Unveiling the Microstructure Elements of President Rodrigo Duterte's Interviews: A Political Discourse Analysis

Yuri C. Lemana
Lyceum of the Philippines University – Manila

Al Ryanne G. Gatcho
Trinity University of Asia, Philippines
ryanne.gatcho@gmail.com

Abstract

This descriptive qualitative study seeks to unravel the microstructure elements of the interviews of President Rodrigo Duterte and how he represents himself and his opponents using political discourse analysis. The corpora consisted of his 30 recent interviews at the time of writing this paper and were retrieved in an online archive of the Presidential Communications Operations Office (PCOO). The findings indicated that Duterte's discourse has these various linguistic features: modality, attributions, disclaimer, presuppositions, validity claims, pronoun use, transitivity, passivation, number of game, lexicon, idioms, metaphors, intertextuality, and profanity. The study revealed that Duterte manipulatively uses language to reflect a positive representation of himself and negative representation of others, legitimizing his authority and delegitimizing those in opposition.

1. INTRODUCTION

Communication is at the nexus of politics as politicians use it for persuasion to achieve decision-making. Consequently, politicians can also use language to depict the world as binary oppositions (Helander, 2014). These are presented through the usage of euphemisms to the things the "us" have done or by directly indicating their positive features in contrast to the negative connotations given to the "them." Similarly, Hudson (1978) perceives political statements, not as something objective, rather, it plays a role in achieving political aims, making affinities or oppositions, and showing a painting of unity within the nation. Simply, politicians' use of language must be subjected to analytical inquiry to reveal the underlying motives and themes contained in their seemingly superficial and harmless use of words.

Additionally, presidents use language as a tool for power to legitimize the establishment of their governance and ensure that they have the consent of the people governed (Hacker, 1996). Due to their position, Rubic-Remorosa (2018) implies that anything they state, regardless if it is written or spoken contains a substance which in itself is a manifestation of power. Hence, it is through the study of discourse that one can weave a tapestry of hidden features relating to power and dominance.

Previous research studies have perceived discourse as a form of utterances, a social interaction, a means of social process and action and as a hybrid discipline within humanities and social sciences which represents the social world (Fairclough, 2010; Musnandar, 2014; Schiffrin, 1994; Stenstrom. 1994). Nonetheless, discourse is the use of texts either through

speech or writing (Utari, 2017). Discourse analysts examine these content-forming texts with attribution to the causes and roles it plays, *inter alia* its production and context (Ismaliyah, 2015).

Discourse analysis is concerned with the manner through which language is used to influence others and the way discourse provides the creation or the maintenance of a specific context (Gee, 2014). Through such a study, discourse analysts can convey the hidden meanings of texts conversed by individuals especially of politicians.

An approach of discourse analysis which is suitable in examining the usage of language in politics is critical discourse analysis (CDA). It primarily focuses on the influence of social inequalities, ideology and power relations and their discursive features (Autida-van der Zee, 2013; Alrefaee *et al*, 2019). That is, language and power are inextricably linked. Likewise, political discourse analysis (PDA) is aimed at analyzing the use of language in the domain of politics. It studies the production of power, domination, and abuse via political discourse. Following Chilton's (2004) theory of this approach, there are two ways to perceive it: (1) micro-level, wherein the focus is the competition for power or the cooperation of a variety of people; and (2) macro-level which involves state institutions in their roles in conflict resolution and assertion of power to dominate others. At the core, however, of political discourse analysis is CDA for it is ought to be carried out through a critical view (Dunmire, 2012).

PDA at times can be confusing because researchers tend to be baffled in determining if their data fall within the precepts of the aforementioned. Nevertheless, Fairclough and Fairclough (2012) assert that the central theme of political discourse analysis is its actors who are politicians. That is, this approach is only geared towards the written or oral discourse of formal politicians such as prime ministers, presidents, senators and the like.

In the Philippines, discourse analysis studies have mainly revolved around speeches and not much attention is rendered to other contexts where political discourse is also apparent. For example, the study of Autida-van der Zee (2013) concentrates on the speeches of former President Benigno Aquino III, Caballero (2015) examined the privilege speech given by Senator Santiago in the Senate, and the recent study of Rubic-Remorosa (2018) also focused on the speeches of President Rodrigo Duterte. However, studies concerning the incumbent president of the country are few. Using critical discourse analysis, studies range from his drug war policy to his speeches, and how he has created an image of himself (Tatcho, 2018; Utari, 2017).

