المجلة العراقية للبحوث الإنسانية والإجتماعية والعلمية
Iraqi Journal of Humanitarian, Social and Scientific Research
Print ISSN 2710-0952 - Electronic ISSN 2790-1254
العدد11A 2023 كانون الاول
No. 11A December 2023

A Functional Analysis of Immigration in the 2016 U S Presidential Debates

Assist Professor Ahmed Hasani Yaseen (PhD)
Department of English/ College of Education/ University of Samarra, Iraq
E-mail: ayaseen20131@gmail.com
Mob.: +9647707535800

Abstract: This study attempts to analyze the U.S. 2016 presidential debates published in The New York Times implementing the functional theory of Benoit (2007). These debates comprise argument of various issues and subjects between both candidates. One of the vital subjects is immigration. The American presidential debates have been investigated by a number of different facets but there has not been an investigation that focuses mostly on the subject of immigration in the 2016 U.S. presidential debates. The declarations concerning this subject between Trump and Clinton were taken out from the three presidential debates and analyzed employing the functional theory of Benoit (2007). Findings exposed that attack declarations happened more frequently than acclaims, but defences were used less than acclaims. The declarations comprised in these debates affected character (%70) and policy (%30). As anticipated, general goals were engaged more frequently by means of the function of acclaim rather than other functions. Conversely, ideals seemed to be used more repeatedly employing the function of defence than to acclaim and attack. Due to diverse contexts, participants, and situations, the functional theory of Benoit (2007) possibly will not be applicable for all debates. This study exposes some discrepancies of certain hypotheses of Benoit's (2007) functional theory regarding our awareness of the presidential debates, precisely the subject of immigration.

Keywords: Immigration, presidential debates, acclaim, attack, defence

تحليل وظيفي للهجرة في المناظرات الرئاسية الامريكية لسنة 2016

استاذ مساعد دكتور احمد حساني ياسين
قسم اللغة الانكليزية/ كلية التربية/ جامعة سامراء/ العراق

المستخلص: تحاول هذه الدراسة تحليل المناظرات الرئاسية الأمريكية لعام 2016 المنشورة في صحيفة نيويورك تايمز بتطبيق النظرية الوظيفية لبينوا (2007). وتشهد المناظرات الرئاسية جدلاً حول مختلف القضايا والموضوعات بين المرشحين. وان احد هذه المواضيع الحيوية هي الهجرة. وقد تم التحقيق في المناظرات الرئاسية الأمريكية من خلال عدد من الجوانب المختلفة، ولكن لم يكن هناك تحقيق يركز في الغالب على موضوع الهجرة في المناظرات الرئاسية الأمريكية لعام 2016. ان جميع التصريحات المتعلقة بهذا الموضوع بين ترامب وكلينتون تم إخراجها من المناظرات الرئاسية الثلاث وتحليلها بتطبيق النظرية الوظيفية لبينوا (2007). وكشفت النتائج أن عبارات الهجوم حدثت بشكل متكرر أكثر من الاشادات، فس حين تم استخدام الدفاعات بشكل أقل من الاشادات. ان التصريحات التي تضمنتها هذه المناظرات أثرت على الشخصية (70%) وعلى السياسة (30%). وكما كان متوقعًا، تم تنفيذ الأهداف العامة بشكل متكرر أكثر من خلال وظيفة الإشادة بدلاً من الوظائف الاخرى. على العكس من ذلك، يبدو ان المثل العليا استخدمت بشكل متكرر في تظمين وظيفة الدفاع بدلاً من الاشادة والهجوم. ونظرًا لتنوع السياقات والمشاركين والمواقف، فمن المحتمل ألا تكون النظرية الوظيفية لبينوا (2007) قابلة للتطبيق على جميع المناظرات.

وتكشف هذه الدراسة بعض التناقضات لبعض فرضيات النظرية الوظيفية لبينوا (2007) فيما يتعلق بوعينا بالمناظرات الرئاسية، وتحديدا موضوع الهجرة.

الكلمات الدالة: الهجرة، المناظرات الرئاسية، الإشادة، الهجوم، الدفاع

1. Introduction

One of the topmost and noteworthy subjects in the 2016 U.S. presidential debates (hencefore PDs) is immigration for the two candidates that separates them. Explanations by Merelli (2016) propose that numerous subjects as stated below, have been debated in the 2016 U.S. PDs by the Democrat Hilary Clinton and the Republican Donald Trump. In the first debate, these subjects are namely, Syrian refugees Achieving Prosperity; Securing America; and America's Direction. The following subjects are involved in the second debate: Islamophobia; WikiLeaks and taxes; and The Affordable Care Act; Leadership and 'deplorable'; compliments; the Supreme Court, the war in Syria, energy policy and. Whereas different subjects such as immigration; global trade, national debt, and jobs; the Clinton foundation and sexual allegation; The Supreme Court; foreign hot spots (Russia and WikiLeaks); the suitability of a candidate to be president (transition of power) are comprised in the third debate.

