A methodological synergy of dramatistic discourse analysis and corpus linguistics: From the discourse of US Presidents to Trump's 2016 Orlando speech

Amir H. Y. Salama [a] [1]

ª Prince Sattam Bin Abdulaziz University, Saudi Arabia

Abstract

The present study offers a novel methodology for corpus-based discourse analysis that combines Kenneth Burke's (1968, 1969) dramatistic method of text analysis and the corpus techniques of keyword extraction and concordance reading. Applying the methodology, a two-stage analysis of Donald Trump's 2016 Orlando speech has been conducted: First, at a micro level, (i) the keywords used by Trump were identified in his speech as compared against the historical reference corpus of US Presidents through WordSmith Tools (Scott, 2012), and (ii) Trump's keyword lexical structures were described and interpreted in the pentadic ratios rhetorically motivated by the "terministic screens" that select and deflect representations of the gay-nightclub-shooting event in the speech; second, at a macro level, the process of substantiating the whole speech event of Orlando was implemented in terms of the different types of substance – geometric, familial, and directional – recognized in the keywords clustering and linking in the speech. The study has reached two findings. First, methodologically, Burke's dramatistic method of text analysis and corpus-linguistics techniques have been synergized in a novel way that contributes to analysing the rhetorical language of political discourse, eventually yielding a corpus-based dramatistic discourse analysis. Second, practically, analysing the pentadic ratios of the speech keywords and their substance types has revealed Trump's rhetoric of selecting and deflecting certain representations of the Orlando political event through a specific ensemble of terministic screens and substantiations.

Keywords: corpus linguistics; Donald Trump; dramatistic discourse analysis; Kenneth Burke; keywords; Orlando speech; pentad; terministic screens; WordSmith Tools

1. Introduction

Kenneth Burke (1897–1993), the philosopher and literary theorist, is perhaps one of the most influential figures who theorized about rhetorical language as "symbolic action," precisely by proposing his famous formula of the "symbol-using, symbol-making, and symbol misusing animal" (Burke, 1966, p. 6). This formula has been established by virtue of Burke's "trackings of terminologies," or the ways humans use

---

[1] Corresponding author.
  E-mail address: amir.salama79@gmail.com

those terminologies and are used by them (Simons, 2004, p. 152). Thus, preoccupied with the *terms* used and misused by symbol users and makers, Burke scrutinized many and various meaning-making resources in different symbolic systems, or discourses, that pertain to philosophy, literature, and religion (Burke, 1931/1968a, 1935/1965, 1941/1973, 1945/1969, 1961/1970, 1972).

Therefore, Burke's works on symbolic communications and discourses (including the ones above) revolve around what Stillar (1998, p. 61) has aptly described as "the simple, but very consequential, fact that life is lived *in terms of* – that is, it is lived through a variety of 'terministic screens'":

> We *must* use terministic screens, since we can't say anything without the use of terms; whatever terms we use, they necessarily constitute a corresponding kind of screen; and any such screen necessarily directs the attention to one field rather than another. Within that field there can be different screens, each with its way of directing the attention and shaping the range of observations implicit in the given terminology. (Burke, 1966, p. 50)

It follows, then, that Burke directly connects the attitudes and motives of social agents with the terms they normally (mis-)use (and certainly make); and there lies the following Burkean maxim: "Our words negotiate relations of power, legitimacy, and authority" (Stillar, 1998, p. 61).

Given the above maxim, Burke has developed a special type of grammar that departs from the traditional model of linguistic grammar and targets a critique of terminology; such a critique has derived from Burke's analytic method of dramatism, which investigates language – and indeed any symbolic act of communication – in dramatic terms. According to Burke's dramatistic model, "for there to be an *act*, there must be an *agent*"; similarly this sort of acting agent entails the presence of a "*scene*"; and acting in a scene, "the agent must employ some means, or *agency*"; and eventually, an act in its full sense would involve a "*purpose*" (Burke, 1968b, p. 446, italics in original).

As is shortly demonstrated below (Section 2), despite the philosophical riches of Burke's dramatistic model and its qualitatively probing analytics, to date there have not been any serious research attempts at integrating quantitative methods into this model. Indeed, the employment of quantitative corpus techniques is argued here to be methodologically of the essence to Burke's classic, albeit still analytically reliable, model. This is especially being so, not least because the model lends itself quite fittingly to the commonly known and well established corpus techniques of keyword extraction and concordance reading (see Section 3). Therefore, the present study touts a methodological synergy of dramatistic text analysis and corpus linguistics in the hope of finding a practical solution to the foregoing research problem.