The rise of political interviews as the focal mode of transmitting politicians' messages across the populace generates the all the more important for studying the political discourse in such a different setting where the spontaneity of the speaker is apparent. This is because the conversation between a politician and an interviewer is broadcasted to a multitude of viewers who can cognize the discourse of a politician and are affected by their use of discourse (Beattie, 1982). Therefore, this study focuses on the examination of the interviews of President Rodrigo Roa Duterte using PDA due to the lack of such endeavor. Specifically, the study aims to: (a) determine the microstructure elements present in President Duterte's discourse, and (b) discover the manner President Duterte represents himself (us) and the opposition (them).

2. METHODOLOGY

The study's main focus was to analyze the political discourse of President Rodrigo Roa Duterte in his political interviews with the media. It made use of a descriptive qualitative design as discourse analysis, along with its offshoot critical discourse analysis, is innately interpretative (Trappes-Lomax, 2006). The corpora of this study involved the 30 recent media interviews of President Duterte at the time of writing this paper to ensure its reliability. The data were dated from August 28, 2017, to December 3, 2018, referred to its extracts as "PI."

These were all retrieved from the publicly accessible online archive of the PCOO (2018). The interviews were methodically analyzed using Chilton's (2004) theory of political discourse to illuminate how Duterte used discourse to manifest power and represent various entities in the polity, and the CDA theory of Van Dijk (1998). While his theory consisted of three structures in understanding the text: macrostructures, superstructures, and microstructures, the researchers only focused on the latter as the study aimed to find out the micro features of Duterte's discourse. Moreover, Van Dijk (2015) indicated that macro and micro levels of discourse form a unified whole, thus by analyzing the microstructure elements of Duterte's discourse, the macro topics of power, inequality, and representations can be reflected. Microstructure analysis as Van Dijk (1998) posited focused on analyzing the local meaning of the text, i.e. its semantic, syntactic, stylistic and rhetoric features.

Semantic feature refers to how the author of the discourse arranges the setting of the event being discussed to imply or hide a meaning (Billig, 2008). Syntax feature pertains to the manner words are used in discourse; how sentences are formed, their voice as either active or passive, and the prevailing pronouns in the sentences of the actor (Varalakshmi, 2012). Stylistic features entail the choice of words and how it presents power relations (Van Dijk, 1977). Finally, the rhetoric feature is the aspect of this analysis that involves the actor's usage of words for emphasis or expression such as metaphors to implicitly convey the message or through vulgar words to augment the discourse (Wajnryb, 2005).

3.   RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

3.1. Semantic Analysis

Semantic microstructures pertain to the propositions or the claims presented in discourse (Van Dijk, 1980). The researchers discovered that Duterte's discourse was filled with linguistic features of modality, attribution, disclaimer, presuppositions, and validity claims.

Modality is a significant instrument in the creation of interpersonal meanings in discourses (Olaniyan & Adeniji, 2015). Central to this is the auxiliary verbs used to indicate modality, e.g. should, can, must and such. However, in CDA, modality is not only exclusive to these apparent auxiliary verbs but it also encompasses the attitude and confidence of the speaker about his propositions (Lillian, 2008). These modality features were evident in the following extracts:

> *"I **must** confess; **I do not know** whether it has become effective or it is now in the pipeline for legislation."* – PI.1

> *"Nobody **should** take advantage or give an advantage to other. What will happen to others who would run to --- demokrasya 'to [this is democracy]."* – PI.2

> *"It becomes dysfunctional **actually**. Kidnappings, drugs, and everything."* – PI.3

Two kinds of modality are present in the aforementioned extracts: epistemic and deontic. Epistemic modality involves levels of certainty expressing the speaker's judgment regarding the truthfulness of their propositions or the lack of it (Milkovich & Sitarica, 2017). In PI.1, Duterte reflected a lack of certainty in his statement. While this can be perceived to be a form of ignorance especially that he holds the highest position in the government, it can also be construed as his strategy to represent himself as an honest public servant. In PI.3, Duterte used a non-hedging adverb "*actually*" to display that he is indeed certain that his statement is an irreversible fact. The utilization of such allows the construction of a setting wherein the

person or object is stereotyped and generalized (Rubic-Remorosa, 2018); in this case, he represented hotels with casinos negatively.

