:** Apr 03, 2018; **Published:** Apr 21, 2018; **Paper Id.:** IJELJUN20181

INTRODUCTION

The presidential campaign speech is a specific type of political discourse delivered to attract voters' attention, to gain and raise support or vote from voters. Simply, political campaign speech requires persuasive strategy by employing pragmatic approach. A persuasive strategy is done by utilizing certain elements and technique to mobilize emotions of the addressee in order to reach their agreement and to change their behavior Nobrega (2014). As stated by Liang and Liu (2016), the presidential campaign is done to gain the support of voters by using various linguistic devices and emotional incitement and one of those linguistic devices is a presupposition.

Besides the notion of persuasive strategy, campaign speech is an important part of the presidential election that will highly influence the success of the candidates. Each candidate has his or her own foci and themes embedded in their campaign speech and packaged in campaign rhetoric. One of the linguistic devices used to construct technical rhetoric is presupposition (Larry S., et.al, 1974, Asher, N. and Lasradides, A., 1998; Horn and Ward (2004).). There are four fundamental components of campaign rhetoric that are highly demanded in the presidential campaign (Medhurst, 2005 in Gunawan 2017) namely: 1) agenda-setting; 2) framing; 3) character construction and 4) emotional resonance. Hence, based upon these theories, the components of campaign rhetoric can be framed by the use of presupposition i.e. presupposition triggers.

Attractively, as reported by Freed and Greenwood (1996, in Wouk Fay, 1999), the differences between male and female in the use of pragmatic devices were minimal when the two sexes were engaged in similar activities. Different pattern of language use is found across professional contexts (Yu, 2013). Bogoch in 1997 pointed that woman in the workforce, specifically whose traditionally male-dominated profession (e.g. politician, physicians, managers, and so on) have been expected to conform to the male norms of professional behavior including language behavior (in Yu, 2013). Koppel et.al (2003) examined the language used by men and women by using ten language style features in which six of them belong to presupposition triggers. Thus, it can be assumed that presupposition triggers can be used differently by male and female.

By these considerations, this study analyzed presupposition as a device of a rhetorical strategy employed by American presidential candidates, Trump and Hillary in their campaign speech to achieve their political intentions and goals. This study examines: 1) the differences of presupposition triggers used by Hillary and Trump (percentage and types) and 2) how presuppositions are used as a tool of rhetorical strategy.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Presupposition

The term of presupposition was firstly introduced by Frege in 1892 as a part of philosophy study. By the time goes, this notion has been reintroduced by philosophers and linguists in the more specific perspective, that is a philosophy of language. In this field of study, there is the critical debate on the nature of reference and singular referring expression (Frege, 1092; Russell 1905; & Strawson 1950; in Huang, 2007). Moreover, in the circle of linguistic, presupposition has dragged attractive debate on what branch of linguistic study it is supposed to be. Some scholars claim that it should be studied in the field of semantic, while some others claim it as a part of a pragmatic study. As a result, there are various definitions proposed by experts.

Levinson (1983) defines that presupposition is the pragmatic inference that is more closely on the actual linguistic structure of a sentence. It is believed that as the preference, presupposition has fundamental roles in delivering utterances implicitly. As stated by Huang (2007), it basically functions as precondition or presumption (a background assumption) of some types of the appropriate use of the sentence. In accordance with Yule (2010) defines presupposition as something speaker assumes to be the case prior to making an utterance; therefore that is a speaker who has the presupposition. El-Nashar (2015) states that presupposition has widely been used as a tool to examine manipulation by presenting certain beliefs as true and questionable and presuming shared background knowledge that does not require explicitly asserted or justified. It is also believed that presupposition can be used as a linguistic tool to mold the addressee's ideology. Nobrega (2014) claims presupposition as a vital linguistic tool to strengthen the power relationship between addresser and addressee.