Numerous academics have examined broadly the varied facets or subjects in the three U.S. 2016 PDs. Though, a lesser amount of consideration has been taken to the subject of immigration in the three debates. The research has a propensity to emphasize this subject instead of other debated subjects because it is a caring subject that Trump concerns with (Caldwell & Timm, 2016). In spite of U.S.A. is a nation of immigrants (The New York Times, 2016c), different activities are realized against and targeted immigrants such as breaking families apart, attacking, exploitation, exile force, abuse, labelling some as drug suppliers, rapists, and criminals. This article proposes that the subject of immigration is the subject that utmost people should pay attention to due to the details stated above to accomplish studies of this subject.

The subject of immigration has a crucial influence in the U.S. PDs. It has established major critical consideration. For the present events in U.S. PDs, it is suitable certainly problematic to disrespect the existence of immigrants. Certain concern has been increased where some immigrants are being deprived (The New York Times, 2016c).

As much as concern such debates, substantial discussion has been subjected to the relative rank of the subject of immigration. Though some research has been performed on the 2016 U.S. PDs, infrequent investigations into this subject have been there. It is unidentified whether Benoit's (2007) functional theory remains valid to all subjects stated in the 2016 U.S. PDs or invalid. Notwithstanding the significance of Benoit's (2007) functional theory, there still a rareness of proof on the discrepancy of some hypotheses of this theory especially about the subject of immigrants in the PDs.

This article aims at testing the workability for using the functions and topics of Benoit's (2007) functional theory to the discourses of both candidates concerning the subject of immigration in the three debates. Based on the hypotheses of this theory, firstly, the present article specified the debated subjects in the three PDs. The standards i.e. the theory's functions and topics are then practised to the subject of immigration to discover the suitability of this theory in relation to Cronbach's alpha test statistic. This article views that certain hypotheses of Benoit's (2007) functional theory intended for this use are insufficient for some subjects offered in PDs but fitting for other hypotheses.

The intent of the current article represents the analysis of the importance of the subject of immigration during the 2016 U.S. PDs by employing the functional theory of Benoit (2007). The data of the study in this article is taken from the 2016 U.S. PDs available on the website of The New York Times (2016). It does not, however, occupy with other subjects which have been debated between both candidates, Trump and Clinton, during the three debates.

The whole structure of this article is alienated into five sections. The first one shows the background and related previous studies. The second section details the functional theory of Benoit (2007) as a model employed in analyzing the three debates. While arrangement of analysis indicates the third section which labels the methods employed in the analysis. The fourth section presents the findings and discussion of the current article, while the conclusions are presented in the fifth section.

2. Background of the Study

A substantial amount of literature has been printed on U.S. PDs. The last two decades, have witnessed expanding information on the application of the functional theory of Benoit (2007) on PDs. Many academics who utilize the functional theory have investigated the PDs. These researches argue various subject from different viewpoints as in Jacobs and Ceaser (2016) who have concerned with 'historical perspective'of numbers'. Moreover, Quam and Ryshina-Pankova (2016) talked about 'Trump, Clinton, and Sanders's manners where they organized themselves with their people'. 'Health care policy' is another dominant subject which is exposed in the 2016 U.S. presidential campaign (Blendon et al., 2016). Furthermore, in 2016, Clarke and Ricketts affirmed that American 2016 presidential election yields the U.S.A. foreign policy to the 'Jacksonian tradition'. On the same vein, Ghayad et.al. (2016) emphasized the two candidates' lack of knowledge to the American low economy (recession) and rapid economy. Extra surveys such as Burden, et al. (2016) explored unanticipated gender gap. Additionally, Powers, et al. (2016) scrutinized the subject of online and digital platforms, and not overlooking Enli (2017) who analyzes 'social media platform'. A significant study presented by Huang (2017) analyzes and discusses the 'unexpected victory' gave notice to numerous observers. In these PDs, Allcott and Gentzkow (2017) have considered the 'false news stories', while 'disabilities

people' have been talked about by Harnish (2017). Besides, Trump's reputation in Russia through the investigation of media viewpoint has been scrutinized Slutsky and Gavra (2017). Crowson and Brandes (2017) is a further study that discovered numerous aspects of 'the right-wing authoritarianism and social-dominance orientation'. Based on character's attribute of self-monitoring, the main interest of Klar et al. (2017) is the societal appeal in the U.S. 2016 PDs. These studies, together, afford vital visions into the subjects discussed during the U.S. 2016 PDs.