Thus, in the current context of research, the following overarching question is posed: How to synergize Kenneth Burke's dramatistic model of text analysis and corpus linguistics in a way that is methodologically useful to the rhetorical analysis of political discourse? I can argue here that addressing this question opens up new vistas for a novel form of discourse analysis, specifically, a corpus-based dramatistic discourse analysis. In due course, it is made clear that the data used towards the empirical validation of this form of discourse analysis is two sets of data: (i) Donald Trump's 2016 Orlando speech, as an actual instance of textual data analysis, and (ii) a historical corpus of the speeches delivered by US Presidents from George Washington to Barack Obama, as a reference corpus (see Section 4).

The remaining structure of this paper is divided in five sections, and they are summarized in the following order. First, a critique of the previous literature on Burke's dramatistic model of the pentad is presented, then followed by the research hypothesis and questions formulated in view of this critique. Second, Burke's model is explained in terms of its analytic components, viz. pentad, ratios, and substance. Third, a brief account of the methodology is provided with a focus on the data used in current research and the procedure followed in data analysis. Fourth, a discourse analysis is conducted on

Trump's 2016 Orlando speech in a way that methodologically synergizes Burke's dramatistic model and concordance-based analysis of the lexical keywords used by Trump in addressing the American people. Finally, and fifth, a summary of the main point of research is given as well as a discussion of the main findings and implications coming out of analysis are presented.

2. Critiquing previous literature on Burke's pentad: New research hypothesis and questions

Burke (1945/1969, p. xv) has technically dubbed the five-term dramatistic model, outlined in the introduction above (Section 1), as "pentad," or the "pentad of key terms," which is more generally known to be a grammar of motives; and as such the terms "dramatism," "pentad," and "grammar of motives" almost denote the same thing in Burkean philosophy. Ever since the theoretical establishment of Burke's dramatism, there has emerged a plethora of studies that utilized the pentadic model in analysing texts, discourses, and many other symbolic acts of communication (e.g., Ling, 1970; Rosenfield, 1976; Jameson, 1978; Hahn & Morland, 1979; Brummeet, 1979, 1980; Condit & Selzer, 1985; Birdsell, 1987; Lule, 1990; Cooks & Descutner, 1993; Appel, 1993, 1997; Anderson & Prelli, 2001; Kenny, 2005; Blain, 2005; Stob, 2008; Prelli & Winters, 2009; Edgar, 2014; Head, 2016; Jensen & Ratcliffe, 2017; Jensen, 2018; Bloomfield & Tscholl, 2018; Ebigbagha, 2020).

Notwithstanding the above literature utilizing Burke's dramatistic model, there has not yet been scholarly endeavours to view the model from the lens of corpus linguistics as based on analysing naturally occurring and machine-readable data, which computationally implements "numerous ways of making sense of linguistic patterns: collocations, keywords, frequency lists, clusters, dispersion plots, etc." (Baker, 2006, p. 21). Of course, all or any of these corpus-based techniques would enhance purely qualitative methods of language, text or discourse analysis; and, being one of those methods, Burke's dramatism – I argue – may not only benefit from corpus-linguistics techniques, but also enrich the qualitative dimension of concordance reading of keyword-in-context (KWIC) format, known among corpus linguists in general (notably, Sinclair, 1991, 2003; Stubbs, 1996; Kennedy, 1998; Biber et al., 1998; Scott & Tribble, 2006).

This methodological aspect may be symbiotically secured if the discourse analyst drawing on Burke's model of dramatism realizes how, as briefly indicated above, crucial the concept of "terms" to pentadic analysis may be; after all, Burke is terminologically oriented when it comes to the analysis of text as a form of symbolic action. This is precisely the point where both the corpus technique of KWIC analysis can assist in a number of ways: First, generating a list of the most frequently used words in a text is a strong indication of textual relevance, and thereby providing more reliable grounds for further Burkean terminological analysis; second, using a concordance or a list of all the textual occurrences of terms or keywords enables the discourse analyst to undertake more reliable pentadic analysis (than it used to be) towards uncovering interesting rhetorical aspects in text; third, employing a Burkean dramatistic form of analysis is likely to add new insights to concordance-based keyword analysis, particularly in terms of the symbolic action in the text and the rhetorical situation wherein this text has been (re-)produced (see the coming section).

