

Manipulating the Masses: A Critical Discourse Analysis of Rhetorical Strategies in Donald Trump's 2024 Nomination Acceptance Speech

Aysar T. Yaseen¹

¹ Modern Languages Department (MLD), Arab American University-Palestine (AAUP), State of Palestine

Correspondence: Aysar T. Yaseen, Arab American University-Palestine (AAUP), P.O.Box 240, Jenin, State of Palestine.

Received: November 14, 2025

Accepted: March 6, 2026

Online Published: April 29, 2026

doi:10.5430/wjel.v16n5p62

URL: <https://doi.org/10.5430/wjel.v16n5p62>

Abstract

The use of rhetorical devices in public discourse is a powerful and indispensable tool for changing recipients' future behavior and shaping their perception of the social world around them. This paper seeks to investigate the use of manipulative persuasion strategies that influence public perception and consolidate political power and hegemony in Trump's 2024 presidential nomination acceptance speech. Donald Trump always tries to expose his audience to a wide range of rhetorical devices, whether they are verbal or non-verbal; in addition, he makes use of diverse linguistic resources such as rhetorical devices in his public discourse. These verbal and nonverbal cues, along with different linguistic resources, are meant to enhance persuasive communication, frame others, and mobilize the masses. His discourse heavily relies on devices such as emotiveness, dysphemism (the purposeful exaggeration of bad qualities of his opponents), hyperbole, the intensive use of rhetorical questions, among others. Used strategically, these powerful linguistic resources operate as influential tools for shaping audience interpretations and guiding anticipated responses. Furthermore, these tools are used by Trump as powerful and hegemonic devices to influence and control others. He perceives them not merely as ornamentations or tools for enhancement but as means to evince effectiveness and persuasive impacts and to manipulate recipients' emotions and shape and reshape public opinion.

Keywords: Critical Discourse Analysis, Political Rhetoric, Rhetorical devices, Donald Trump, language and power

1. Introduction

In contemporary societies it is reasonable to argue that media outlets facilitate politicians' direct access to widely available channels with their audiences. In contemporary politics, politicians have unprecedented access to media channels, allowing them to communicate directly with mass audiences and shape public opinion with greater speed and intensity. Central to this communicative power is the strategic use of rhetorical devices—linguistic tools that serve not merely to convey information, but to influence, persuade, and manipulate audiences. Techniques such as hyperbole, emotive language, dysphemism, and rhetorical questions allow politicians to craft increasingly persuasive, emotive, and ideologically loaded realities that advance their political agendas. Political communication research shows that politicians can construct persuasive realities through strategic language choices: Both, Critical Discourse Analysis and sociocognitive approaches to purposeful language use argue that discourse shapes shared interpretations and mental models (internal representations of external realities or pseudo-realities created by language users, politicians in this case) (Fairclough, 1992; van Dijk, 2022), while framing theory explains how speakers highlight certain aspects of events to steer problem definitions and moral evaluations (Entman, 1993). Framing theory begins with explicit views: political leaders do not merely describe events—they shape how it is interpreted. A frame focuses attention on particular parts of a situation, making people more likely to perceive the issue from that angle. In Entman's 1993 definition, framing refers to selecting specific aspects of what people perceive as reality and making those aspects highly visible in a message. This helps the person delivering the message identify what the problem is, determine the causes, make judgments, and propose solutions; while the audience may be influenced by the language used, they retain the capacity to interpret, resist, or reinterpret these frames. Put differently, frames aren't just a matter of strategic framing; they function as cognitive heuristics that help people ascertain questions like: What is the underlying situation? Who holds authority? Narrative persuasion further suggests that story-based messaging can heighten engagement and reduce counterarguing, strengthening attitude change (Green & Appel, 2024; Oschatz & Marker, 2020). Within these processes, devices like hyperbole, emotive language (as modelled in appraisal theory), dysphemism, and rhetorical questions intensify evaluation, polarize in-groups/out-groups, and guide audiences toward implied conclusions—supporting political agendas through emotionally charged, compelling narratives (Allan & Burridge, 1991; Martin & White, 2005; Ziembicki, 2025). Parallel developments in the use of rhetorical devices in political discourse are evident as well. The art of crafting emotionally charged statements has become more effective with the prevalence and sophistication of social media outlets. Linguistic resources, such as using hyperbole to instil fear and anger, emotive language to gain sympathy and empathy, dysphemism, and rhetorical questions, as well as the dissemination of key messages, have become readily accessible to us through visual and vocal communication. This expansion of political communication channels has intensified the strategic deployment of rhetorical devices, making political discourse increasingly persuasive, emotive, and ideologically loaded.

Rhetorical devices have long been central to political persuasion, from classical rhetoric to contemporary political communication.:

Aristotle (trans. Kennedy, 2007) explains how public speakers use techniques to influence civic audiences. Modern scholarship likewise shows that politicians still rely on devices like metaphor and carefully crafted public address to shape how people think and act (Charteris-Black, 2005; Tulis, 1987). The purposeful deployment of these rhetorical devices serves not only to communicate ideas but to manipulate perceptions and emotions of supporters, mislead supporters, and disempower and exclude political opponents. The study of rhetorical techniques in political discourse is crucial because these devices are not neutral; they play a decisive role in shaping social and political realities, consolidating authority, and marginalizing opponents. Politicians deploy rhetorical strategies to guide audiences' perceptions, reinforce ideological positions, and even generate consent for policies or political actions. A Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) perspective is particularly suitable for examining these phenomena, as CDA focuses on uncovering the power relations, social inequalities, and ideological underpinnings embedded in language use. Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) investigates how language helps create and sustain power relations and ideological meanings in society (Fairclough, 1995). It specifically examines how discourse can reproduce dominance and social inequality, making hidden power structures visible through close analysis of texts and talk (van Dijk, 1993). Across CDA approaches, power, ideology, and critique are core shared concerns (Wodak & Meyer, 2009). Through CDA, researchers can critically evaluate how rhetorical devices are employed to sustain dominance, manipulate public sentiment, and influence electoral and social outcomes. Understanding these dynamics is crucial for deciphering the underlying messages and power structures within political communication. This study approaches rhetorical devices not as neutral stylistic ornaments, but as strategic tools embedded within power relations.

This study focuses on the public speeches of Donald Trump and offers useful case for examining how rhetorical devices may be used to shape political and social realities. Through close examination of his speeches, this research aims to uncover the intricate strategies by which Trump attracts his audience, constructs his political agenda, and marginalizes his political opponents.

This study argues that Trump's 2024 nomination acceptance speech uses hyperbole, dysphemism, emotive language, and rhetorical questions to construct political legitimacy and delegitimize opponents. Through a detailed analysis of Trump's use of selected rhetorical devices such as hyperbole, rhetorical questions, emotive language, and dysphemism, this research shows how these factors consolidate the construction, projection, and maintenance of power and authority. It not only offers insight into how Trump has managed to successfully use rhetorical strategies, but also shows how politicians in general use this persuasive instrument to distract, manipulate, and galvanize voters.

By examining the manipulative use of rhetorical techniques in Trump's speeches, the study is focused on evaluating the approach of political communication that provides insight into how powerful language is used to exert power and control. Contemporary politics makes use of the overlaps between power, language, and persuasion to achieve personal or factional interests. The core objective of CDA analysts is to identify these inequalities and uncover the hidden power relations embedded within linguistic construction (Wodak & Meyer, 2009; Chouliaraki & Fairclough, 1999; Fairclough, 1992).