3. The Discourse of Political Campaign through Benoit's (2007) Functional Theory

Benoit's (2007) functional theory that concerns with political campaign discourse is one of the greatest used theories in the field of PDs. In the 1990s, Benoit and Wells analyzed 'Nomination Convention Acceptance Addresses from 1960-1996' and 'Keynote Speeches from 1960-1996' in terms of the functional theory of political campaign discourse. They sustained their study on TV ads and presences on talk radio in addition to many PDs. Furthermore, they analyzed PDs during 1948-2000 as well as other presidential TV spots during 1952-1996 (Benoit, 2007). Some scholars as Benoit, Brazeal, Stein, Pier, Harthcock, Blaney, and others have gradually evolved and improved this theory. The pioneer and developer of this theory is Benoit (2007). Function and topic, which are two main aspects, make this theory the greatest suitable one for analyzing political campaign discourse. In regard to function, to gain a presidential election, functional theory suggests that a candidate has to give the impression in a preferable form than the rival. Acclaim, attack, and defence, as the three functions, can work as messages for presenting confidence to a candidate to be superior to rivals (Benoit, 2017). According to Benoit and Airne (2005), these functions play together as an easy process of cost-benefit analysis: acclaims promote benefit, attacks promote an rival's cost, and defences dominate a rival's supposed cost. A positive utterance for a candidate called an acclaim; taking into consideration a negativity or drawback of an opponent is regarded an attack; refutal an attack that is focused on the defending rival is regarded a defence (Benoit, 2017). Moreover, in German politicians' debates, acclaims are appropriate to support the political rival's utterances, meanwhile his attacks are attended to attract the voters (Reinemann and Maurer, 2005).

The other aspect of Benoit's (2007) functional theory is topic, which concerns with two sub-aspects: character and policy. This theory adopts that policy and character in political election campaign are mainly argued. Candidates use these topics to persuade voters to select their superior rival. Zarefsky (2016) illustrates that this theory is intended to display that the functional messages of the candidate are shaped to persuade electorates where some candidates win more favourite, support, and approval than other the candidates.

Policy which is one of the main two topics of this theory is divided into three sub-divisions that allow the presidential candidates to either attack, acclaim, or defend past deeds (legislative activities achieved by the candidate or his/her party), future plans (accurate promises or obligations that presidential candidates have to be followed if they nominated or re-nominated), or general goals (concerns with consequences more than means, and no data associated with the candidates' suggestions). However, character (some academics name it image) as a topic, contains triple objects: personal qualities (refers to sympathy, morality, and honesty), leadership capability (indicates the candidate's ability to manage the government, or the candidate's success in business), and ideals (the candidate's principles and values) (Benoit, 2007).

The functional theory takes into consideration the messages that are designed, shaped, or created rather than the technique which electors' obtain messages whether persuasive or not. Accordingly, (4) hypotheses in addition to (2) research questions are examined in the current article on the subject of immigration in the 2016 U.S. PDs using the functional theory of Benoit (2007). These hypotheses are stated below:

Hypothesis (1): Acclaims occur more often than attacks, whereas defenses have the least happening in the immigration subject used by Trump and Clinton.

Frequently in such PDs, the function of acclaims occur more than attacks, yet defenses happen fewer than attacks. For the presidential candidates, limits are not assumed to express or say their messages to persuade the electorates. Some presidential candidates may have an exclusion with the option of employing acclaim more than attack.

With regards to the topics of policy and character, there is a belief that presidential candidates keep an eye on the policy of their parties. To state the matter differently, the two candidates are ready previously to a specific policy expressed, implemented, and required by their parties. Public opinion votes illustrate that greatest electorates declare that they are going to select the candidate who has dominant policy (Benoit, 2003). Therefore, the next hypothesis is:

Hypothesis (2): policy is talked by Trump and Clinton more repeatedly than character in the subject of immigrants. In fact, both candidates purposely talk about policy more than character. Undoubtedly, some exclusions may occur for the candidates.

Policy and character are analyzed in terms of three functions: acclaim, attack, and defence that can be realized in both research questions below:

Research Question (1): How is the supply of the three functions in talking about policy in relation to subjects of immigrants?

Research Question (2): How is the supply of the three functions in talking about character in relation to subjects of immigrants?

General goals that are associated with the procedure of policy, and ideals that are associated with the procedure of character, address the hypotheses (3 and 4) respectively.

Hypothesis (3): General goals are employed by both Trump and Clinton further occurrences to acclaim and less to attack immigration subject.

Hypothesis (4): Most of the time, ideals are utilized by Trump and Clinton to acclaim in comparison to attacking or defensing immigration subject.

To improve our comprehension of the nature of immigration subject, it is essential to examine the discourses of Trump and Clinton concering immigration on the above mentioned hypotheses.