Thus, the present study offers the following hypothesis: A symbiotically effective methodology for analysing the rhetorical language of political discourse may emerge from synergizing Kenneth Burke's dramatistic method of text analysis and the corpus-linguistics techniques of keyword extraction and concordance reading, and this may yield a novel corpus-based dramatistic discourse analysis. In order to (dis-)prove the foregoing hypothesis, the following overarching question needs to be addressed: How to synergize Kenneth Burke's dramatistic model of text analysis and corpus linguistics in a way that is methodologically useful to the rhetorical analysis of political discourse? An answer to this general question entails addressing three sub-questions related to the research data under analysis: (1) What is

Donald Trump's 2016 Orlando speech mainly about? (2) What are the terministic screens motivating Trump in his rhetorical representation of the speech event? (3) How can the whole speech event be explained in relation to Trump's rhetorically motivated terms?

In the coming section, a form of corpus-based dramatistic discourse analysis is detailed in relation to its twofold componential structure: (i) Burke's dramatistic method/grammar and (ii) the potential correlation of keywords and terministic screens.

3. Corpus-based dramatistic discourse analysis: A new methodology

This section is dedicated to the theoretical explanation of the proposed methodology for analysing the rhetorical language of political discourse; this methodology is presented here as a new form of corpus-based dramatistic discourse analysis, which combines Burke's dramatistic method/grammar of text analysis in terms of pentad, ratios and substance on the one hand and the corpus-linguistics techniques of keyword extraction and concordance reading – collectively known as KWIC (keyword-in-context) – on the other. The composite methodology is presented in the coming subsections.

3.1. Burke's dramatistic method/grammar: Pentad, ratios, and substance

"To discuss the grammatical resources (systems and structures) of symbolic action," Stillar (1998, p. 59) writes, "Burke draws on an understanding of human relations and activities as drama." This account is clear from Burke's (1968b) concept of "pentad" – glossed earlier in the introduction – which consists of typically dramatic terms, namely, act, agent, agency, scene, and purpose; and these pentadic elements are intended to explain the different structures of the text in a way that construes the different motives and attitudes associated with human actions; hence the Burkean term "grammar of motives" (1945/1969). That is, this type of grammar "deals with analysis of the vocabularies and structures of texts used in the construction of motives" (Stillar, 1998, p. 62).

Thus, it can be said that Burkean grammar is "dramatistic," for it focuses on analysing the language of the text as *motivated act*:

> In a rounded statement about motives, you must have some word that names the *act* (names what took place, in thought or deed), and another that names the *scene* (the background of the act, the situation in which it occurred); also, you must indicate what person or kind of person (*agent*) performed the act, what means or instruments he [*sic*.] used (*agency*)*,* and the *purpose.* (Burke, 1945/1969, p. xv; italics in original)

Crucially, Burke scrutinizes text structures as pentadic combinations, or technically "ratios," that may reveal how motivated certain acts in text are – as elements of symbolic action. So, as Burke (1968b, p. 446) explains, one agent's act may be viewed against some background or scene, which would constitute a "scene-act ratio"; one more pentadic combination is a "purpose-agency ratio," where the logic of "means selecting" or the relation of "means to ends" obtains; an "agent-act ratio" reflects "the correspondence between a man's character and the character of his behavior"; and finally, as Stillar (1998, p. 64) exemplifies, a purpose-act ratio would "characterize the act as made necessary by some purpose."

Further, Stillar (1998) follows Burke's (1945/1969) lead in recognizing that the motives or attitudes arising from the pentadic ratios hinge upon "the assignation of substance":

> Assigning substance is hence a selection and a deflection, just as a particular ratio (scene:act, for example) constitutes a selection (one of many) of the ways in which

motives may be attributed or understood, and it is a deflection because it impels us to see in *its* terms, not in *others*. (Stillar, 1998, p. 67, italics in original)

Significantly, then, how ratios function in one text or another is determined by the different substance types "(presuppositions of '*what is*')" – substantiation. Burke's identification of these substance types is essentially tripartite: geometric, familial, and directional (1945/1969, pp. 29-33). Geometric substance is encapsulated in the formula "Participation in context," whereby some object is placed in its setting, spatial and/or temporal; and it exists "both in itself and as part of its background" (Burke, 1969, p. 29). Familial substance underscores definition in terms of "common ancestry in the strictly biological sense"; but, as Burke insightfully adds, the concept "is usually 'spiritualized', so that it includes merely social groups, comprising persons of the same nationality or beliefs" (Burke, 1969, p. 29). Directional substance provides definition in terms of motion or path such that it "stresses the sense of motivation from within" (Burke, 1969, p. 31); this may explain why the directional "has encouraged much sociological speculation in terms of 'tendencies' or 'trends'" (Burke, 1969, p. 32).