By this definition, it is considered that presupposition can function as a linguistic tool to arise and attract the interest and attention from audiences, to mobilize emotion and change the belief of audiences and to persuade people to be what the speaker intends the addressees to do. Simply, its function seems to mark the new information as old, background information which the listener could reasonably be expected to recognize or agree with.

Presupposition Triggers

There are presupposition triggers that will be used as the framework for this study based on by Levinson (1983) and Yule (2010). These triggers were categorized into two level by Li (2010) and Du (2012) which are presented in the table below (adapted from Liang & Liu, 2016):

Table 1: Categorisation of Presupposition Triggers

Presupposition Triggers	Types of Presupposition Triggers	Examples
Lexical Level	Factive Verbs	Know, realize, regret, be glad that...
	Implicative Verbs	Manage, forget, avoid...
	Iterative Verbs	Restore, return, come back...
	Change-of-state Verbs	Stop, begin, continue...
	Verbs of Judging	Praise, accuse, criticize...
	Non-Factive	Imagine, dream, pretend, ...
	Restrictive Expression Pronouns	His, her, our, their
	Other Restrictive expressions	Another, only.....
	Iterative Particles	Again, too, either...
	Other Particles	Even, still, just, enough..
Syntactical Level	Temporal Clauses	After, during, whenever, when, as...
	Comparison & Contrast	More than, as much as, comparative construction,
	Counter-factual Conditionals	Conditions contrary to facts
	Non-restrictive relative clauses	Who, which, when, where...
	Questions	Yes/no question, rhetorical questions, wh-questions

Political Discourse

As stated by Angermuller (2007), discourse is a concept of interaction emerging in a social situation. In the campaign speech, specifically presidential election, all candidates make use the interaction during the campaign speech by utilizing and optimizing language to express their ideas, to grab people attention, to persuade an audience and even to do the manipulation. Language is a device used to combine and manipulate ideas, thought, and relationship in order to show the power and to do control. As a consequence, politicians need a concept featuring belief that is still implicit such as making clear meaning and leading to presupposed discourse, (Wodak & van Dijk, 2000, in Peter, et.al., 2016).

Attractively, politicians are not always consistent in which they quite often argue other's arguments that they previously support. To manoeuvre it, they use various linguistic and discourse strategies as every single word produced by them has a great impact on others' belief, thought, mind and life of the land they live in. The discourse politician's use is mostly affected by culture and history (Jakaza, 2013). As the concept of campaign speech is making use various linguistic devices and emotional incitement to gain support from voters (Liang & Liu, 2016), it can be said that presidential campaign speech is smooth and peace battle containing critical content. It is a complex speech taking place in a certain context and certain setting (time and place) aiming at persuading interlocutors by giving reasons and opinion, exploring the insight, showing the power, and proposing a bright future.

Campaign Rhetoric

A campaign speech is public speech usually containing four fundamental components: 1) agenda-setting; 2) framing; 3) character construction and 4) emotional resonance (Medhrust, 2005 in Gunawan 2017). Agenda setting is defined as the speaker decision to explore the issue which is foregrounded to become more salient than any other issues. Framing is

noticed by the speakers' choice to use the particular aspect of perceived reality that can be addressed as a salient part within a text. Character construction is engaged with a speaker representation of himself or herself as a stronger leader than previous leaders who have power to solve the problems that she or he has framed. Emotional resonance is speaker's evocation of the audiences' emotions such as a sense of urgency, insecurity, injustice, and hope for the rewarded economy. These four components are fundamental for candidates of presidential elections in order to grab the trust from the voters and to build strong image and power as a leader. These components will be used as the framework to analyze the rhetorical strategy of this study where presuppositions involved in.