This research specifically focuses on the nomination acceptance speech of Donald Trump in 2024, a rich site for investigating rhetorical manipulation due to its political significance and Trump's distinctive communicative style. By analysing the deployment of hyperbole, dysphemism, rhetorical questions, and emotive language, this study highlights the ways in which Trump constructs persuasive narratives. The findings illuminate not only the strategies employed by Trump but also broader mechanisms of persuasion in contemporary political discourse, demonstrating how rhetorical techniques are instrumental in consolidating power, shaping ideological perceptions, and influencing public behavior.

Trump's primary objective is to manipulate rhetorical devices to shape public opinion in a way that serves his interests. These devices are meant to establish political identities, influence electoral results, gain support, delegitimize political rivals, and deepen the ideological stratifications already existing in American society. This is feasible through competent and carefully coordinated interplay between language, power, and persuasion in political discourse. My research focuses on the transcribed speech in order to capture details of hyperbole and choice of lexical units as rhetorical devices (this choice includes but is not limited to emotive terminology, hyperbole, rhetorical questions, and dysphemism).

The list of rhetorical devices in the paper, namely, hyperbole, emotive language, rhetorical questions, and dysphemism, is not meant to be exhaustive. The focus of this study is on the most salient rhetorical devices that serve persuasive and hegemonic purposes in the specific context of Trump's speech. These devices were selected because they are particularly prominent in Trump's 2024 nomination acceptance speech and are representative of the strategies he uses to manipulate emotions, construct political identities, and influence audience behavior. Other rhetorical devices exist, such as repetition, metaphor, parallelism, alliteration, rhymed structures, and inclusion and exclusion pronouns, but they are not discussed in the study due to space constraints.

2. Literature Review

The study stems from Fairclough and Wodak (1997); Wodak (2000c), and other scholars' perspectives of critical discourse analysis and how language is perceived as a social practice. In other words, language forms the foundational elements of texts and communication in societies. Van Dijk (1986) argues that critical discourse analysis is concerned with prevailing social problems and takes the side of those who suffer most (p. 4); furthermore, CDA is concerned with critically analyzing those in power who have the means and the opportunity to solve these social problems. This theoretical framework is particularly relevant to political discourse, where power asymmetries are enacted and reproduced linguistically.

This approach gives special attention to the interplay between language and power, and therefore, political, media, institutional, and gender discourses form a key domain of CDA research. Van Dijk (1993); Krings et al. (1973); Fairclough (1985); Connerton (1976) stress the practical linkage of ‘social and political engagement’ with ‘construction of society’, and that the term ‘critical’ shows clearly the interconnectedness of things in human matters.

Habermas (1977) stipulates that language is a medium of domination and social force as it serves to legitimize relations of organized power (p. 259). In other words, language is ideological in nature. Therefore, it is acceptable to state that CDA’s main concern is to analyze opaque as well as transparent structural relationships of dominance, discrimination, power, and control as manifested in language, i.e., CDA aims to investigate critically social inequalities as they are expressed, signalled, constituted, and legitimized by language use (in discourse).

Classical rhetoric, sociolinguistics, and pragmatics constitute other roots of CDA where notions of ideology, power, hierarchy, and gender, and social variables are all seen as relevant for the interpretation and explanation of texts (Wodak et al., 1999; Martin-Rojo & van Dijk, 1997; Martin-Rojo & Whittaker, 1998).

Critical-political discourse analysis deals especially with the reproduction of political power, power abuse, or domination through political discourse, including the various forms of resistance or counter-power against such forms of discursive dominance. In particular, such an analysis deals with the discursive conditions and consequences of the social and political inequality that results from such domination (Fairclough, 1995; van Dijk, 1993).

Dominance structures in societies are legitimized by powerful groups when resistance is absent; Hodge and Kress (1993) contend that dominant structures stabilize conventions and naturalize them, and this dominance of power and ideology adds to the obscurity of meanings, which requires CDA intervention.

Van Dijk (2000) argues that emotive language, dysphemism, and hyperbole are used as rhetorical features of political discourse; he further adds that critical analysis of political discourse includes studying arguments, lexical style, and rhetorical devices such as dysphemism, emotive language, hyperbole, etc. Van Dijk (1993) stresses that critical discourse analysis explicitly investigates style (how language is used) and rhetorical devices (persuasive techniques that include hyperbole, emotive language, and dysphemism) and that both style and rhetorical devices are used as strategies to produce, reproduce, consolidate, and conceal power relations.

Golubeva (2019) stipulates that hyperbole is tactically used as a rhetorical device in politics; her example of political speeches of UK politicians on the Salisbury incident proves that politicians’ intensive use of rhetorical devices that exaggerate social and political events, and that hyperbole and other rhetorical devices are central to persuasion in political discourse. Aghalarova (2024) explicitly argues that hyperbole is a rhetorical device, tracing its history in rhetoric and linking it to persuasive language and political rhetoric. Snoeck Henkemans (2017) claims that hyperbole is, without doubt, a strategic rhetorical manoeuvre in political argumentation. Wodak (2020) argues that the terms discursive strategies and linguistic devices (e.g., victimization, dramatization, and exaggeration) are used as rhetorical devices in political discourse.

Rhetorical questions are perceived as rhetorical devices in political discourse as they are mainly and purposefully used in politics to assert, attack, frame, and persuade rather than soliciting answers and information. They might act as interrogative forms, but they perform assertive, evaluative, or directive functions in discourse (Ilie, 1994). Majeed and Ahmed (2017) stipulate that rhetorical questions are indirect speech acts, and in political speeches in particular, they are used mainly to persuade the audience. Rhetorical questions help politicians frame problems and guide how the audience reasons about them. Ilie (2022) argues that rhetorical questions are used to foster or inhibit particular ways of thinking and reasoning and support or undermine beliefs and policies. Ilie (1994) links rhetorical questions to enthymematic reasoning: the question prompts the audience to fill in the missing premise or conclusion themselves. This eventually makes the argument feel obvious and shared. The rhetorical questions also simulate dialogue and invite the audience to silently answer. It creates a sense of shared knowledge and collective judgment. Ilie (1994, 2022); Majeed and Ahmed (2017) stipulate that politicians also use rhetorical questions to organize their speeches and build emotional intensity; a series of rapid rhetorical questions can dramatize a crisis or injustice and prepare the ground for a proposed solution. This pattern is well-documented in rhetorical tradition and observed in modern political speeches. Ilie (1994, 2015, 2022); Majeed and Ahmed (2017); Zhang et al. (2017) contend that in political discourse, rhetorical questions function as strategic rhetorical devices rather than genuine information-seeking moves; they present implicit assertions and enthymematic arguments, frame issues and guide audience inferences, attack and shame opponents, create in-group alignment, and heighten emotional intensity.

Together, these clearly prove that hyperbole, dysphemism, emotive language, and rhetorical questions themselves are treated as rhetorical/figurative devices in political discourse, and they are used to produce and/or conceal power relations.

3. Data and Methodology

The analysis of rhetorical devices in this work is based on a scrutinized reading and categorization of rhetorical devices strategically used in Trump’s nomination acceptance speech of 2024. The speech was selected based on its political and linguistic values, along with the representativeness of Trump’s style, which is a mixture of vernacular and anecdotal style in which Trump successfully identified his audience and addressed them accordingly. A copy of the full text of the speech was obtained from verified news outlets (Pons, 2024). The methodological approach adopted in this study is qualitative and interpretive, consistent with the principles of Critical Discourse Analysis.

Furthermore, the speech under analysis was selected due to its political significance as well as its ostensible personal significance for Trump himself. Trump's nomination acceptance speech was delivered in a highly charged political context. That context included the aftermath of January 6, his repeated claims that the election had been "stolen," and the assassination attempt of July 13, 2024. These factors provide important background for interpreting the rhetorical choices examined in this study. These contextual factors are treated as discursive conditions that shape the rhetorical choices observed in the speech.