Commenting on Burke's treatment of the "paradox of substance," Stillar (1998) points out that despite its seemingly natural presence in text – "as the 'taken-for-granted' of being" – substance is "as much a social construction, as much a selection and deflection, as any other speaking *in terms of*" (p. 69). This should take us back to Burke's crucial notion of "terministic screens," which conditions and constrains the substantial terms being (mis-)used and made *dramatic* in text. Thus, looking for text-based terms of the sort may bring the discourse analyst closer to discovering pentadic structures of ratios and their respective substances; and those terms are argued here to be **keywords** in corpus-linguistics parlance.

3.2. Keywords and terministic screens

Phillips (1983) is credited with the statistically substantiated proposition that the topic of a given text could be specified by identifying the keywords frequently used in this text (Phillips, 1983, cited in Pearson, 1998, p. 54). The idea of identifying a list of keywords in a text or a group of texts relies on the information retrieval technique of corpus software. The computational tool of such software operates on the principle of "keyness" as being a quality that words may have in a text or a number of texts, "suggesting that they are important, they reflect what the text is really about, avoiding trivia and insignificant detail" (Scott & Tribble, 2006, pp. 55-56).

It follows, then, that typical of every textual practice is the presence of patterns of repetition that may aid in specifying what this practice is about (Kintsch & van Dijk, 1978; Hoey, 1991). But this is conditioned by the presence of a reference corpus against which textual practices will be compared for the sake of deciding on their lists of keywords; a reference corpus should ideally be an "appropriate sample" of language use that suits the textual practice under investigation, either in terms of genre, style, or any other comparable aspect; the phrase "appropriate sample" usually denotes a large corpus of texts, "probably many thousands of words long and possibly much more" (Scott & Tribble, 2006, p. 58). Taken as *aboutness* indicators, lexical (and not grammatical) keywords would be more relevant to textual practices if conceived of as belonging to or enacted by certain discourses; this can be specially so if one takes on board the assumption that keyword lists – further to providing "excellent insights into the 'aboutness' of single instances of a text" – can readily offer a clearer understanding of the "collocational relationships which generically significant words take on in the discourse" (Tribble, 2002, p. 137). This chimes well with Mahlberg's (2007, p. 197) description of the keywords derived by the KeyWords Tool in WordSmith (Scott, 2004, 2012) as being capable of providing "insights into aspects of social organization and views of the world."

One of the classic examples of research on how keyword analysis can provide such insights in the field of discourse studies is Fairclough (1990, 1992), who investigated the meanings of the keyword "enterprise"; he used corpus data that comprise the speeches delivered by Lord Young, Secretary of State for Trade and Industry in the Thatcher government, between 1985 and 1988. Fairclough (1992, pp. 187-190) found that, since its use by the British Conservative government in the 1980s, this keyword has changed in a way that is sensitive to political circumstances; the patterns of using the keyword demonstrated meaning shifts that reflected a more general extension of consumerism discourses into educational discourses, with the students represented as customers; and thus there seemed to be relationship between the restructuring of the senses of "enterprise" and the restructuring of orders of discourse.

As such, at the level of empirical research on discourse studies, there is great prospect for taking keywords as "useful signposts" to Burke's terministic screens, whose existence in one discourse type draws upon the selection of significant terms used by social agents in specific textual practices associated with this discourse type; the idea of keywords standing as "useful signposts" has been offered by Baker (2010) on the grounds that keywords "identify the lexical focus or preoccupations of a corpus (or specific text)"; but, as he further explains, "qualitative investigation of concordances is often required in order to identify exactly how keywords are used" (Baker, 2010, p. 26). Perhaps, the qualitative aspect of analysing keywords in their concordances or textual contexts (KWIC) may be enhanced and enriched should the analyst consider Burke's dramatistic model of pentad, ratios and substance, as proposed above; and this is exactly the focus of current research – Burkean dramatistic discourse analysis in a corpus-linguistics perspective.