On the other hand, deontic modality pertains to freedom in action demonstrating obligation or permission rendered by the speaker to others or upon himself (Chilton, 2004). The usage of *should* indicates a necessary obligation for the actor. Saeed (1997) posits that deontic modals are bound with the amalgamated knowledge of the speaker regarding legality and morality concerning his authority. The said extract bear Duterte's cognizance of the moral and legal aspects of the Philippine state. That is, it allowed him to express his morals on democracy.

Features of attribution were also discovered in Duterte's discourse. Attributions are made to situate one's behavior to a cause and to provide justification for their actions and create theories to control their environment (Heider, 1958). These were apparent in the following extracts:

> *"The **Constitution** says that you must let the people know. But the procedure is **not go direct to the people**." –* PI.4

> *"'Pag sinabi [If it is said] there will be increase in **oil**...**That drives inflation**." –* PI.5

> *"Ngayon, [Now] because of the **not so predictable weather** now. It has **affected really rice planting**." –* PI.6

In PI.4, Duterte attributed his action for not divulging information about his health to the Constitution which supported his argumentation. Chilton (2004) points out that attribution to a reference allows the possibility to intimidate and simultaneously legitimize one's utterance while avoiding personal accountability for making the statement. In PI.5, Duterte indicated the role of oil and attributed it to the rise of inflation in the country's economy. This was also similar to PI.6 where he derived the result of the lack of rice to the weather. Thus, he avoided taking responsibility for the increasing prices of goods and shortage of rice. In other words, attributions in discourse benefit those in power as they manipulate it to serve their interests (Robinson, 2017).

Disclaimer strategy is also utilized by Duterte which is a tool to present oneself as upholding the rule of law. That is to say, it is a well-thought strategy to delimit one's actions (Utari, 2017). In the following extracts where this strategy was manifested by Duterte:

> *"**But** the problem is, I said, I forgot to ask him if I --- **if I have the authority** to announce his name." –* PI.7

> *"It's **not a good policy** to let know the --- to telegraph your intention or what you know about the other fellow, especially in matters of **breaking penal laws**. No, **I will not**. –* PI.8

> *"The **President cannot**… it has to be a **law**. And the law must come **from Congress, not from me**." –* PI.9

> *"**I cannot** grant it. It is only **Congress**." –* PI.10

In these extracts, Duterte represented himself as someone in authority to be maintaining the rule of law. The presence of disclaimer enabled him to convey to his interviewers that albeit he is the president, still, he is bound by law. That is, he presents an identity of himself to be working under the rule of law.

Characteristics of presuppositions were also manifested in his interviews. A presupposition is a strategy wherein a speaker assumes certain ideas as truths (Helander, 2014). This can be achieved through various means as long as it creates a consensual reality (Chilton, 2004), as shown in the following extracts:

> *"They borrowed billions from the…DBP. They never paid. **You know what happened at the end of the day?** It was **condoned by the powers** because **they are the elite**." –* PI.11

> *"**You know** because the human rights will not investigate the Maute or the ISIS. The Human Rights Commission is geared to investigate government abuses and mistakes, shortcomings, whatever." –* PI.12

> *"Because while **they were shouting** in the streets that there's no food, we were --- all along **we were already importing** so many tons of rice." –* PI.13

> *"**Now**, China buys everything from us. When I assumed the --- my work as a --- in the national government, **everything was all right already**." –* PI.14

PI.11 is an example of a rhetorical question that enables the questioner to presuppose their answers as true and justified (Eggins, 2011). In PI.11, Duterte presumed the pervasiveness of the elites in the past presupposing that in his administration they will be condemned. In PI.15, Duterte presumed shared knowledge with the audience through the phrase, *you know*. This placed the Human Rights Commission, a critic of the current administration, unfavorably; presupposing that they are only critical of the government but not of terrorists.

Thus, presuppositions are utilized to present the "*us*" positively and the "*them*" negatively. That is to say, attributing amiable properties to the speaker and evaluating others with disdainful remarks (Mazid, 2007). To wit, he builds a consensual reality that his administration is doing good for the country while the opposition is doing nothing but to criticize him.