METHODOLOGY

This study used descriptive qualitative aiming at describing presupposition triggers employed in a campaign speech delivered by Trump and Hillary in Presidential Election of USA 2016. The data were collected from the speech of candidates of The Presidents of USA, Trump and Hillary in their first campaign speech in 2015. The duration of those speeches is similar, that is about 46 minutes, due to the intention to keep the balance of the percentage of the presuppositions used. Firstly, all presupposition triggers used by both candidates in their campaign speeches were analyzed based on categorization proposed by Levinson (1983) and Yule (2010) adapted from Liang & Liu (2016) (see table.1). This analysis was also followed by presenting the number of the appearances of the presupposition triggers in form of a percentage. This study also employed Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA), viewed as a way to explore the hidden meaning unconsciously and consciously embedded in utterances. CDA has a big role in doing control and constructing power since it deals with the development and interpretation of linguistic interaction (Thomas, 1985 in Mazid, 2007). This categorizing is based on component of rhetoric campaign proposed by (Medhurst, 2005 in Gunawan 2017): 1) agenda-setting; 2) framing; 3) character construction and 4) emotional resonance.

FINDINGS

The use of Presupposition Triggers by Hillary and Trump

The Distribution of the Use of Presupposition Triggers in Lexical Level

226 cases of lexical presupposition triggers were found in Trump's speech and 225 cases in Hillary's speech. The proportion and the type of presupposition triggers used in lexical level can be seen in figure 1 below (per 100 lexicons).

Figure 1: The Distribution of Presupposition Triggers in Lexical Level

Based on the figure above, lexically, there is no significant difference between both candidates in the number of presupposition triggers used. Both of them used Pronouns as lexical presupposition trigger the most in which Hillary used

it more frequently than Trump did, by 0.08 percent. The same case also occurs to the number of Change of State Verb, in which Hillary still used it more frequently (0.12 for Hillary and 0.11 for Trump). Meanwhile, Other Particles in Trump's speech contains 0.14 while Hillary's speech contains 0.12. For the number of the type of other expressions, Trump's speech excels Hillary's speech, by 0.01. The same case happens to the number of the use of Factive in which Trump still used it more frequently than Hillary did (0.11 for Trump and 0.06 for Hillary) and the use of Iterative which is more frequently found in Trump's speech than Hillary's speech, by 0.04 per100 triggers. Meanwhile, the same frequency was found in the use of iterative particles with 0.05 per100 triggers. Interestingly, although in terms of the frequency, the use of lexical presupposition triggers is slightly different, there were two types of lexical presupposition triggers only found in Hillary's speech those are 0.01 (2 cases) and 0.02 (5 cases) respectively for Implicative and Non-Factive.

The Distribution of the Use of Presupposition Triggers in Syntactical Level

A 153 cases of syntactical presupposition triggers were found in Trump's speech and 152 cases in Hillary's speech. The proportion and the type of presupposition triggers used in syntactical level can be seen in figure 2 below (per 100 sentences).

Figure 2: The Distribution of Presupposition Triggers in Syntactical Level

The figure above indicates the most high number of syntactical presupposition trigger use that goes to Non-Restrictive Relative Clauses 0.37 and 0.35 respectively for Hillary and Trump. Hillary also more frequently used Comparison and Contrast than Trump did (0.30 for Hillary and 0.15 for Trump). It seems to be highly different as Hillary used it twice more than Trump did. Although the use of Temporal Clause is placed third in the most frequent syntactical presupposition triggers in their speech, Hillary still used it more frequently than Trump did: 0.20 and 0.15 respectively for Hillary and Trump, with 0.05 gap. Whereas, for Counter-factual conditionals, the number of users found in Trump's speech is higher 0.02 per 100 sentences than in Hillary's. Moreover, the high different frequency was identified in the use of questions with gap 0.20 per 100 sentences (0.25 for Trump and 0.05 for Hillary).

Presupposition Triggers Used as Rhetorical Strategy

Agenda-Setting

The main issues that Trump and Hillary focus on were addressed through several types of presupposition as follows:

Trump's Agenda-Setting

(T1) We have to end, education has to be local.

- Education is not local.

(T2) We need somebody that can take the brand of the United States and make it great *again*.