It may be argued that it is both the political significance of this speech and the personal context (the sense of vindication, a righting of perceived wrongs) shape his rhetoric. All these factors influence his ultimate emotive language, hyperbole, and other lexical choices, all of which are tools of manipulation. His rhetoric is conspicuously emotive and flamboyant, including spontaneous personal asides or anecdotal digressions which create intimacy, the use of hyperbole, pathos, and homonyms, the dehumanization of minorities and political opponents (playing upon or encouraging people's insecurities, grievances, and/or ignorance), and his instrumentalization of the 'victim' persona—that is, his repeated suggestions of being unfairly maligned, which place criticism of or opposition to him in an emotional, personal context as opposed to a political or ideological context.

Trump's speech exemplifies the idea that discourse sustains power and that power abuse and domination in institutional discourse result in social inequalities as they foster and deepen the gap between the powerful and the powerless groups. The manipulative use of rhetorical devices may result in creating new realities, and this is considered falsification of truths as well as violation of standards of textuality.

The text was found to be useful for interpretation and explanation to try to unearth the inequalities caused by the misuse and/or abuse of power.

3.1 Data Analysis Procedure

The methodology followed a structured qualitative approach:

1. Segmentation and Annotation: The speech was segmented into clauses, sentences, and discourse units for detailed scrutiny. Each segment was examined for instances of rhetorical devices, particularly hyperbole, emotive language, rhetorical questions, and dysphemism.

2. Criteria for Identifying Hyperbole: Hyperbolic statements were identified using criteria adapted from McCarthy and Carter (2004), which include:

- Disjunction of context: Statements that appear inconsistent or exaggerated relative to the situational or factual context.
- Shifts of footing: Indications that the speaker moves to a narrative or evaluative frame where counterfactual or impossible claims are introduced.
- Counterfactuality is not challenged: Statements that are obviously exaggerated but accepted or reinforced by the audience.
- Extreme case formulations and intensification: It includes the use of adjectives, adverbs, numerical exaggerations, or superlatives to overstate events, quantities, or qualities.
- Dysphemism: Exaggerated depiction of negative qualities of opponents to delegitimize them.
- Listener take-up: Audience reactions (e.g., applause, cheering, laughter) that are supportive towards the hyperbolic or emotive content.

3. Annotation and Coding: Each instance of rhetorical device was coded according to type (e.g., hyperbole, emotive language, rhetorical questions, and dysphemism) and subcategory (e.g., overstatement of quantity, extreme case formulation, counterfactuality). This systematic coding enabled quantitative tracking of frequency and qualitative analysis of context and effect.

4. Effectiveness Assessment: The effectiveness of rhetorical devices was inferred based on the audience's immediate responses documented in the transcript, media coverage, and video recordings. Indicators included:

- * Collective audience engagement (standing ovations, cheering, chanting)
- * Reinforcement of intended emotional responses (fear, loyalty, admiration)
- * Evident alignment with Trump's narrative, indicating acceptance of hyperbolic or emotive constructs as reality

3.2 Rationale for Methodological Approach

This methodology enables a rigorous, replicable analysis of rhetorical strategies in political discourse. By linking linguistic form (hyperbole, emotive language, dysphemism, and rhetorical questions) with audience reception and interaction, the study demonstrates how rhetorical devices function to manipulate perception, reinforce power, and create new realities in political communication. The combination of qualitative interpretation and systematic coding ensures that the findings are both contextually grounded and analytically robust, addressing concerns regarding transparency and credibility in the research process.

4. Rhetorical Devices as Tools of Power and Hegemony

Politicians use rhetorical devices as robust tools to manipulate emotions for persuasive purposes. Hyperbole is among the most commonly used tools. By stimulating recipients' emotions and responses, these tools can profoundly influence their perceptions and beliefs. From a Critical Discourse Analysis perspective, rhetorical devices are not merely stylistic choices, but discursive mechanisms through which

power relations are enacted, reinforced, and legitimized.

Politicians' manipulative use of rhetorical devices can create compelling arguments, consolidate new realities, and bring about change by influencing public opinion. This persuasive power of political language, made possible by rhetorical devices, may inspire, unite, or transform the audience's behavior; politicians should be vigilant when using rhetorical devices as they are required to uphold social values and ethics of their societies in their discourse. In this sense, rhetorical devices operate within a hegemonic framework, where dominant actors shape social realities and normalize particular interpretations of events.

Ethical and responsible language must serve to foster discourse that is both informative and influential. It shall avoid the imposition of fear, hatred, and anger. More often than not, dragging the audience or participants into this intentional manipulation of linguistic resources may result in the creation of irrational beliefs, thoughts, and behaviors as the misled audience becomes vulnerable to particular claims and lies. Such vulnerability is especially significant in political contexts, where discourse is consumed by large and ideologically diverse audiences.

Politicians should be careful when using rhetorical devices, considering ethical approaches during the progression of their discourse and must avoid hegemonizing people. Exploiting the audience's fear and the emotions caused by violating the standards of quality and quantity without gauging their feelings and emotions may cause adverse consequences. Violations of these standards may result in distorted representations of reality that privilege the speaker's interests over factual accuracy.

Engaging in truthful and honest discourse in order to provide reliable and accurate information to the public should be the priority of any politician. Ethical guidelines for political discourse must be upheld to safeguard honest political communication. This is the responsibility of the politicians themselves. Within the framework of this study, the discussion of rhetorical devices as tools of power and hegemony provides the theoretical foundation for the subsequent analysis of hyperbole, rhetorical questions, dysphemism, and emotive language in Trump's discourse.

5. The Persuasive Power of Hyperbole

Hyperbole is a kind of 'structuring' of reality where there are competing realities; it can enable sharp focus on one account of reality and downplay rival accounts, and it brings the listener into the perspective of the speaker in a powerful way (Christodoulidou, 2011). In political discourse, this structuring function allows speakers to privilege specific ideological interpretations while marginalizing alternative viewpoints.

Hyperbole in political discourse is an effective rhetorical device used to evoke persuasion. It is used in casual speeches as an intensifier as well as an emphasis or focus device to make overstatements or exaggerations. Hyperbole is also used to add dramatic effect not only to past events but also to present and future events. In addition, they are used as powerful devices where images associated with metaphors become vivid and powerful. Furthermore, the emotional effects of hyperbole are not an exception as they circulate in the same sphere. Hyperbole, as overrated or exaggerated statements, violates the truth value of what has been said and can safely be considered a form of lying. From a CDA perspective, such violations are not accidental but function strategically to normalize exaggerated or distorted versions of reality.

Hyperbole is "a figure of speech of bold exaggeration" (Preminger, 1974: p. 359). Hyperbole as a rhetorical device was traditionally associated with persuasive speech and the exercise of power. This association with power explains its prevalence in political discourse, where persuasion and authority are central objectives.

This research is concerned with the purposeful exaggeration in Trump's political discourse, where Trump exaggerates narrative, descriptive, and argumentative features and makes assertions that are overstated, literally impossible, inconceivable, or counterfactual in many different types of discourse contexts. Such hyperbolic expressions are not challenged by listeners, who accept them as creative intensifications for evaluative or affective purposes such as drama and irony, and who often make their own supportive contribution to the figure of speech (McCarthy & Carter, 2004: p. 150). These observations guide the analytical focus of the present study.

Two main types of hyperbole will be under scrutiny in this research, namely overstatements (size, number, and quantities) and dysphemism (accusations of bad or negative qualities).