Duterte, in his interviews, also conveyed claims of validity. Habermas (1981) asserts that language has an aim and that is to create consensus founded upon agreement and understanding. Thus, politicians who use language in any given social situation implicitly try to validate their claims. These are apparent in the following extracts:

> *"We cannot control unless we **expropriate** but that is **not a good way of doing it in governance**..." –* PI.15

> *"So it's the **voice of the people**…If it is the **wish of the population** here that they do not want a casino, then it will be a no casino." –* PI.16

> *"And that was — that's being **asked by the Visayas and Mindanao** for the longest time, an equal sharing of the wealth of the nation, the taxes and all…and that's why some of them are rebellious." –* PI.17

The above-mentioned extracts are closely associated with the claim to "rightness" and "telling the truth." The former pertains to asserting one's authority and the legitimization of oneself while the latter is concerned with the claim of the speaker that his utterances are sincere and are attributed to a source which is covertly conditioned upon his beliefs (Habermas, 1981). In PI.15, Duterte legitimized himself for not expropriating lands for government-use as he believed that it was not a good policy, hence, again he represented himself as a good statesman. In PI.16 and PI.17, he claimed to be "telling the truth" as he made generalizations

that those were what the people wanted. This is to say, that Duterte is claiming ascendancy as he legitimizes his propositions with morality and generalization.

3.2. Syntactic analysis

The syntax aspect of the text involves not only the pronouns used and the coherence of the sentence but also its voice: either active or passive (Utari, 2017). The researchers identified the following syntax features in Duterte's interviews: pronouns, transitivity, passivation, and number of the game.

Pronouns are paramount to the way groups or individuals are identified, *ipso facto*, they are consistently and politically assigned with relations of power (Wodak & Meyer, 2001). They are, hence, used to influence language through the creation of an imagined communication reflecting the proximity of the speaker and the audience (Utari, 2017). The following extracts show the pronouns used by Duterte:

> *"And **I**'m trying to convince everybody that it is for **our** own — to **our** national interest that **we** start changing the unitary type into a federal type."* – PI.18

> *"**We** will do it because **we** have to restore the dignity of the place."* – PI.19

> *"**You** do not belittle the Chinese intelligence."* – PI.20

The conceptualization of Duterte was affected by the pronouns that he used as they can be inclusive, marked by the usage of we, us, our; or exclusive, e.g. you, them, they and such (Rubic-Remorosa, 2018). This is supported by Chilton (2004) who indicates that first-person plural pronouns like *we* and *our* can be employed to present collective identity either as part of the in-group or outsiders. The usage of *we* displayed Duterte's strategy to diminish his distance to the audience encompassing their social status, age and such; thus, making the audience closer to him and his arguments (Wang, 2010). That is to say, as he is the president of the country, he uses "*we*" to show that he is the spokesperson of the whole government while "*I*" to represent his authority. Pronouns can also be used to present allies or criticize others (Rubic-Remorosa, 2018). Thus, pronouns are utilized in discourse to display power, authority, and/or solidarity (Bull & Fetzer, 2006). Moreover, Duterte employed transitivity and passivation. The former is perceived as a segment in discourse that illustrates the cause and effect relationship of an event (Utari, 2017). On the other hand, passivation or using a passive voice in a sentence can systematically render responsibility for an action or event to oneself or others (Wodak & Meyer, 2001). This enables the speaker, Duterte, to make a positive or negative representation of those present in his sentences. These are evident in the following extracts:

> *"You **crucify government**, you **crucify everybody**."* – PI.21

> *"It **was a hysteria built by [this] red**, itong bigas-bigas. [this rice shortage]"* – PI.22

> *"I **was elected by the people**, not by the military."* – PI.23

A transitive strategy in PI.21 enabled Duterte to provide a cause-and-effect feature for those who protest against his administration. On the other hand, the passivation strategy disposes to conceal the subject of the action while the attention of the consumer of the discourse pivots around the object implicitly controlling them (Van Leeuwen, 2008). It allows Duterte to blame the object of the sentence either for positive and negative representation. In PI.22 and PI.23, he had delegitimized the *others*, communists, through accusations and he had also legitimized himself by the claim that it was the people who granted him power and delegated his authority.

Transitive and passivation strategies allowed Duterte to create a plethora of representations of himself and others. It allowed him to demonstrate a cause-effect relationship, thus, steering the focus towards the subject or to hide the latter and emphasize the object. In such a manner, the emotion of the audience is magnified and the willingness to devote oneself to the country is reinforced (Rubic-Remorosa, 2018).