Indeed, the dramatistic environment of keywords can be fully utilized if the Burkean discourse analyst considers seriously what Scott and Tribble (2006, p. 66) describe as the "linkages" between keywords as "collocational neighbours." But, crucially, such linkages would be more than just a node-collocate relationship, for the linkage in this case comprises two keywords, with almost the same semantic weight in text. At this point, keyword linkages can be illuminating in relation to the pentadic ratios: lexically extended units of keywords can be a rich site for combinations of the pentad elements running through the text.

Thus, in view of the above corpus tools of keyword list and cluster as well as concordance reading, Burke's dramatistic model for investigating the terministic screens associated with a given textual practice may be developed far beyond the intuition of the analyst. As stated earlier, terministic screens represent the conscious use of certain terms – to the exclusion of others – in a way that directs and deflects attention; and therefore these terministic screens are not merely representational, but are essentially attitudinal or orientational; that is, they do rhetorically reflect the stance of the symbol (mis-)user/maker. Crucially, then, deciding computationally on those terms in text and scrutinizing them in their linguistic contexts may well contribute to the field of discourse studies by providing a methodologically robust form of discourse analysis; this form will combine Burke's qualitatively insightful model of dramatism and the rigorously quantitative methods of corpus linguistics.

4. Methodology

This section discusses the data empirically drawn upon towards the validation of the proposed corpus-based dramatistic discourse analysis, and then presents the methodological procedure for conducting this form of discourse analysis; the procedure starts from identifying the keywords in the data, through the stages of describing the pentadic structures of these keywords and interpreting the terministic screens motivating their usages in text, to the final stage of explaining the substances contextualizing the speech event in the same data.

4.1. Data

The current study draws on two sets of data. The first set is Donald Trump's Orlando speech; the speech is 4,290 words, and it was delivered on 13 June 2016 in reaction to the shooting at a gay nightclub in Orlando on 12 June 2016. In his speech, as a consequence of the shooting event, Trump called for suspending immigration from countries with a history of terrorism. Trump's speech is used as the primary form of data that is analysed in conformity with the present method of corpus-based dramatistic discourse analysis. The second set of data is a historical corpus; it contains data scraped from archives of speeches made by US Presidents from George Washington to Barack Obama. The total word count for the corpus is about 3.5 million words. This corpus is used as a reference corpus against which Trump's speech is compared for deriving the latter's keyword frequency list.

4.2. Procedure

The methodological procedure followed in the present study proceeded at two stages. The first stage is dedicated to the phases of (1) identifying the keywords used by Trump in his speech as compared against the historical reference corpus of US Presidents by means of the WordSmith Tools (Scott, 2012), (2) describing the pentadic ratios associated with these keywords and/or their lexical linkages, and (3) interpreting the terministic screens rhetorically motivating Trump's usages of the speech keywords. The second stage is mainly concerned with substantiating the whole speech event of Orlando in terms of the different types of substance – geometric, familial, and directional – recognized in the keywords clustering and linking in the speech.

5. A corpus-based dramatistic discourse analysis of Trump's 2016 Orlando speech

The present section applies the corpus-based dramatistic discourse analysis outlined above to Donald Trump's 2016 Orlando speech. In the coming two subsections, the analysis tackles the pentadic structures and substances associated with the lexical keywords used by Trump in representing the Orlando-nightclub-shooting event in his speech. In the first subsection, the speech keywords, having been identified by WordSmith Tools (Scott, 2012), are described and interpreted in their concordances as ratios comprising elements of pentad, which are in turn motivated by Trump's terministic screens of the whole speech event. In the second subsection, the analysis is taken a step further towards explaining how the different keyword-based types of substance enable Trump to substantiate the whole speech event in a way that rhetorically serves his speech message and appeals to his audience.

5.1. Pentadic structures of the Orlando speech: Trump's terministic screens

Using the corpus analysis software WordSmith (Scott, 2012) with a default of $p < 0.000001$, Trump's speech gives a total of 30 keywords when compared against the reference corpus of US Presidents. In Table 1, the thirty keywords have been cut down to only fourteen, for all grammatical keywords have been excluded from the scope of present analysis.