5.1 Identifying Hyperbole

The criteria for the identification of hyperbolism in this study are based on McCarthy and Carter's study (2004: pp. 162–163). These criteria serve as the methodological framework through which hyperbolic expressions are identified and interpreted in the data.

Some of the following characteristics of hyperbole will be examined:

1. Disjunction of context: the speaker's utterance seems at odds with the general context.
2. Shifts of footing: there is evidence (e.g., discourse marking) indicating a shift in footing is occurring to a conversational frame where impossible worlds or plainly counterfactual claims may appropriately occur.
3. Counterfactuality not perceived as a lie: the listener accepts a statement that is counterfactual as reality, without challenge.
4. Impossible worlds: speaker and listener between them engage in the construction of fictitious worlds where impossible, exaggerated events take place.

5. Listener take-up: the listener reacts with supportive behavior such as laughing or asserting back-channel marker, thus contributing to the counterfactuality, impossibility, contextual disjunction, etc.
6. Extreme case formulations and intensification: the assertion is expressed most strongly (with, e.g., adjectives such as “endless,” “massive”) and/or extreme intensifiers such as “nearly,” “totally”. These expressions are not counterfactuals or absurd worlds, as many may be heard as (semi-) conventional metaphors.
7. Relevant interpretability: the trope is interpretable as relevant to the speech act being performed, and that is understood to be figurative within its context, though there may also be evidence of literal interpretations being exploited for interactive/affective purposes.

6. Results and Discussion

In this section, exaggerated statements of quantity (extreme-case formulations and intensification, overstatement of numbers and quantities), dysphemism (exaggerating the bad qualities and characteristics of one's opponents), and counterfactuality, such as lies, impossible worlds, and listener take-up, will be analyzed. Each subsection below corresponds directly to the identification criteria outlined above.

6.1 Overstatement of Numbers and Quantities

Hyperboles such as overrated numbers and quantities were identified in Trump's use of numerical expressions (e.g., “hundreds and thousands”), measurements (e.g., “inches”), and sizes (e.g., “massive crowd”, “giant audience”, and related examples. By using these expressions, Trump emphasizes his point and intensifies contrasting situations. He intends to draw a comparison between his own achievements and those of his rivals in order to clarify and show superiority.

Some examples are as follows:

- 1) "This massive crowd of tens of thousands of people stood by and didn't move an inch. In fact, many of them bravely but automatically stood up, looking for where the sniper would be."
- 2) "Bullets were flying right over them, missing them by a very small number of inches."
- 3) "But I could see it, and I wanted to do something to let them know I was OK. I raised my right arm, looked at the thousands and thousands of people who were breathlessly waiting, and started shouting, “Fight, fight, fight.”"
- 4) "For the rest of my life, I will be grateful for the love shown by that giant audience of patriots that stood bravely on that fateful evening in Pennsylvania."
- 5) "Now, people don't realize, I brought taxes way down, way, way down. And yet we took in more revenues the following year than we did when the tax rate was much higher. Most people said, how did you do that? Because it was an incentive. Everybody was coming to the country; they were bringing back billions and billions of dollars into our country. The companies made it impossible to bring it back. The tax rate was too high, and the legal complications were far too great. I changed both of them, and hundreds of billions of dollars by Apple and so many other companies would work back into our nation, and we had an economy the likes of which nobody, no nation had ever seen."
- 6) "On the wall, we were dealing with a very difficult Congress, and I said, “Oh, that's OK. We won't go to Congress.” I call it an “invasion.” We gave our military almost \$800 billion. I said, “I'm going to take a little of that money, because this is an ‘invasion.’” And we built — Most of the wall is already built, and we built it through using the funds, because what's more, what's better than that? We have to stop the invasion into our country that's killing hundreds of thousands of people a year. We're not going to let that happen. These numerical exaggerations function to elevate Trump's self-presentation while simultaneously diminishing the perceived achievements of political rivals."

6.2 Extreme Case Formulations and Intensifications

Hyperbole as extreme case formulations and intensifications in Trump's speeches, was identified as assertions and expressed most strongly...

- 1) "Music was loudly playing, and the campaign was doing really well. I went to the stage, and the crowd was cheering wildly. Everybody was happy. I began speaking very strongly, powerfully, and happily. Because I was discussing the great job my administration did on immigration at the southern border. We were very proud of it."
- 2) "Behind me, and to the right, was a large screen that was displaying a chart of border crossings under my leadership. The numbers were absolutely amazing."
- 3) "And moved my right hand to my ear, brought it down. My hand was covered with blood. Just absolutely blood all over the place. I immediately knew it was very serious. That we were under attack. And in one movement, proceeded to drop to the ground. Bullets were continuing to fly."
- 4) "The reason is that they knew I was in very serious trouble. They saw it. They saw me go down. They saw the blood, and thought, actually most did, that I was dead."

- 5) "Once my clenched fist went up, and it was high into the air, you've all seen that, the crowd realized I was OK and roared with pride for our country like no crowd I have ever heard before. Never heard anything like it."
- 6) "They all said the same thing: "You're right, sir; we appreciate so much what you're doing, but nothing can take the place, in the case of Corey." And the other two. By the way, they were very, very seriously injured."
- 7) "This election should be about the issues facing our country and how to make America successful, safe, free, and great again."
- 8) "It's time for a change. This administration can't come close to solving the problems. We're dealing with very tough, very fierce people. They're fierce people. And we don't have fierce people. We have people who are a lot less than fierce, except when it comes to cheating on elections and a couple of other things, then they're fierce. Then they're fierce."
- 9) "Just a few short years ago, under my presidency, we had the most secure border and the best economy in the history of our country, in the history of the world. We had the greatest economy in the history of the world. We had never done anything like it. We were beating every country, including China, by leaps and bounds. Nobody had seen anything like it."

Analysis of these examples clearly emphasizes that Trump positively assessed and evaluated achievements of his former presidency via the use of emphasis, overstating numbers, and employing counterfactuality in gaining acceptance of his lies by his audience. Audience acceptance is central to the effectiveness of these exaggerations.

He used comparisons on many occasions to intensify his claims. These comparisons were invariably exaggerations of his claims. Assessments of situations and/or events in which he drew comparisons between claims and counterclaims also reveal hyperboles.

Intensification of claims were expressed in many forms such as, adverbs (loudly, wildly, strongly, powerfully, happily, and seriously) and adjectives (great, proud, amazing, serious, dead, successful. Fierce, and great) as well as overrating of events and situations ('cheering widely', 'the numbers were absolutely amazing', 'just absolutely blood all over the place', 'we were under attack', 'bullets were continuing to fly', 'they saw the blood, and thought, actually most did, that I was dead', 'we have people that are a lot less than fierce, except when it comes to cheating on elections and a couple of other things, then they're fierce. Then they're fierce, and 'Just a few short years ago, under my presidency, we had the most secure border and the best economy in the history of our country, in the history of the world. We had the greatest economy in the history of the world.

In the above excerpts from Trump's speech, some hyperboles enter as illusions, fantasies, or fallacies of Trump's own creation. They either never took place or they are nonfactual entities or events. He only uses them figuratively, far from reality, in his speech to effect persuasion, but his extreme description of events and objects has detached them from reality.

These examples show that Trump uses intensifying adjectives, adverbs, and superlative comparisons to magnify events and achievements. Their persuasive force depends not only on exaggeration itself but also on audience uptake, which helps normalize these claims within the speech context

As a powerful person, Trump used hegemony and evinced it via words. Consequently, the target audience accepted all these hyperbolic descriptions, illusions, and fallacies as realities, where in different contexts they are perceived as extraordinary and uncommon. These hyperbolic expressions gained momentum and acceptance as audiences fully supported them, even though they were employed by Trump for effective and persuasive purposes. This illustrates how linguistic dominance operates subtly through voluntary audience alignment.