4. Arrangement of Analysis

In this article, the subject of immigration in the 2016 PDs in America were analyzed. The discourses which are signified at this time are the statements of both candidates. Initially, the issues of each debate were determined. Each issue covers many statements that are distinguished in length (some statements are phrases, sentences, whereas others are full paragraph). Both candidates' statements were analyzed and categorized by function: acclaim, attack, or defence. At that time, data was further analyzed to limit whether it was associated with the of issue polic in its forms (future plans, general goals, or past deeds) or the of image character in its procedures (ideals, personal qualities, or leadership quality).

The statistical analysis of inter-rater reliability is achieved to confirm steadiness and trustworthiness of the data utilized in current article. For this, two raters were analyzed the data. As stated in Table (1), the average .940 of Cronbach Alpha value is found highly reliable for the result of the reliability test and as a rule of thumb. Depending on the findings, all pairs realized exceptional agreement on the Alpha Cronbach, that fluctuated between 0.835 and 1.00. The sample was purposive where it composed and analyzed the three 2016 U.S. PDs.

Table (1): The Reliability Statistics

No. of raters	Variables*	No. items	Cronbach's alpha	
2	O1 vs O2	56	.987	
2	P1 vs P2	56	.835	
2	Q1 vs Q2	56	.934	
2	R10 vs R2	56	1.000	
2	S1 vs S2	56	.979	
2	T1 vs T2	56	.860	
2	U1 vs U2	56	.989	
2	All	56	Average	.940

* O: policy, P: character, Q: acclaim, R: attack, S: defence, T: Benefit, U: cost, 1: the first rater, 2: the second rater

5. Findings and Discussion

The functional analysis of the definite extracts of both candidates' discourses, that are associated with the subject of immigration in the 2016 American PDs, will be exemplified using some excerpts selected from the three PDs. The supply of functions in these debates is the key function of hypothesis (1). Acclaim that represents one function can be realized in the subsequent nominated excerpts:

Excerpt (1): Clinton: "I have been for border security for years. I voted for border security in the United States Senate. And my comprehensive immigration reform plan of course includes border security. But I want to put our resources where I think they’re most needed: Getting rid of any violent person. Anybody who should be deported, we should deport them" (The New York Times, 2016c).

The statements mentioned above show that Clinton labels her earlier good deeds and accomplishments as a secretary for a number of years. In addition to a lot of reputable and rational plans, she inclines to achieve in the near future. Thus, Clinton's benefit is rised in such acclaim.

Additionally, the subsequent utterances in excerpt (2) show how Trump discovers his constructive facets where he has extended the endorsement from about to 16,500 agents in U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE). He exemplifies that, formerly, those agents did not support any candidate at all. This implies that they approve his policies as the subsequent U.S. President. So, by this acclaim, Trump increases his benefit.

Excerpt (2): Trump: "The border — as you know, the Border Patrol agents, 16,500-plus ICE last week, endorsed me. First time they’ve ever endorsed a candidate. It means their job is tougher. But they know what’s going on. They know it better than anybody" (ibid.).

Another function in the following samples represents attack which is involved in the subject of immigration in the PDs.

Excerpt (3): Trump: “In a place like Chicago, where thousands of people have been killed, thousands over the last number of years, in fact, almost 4,000 have been killed since Barack Obama became president, over — almost 4,000 people in Chicago have been killed” (The New York Times, 2016a).

This excerpt signposts that Trump's storm to Clinton by telling the negative actions that occurred throughout the era of President Obama, her teammate in the Democrat Party. Such a storm lessens the benefit of Clinton by implying the poor domination of the Democrat leader and henceforth, assumes a necessity for change.

However, Trump has been attacked by Clinton in excerpt (4) demanding that he convicts immigrants especially Mexicans, and has an opposed view from her in

addressing immigrants. Trump labels them as breaking the U.S.A. law. Such an attack reduces the benefit of Trump.

Excerpt (4): Clinton: "But it is clear when you look at what Donald has been proposing, he started his campaign bashing immigrants, calling Mexican immigrants rapists and criminals and drug dealers, that he has a very different view about what we should do to deal with immigrants" (The New York Times, 2016c).

Defenses denote the last function inserted in these PDs. The following excerpts exemplify the function of defence:

Excerpt (5): Clinton: "Well, within hours I said that I was sorry about the way I talked about that, because my argument is not with his supporters" (The New York Times, 2016b).

Clinton, in excerpt (5), recognizes Trump's attack; protects herself by making an apology as a response to his attack that was aimed to decrease the of cost Clinton.

Whereas in excerpt (6), Trump protects himself as a response once Clinton attacks him concerning the subject of the unrecognized labour where Trump poorly paid unrecognized staffs. Such a defence may reduce the cost of Trump.