- United States once was great.

(T3) We need a leader that can *bring back* our jobs, can *bring back* our manufacturing, can *bring back* our military, and can take care of our vets.

- American people have lost their jobs, manufacturing and military.

(T4) Our enemies are getting stronger and stronger by the way, and we as a country are getting weaker.

- American enemies are strong but they are weak

Those presuppositions used by Trump show that he seeks to make America great again. He promises to create better education and greater economy (T1 & T2). He used *Change-of-state-verb* “end” that presupposes Education which is not local and he thinks that it is not good enough for the USA. Yet, he acknowledges that the USA had once gained its glory. He presented it by the use of iterative particle “again” (T2) and he shows his willingness to bring it back. By the use of *Iterative* triggers “bring back” presupposing the loss of glory in an economy atmosphere, he stresses the urgency to bring back the jobs and manufacturing and rebuild the infrastructures (T3). By the use of *Comparison and Contrast* triggers (see T4) presupposing America is weaker compared to its enemies and other countries, he strongly sets the promise to make America stronger. That is why he intends to make America greater than other countries and bring back the glories.

Hillary’s Agenda-Setting

(H1) Now, building an economy for tomorrow also requires investing in *our* most important asset, *our* people, beginning with *our* youngest.

- They have their own fundamental asset, their own people and their own youngest.

(H2) I am not running to be a President *only* for those Americans who already agree with me.

- She wants to be President not only for her supporters but also for all American.

(H3) The middle class needs more growth and more fairness.

- The growth and fairness exist in the middle class

(H4) That’s why we have to win the fourth fight-reforming our government and revitalizing our democracy so that it works for everyday Americans.

- The government had once been formed and democracy had once been vitalized.

The use of trigger Pronoun “our” (H1) shows that by putting into American important assets, its people and youngest, it can empower economy for tomorrow. The use of Restrictive Expression “not only” that presupposes a president should not only run for his or her people but also for all citizens (H2). Based upon this, she impresses the justice in which America is for all not only for some people who win the election. The justice is also impressed by the use of Comparison and Contrast clause (H4) that presupposes middle class can achieve some growth and fairness. By this presupposition, she implies that it is not sufficient so that she wants to make it greater. In addition, she sets to continue the Democrat’s glory by reforming and revitalizing American’s democracy for the betterment of the USA as her predecessor, Presi-

dent Obama, had done the great things for America specifically for social life. It is presented by the use of Iterative Verbs “reforming” and revitalizing (H4) that presupposes the previous government who had once been formed and vitalized.

Framing

Trump and Hillary frame her political agenda by choosing a particular aspect of perceived realities by making use presupposition in her campaign speech as follows:

Trump's Framing

(T5) *Rebuild* the country's infrastructure.

- The country's infrastructure had once been built.

(T6) Renegotiate our foreign trade deals.

- They had negotiated their foreign trade deals.

(T7) Because we have to stop doing things for some people, but for this country, it's destroying our country.

- They are doing things for some people not for the country.

(T8) And they'll be proud, and they'll love it, and they'll make much more than they would've ever made, and they'll be— they'll be doing so well, and we're going to be thriving as a country, thriving.

- They are lack of pride and love of their country, USA.

The use of *Iterative Verb* “rebuild” by Trump was to presuppose that the infrastructures in America had been built, but he thinks that the buildings are not in good appearance (T5) Another iterative verb “renegotiate” was also used to presuppose that foreign trade deals had been negotiated but he feels that the negotiation is not optimal (T6). By this presupposition, he frames to make America become an independent country that other countries count on by renegotiating great deals with foreign. Using *Change-of-state-verb* “stop” (T7), that presupposes injustice, he gave the impression to be united for all American people so that the glory is not only possessed by some “particular” people but also by all American from all sides. Moreover, by using *Comparison and Contrast* (T8), Trump shows his willingness to make American people prouder and love their country more by making America great again.