6.3 *Dysphemism and the Bad Qualities of Opponents*

Hyperbole as dysphemism was identified in Trump's speeches on countless number of occasions. By these statements, he intended to downgrade and belittle his political opponents and their deeds. In other words, Trump intentionally exaggerated his opponents' bad qualities; in a way, he tried to create new realities about his political opponents.

In addition, Trump combines dysphemistic expressions with language associated with crisis, decline and fear of the future under Biden's administration. Fear and anger, as intrinsic emotions, can easily be exploited in political discourse to exert influence. Trump masterfully succeeded in constructing this slanderous image of the Biden presidency as irredeemably bad and chaotic. This fear of the future was framed as warnings that targeted the concerns of the American people, such as 'weaponizing the justice system', 'weak economy', 'declining nation', 'inflation crisis that is making life unaffordable', 'ravaged incomes', 'illegal immigration crisis that has spread misery, crime, poverty, disease, and destruction to communities all across our land', and related examples. This dramatic image, drawn by Trump, is meant to stimulate strong emotional responses among recipients as he managed to portray himself as a messiah whose divine goal is to save these people.

Similarly, Trump frequently indulged in *lalochezia* and *ad hominem* to insult and scandalize his political opponents and to provoke anger among his supporters. Expressions such as 'crazy Nancy Pelosi', 'If you took the 10 worst presidents in the history of the United States. Think of it. The 10 worst. Added them up, they will not have done the damage that Biden has done. We must first rescue our nation from failed and even incompetent leadership. We have totally incompetent leadership, 'this administration can't come close to solving the problems', ' This is a shame, what this administration, the damage that this administration has done', and related examples, are strategically used by Trump to delegitimize his political opponents and to give strength and legitimacy to himself. He further managed through targeting people's emotions and feelings, and the use of vulgar, fearful language while describing his opponents, to create a sense of outrage and denial among the audience. Therefore, Trump succeeded in creating a feeling of loyalty and commitment among future

voters.

Some examples are as follows:

- 1) "The Democrat party should immediately stop weaponizing the justice system and labeling their political opponent as an enemy of democracy. Especially since that is not true. In fact, I am the one saving democracy for the people of our country."
- 2) "If Democrats want to unify our country, they should drop these partisan witch hunts, which I've been going through for approximately eight years. And they should do that without delay and allow an election to proceed that is worthy of our people. We're going to win it anyway."
- 3) "Every week, they get another subpoena from the Democrats. Crazy Nancy Pelosi, the whole thing. Just boom, boom, boom."
- 4) "They've got to stop that because they're destroying our country. We have to work on making America great again, not on beating people. And we won. We beat them in all. We beat them on the impeachments. We beat them on the indictments. We beat them. But the time that you have to spend, the time that you have to spend. If they would devote that genius to helping our country, we'd have a much stronger and better country."
- 5) "But to achieve this future, we must first rescue our nation from failed and even incompetent leadership. We have totally incompetent leadership. This will be the most important election in the history of our country."
- 6) "Under the current administration, we are indeed a nation in decline."
- 7) "We have an inflation crisis that is making life unaffordable, ravaging the incomes of working and low-income families, and crushing, just simply crushing our people like never before. They've never seen anything like it."
- 8) "We also have an illegal immigration crisis, and it's taking place right now, as we sit here in this beautiful arena. It's a massive invasion at our southern border that has spread misery, crime, poverty, disease, and destruction to communities all across our land. Nobody's ever seen anything like it."
- 9) "This is a shame, what this administration, the damage that this administration has done. And I say it often. If you took the 10 worst presidents in the history of the United States. Think of it. The 10 worst. Added them up, they will not have done the damage that Biden has done. Only going to use the term once. Biden. I'm not going to use the name anymore. Just one time. The damage that he's done to this country is unthinkable. It's unthinkable."

Dysphemism here functions both as a delegitimizing strategy and as a mechanism for emotional mobilization.

6.4 Counterfactuality as Lies / Violation of "Truth Conditions" and "Felicity Conditions" as a Hyperbole

On the one hand, truth conditions refer to the semantic content of sentences and utterances. The meanings of certain types of utterances depend on their truth conditions and can be easily measured or tested against whether they are 'true' or 'false'. On the other hand, felicity conditions in speech act theory are the circumstances that are required for a performative act to be successful; they often involve the rights, obligations, beliefs, or abilities of participants (Austin, 1962: pp. 14–24; 1975). For example, in 'I sentence you to 10 years imprisonment', the speaker needs to be qualified to make the statement (these are called preparatory conditions). In 'The year 2025 will be the year of peace', the speaker needs to have all sorts of evidence to make such a statement. In addition, the speaker must also genuinely intend to make the performative statement (this refers to sincerity conditions).

Violations of 'truth conditions' and 'felicity conditions' were abundantly used as hyperboles in Trump's speeches. Some examples are as follows:

- 1) "Together, we will launch a new era of safety, prosperity, and freedom for citizens of every race, religion, color, and creed."
- 2) "No matter what obstacle comes our way, we will not break. We will not bend. We will not back down, and I will never stop fighting for you, your family, and our magnificent country. Never."
- 3) "And everything I have to give with all of the energy and fight in my heart and soul, I pledge to our nation tonight. Thank you very much. I pledge that to our nation. We're going to turn our nation around, and we're going to do it very quickly. Thank you."
- 4) "But I'm thrilled to have a new friend and partner fighting by my side: the next vice president of the United States, the current senator from Ohio, J.D. Vance, and his incredible wife, Usha."
"He's going to be a great vice president; he's going to be great. He'll be with this country and with this movement. The greatest movement in the history of our country. Make America Great Again. When they criticize it, they say, "We're going to try and stop MAGA." MAGA is "Make America Great Again." What are you going to stop? There's nothing to stop. Then they say, "Oh, that's right." It's very tough to fight it."
- 5) "I will end every single international crisis that the current administration has created, including the horrible war with Russia and Ukraine, which would have never happened if I was president. And the war caused by the attack on Israel, which would never have happened if I was president."
- 6) "I will end the devastating inflation crisis immediately, bring down interest rates, and lower the cost of energy."

- 7) "With proper leadership, every disaster we are now enduring will be fixed — and it will be fixed very, very quickly."
- 8) "We stopped human trafficking and forged historic agreements to keep illegal aliens on foreign soil."
- 9) "We will soon be on the verge of finding the cures to cancer, Alzheimer's disease, and many other diseases."

In the previous examples, Trump not only violated truth conditions and felicity conditions, but he made factually unsupported assertions appear to be true realities. In all situations, Trump made promises he cannot keep or for which he has no guarantee they will be as indicated in his speech. During his presidency (2016-2020), he failed to end the inflation crisis. Similarly, his presidency will not be able to fix disasters, end human trafficking, find a cure for cancer, launch a new era of safety, prosperity, and freedom for citizens of every race, end every single international crisis that the current administration has created, among others. During his previous presidency, Trump had the opportunity to fulfill the commitments reiterated in the current speech; however, many of these pledges were not realized. Consequently, the promises advanced in this address may be interpreted as rhetorically aspirational rather than grounded in demonstrable policy outcomes. Truth conditions and felicity conditions are clearly violated in his nomination acceptance speech of 2024. This is a clear indication that Trump is not in a position to make such promises credibly to the audience, since he cannot keep these promises and is unable to fulfill them.