Excerpt (6): Trump: "President Obama has moved millions of people out. Nobody knows about it, nobody talks about it. But under Obama, millions of people have been moved out of this country. They've been deported. She doesn't want to say that but that's what has happened and that's what happened big league" (The New York Times, 2016c).

The debates' analysis regarding the subject of immigration exposed that acclaims accounted for %34 of the statements of both candidates (%50 for each candidate) whereas attacks covered %47.5 (%39 for Clinton versus %61 for Trump) and defences realized %18.5 (%58 for Clinton versus %42 for Trump). The findings exemplified in Table (2) disagree with hypothesis (1). In relation to the assessment between the happening of acclaims and attacks, hypothesis (1) is incompletely not supported.

Table (2): Functions and topics in relation to the subject of immigration

	Functions						Topics			
	Acclaims		Attacks		Defences		Policy		Character	
	C	**T**	**C**	**T**	**C**	**T**	**C**	**T**	**C**	**T**
Total	11	11	12	19	7	5	13	18	39	33
	%50	%50	%39	%61	%58	%42	%42	%58	%54	%46
	(22) %34		(31) %47.5		(12) %18.5		(31) %30		(72) %70	

- T: Trump; C: Clinton.

The expectation of hypothesis (2) is that both candidates argue policy more frequently than character. Two nominated samples are revealed below stating the issue of policy:

Excerpt (7): Trump: "I'm going to help the African-Americans. I'm going to help the Latinos, Hispanics. I am going to help the inner cities" (ibid.).

Trump's policy in this excerpt typifies his aims to afford support to many U.S. cultural societies as well as people who need assistance in the U.S. inner settlements. Trump, in this excerpt, protects himself also and reduces his supposed cost.

Concerning Clinton, the explanation in excerpt (8) displays how Clinton uses the issue of policy by manging her aptitude in leadership as a U.S.A. president. In accordance with the slogan of Clinton (Stronger Together) through her campaign, she states, in this excerpt, her intent in addressing all ethnics, traditions, and religions in U.S.A. to be a united nation dissimilar to the claim of Trump opposite persons from diverse ethnics that would disturb many families in U.S.A. Further, Clinton's statements in this excerpt lessen the benefit of Trump because they reckon as an attack.

Excerpt (8): Clinton: "I think that is an idea that is not in keeping with who we are as a nation. I think it's an idea that would rip our country apart" (ibid.).

Nominated excerpts are elucidated to expose the character (images). These are:

Excerpt (9): Trump: "We need law and order in our country" (The New York Times, 2016a).

This instance exemplifies Trump's leadership ability and his solid character when he proclaimed that law and order have to be activated in U.S.A. Such an announcement is regarded an acclaim besides that rises the benefit of Trump.

Moreover, Clinton in the subsequent excerpt pronounces herself as an ideal image. She is sympathetic with many persons that Trump had not made an apology for. Clinton's attack to Trump is revealed in this situation that results about decrease the benefit of Trump.

Excerpt (10): Clinton: "And what he has said about African-Americans and Latinos, about Muslims, about POWs, about immigrants, about people with disabilities, he's never apologized for" (The New York Times, 2016b).

The findings from this article showed that character 70% (54% for Clinton versus 46% for Trump) was argued more than policy 30% (42% for Clinton versus 58% for Trump). The findings shown in Table (2) do not approve hypothesis (2).

The frequency of happening for procedures of policy (future plans, past deeds, and general goals) are scrutinized in research question (1). Some excerpts are detailed below:

Excerpt (11): Clinton: "I voted for border security, and there are... There are some limited places where that was appropriate" (The New York Times, 2016c).

Excerpt (12): Trump: "First of all, I had a very good meeting with the president of Mexico" (ibid.).

Regarding excerpts (11, 12), the two candidates address their past deeds, where excerpt (11) recognizes the deed of Clinton that she has elected to support border security. In addition, this excerpt provides a sign to the function of acclaim that in turn rises Clinton's benefit. On the other hand, excerpt (12) labels Trump's deed of his successful meeting with the President of Mexico. In this situation, Trump's enunciation represents the two functions of acclaim and defence that rises Trump's benefit and reduces his cost. With regard to the form of future plans, excerpts (13 and 14) elucidate the plans of the two candidates in the upcoming period. Clinton's plan in excerpt (13) states that she has a tendency to make a reform in many facets. Concurrently, this excerpt uses the acclaim function that rises Clinton's benefit and attack function which decreases Trump's benefit. Yet, Trump's plan in excerpt (14) is to finish terrorism relate to radical Muslims in U.S.A. depending on this excerpt, it infers the acclaim functions that represents a rise of benefit for Trump.