Hillary's Framing

(H5) Hillary: To make the middle class mean something *again*, with rising incomes and a *broader* horizon.

- The middle class has meant something before but because of many reasons, it has stopped once.

What part of democracy are they afraid of?

- There is a part of democracy that they afraid of and she still does not know what it is.

(H7) We're still working our way back from a crisis that happened because time-tested values were replaced by false promises.

- America is working its way back from a crisis

(H8) We need justice on the *Supreme Court* who will protect every citizen's right to vote, rather than every coop-

eration's right to buy elections.

- Supreme Court protects citizen's right to vote.

By making use those lexical and syntactical presuppositions, Hillary frames her political concerns to improve the situation of social and economy in America. The use of *Iterative Particle* "again" (H5) was chosen by Hillary to presuppose that the middle class has once been in the meaningful position but because of some reasons, they are left behind. By this presupposition, Hillary shows her enthusiasm to encouraging justice for all classes of American people. *Question* (H6) is addressed by her to presuppose that some people are afraid of Democracy, yet she believes that there is nothing to be afraid of and Democrat is a good party for America. Besides, the particle "still" is used to presuppose that America is struggling free from a crisis (H7) and it shows her intention to make the economy atmosphere in America better. The justice is also promoted by Hillary by the use of *Non-restrictive relative clause* (H8) presupposing that Supreme Court protect every citizen right to vote but she assumed that citizen rights are not protected. Critically, she assumed that Supreme Court protects cooperation's right to buy the election. Thus, by this presupposition, she wants to empower justice for all citizens.

Character Construction

Trump and Hillary build and present their characters by the use of presupposition as follows:

Trump's Character Construction

(T9) But I *know* the negotiators in the world, and I put them one for each country.

- There are negotiators in the world that he knows.

(T10) *If I was president, I'd say*, "Congratulations. I understand that you're building a nice \$2.5 billion car factory in Mexico and that you're going to take your cars and sell them to the United States zero tax, just flow them across the border."

- He was not a president

(T11) But *if I get elected president I will bring it back bigger and better and stronger than ever before, and we will make America great again*.

- He is not a president and he wants to be

(T12) We need somebody that can take the brand of the United States and make it great *again*.

- USA had been great once.

(T13) I would build a great wall, and nobody builds walls *better* than me, believe me.

- Trump and other have different quality in building a wall

(T14) Nobody would be *tougher* on ISIS than Donald Trump

- People are tough on ISIS

It can be assumed that most of the presuppositions were used by Trump to construct his strong characters. He used *Factive* "know" to presuppose that there are negotiators in every country who he knows well. It presents himself as a strong leader having power and tight ties with other countries where he has negotiators for each country (T9). He also cap-

tures brave character by the use of *Counter-factual Presupposition* (T10) where if he was president he would directly protest Ford for building a car factory in Mexico and sell them with zero tax to the USA. Moreover, optimist character of a leader was also constructed by Trump by promising America to build a great wall, bring America better, stronger and great again. This optimist is shown by the use of *Iterative Particle* (T12) presupposing that the USA had been great once but Trump claimed that it does not happen today and someone should bring it back. Therefore, by this presupposition, he implies that America needs a great leader. The optimist is also shown by the use *Comparison and Contrast* (T13 and T14). Another *Counter-factual Presupposition* (T11) presupposing that America is big, good and strong. However, Trump assumes that it is not sufficient so that by this presupposition he shows his optimist.

Hillary's Character Construction

(H9): I believe the future holds far *more* opportunities than threats *if we exercise creative and confident leadership that enables us to shape global events rather than shaped by them*.

- They have an opportunity.
- They do not exercise creative and confident leadership.

(H10) if you'll give me the chance, I'll wage and win four fights for you.

- Hillary has no chance.

(H11) And saw lives changed because an abusive marriage ended or an illegal eviction stopped.

- An abusive marriage and illegal eviction currently happen in America.