6.5 Impossible World

Speaker and listener engage between them in the construction of fictitious worlds where impossible, exaggerated events take/took place (McCarthy & Carter, 2004: pp.162-163). This happens when the listener is totally under the control of the speaker due to power, inequalities in societies, or hegemony. Strategic progression of Trump's discourse, where the opening of his speech came as a reminder of a tragic event, the assassination attempt, relies heavily on emotive language to engage the audience and to gain full support. This control over the audience helped him to invoke new realities and fictitious worlds of his own creation, where beliefs and thoughts were induced brilliantly in the audience. Eventually, Trump was perceived as a savior and a keeper of people's interests and needs. Receivers became wholly and fully immersed in his lies, which became concrete realities. Examples of creating utopian worlds are:

- (1) "And this is the love that will lead America back to the summit of human achievement and greatness. This is what we need."
- (2) "Our resolve is unbroken, and our purpose is unchanged, to deliver a government that serves the American people better than ever before. Nothing will stop me in this mission, because our vision is righteous and our cause is pure."
- (3) "Together, we will lead America to new heights of greatness like the world has never seen before."
- (4) "Under our leadership, the United States will be respected again. No nation will question our power. No enemy will doubt our might. Our borders will be totally secure. Our economy will soar. We will return law and order to our streets, patriotism to our schools, and importantly, we will restore peace, stability, and harmony throughout the world."
- (5) "To all of the forgotten men and women who have been neglected, abandoned, and left behind, you will be forgotten no longer. We will press forward, and together, we will win, win, win."

These utopian constructions are ideologically loaded representations of the future.

6.6 Listener Take-up

The listener reacts with supportive behavior such as laughter or asserting back-channel markers and/or contributes further to the counterfactual, impossibility, contextual disjunction, etc. (McCarthy & Carter, 2004: pp. 162-163). These back channels were realized in many forms during the delivery of Trump's speech; some chanted Trump's name on many occasions throughout his speech; others chanted pro-Trump slogans. Tens of thousands of supporters collectively cheered him, and this same group of proponents jeered his political opponents as they cried out with derision, spite, aversion, contempt, distaste, and mockery to downgrade and show contemptuously rude and impertinent speech to Trump's opponents. Furthermore, thousands of his supporters rose and gave him standing ovations repeatedly throughout the lengthy speech. In addition, the audience roared its approval with thundering applause on countless occasions during the speech. All in all, his recipients showed total submissiveness and obedience, and the speech was a total success from a rhetorical point of view. Listener take-up confirms the success of hyperbolic persuasion and reinforces hegemonic alignment.

7. Emotiveness as a Persuasive Device

In discourse, the strategic management of a communicative event to advance the speaker's objectives is closely associated with the effective use of emotive language, which appeals primarily to the audience's affect rather than to purely rational evaluation. Evincing a great deal of influence requires the deliberate selection of emotionally charged lexical choices that intensify salience and guide interpretation. From a Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) perspective, emotive language operates not only as a persuasive resource but also as a mechanism for shaping audience affective alignment, thereby contributing to the maintenance and reproduction of power asymmetries.

Interpersonal influence goals are desired outcomes you can achieve only if you convince another interlocutor to cooperate with you (Dillard et al. 2002). Your interpersonal influence depends on your ability to use communication to change another person's thoughts, attitudes, or future behaviors (Solomon & Theiss, 2013). We use different approaches in communication to achieve different influence goals, such as asking for a favour, giving advice, or enforcing obligations (Cai & Wilson, 2000; Dillard et al., 1996). The interpersonal influence goal that motivates communication is the primary goal, while the other considerations that arise during interpersonal influence

interactions are secondary goals (Dillard et al., 1989).

In this speech, Trump's primary goal is to guarantee recipients' attendance and involvement. His mastery of using highly emotive language was put to use in this particular context. This can be accomplished by emotive language, which entails soliciting and securing the sympathy and empathy of recipients, and the shooting incident was served to reinforce this appeal. The assassination attempt functions as a discursive device that amplifies pathos and constructs Trump as both vulnerable and heroic, strategically shaping audience perception.

Once Trump succeeded in achieving his primary goal at the opening of his speech, he could easily move to achieving other goals, the audience was already highly engaged, captivated, and under his control. In this case, his didactic style is found effective. Audience's adulation and alacrity gave Trump the discursive permission to abuse a wide range of linguistic strata in his discourse and to employ hostile language as emotive language to serve his own personal goals, while showing no compunction whatsoever about using such deceptive language. This aligns with the CDA principle that language is not neutral; it can be deliberately used to manipulate cognitive and emotional responses to consolidate authority.

Examples of Emotive Language:

- 1) "The discord and division in our society must be healed. We must heal it quickly. As Americans, we are bound together by a single fate and a shared destiny. We rise together. Or we fall apart."
- 2) "Let me begin this evening by expressing my gratitude to the American people for your outpouring of love and support following the assassination attempt at my rally on Saturday."
- 3) "They knew it was a shot to the head. They saw the blood. And there's an interesting statistic. The ears are the bloodiest part. If something happens with the ears, they bleed more than any other part of the body. For whatever reason, the doctors told me that."
 "And I said, 'Why is there so much blood?'"
 "He said, 'It's the ears, they bleed more.'"
 "So, we learned something. But they just —"
 "They just, this beautiful crowd, they didn't want to leave me. They knew I was in trouble. They didn't want to leave me. And you can see that love written all over their faces. True."
- 4) "Tragically, the shooter claimed the life of one of our fellow Americans: Corey Comperatore. Unbelievable person, everybody tells me. Unbelievable." "And seriously wounded two other great warriors. Spoke to them today: David Dutch and James Copenhagen. Two great people. I also spoke to all three families of these tremendous people." "Our love and prayers are with them and always will be. We're never going to forget them. They came for a great rally. They were serious Trumpsters, I want to tell you. They were serious Trumpsters and still are. But Corey, unfortunately, we have to use the past tense."

Trump commenced his speech by reminding the crowd of a dramatic event that happened to him recently, namely, the assassination attempt. This is a highly effective strategy and topic to start with. His lengthy description of what happened and the amount of emotive language used played a major role in creating immediacy, closeness, and empathy. This is how recipients perceived his words, but Trump opted for this progression or staging of his discourse to achieve affective purposes where he intended to hegemonize the feelings and emotions of the audience. Staging emotive content early in the speech functions to secure cognitive and emotional dominance over the audience, aligning with the CDA principle that discourse constructs social reality.

Then he continued his speech, addressing an enraptured audience. Gradually, he was able to instill into their minds these constructed claims and representations as if they were factual events or realities. Words such as 'healed,' 'fate,' 'destiny,' 'gratitude,' 'love,' 'support,' 'assassination,' 'blood,' 'bleed,' 'bloodiest,' 'so much blood,' 'beautiful crowd,' 'fellow Americans,' among others were used strategically and purposefully to evince persuasion and support. These lexical choices are calculated to produce high emotional arousal, establish in-group solidarity, and intensify allegiance toward Trump, demonstrating the power of emotiveness as a persuasive device.

8. Rhetorical Questions as a Powerful Rhetorical Device and Audience Engagement Tool

Rhetorical questions are not intended to solicit literal answers from recipients or the audience; in other words, they only elicit submission and/or agreement on behalf of the audience. Their power lies in their ability to confirm, affirm, and emphasize particular ideas and thoughts in the minds of listeners. Through strategic deployment, a rhetorical question can establish a point as an undisputed reality, often without requiring evidence, due to the context, delivery, and authority of the speaker. Audience members become mentally engaged, concluding themselves, which integrates them into the progression of the discourse. From a CDA perspective, rhetorical questions are instruments of power and influence: they manipulate audience cognition and affect, creating a sense of co-authorship while reinforcing the speaker's dominance over the discourse.