A number of the game is a strategy in discourse used to indicate the degree or severity of the situation by specifying a set of numbers (Utari, 2017). This is apparent in the following extracts:

> *"Ito 'yung matrix [this is the matrix]. Ito 'yung nagbili ng AK-47 [This is the AK-47 bought], **1,000** and --- **1,000 plus** na dumating sa NPA [delivered to the NPA]."* – PI.24

> *"I lose **two** or **three** soldiers and police every day, all over the — drug-related."* – PI.25

> *"Your IQ is about **four** or **five**."* – PI.26

Through the explicit declaration of numbers, albeit a mere probability, Duterte had shown the magnitude of the problem. This provided him the means to create a negative representation of the *others*. In this case, the National People's Army (NPA) in PI.24 with the number of AK-47 guns that they received echoed the need to increase the security of the country, hence, rendering him the justification for continued militarization. Also, in PI.25, the aim of determining a set of numbers was to gain public support for his drug war. Finally, in PI.26, he indicated a set of numbers regarding the intelligence quotient of one of his critics which allowed him to illustrate his detractor cynically.

3.4. Stylistic analysis

The stylistic aspect of discourse pertains to the actor's choice of words to present his propositions or ideas. That is to say, the main idea of a text can only be comprehensible if the author of discourse uses appropriate words in his description of ideas (Utari, 2017). Apart from being intelligible, a lexical choice also provides positive and negative representations and justification (Van Dijk, 1998). The following extracts present the diction of Duterte:

> *"Ang Amerikano naman [The Americans], historically, may **umbilical cord** tayo, lalo na mga military, the police [we have an umbilical cord especially the military and the police]."* – PI.27

> *"The horrors in Hiroshima and Nagasaki... an **atomic war** is an infliction of **genocide**. Eh itong [this] human rights na ICC [of International Criminal Court] **mga bugok** [are idiots]. Why genocide? Namatay 'yung **kriminal** diyan, **genocide?** [There are dead criminals, is it genocide?]"* – PI.28

Duterte in PI.27 used the word "umbilical cord" to describe the connection between the Philippines and the United States. The use of the said word can be interpreted as the historical mother-infant relationship of the US and the Philippines as the latter had been a colony of the former. Hence, it can be perceived as a reproduction of the neo-colonial discourse in the country. In PI.28, Duterte used the word *atomic war* to characterize the degree of genocide, thus, defending his administration amid the rising death toll of criminals, and using the word *bugok* (idiot) to negatively represent human rights groups for their lack of knowledge of what constitutes genocide.

Another lexical feature of Duterte's discourse is the usage of idioms as apparent in the following extracts:

> *"And that is what makes the Human Rights and some **bleeding hearts** ignorant."* – PI.29

> *"I want to **shake the tree** in the middle of a speech kasi boring 'pag wala [because it's boring if there's none]."* – PI.30

Idioms are lexical devices that function as one unit and have cemented meanings (Elshamy, 2016). Pavlina (2017) avers that idioms are utilized by politicians for their self-representation as learned individuals and to criticize their opponents. In PI.29, his usage of an idiom allowed him to criticize those who were more sympathetic towards criminals than to the police.

3.5. Rhetoric analysis

Rhetoric is an aspect of discourse that presents the emphasis and tendency in the expression of discourse (Utari, 2017). The researchers found several features in Duterte's rhetoric such as metaphor, intertextuality, and profanity.

Metaphors are influential rhetorical tools to transform abstract ideas into concrete ones (Van Dijk, 2015). In CDA, the usage of metaphors does not merely convey the style of the speaker but also his manner of argumentation (Li, 2016). Chilton (2004) points out that metaphors are part of the individual's conceptualization, thus, metaphors must be analyzed critically to find out the underlying conceptual systems that can affect people's thoughts, i.e. metaphors are not simply metaphors but are conceptual. It can be construed that the purpose of a metaphor in political discourse is to persuade the audience to construct a positive representation of the speaker.

Conceptual metaphors are divided into structural, where a concept is described using another concept; orientational, where a system of concepts is arranged vis-à-vis another concept; and, ontological, where abstract ideas are understood using concrete objects (Lakoff &Johnson, 2004). Ontological metaphors are the most common in political discourse and are made either through reification and personification (Borčić et al., 2016). Reification is done by employing a concrete word to refer to an abstract concept while personification is through the usage of an animate word or providing human characteristics to an inanimate object (Agbo et al., 2018). Moreover, Penninck (2014), in line with Lesz (2011), conveys that there are also various themes in conceptual metaphors that can render different connotations and themes such as machine, heroic myth, motion, and the like. The following excerpts from Duterte's interviews present the conceptual metaphors he used:

> *"Just like Cimatu when I said, "You **fix the Boracay** in six months' time."*– PI.31

> *"**The stomach come first**. So the **policy of the government** is to keep the people, not from --- **keep them away from hunger**."* – PI.32

> *"Well, **my job** is to **protect** the people and **defend** the nation."* – PI.33

> *"Because **oil is everything**. **The world cannot move**."* – PI.34

In PI.31, Duterte used an ontological metaphor when he reified the abstract idea of the problems of Boracay with the verb "fix"; implying that the island's problems were akin to a machine's that simply needed fixing. Political leaders typically use the theme of the *machine* to show a complex subject as a mere machine or system to oversimplify it and make it more

comprehensible to the public. Through personifying his statements as well, he was able to present a positive representation of the policies taken by his administration, that is to say, focusing on the basic need of the people – food. The metaphorical theme present in PI.32 and PI.33 is the *heroic myth* that politicians employ to paint themselves as heroes or saviors of their country, thus, legitimizing their authority. In PI.34, Duterte utilized both structural and ontological metaphors by describing oil as "everything" (structural) and personified the world with the verb "move" (ontological). In this extract, he used the *motion* theme to indicate movement which simplified his thoughts. This provided the reason for his prior assertion that "oil is everything," insinuating that oil is what drives the world; and with the lack of it, a country is powerless. In other words, metaphors allowed Duterte to simplify his statements and provide reasons for his action concretizing his authority to the public.

In his interviews, Duterte also used intertextuality to present his thoughts, as presented in the following:

> "In **Murphy's Law**, anything can happen but I believe that he is really running." – PI.35

> "He who is the cause of the cause is the cause of them all [Spanish legal maxim]." – PI.36

> "I think it's the words of **President Quezon** when he said, "**my loyalty to the party ends where my loyalty to my country begins**." – PI.37

The borrowing of well-known statements enabled Duterte to be understood by his audience better. The usage of those, as Kremneva and Manukhina (2013) postulated, allows the politician to increase his credibility.

Profanity or the usage of curse words allow people to express mood, aggression, dominance and the like (Jay 2009). Cavazza and Margherita (2014) assert that it also enables them to strengthen the effectivity of their messages. Duterte, before winning the 2016 presidential elections, has been internationally known due to his profanity criticisms ranging from the United States president and Pope Francis (Curato, 2016). These are apparent in the following excerpts:

> "**Fuck you**. Why do I have to do that?" – PI.38

> "**Tang ina** niya, sabihin mo. **Putang ina** niya [Tell him, he is the son of a bitch. He is the son of a whore]." – PI.39

> "Do not **fuck** with drugs. **Goddamn** I will…" – PI.40

Duterte, throughout his recent thirty interviews, has uttered curse expressions 150 times. Politicians use swear words to be viewed as a common man through its elicitation of informality (Barisione, 2009). Furthermore, various studies indicate people who swear are perceived as incompetent, lowly and untrustworthy (Hamilton, 1989; Paradise et al., 1980), still, it renders a positive general impression to the speaker if it is used appropriately. In the case of politicians, it can enable them to be closer to the populace who use swear words normally in conversations (Cavazza & Margherita, 2014).

4. CONCLUSION

The study has investigated the microstructure elements of the discourse of President Rodrigo Roa Duterte and the way he represents himself or his allies and his opponents. The

findings show various discourse features under semantic, syntactic, stylistic and rhetoric analyses that represent the "*us*" and the "*them*" division. Overall, the study renders implications not only in the approach of political discourse analysis under the umbrella of critical discourse analysis but also in political science as it shows how language is used by politicians. First, it has provided insights into political interviews whereas most studies have focused on inaugural addresses or speeches. Second, it has shown how Duterte, one of the most controversial politicians in contemporary politics, asserts power and domination in the Philippine state through his manipulative use of language, *ipso facto* painting himself positively while commenting negative remarks to others. Finally, it presents importance to the critical examination of discourse to discover the underlying messages of politicians – to seek what they mean.

REFERENCES

Agbo, I., Kadiri, G., & Ijem, B. U. (2018). Critical Metaphor Analysis of Political Discourse   in Nigeria. *English Language Teaching, 11*(5), 95-103.