(H12) We should welcome the support of all Americans who want to go forward together with us.

- Americans want to go forward together.

By these presupposition triggers, Hillary shows herself as a great leader for America who intends to fight for the betterment of USA to shape the global world rather than let the world shape America (the use of Comparison and Contrast and Counter-factual, see H9 and H10). She also used Change of State Verb (see H11) to show her strong character by concerning on the right for all American people to create the change by stopping an abusive marriage and illegal eviction. She pictures herself as a brave leader having the tight relationship with allies that support America to go forward (by the use of a non-restrictive clause in H12). Comparison and contrast trigger (H9) presupposes America has opportunities but Hillary claims that America needs it more so that she shares her optimist to believe that it will be more opportunities in future. In addition, Counter-Factual clause (H10) presupposes Hillary has no chance but she optimist to be given the chance by the audiences.

Emotional Resonance

Trump and Hillary evoke their emotional resonance by the use presuppositions as follows:

Trump's Emotional Resonance

(T15) How are they going to beat ISIS?

- They try to beat ISIS

(T16) How stupid are our leaders? How stupid are these politicians to allow this to happen?

- The leaders and politicians are stupid

(T17) We have people that are morally corrupt.

- People are morally corrupt

(T18) When do we beat Mexico at the border?

- They do not beat Mexico

(T19) Sadly, the American dream is dead.

- American had had the dream once but it is dead.

Trump speaks to the emotion of American leaders and politicians who make America be left behind and who are weak to against ISIS (by the use of Questions see T15 & T16). He used Non-Restrictive relative clause (T17) that presupposes some people are morally corrupt to show his apprehensiveness. In addition, the use of Question (T18) presupposes America does not beat Mexico at the border and intends to make it real. It indicates Trump's disappointment towards the situation of America which he claimed is left behind other countries such as Mexico. The feeling of regret and sad was addressed by the use of Change of State Verb (T19) to the loss of American victory that has once been on the glory but today even the dream is dead. Thus, he shares the emotional of morality, nationalism, spirit, care, justice, freedom and wise.

Hillary's Emotional Resonance

(H13) An America where a father can tell his daughter: Yes, you can be anything you want to be. Even a President of the United States

- A few American women have ever thought about being President of USA.

(H14) For lasting prosperity, you cannot have one without the other. Is this possible in today's world?

- They are not united.

(H15) New Chapters are being written by men and women who believe that all of us -not just some, but all- should have the chance to live up our God-given potential.

- Not all of the American people have the chance to live up their potential given by God.

(H16) Hillary: And we all know that in order to be strong in the world, though, we first have to be strong at home.

- Hard lives are experienced both at home and in the world.

Hillary shares the emotional feelings such as a sense of gender equality in which women have the same right as men to be on the top position even as a president (by the use of particle "even" in H13). She shares the emotional of intimacy, care, freedom, and wise by picturing her family specifically her father who trust and gave her a right to choose and run her life by herself. She also evokes the audiences' emotions by flooring the urgency to be united for lasting prosperity and she believes that it is possible to achieve as long as the United States of America is administratively and socially united (by the use Restrictive Expression "other" in H14 and "not just" in H15). Moreover, by employing Non-restrictive relative

clauses (H3) she shares the grateful feeling to God and encourages people to maximize the potential given to make new greater chapter. The feeling of worry is shared by Hillary (H16) by using Factive Verb “know” that presupposes the fact that is American people face hard lives and great challenges both in the world and at home so that they have to be strong in these both environments. She speaks to deliver her same feeling of worry about the worse condition of the world.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