Rhetorical questions are common and widely used in Trump's speeches, where abstract thoughts and subjective ideas are framed as concrete, undeniable points for the audience. This effect is amplified by the hegemonic and authoritative style Trump imposes, allowing him to shape recipients toward confirming his perspective without verification or proof. Moreover, rhetorical questions give audience members the illusion of participation, making them feel involved in constructing the speaker's argument rather than being passive

recipients.

By employing rhetorical questions strategically, Trump achieves multiple objectives:

- Reinforcement of his own assertions: The audience is directed to accept his point of view as factual and authoritative.
- Audience engagement and investment: Listeners feel included and active, perceiving themselves as partners in the discourse or participants.
- Strengthening loyalty and defensiveness: Recipients become more tenacious in defending their ideas against political opponents.
- Creation of fervent supporters: The audience becomes emotionally aligned with Trump's agenda, adopting a combative stance against the opposition.

This demonstrates how rhetorical questions operate as both a persuasive tool and a mechanism of hegemonic control, consistent with CDA analysis of political discourse.

Examples of Rhetorical Questions in Trump's Speeches:

- 1) "You saw a few of them up there on my lap before. And how good was Dana? Was Dana good?"
- 2) "But they all wanted to be here. They called ... And how about the Hulkster? How good was he? You see that? Where is he? Boy, oh boy."
- 3) "There aren't a lot of entertainers that could do that, right?"
- 4) "By the way, you know who's taking the jobs, the jobs that are created?"
- 5) "And you know who's being hurt the most by millions of people pouring into our country?"
- 6) "I wanted a sealed border. Again, come in, but come in legally. You know how unfair it is?"
- 7) "See, in the old days, you'd say that's a wonderful thing. Now they say, 'How can you possibly do that?'"
- 8) "Mr. Congressman from Miami, by the way, happens to be here. Correct?"
- 9) "But now we have unbelievable technology. And why should other countries have this, and we don't?"

Each of these examples demonstrates how Trump uses rhetorical questions to frame the audience's perception, assert authority, and co-opt the audience into agreeing with his claims, all while reinforcing the emotional and evaluative alignment of the group.

9. Conclusion

Rhetorical devices are, without doubt, considered by linguists as the most powerful means of persuasion, and their effectiveness is measured according to the audience's cultural background, the communication event, and the tailored approaches of the persuasive strategies. In other words, purposeful persuasion is achieved by the knowledge language users have about the audience's cultural background and their beliefs and ideologies (Trump's particular knowledge of Whites' ideology and belief of supremacy and worth), knowledge of and familiarity with the communicative event, and above all, mastery of the use of the rhetorical devices. More often than not, rhetorical devices evince persuasive communication by engaging audiences, underlining decisive and existential messages, and mobilizing collective responses, making discourses more compelling in influencing and/or changing future opinions and eventually behaviors. Furthermore, rhetorical devices heighten persuasive communication by targeting and safeguarding the audience's interests; these devices manage to convince the audience of the speaker's viewpoint. Therefore, speakers must use them carefully and strategically in order not to end up having adverse reactions or consequences.

a distinctive rhetorical style and contemptuous language in delivering public speeches were used successfully and effectively by Trump in his nomination acceptance speech of 2024. This does not imply that he is exceptionally knowledgeable or highly educated; instead, it indicates that he is politically and rhetorically astute in recognizing what serves his interests. On numerous occasions throughout the speech, he strategically redirected the discussion to advance his own objectives. To this end, he used two strategies. First, Trump focused on audience engagement in the articulation of his speech; this was made possible by the use of two main rhetorical devices, namely, emotive language and rhetorical questions. This strategy formed his primary goal. The audience felt they were not just mere recipients but articulators who played a major role in drafting the speech. They had the feeling that they were partners rather than receivers, which is obvious simply by their reactions to the speech. Second, Trump, as a powerful person (affluent and former president), used control, dominance, and hegemony to instill his views in his audience through mastering linguistic manipulation. This was his secondary goal. He managed to create new realities by using aggressive and derogatory language, especially when describing his political opponents, where this type of language is not perceived as offensive anymore by the audience. On the contrary, the audience showed enthusiasm towards such language. For them, Trump does not sound as a person displaying an aggressively hostile attitude. They did not perceive his remarks as offensive. Negative remarks and vulgar language received acceptance from the audience as they became totally hegemonized and dominated by Trump's dazzling words. Eventually, Trump appeared to have complete control over his listeners. This complete submissiveness of the audience encouraged Trump to invoke other rhetorical devices in his speech in order to secure full control over his recipients. Hyperbolicism of different types, dysphemism, violation of truth and felicity conditions, as well as the use of fear and anger to

force persuasion, are also employed as rhetorical devices in Trump's speech. The audience, instead of excoriating Trump, adulated him and showed full support for his policy. Subsequently, lies became truths and realities; accusations and vilifications became ubiquitous and found circulation and acceptance among a large number of people; eventually, and during his speech, insouciant Trump became an affable person. This was made possible by the manipulative strategies in using diverse linguistic resources and devices that served Trump in his endeavor, namely, achieving persuasion and full alignment of his audience.

Trump's use of emotive language, rhetorical questions, hyperbolism, dysphemism, and manipulative lexical strategies successfully guided the audience's attention, emotions, and interpretations. Audience reactions—such as applause, chanting, standing ovations, and uptake of evaluative expressions—demonstrated immediate alignment with his speech content. These responses indicate that, within this cultural and political context, Trump's rhetorical strategies were effective. However, it is important to note that such effectiveness cannot be generalized universally, as it depends on the interaction between speaker strategies, audience predispositions, and contextual factors.

This study has shown that Trump's 2024 nomination acceptance speech relies on hyperbole, dysphemism, emotive language, and rhetorical questions as strategic resources of persuasion. Through a CDA framework, these devices can be understood not as neutral stylistic features but as mechanisms for shaping perception, legitimizing authority, and delegitimizing opponents. Furthermore, audience responses in the speech context further indicate that rhetorical effectiveness depends on the interaction between speaker strategy and audience predisposition.

Overall, this study explains how rhetorical devices, when deployed with cultural and situational awareness, can shape collective perceptions and behaviors, underscoring the value of analysing political discourse through a CDA lens.

Acknowledgement

I thank Professor Lucy Anne Perry for her helpful comments and editorial assistance on this manuscript.

Authors' contribution

Inapplicable (single author)

Funding

Inapplicable (self-funded)

Competing interest

The author declares that he has no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

Informed consent

Obtained.

Ethics approval

The Publication Ethics Committee of the Sciedu Press.

The journal's policies adhere to the Core Practices established by the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE).

Provenance and peer review

Not commissioned; externally double-blind peer reviewed.

Data availability statement

The data that support the findings of this study are available on request from the corresponding author. The data are not publicly available due to privacy or ethical restrictions.

Data sharing statement

No additional data are available.

Open access

This is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

Copyrights

Copyright for this article is retained by the author(s), with first publication rights granted to the journal.

References

- Aghalarova, A. (2024). Hyperbole as a persuasive tool. *Ancient Land*, 36, 37-43. <https://doi.org/10.36719/2706-6185/31/37-43>
- Allan, K., & Burrige, K. (1991). *Euphemism and dysphemism: Language used as shield and weapon*. Oxford University Press.
- Aristotle. (2007). *On rhetoric: A theory of civic discourse* (G. A. Kennedy, Trans., 2nd ed.). Oxford University Press. (Original work published ca. 4th century BCE).