Alrefaee, Y., Abdul-Ghafour, A., Alazzany, M., Alrefaee, S. (2019). A Critical Discourse Analysis of the Selected Opposition and State Printed Media on the Representation of Southern Mobility in Yemen. *International Journal of Linguistics, Literature and Translation (IJLLT); 2*(2), 136-144.

Autida-van der Zee, T. (2013). Critical Discourse Analysis of the Speeches of President Benigno S. Aquino III. Unpublished thesis. College of Arts and Sciences: University of Southeastern Philippines.

Barisione, M. (2009). Valence Image and the Standardisation of Democratic Political Leadership. *Leadership* (5), 41-60.

Beattie, G. (1982). Turn-taking and Interruption in Political Interviews: Margaret Thatcher and Jim Callaghan Compared and Contrasted. *Semiotica*, 93-114.

Billig, M. (2008). The Language of Critical Discourse Analysis: The Case of Nominalization. *Discourse & Society, 19*(6), 783-800.

Borčić, N., Kanižaj, I., & Kršul, S. (2016). Conceptual Metaphor in Political Communication. *Zbornik Sveučilišta u Dubrovniku* (3), 73-94.

Bull, P., & Fetzer, A. (2006). Who are we and who are you? The Strategic Use of Forms of Address in Political Interviews. Text & Talk - *An Interdisciplinary Journal of Language, Discourse Communication Studies, 26*(1), 3-37.

Caballero, B. K. (2015). A Critical Discourse Analysis of Sen. Santiago's Speech: "Navigating the Crimes of the Plunder Mastermind". *International Journal of Humanities   and Social Sciences, 4*(1), 8-34.

Cavazza, N., & Margherita, G. (2014). Swearing in Political Discourse: Why Vulgarity Works. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology, 33*(5), 537-547.

Chilton, P. (2004). Analysing Political Discourse: Theory and Practice. London: Routledge.

Curato, N. (2016). Politics of Anxiety, Politics of Hope: Penal Populism and Duterte's Rise   to Power. *Journal of Current Southeast Asian Affairs, 35*(3), 91-109.

Dunmire, P. (2012). Political Discourse Analysis: Exploring the Language of Politics and the Politics of Language. *Language and Linguistics Compass, 6*(11), 735-751.

Eggins, V. (2011). Manifestations of Nommo: Afro-centric Analysis of President Barack Obama. *Journal of Black Studies, 42*(5), 737-750.

Elshamy, H. M. (2016). An Analysis of the Pragmatic Functions of Idiomatic Expressions in the Egyptian Novel 'Taxi'. Unpublished master's thesis. Department of Applied Linguistics: The American University in Cairo.

Fairclough, I., & Fairclough, N. (2012). Political Discourse Analysis. A Method for Advanced Students. London: Routledge.

Fairclough, N. (2010). Critical Discourse Analysis: The Critical Study of Language (2nd ed.). London: Longman.

Gee, J. (2014). How to do Discourse Analysis: A Toolkit. Oxon: Routledge.

Habermas, J. (1981). Theorie des Kommunikativen Handelns. Frankfurt: Suhrkamp.

Hacker, T. (1996). Changing Teachers, Changing Times: Teachers' Work and Culture in the Postmodern Age. New York: Teachers College Press.

Hamilton, M. A. (1989). Reactions to Obscene Language. *Communication Research Reports* (6), 67-69.

Heider, F. (1958). The Psychology of Interpersonal Relations. New York: Wiley.

Helander, R. (2014). Appraisal in Political Speech: A Comparative Discursive Study of Winston Churchill and Tony Blair. English Studies: Lund University.

Hudson, K. (1978). The Language of Modern Politics. London: MacMillan.

Ismaliyah, N. (2015). Conversation Analysis of Turn-Taking Mechanism in Piers Morgan Tonight Talk Show. Unpublished Thesis. English Letters Department: State Islamic University of Syarif Hidayatullah.

Jay, T. (2009). The Utility and Ubiquity of Taboo Words. *Perspectives on Psychological Science* (4), 153-161.

Kremneva, A., & Manukhina, I. (2013). The Role of Intertextuality in American Presidential Discourse. *Black Sea, 1*(20), 180-188.

Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (2004). Leben in Metaphern. Heidelberg: Carl-Auer Systeme.

Lesz, B. (2011). To Shape the World for the Better: An Analysis of Metaphors in the Speeches of Barack Obama. Unpublished master's thesis. Norway: University of Tromsø.

Li, W. (2016). Rethinking Critical Metaphor Analysis. *International Journal of English Linguistics, 6(*8), 92-98.