Excerpt (13): Clinton: "I want to get everybody out of the shadows, get the economy working, and not let employers like Donald exploit undocumented workers, who has hurt them, but also have hurt American workers" (ibid.).

Excerpt (14): Trump: "We are going to stop radical Islamic terrorism in this country" (ibid.).

General goals the third policy issue is concerned with both excerpts (15 and 16). In excerpt (15), Clinton maintains that energy is one of the recognized trades with the neighbours of U.S.A. rather than with all other states in the globe. During this time, she uses acclaim that increases her benefit. Differently, the same function is employed by Trump in excerpt (16), but it rises his benefit, when he focuses on the border of his country and proclaims that American people will lose their country if U.S.A. has no fixed border or an open border. Trump's general goal expresses this policy.

Excerpt (15): Clinton: "You know, we trade more energy with our neighbours than we trade with the rest of the world combined" (ibid.).

Excerpt (16): Trump: "We have no country if we have no border" (ibid.).

Detailed data are reported in Table (3) concerning the three procedures of policy: future plans, past deeds, and general goals. This table displays that %35.5 of past deeds comprised involved in policy issues (%40 for Clinton versus %60 for Trump), while %40.5 of policy utterances related to future plans (%64.5 for Clinton versus %35.5 for Trump), and %24 of occurrences associated with general goals (%20 for Clinton versus %80 for Trump).

Table (3): Policy forms in the subject of immigration

P.	Past deeds	Future plans	General goals

	Acclaim		Attack		Defence		Acclaim		Attack		Defence		Acclaim		Attack		Defence	
	C	T	C	T	C	T	C	T	C	T	C	T	C	T	C	T	C	T
	3	2	1	6	2	1	5	3	2	2	4	1	1	6	0	2	1	0
	%60	%40	%14	%86	%67	%33	%62.5	%37.5	%50	%50	%80	%20	%14	%86	%0	%100	%100	%0
	(5) %33		(7) %47		(3) %20		(8) %47		(4) %23.5		(5) %29.5		(7) %70		(2) %20		(1) %10	
	T		C		T		C		T		C							
	(9) %60		(6) %40		(6) %35.5		(11) %64.5		(8) %80		(2) %20							
	(15) %35.5				(17) %40.5				(10) %24									

According to the data presented in Table (3), the third hypothesis is supported in which %70 of general goals are used for acclaims (%14 for Clinton versus %86 for Trump), and %20 for attacks (%0 for Clinton versus %100 for Trump), meanwhile defences have %10 of used general goals for (%100 for Clinton versus %0 for Trump).

As concerns the research question (2), the amount of happening for forms of a character or an image -ideals, leadership abilities, and personal qualities - are examined. A number of particular samples of these forms are elucidated as follows:

Excerpt (17): Clinton: "So I think we are both a nation of immigrants and we are a nation of laws and that we can act accordingly" (ibid.).

Excerpt (18): Trump: "The border — as you know, the Border Patrol agents, 16,500-plus ICE last week, endorsed me" (ibid.).

Excerpts (17 and 18) indicate the personal abilities of the image or character of both presidential candidates. In the prior excerpt, the personal opinion is described by Clinton about immigrants and law that U.S.A. people can perform consequently. This attitude is reckoned as an acclaim that rises the benefit of Clinton. Correspondingly, Trump's attitude in excerpt (18), that is mirrored as a private image as he debates about the personal authorizations of about to 16,500 agents of the Border Patrol, is regarded as an acclaim that increases Trump's benefit.

Excerpts (19 and 20), on the other hand, demonstrate the leadership ability of character. In excerpt (19), Clinton debates that pushing refugees, who are in the shades, in the appropriate economy will be proper for the refugees and employers who take no benefit and deteriorate Americans' payments. This declaration includes acclaim function that rises Clinton's benefit. She regularly seems to provide keys to address present problems. Her empathy for the refugees is pure when she wishes to give help to those who are needy. Yet, in excerpt (20), Trump, who is dissimilar to his foe Clinton, shows the responsibility game by cunning the undesirable behaviours of immigrants and to basically close the borders. In this sense, he decreases Clinton's benefit and rises his via the attack and acclaim functions congruently. He highlights the solid borders to stop drugs and illegitimate immigrants to transfer into U.S.A. Moreover, he stresses that he will give no forgiveness. While Trump's declarations may signpost a sense of partisanship, his declarations expose a rougher character or image of the leadership quality of Trump.

Excerpt (19): Clinton: "Now, what I am also arguing is that bringing undocumented immigrants out from the shadows, putting them into the formal economy will be good, because then employers can't exploit them and undercut Americans' wages" (ibid.).