In terms of the total number of frequency, the presupposition triggers use by Hillary and Trump in their first campaign speech is not significantly different. This finding is in line with Freed and Greenwood (1996, in Wouk Fay, 1999) stating that the difference between the male and female use of pragmatic devices is minimal when the two sexes were engaged in similar activities. However, the differences occur in the number of the use of the several types of presupposition triggers both in lexical and syntactical level. Lexically, Factive and Pronoun were used more frequently by Hillary (in line with Liang and Liu, 2016) than Trump did; while, the Iterative lexical trigger was more frequently used by Trump. In a syntactical level, the significant difference can be observed in the use of Temporal Clause, Comparison and Contrast, and Question in which all of them were used more frequently by Hillary than Trump did. This finding is not in line with Bogoch in 1997 pointed that women in the workforce, specifically whose traditionally male-dominated profession (e.g. politician, physicians, managers, and so on) are confronted to conform to the male norms of professional behavior including language behaviour (in Yu, 2013). Moreover, the difference of language behavior is also indicated by the use of Implicative and Non-factive by Hillary which was not found in Trump's speech.

In the context of the function of the use of presupposition as rhetorical strategy, the finding of this study supports the theory proposed by (Larry S., et.al, 1974, Asher, N. and Lasradides, A., 1998; Horn and Ward (2004) stating that one of the linguistic devices used to construct technical rhetoric is presupposition. Both candidates successfully presented all of four components of rhetoric campaign namely Agenda-setting, Framing, Character Construction and Emotional resonance by the use of presupposition.

Based on the analysis of presupposition triggers above, it can be assumed that the use of presupposition triggers help Trump and Hillary deliver their political messages, construct their rhetoric campaign and grab and hold their audiences. Both lexical and syntactical levels of trigger hold fundamental roles in strengthening information, building interaction and intimacy with audiences, making language more vivid and helping the candidates gain their political goals. It is in line with the findings discovered by some scholars examining presupposition triggers in political discourse such as Mazid, B. M. (2007) El-Nashar, M. M. M. (2015), Liang, R. & Liu, Y. (2016) and Peter, C. A. (2016). Thus, both male and female can make use presupposition to help them communicate effectively, efficiently, attractively and persuasively although they may use different types of triggers lexically and syntactically. Even though, the result of this study cannot represent the judgment of the effect of gender on the use of presupposition as limited number of the data, hopefully, this study can be used as the reflection for language users to have more understanding of political speech and knowledge of presupposition. Thus, to get stronger judgment, it is highly recommended to study the effect of gender on the use of presupposition triggers in wider scope by using ANOVA and MANOVA.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

In accomplishing this study, through this acknowledgement the writer would like to present my greatest gratitude to LPDP (Indonesia Endowment Fund for Education) that recently funds my study of my master's degree and to numerous

people whose support and advise me were psychologically encouraging me during writing this study. I would like to express my special gratitude to: my lecturers, my parents and all of my friends (Class C, Master's Students of English Education Program, UPI and LPDP Awardees in Bandung).