Lillian, D. (2008). Modality, Persuasion, and Manipulation in Canadian Conservative Discourse. *Critical Approaches to Discourse Analysis across Disciplines, 2*(1), 1-16.

Mazid, B. (2007). Presuppositions and Strategic Functions in Bush's 20/9/2001 Speech: A Critical Discourse Analysis. *Journal of Language and Politics, 6*(3), 351-375.

Milkovich, M., & Sitarica, A. (2017). Epistemic Modality in Political Discourse. Research Result. *Social Studies and Humanities, 3*(1), 75-79.

Mustafa. (2014). A Critical Discourse Analysis of Global Economy in Strategic Texts. Unpublished dissertation. Faculty of Languages and Linguistics: University of Malaya.

Olaniyan, K., & Adeniji, A. (2015). Modality in Statement of Objectives in Arts-Based Research Article Abstracts. *British Journal of English Linguistics, 3*(1), 42-51.

Paradise, L. V., Cohl, B., & Zweig, J. (1980). Effects of profane language and physical attractiveness. *Journal of Counseling Psychology* (27), 620-624.

Pavlina, S. (2017). Separated by a Common Language: on the Usage of Idioms in British and American Electoral Discourse. *Journal of Siberian Federal University, 10*, 1563-1572.

Penninck, H. (2014). An Analysis of Metaphor Used in Political Speeches Responding to the Financial Crises of 1929 and 2008. Unpublished master's thesis. Faculty of Arts and Philosophy: Ghent University.

Presidential Communications Operations Office. (2018, December 14). Media Interviews. Retrieved from Presidential Communications Operations Office: https://pcoo.gov.ph/media-interview/

Robinson, R. (2017). Is 'Attribution' Constructed Within and Throughout Discourse? *EC Psychology and Psychiatry, 4*(2), 68-72.

Rubic-Remorosa, R. (2018). President Rodrigo Roa Duterte's Political Speeches: A Critical Discourse Analysis. *IOSR Journal of Humanities and Social Science, 23*(8), 72-87.

Saeed, J. I. (1997). Semantics. Oxford: Blackwell.

Schiffrin, D. (1994). Approaches to Discourse. Oxford: Blackwell.

Stenstrom, A. (1994). An Introduction to Spoken Interaction. London: Longman.

Tatcho, O. (2018). Duterte's Image Building in the 2016 Philippine Presidential Debates. *Th Journal of the South East Asia Research Centre, 10*(2), 1-30.

Trappes-Lomax, H. (2006). Discourse Analysis. In A. Davies, & C. Elder, The Handbook of Applied Linguistics (pp. 133-164). New Jersey: Wiley-Blackwell.

Utari, N. (2017). A Political Discourse Analysis on Rodrigo Roa Duterte's Drug War Policy. Unpublished thesis. English Letters Department: Maulana Malik Ibrahim State Islami University of Malang.

Van Dijk, T. A. (1977). Text and Context: Explorations in the Semantics and Pragmatics of Discourse. New York: Longman Incorporated.

Van Dijk, T. A. (1997). What is Political Discourse Analysis*?. Discourse & Society, 4*(2), 249-283.

Van Dijk, T. A. (1998). Ideology. London: Sage.

Van Dijk, T. A. (1980). Macrostructures: An Interdisciplinary Study of Global Structures in Discourse, Interaction, and Cognition. Hillsdale, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Van Dijk, T. A. (2015). Critical Discourse Analysis. In D. Tannen, H. Hamilton, & D. Schiffrin, The Handbook of Discourse Analysis (pp. 466-485). Hoboken, New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Van Leeuwen, T. (2008). Discourse and Practice: New Tools for Critical Discourse Analysis. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Varalakshmi, S. (2012). Grammar, Syntax, Semantics, and Discourse. *International Proceedings of Economics Development and Research*, 33, 166-169.

Wajnryb, R. (2005). Expletive Deleted: A Good Look at Bad Language. New York: Free Press.

Wang, L. (2010). Language Feature Analysis and Translation Method of Political Speeches. *Journal of Peking Printing College, 13*(4), 75-78.

Wodak, R., & Meyer, M. (2001). Disorders of Discourse. London: Longman.

Yumin, C. (2007). An Analysis of Style Features of Inaugural Speeches Given by American Presidents Based on the Fundamental Theory of HanLide. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics, 6*(1), 3-9.