Excerpt (20): Trump: "We have to have strong borders. We have to keep the drugs out of our country. We are — right now, we're getting the drugs, they're getting the cash. We need strong borders. We need absolute — we cannot give amnesty" (ibid.).

Further character's image, which is ideals, employed by both presidential candidates in these debates. Clinton's positive values and moralities, in excerpt (21), illustrates that she supports and stands for the Americans to exchange respect with each other. At this point, she announces the importance of America to the whole globe. Clinton calls Americans to collaborate and realize diversity in America. In addition, this excerpt reveals Clinton's employment of the acclaim function that leads to a rise in her benefit. Conditionally, in excerpt (22), Trump revels his "police-like" and one-sided sentiment where he emphasizes law implementation as precedence in U.S.A. He utilizes the function of acclaim as well, which increases Trump's benefit.

Excerpt (21): Clinton: "That's why — to go back to your question — I want to send a message — we all should — to every boy and girl and, indeed, to the entire world that America already is great, but we are great because we are good, and we will respect one another, and we will work with one another, and we will celebrate our diversity" (The New York Times, 2016b).

Excerpt (22): Trump: "We are a country of laws" (The New York Times, 2016c).

Table (4) reveals that the subject of immigration deals with characters or images of personal abilities in %29 of declarations (%69.5 Clinton versus %30.5 Trump),

leadership ability in %26.5 of statements (%38 Clinton versus %62 Trump), and ideals in %44.5 of declarations (%46 Clinton versus %54 Trump).

In accordance to the data stated in Table (4) the fourth hypothesis is incompletely supported. Here, Trump and Clinton exploit ideals more frequently to attack immigrants than to use the functions of acclaim and defend in which acclaim is %37 that infers %54 for Clinton versus %46 for Trump, attack signposts %48.5 that comprises %47 for Clinton versus %53 for Trump, while defence denotes %14.5 that contains %20 for Clinton% versus 80 for Trump.

Table (4): Character's forms in the subject of immigration

	Personal qualities						Leadership ability						Ideals					
	Acclaim		Attack		Defence		Acclaim		Attack		Defence		Acclaim		Attack		Defence	
	C	T	C	T	C	T	C	T	C	T	C	T	C	T	C	T	C	T
Character	6	1	9	4	1	2	2	3	3	10	3	0	7	6	8	9	1	4
	86%	14%	69%	31%	33%	67%	40%	60%	23%	77%	100%	0%	54%	46%	47%	53%	20%	80%
	(7) 30.5%		(13) 56.5%		(3) 13%		(5) 24%		(13) 62%		(3) 14%		(13) 37%		(17) 48.5%		(5) 14.5%	
	C		T				C		T				C		T			
	(16) %69.5		(7) %30.5				(8) %38		(13) %62				(16) %46		(19) %54			
	(23) 29%						(21) 26.5%						(35) 44.5%					

6. Conclusion

The current study affords a new idea to our awareness of PDs generally and immigrants' subject principally. This study exposes that many functions and topics of the functional theory related to Benoit (2007) which are examined the discourses of both presidential candidates concerning the subject of immigration in the U.S. 2016 PDs are unrealizable. The functional theory prediction of acclaims happens more repeatedly than attacks while the occurrence of defences is the least which is not inveterate in the data of the current study. furthermore, the second prediction of this theory, which indicates that policy happens more frequently than character that is not confirmed as well. The recognition of this theory is that both presidential candidates in the three PDs can personally choose to deal with character more repeatedly than policy or to deal with them at the same level. The issues of presidential races in Benoit (2017), are anticipated to highlight character more frequently than policy.

Regarding the arrangement of forms of the two functions of policy and character, that is outstanding, any prediction is not made here by Benoit's (2007) functional theory. In the 2016 U.S. PDs, with respects to the general goals, both presidential candidates utilize acclaims further than attacks and a lesser amount of defences. As regards ideals, the two presidential candidates drive more frequently on defences than attacks and acclaims. It is hard to attack goals or ideals, where both presidential candidates are most likely "to acclaim a goal of more jobs or an ideal of justice than to attack these ideas" (Benoit, 2017). The significance of the present article is shown in combining new prospects of discrepancy of a number of hypotheses related to functional theory to the subject of immigration in the U.S. 2016 PDs.

References

Allcott, H., & Gentzkow, M. (2017). "Social Media and Fake News in the 2016 Election." *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 31(2): 211-36.

Benoit, W. L. (2003). Topic of presidential campaign discourse and election outcome. *Western Journal of Communication (includes Communication Reports)*, *67* (1), 97-112.

Benoit, W. L. (2007). *Communication in political campaigns* (Vol. 11). Peter Lang.