REFERENCES

1. Akhaf, N. (2017) *Presupposition triggers in "The Big Bang Theory Season Nine" situational comedy*. *SELL Journal*, 2 (1), 2528-6595.
2. Al-Gublan, B. K. (2015). *A pragmatic study of political discourse from the perspective of the linguistic adaptation theory*. *International Journal of English Linguistics*, 2 (5).
3. Al-Rassam, E. M. (2010). *Analysing political discourse: towards a pragmatic approach*. *College of Basic Education Researchers Journal* 10 (1), 528-552.
4. Ananda, S., Wihadi, M., Suryana, Y. (2016). *Presupposition analysis in some selected consumer advertisement slogans of the Jakarta Post*. *Journal of English Education*, 5 (1), 141-148.
5. Angermüller, J. (2007). *Research report: Major research centers in discourse analysis in France*. *Forum Qualitative Social Research* 8 (2) pp 4.
6. Asher, N. and Lasradides, A., (1998). *The Semantics and Pragmatics of Presupposition*. University of Edinburgh.
7. Baikalova, N. S. (2016). *Gender Features in Female Political Discourse: The Construction of Hillary Clinton's Political Image*. *Journal of Siberian Federal University: Humanities and Social Science*, 1-9.
8. Cummins, C., Amaral, P., & Katsos, N. (2012). *Experimental investigation of the typology of presupposition triggers*. *Journal of Philosophical Studies*, 23, 1-15.
9. El-Nashar, M. M. M. (2015). *Media manipulation: presupposition triggers and lexical choices in the CNN coverage of two presidential elections in Egypt*. *International Journal of Art and Science*. 08 (3), 565-586.
10. Ginsberg, M. (1972). *The entailment-presupposition relationship*. *Journal of Formal Logic*, 13 (4), 511-515
11. Gunawan, S. (2017). *Hillary Clinton's presidential campaign rhetoric: making America whole again*. *Kasetsart Journal of Science*, 38, 50-55.
12. Horn, L. and Ward, G. (2004). *Handbook of Pragmatics*. Blackwell, Oxford.
13. Anorue L.I. & Nwanguma U.Q., *An Evaluation of Audience Response to Media Campaigns on Ebola Virus Disease Prevention and Control in South-South Nigeria*, *International Journal of Communication and Media Studies (IJCMS)*, Volume 5, Issue 3, September - October 2015, pp. 1-12
14. Huang, Yan (2007). *Pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
15. Clinton, H. R (2015). *Transcript: Read the full text of Hillary Clinton's Campaign Launch Speech Retrieved from <http://time.com/3920332/transcript-full-text-hillary-clinton-campaign-launch/>*
16. Jakaza, E. (2013). *Appraisal and evaluation in zimbabwean parliamentary discourse and its representation in newspaper articles*. Unpublished Ph. D: Stellenbosch University.
17. Koppel, M., Argamon, S., and Shimoni, A. (2003). *Automatically categorizing written texts by author gender*. *Literary and Linguistic Computing*, 17: 101-8.
18. Larry S., Louis T., and Robert V. (1974). *Presupposition and technical rhetoric*. *Journal*, 29 (1), 59-65.

19. Liang, R. & Liu, Y. (2016). An analysis of presupposition triggers in Hillary Clinton's first campaign speech. *International Journal of English Linguistics*, 5 (6), 68-73.
20. Levinson, S. C. (1983). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
21. Magalhaes, M. I. S. (1995). A critical discourse analysis of gender relations in Brazil. *Journal of Pragmatics* 23, 183-197.
22. Mazid, B. M. (2007). Presupposition and strategic functions in Bush's 20/9/2001 speech. *Journal of language and politics*, 6 (3), 351-375.
23. Nobrega, J. V. (Discourse analysis: Ronald Reagan's evil empire speech. *Open Journal of Modern Linguistics*, 4, 166-181
24. Peter, C. A. Mukuthuria, M., & Muriungi, P. (2016). The use of presupposition in the creation of socio-political dominance in Kenyan parliamentary debates between 1992 and 2010. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 24 (7), 154-172.
25. Polyzou, A. (2015). Presupposition in discourse: Theoretical and methodological issues. *Critical Discourse Studies*, 12 (2), 123-138.
26. Sivric, M. & Jurcic, D. (2014). Gender Differences in Political Discourse. *Journal of Foreign Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics* 173-185.
27. Trump, D. (2015) Transcript: Our Country Needs a Truly Great Leader Retrieved from <http://blogs.wsj.com/washwire/2015/06/16/donald-trump-transcript-our-country-needs-a-truly-great-leader/>
28. Wouk, F. (1999). Gender and the use of pragmatic particles in Indonesian. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 3 (2), 194-219
29. Yu, B. (2013). Language and gender in Congressional speech. *Literary and Linguistic Computing*, 1-15.
30. Yule, G. (2010). *Pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511757754.011>
31. Zare, J., Abbaspour, E., & Nia, M. R. (2012). Presupposition trigger: a comparative analysis of broadcast analysis. *International Journal of Linguistics*, 4 (3), 1948-5425.