- Austin, J. L. (1975). *How to do things with words*. Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780198245537.001.0001>
- Cai, D. A., & Wilson, S. R. (2000). Identity implications of influence goals: A cross-cultural comparison on interaction goals and facework. *Communication Studies*, 51(4), 307-328. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10510970009388529>
- Charteris-Black, J. (2005). *Politicians and rhetoric: The persuasive power of metaphor*. Palgrave Macmillan. <https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230501706>
- Chouliaraki, L., & Fairclough, N. (1999). *Discourse in late modernity: Rethinking critical discourse analysis*. Edinburgh University Press.
- Christodoulidou, M. (2011). Hyperbole in everyday conversation. *Proceedings of the 19th International Symposium on Theoretical and Applied Linguistics*. <https://doi.org/10.26262/istal.v19i0.5489>
- Connerton, P. (1976). *Critical sociology: Selected readings*. Penguin.
- Dillard, J. P., Anderson, J. W., & Knobloch, L. K. (2002). Interpersonal influence. In M. L. Knapp & J. A. Daly (Eds.), *Handbook of interpersonal communication* (3rd ed., pp. 425-474). SAGE.
- Dillard, J. P., Kinney, T. A., & Cruz, M. G. (1996). Influence, appraisals, and emotions in close relationships. *Communication Monographs*, 63(2), 105-130. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03637759609376382>
- Dillard, J. P., Segrin, C., & Harden, J. M. (1989). Primary and secondary goals in the production of interpersonal influence messages. *Communication Monographs*, 56(1), 19-38. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03637758909390247>
- Entman, R. M. (1993). Framing: Toward clarification of a fractured paradigm. *Journal of Communication*, 43(4), 51-58. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1460-2466.1993.tb01304.x>
- Fairclough, N. (1985). Critical and descriptive goals in discourse analysis. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 9(6), 739-763. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166\(85\)90002-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166(85)90002-5)
- Fairclough, N. (1992a). *Discourse and social change*. Polity Press.
- Fairclough, N. (1992b). Discourse and text: Linguistic and intertextual analysis within discourse analysis. *Discourse & Society*, 3(2), 193-217. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0957926592003002004>
- Fairclough, N. (1995). *Critical discourse analysis: Papers in the critical study of language*. Longman.
- Fairclough, N., & Wodak, R. (1997). Critical discourse analysis. In T. A. van Dijk (Ed.), *Discourse studies: A multidisciplinary introduction* (Vol. 2, pp. 258-284). SAGE.
- Golubeva, T. M. (2019). Hyperbole as a persuasion tool in political discourse (The case of British politicians' speech). *Science Journal of Volgograd State University. Linguistics*, 18(3), 195-205. <https://doi.org/10.15688/jvolsu2.2019.3.16>
- Green, M. C., & Appel, M. (2024). Narrative transportation: How stories shape how we see ourselves and the world. *Advances in experimental social psychology*, 70, 1-82). Elsevier. <https://doi.org/10.1016/bs.aesp.2024.03.002>
- Habermas, J. (1977). *Erkenntnis und Interesse*. Suhrkamp.
- Hodge, R., & Kress, G. (1993). *Language as ideology* (2nd ed.). Routledge.
- Ilie, C. (1994). *What else can I tell you? A pragmatic study of English rhetorical questions as discursive and argumentative acts*. Almqvist & Wiksell International.
- Ilie, C. (2015). Questions and questioning. In K. Tracy, C. Ilie, & T. Sandel (Eds.), *The international encyclopedia of language and social interaction*. Wiley-Blackwell. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118611463.wbielsi018>
- Ilie, C. (2022). How to argue with questions and answers: Argumentation strategies in parliamentary deliberation. *Languages*, 7(3), 205. <https://doi.org/10.3390/languages7030205>
- Krings, H., Baumgartner, H. M., & Wild, C. (1973). *Handbuch philosophischer Grundbegriffe*. Kösel.
- Majeed, M. R., & Ahmed, A. H. (2017). A pragmatic analysis of rhetorical questions in selected American political speeches. *Journal of Garmian University*, 4(3). <https://doi.org/10.24271/garmian.119>
- Martin, J. R., & White, P. R. R. (2005). *The language of evaluation: Appraisal in English*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Martín Rojo, L., & van Dijk, T. A. (1997). "There was a problem, and it was solved": Legitimizing the expulsion of "illegal" immigrants in Spanish parliamentary discourse. *Discourse & Society*, 8(4), 523-567. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0957926597008004005>
- Martín Rojo, L., & Whittaker, R. (Eds.). (1998). *Poder-decir o el poder de los discursos*. Arrecife.
- McCarthy, M., & Carter, R. (2004). "There's millions of them": Hyperbole in everyday conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 36(2), 149-184. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166\(03\)00116-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166(03)00116-4)
- Oschatz, C., & Marker, C. (2020). Long-term persuasive effects in narrative communication research: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Communication*, 70(4), 473-496. <https://doi.org/10.1093/joc/jqaa017>
- Pons, G. (2024, July 19). *Read Donald Trump's full RNC speech accepting GOP nomination*. NBC Boston; NBC10 Boston. Retrieved from

- <https://www.nbc.com/news/national-international/read-donald-trumps-full-mc-speech-accepting-gop-nomination/3432055/>
- Preminger, A. (Ed.). (1974). *Princeton encyclopedia of poetry and poetics*. Princeton University Press.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-349-15617-7>
- Snoeck Henkemans, A. F. (2017). Strategic manoeuvring with hyperbole in political debate. In F. H. van Eemeren & P. Wu (Eds.), *Contextualizing pragma-dialectics* (pp. 269-280). John Benjamins. <https://doi.org/10.1075/aic.12.15sno>
- Solomon, D. H., & Theiss, J. A. (2013). *Interpersonal communication: Putting theory into practice*. Routledge.
- Tulis, J. K. (1987). *The rhetorical presidency*. Princeton University Press.
- van Dijk, T. A. (1986). *Racism in the press*. Arnold.
- van Dijk, T. A. (1993). Principles of critical discourse analysis. *Discourse & Society*, 4(2), 249-283.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0957926593004002006>
- van Dijk, T. A. (2000). *Political discourse and ideology* [Manuscript]. University of Amsterdam.
- van Dijk, T. A. (2022). *The discourse, cognition, society framework* [Working paper]. Centre of Discourse Studies.
- Wodak, R. (2000, April). Does sociolinguistics need social theory? New perspectives on critical discourse analysis [Keynote address]. SS 2000, Bristol, United Kingdom. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781529739664>
- Wodak, R. (2020). *The politics of fear: The shameless normalization of far-right discourse* (2nd ed.). SAGE.
- Wodak, R., de Cillia, R., Reisigl, M., & Liebhart, K. (1999). *The discursive construction of national identity*. Edinburgh University Press.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0957926599010002002>
- Wodak, R., & Meyer, M. (2009). Critical discourse analysis: History, agenda, theory, and methodology. In R. Wodak & M. Meyer (Eds.), *Methods of critical discourse analysis* (2nd ed., pp. 1-33). SAGE.
- Zhang, J., Spirling, A., & Danescu-Niculescu-Mizil, C. (2017). Asking too much? The rhetorical role of questions in political discourse. In *Proceedings of the 2017 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing* (pp. 1558-1570). Association for Computational Linguistics. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/D17-1164>
- Ziembicki, D. (2025). Questions as elements of argumentation in political debates. *Argumentation*, 39, 601-634.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10503-025-09674-z>