Benoit, W. L. (2017). A Functional Analysis of 2016 Direct Mail Advertising in Ohio. *American Behavioral Scientist*

Benoit, W. L., & Airne, D. (2005). A functional analysis of American vice presidential debates. *Argumentation and Advocacy*, *41*(4), 225-236.

Blendon, R. J., Benson, J. M., & Casey, L. S. (2016). Health care in the 2016 election—a view through voters' polarized lenses. *New England Journal of Medicine*, *375*(17), e37.

Burden, B. C., Crawford, E., & DeCrescenzo, M. G. (2016, December). The Unexceptional Gender Gap of 2016. In *The Forum* (Vol. 14, No. 4, pp. 415-432).

Caldwell, Leigh Ann and Jane C. Timm (2016). *Crash Course 2016: Where Donald Trump, Hillary Clinton Stand on the Issues*. [Online] Available: http://www.nbcnews.com/storyline/2016-presidential-debates/presidential-debate-guide-where-donald-trump-hillary-clinton-stand-issues-n653536 (July 25, 2017).

Clarke, M., & Ricketts, A. (2016). Understanding the Return of the Jacksonian Tradition. *Orbis*. *61*(1), 13-26.

Crowson, H. M., & Brandes, J. A. (2017). Differentiating Between Donald Trump and Hillary Clinton Voters Using Facets of Right-Wing Authoritarianism and Social-Dominance Orientation: A Brief Report. *Psychological Reports*, *120*(3), 364-373.

Enli, G. (2017). Twitter as arena for the authentic outsider: exploring the social media campaigns of Trump and Clinton in the 2016 US presidential election. *European Journal of Communication*, *32*(1), 50-61.

Ghayad, R., Cragg, M., & Pinter, F. (2016). Elections and the Economy: What to do about Recessions? *The Economists' Voice*, *13*(1), 9-25.

Harnish, A. (2017). Ableism and the Trump phenomenon. *Disability & Society*, *32*(3), 423-428.

Huang, C. H. (2017). *Disillusionment and Disaggregation: Why Did Asian Americans Vote for Trump?*. CMC Senior Theses. 1514.

Jacobs, N., & Ceaser, J. W. (2016, December). The 2016 Presidential Election by the Numbers and in Historical Perspective. In *The Forum* (Vol. 14, No. 4, pp. 361-383).

Klar, S., Weber, C. R., & Krupnikov, Y. (2016, December). Social Desirability Bias in the 2016 Presidential Election. In *The Forum* (Vol. 14, No. 4, pp. 433-443).

Landis J, Koch G (1977). *The measurement of observer agreement for categorical data*. Biometrics 33:159–74.

Lee, C., & Benoit, W. L. (2005). A functional analysis of the 2002 Korean presidential debates. Asian Journal of Communication, 15 (2), 115-132.

Merelli, Annalisa (2016). *All the questions Trump and Clinton faced at the second presidential debate of 2016*. [Online] Available: https://qz.com/805037/second-presidential-debate-2016-what-questions-were-asked-of-donald-trump-and-hillary-clinton/ (March 13, 2017).

Powers, E. M., Moeller, S. D., & Yuan, Y. (2016). Political Engagement During a Presidential Election Year: A Case Study of Media Literacy Students. *Journal of Media Literacy Education*, *8*(1), 1-14. [Online] Available: http://digitalcommons.uri.edu/jmle/vol8/iss1/1 (May 22, 2017).

Quam, J., & Ryshina-Pankova, M. (2016). "Let Me Tell You...": Audience Engagement Strategies in the Campaign Speeches of Trump, Clinton, and Sanders. *Russian Journal of Linguistics*, *20*(4), 140-160.

Reinemann, C., & Maurer, M. (2005). Unifying or Polarizing? Short-Term Effects and Post Debate Consequences of Different Rhetorical Strategies in Televised Debates. *Journal of Communication*, *55*(4), 775-794. http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi /10.1111/j.1460-2466.2005.t b03022.x.

Slutsky, P., & Gavra, D. (2017). The Phenomenon of Trump's Popularity in Russia: Media Analysis Perspective. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 0002764217693281.

The New York Times (2016a). *The first 2016 presidential debate*. [Online] Available: http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/27/us/politics/transcript-debate.html. (October 24, 2016).

The New York Times (2016b). *The second 2016 presidential debate*. [Online] Available: http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/10/us/ politics/transcript-second-debate. html?_r=0. (October 23, 2016).

The New York Times (2016c). *The third 2016 presidential debate*. [Online] Available: http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/20/us/ politics/third-debate-transcript.html?_r = 0. (October 24, 2016).

Zarefsky, D. (2016). How It All Began: The Origins of Presidential Campaigning in the United States. In W. L. Benoit (Eds.), *Praeger Handbook of Political Campaigning in the United States*, 1.