Table 1. Lexical keywords in Trump's 2016 Orlando speech

No.	Lexical Keyword	Freq.	%	RC. Freq.	RC. %	Keyness	P value
1	RADICAL	21	0.49	23	--	122.52	0.0000000000
2	CLINTON	18	0.42	36	--	106.99	0.0000000000
3	HILLARY	16	0.37	32	--	95.09	0.0000000000
4	IMMIGRATION	21	0.49	104	0.02	92.82	0.0000000000

5	ISLAMIC	13	0.30	33	--	72.24	0.0000000000
6	TERRORISM	13	0.30	66	0.01	56.87	0.0000000000
7	ISLAM	9	0.21	41	--	41.06	0.0000000000
8	ORLANDO	6	0.14	7	--	40.54	0.0000000000
9	BERNARDINO	5	0.12	5	--	34.86	0.0000000006
10	SAN	5	0.12	7	--	32.45	0.0000000093
11	ADMIT	6	0.14	17	--	32.24	0.0000000107
12	OBAMA	5	0.12	10	--	29.70	0.0000000474
13	GAY	6	0.14	25	--	28.30	0.0000001009
14	WANT	21	0.49	637	0.11	28.22	0.0000001054

As exhibited in Table 1, the first column (No.) simply numbers the keywords in the order that they are presented (i.e., in terms of their keyness strength). The second column (Lexical Keyword) lists each lexical keyword. The third and fourth columns (Freq. & %) give the frequencies of each keyword (minimum 3) as it occurred in Trump's Orlando speech and their corresponding percentages, respectively. The fifth and sixth columns (RC. Freq. & %) give the frequencies of each keyword in the reference corpus of US Presidents and their corresponding percentages, respectively. The seventh column (Keyness) provides the log-likelihood keyness rate of each keyword. The eighth column (P value) gives the p value of each keyword.

Prior to analysing the pentadic structures of the keywords appearing in Table 1, it is worth remarking on the whole symbolic act of communicating the Orlando speech. As stated above, the whole speech was delivered as a reaction to the crisis of mass shooting at a gay nightclub in Orlando, Florida, US, on 12 June 2016. The whole event was triggered by the shooter, a single American Muslim guard, whose family – according to Trump himself – was allowed to emigrate from Afghanistan to America. Interestingly, too, the timing of the event synchronized with Trump's presidential campaign, which was officially launched on 16 June 2015, with Hillary Clinton as the Democratic rival to Trump in the 2016 election. Significantly, Clinton acted as US Secretary of State in the Obama Administration from 2009 to 2013. With these contextual details in mind, the great majority of the lexical keywords exhibited in Table 1 can be viewed as contextualization cues for the whole symbolic communication act, e.g., RADICAL, CLINTON, HILLARY, IMMIGRATION, ISLAMIC, TERRORISM, ISLAM, ORLANDO, OBAMA, and GAY.

Notably, however, the epithet RADICAL appears at the top of the keyword list, which means that it constitutes a whole significant configuration of described entities of some sort. This is made explicit in Figure 1, where the terms *views*, *mosques*, *terrorism*, *terrorist*(*s*), *preachers*, and above all *Islam* are recurrently positioned to the right of RADICAL. But, since the current method of corpus-based dramatistic discourse analysis regards keywords as the terms worthy of investigation for the most part, the analytic focus is laid strictly on the keyword linkages in Figure 1. There are three keyword linkages here: (a) RADICAL and ISLAMIC, (b) RADICAL, ISLAMIC and TERRORISM, and (c) RADICAL and ISLAM. In each case, the **scene:agent** ratio can be recognized. In the first case of RADICAL ISLAMIC, the terms *terrorism*, *terrorist*(*s*), and *preachers of hate and violence* are co-textually featured in a number of concordance lines (lines 3-9).

N	Concordance
1	the Afghan Taliban, a regime which murders those who don't share its radical views, and they murdered plenty. The father even said he was
2	friends and associates. We need to know if he was affiliated with any radical mosques or radical activists and what, if any, is their
3	it's coming ... With these people, folks, it's coming. We're importing radical Islamic terrorism into the West through a failed immigration
4	how poor she'd do as president in these very, very troubled times of radical Islamic terrorism. Even her former Secret Service agent, who's
5	ever experience. This is a very dark moment in America's history. A radical Islamic terrorist targeted the nightclub, not only because he
6	to that community, I will tell you right now. Clinton wants to allow radical Islamic terrorists to pour into our country. They enslave women
7	and a Secretary of Defense who'll know how to fight a war on radical Islamic terrorism. And they will have the support that they
8	not only our society but our entire way of life. When it comes to radical Islamic terrorism, ignorance is not bliss. It's deadly — totally
9	people, Jewish people are targets of persecution and intimation by radical Islamic preachers of hate and violence. This is not just a
10	and we need to do it now. We need to tell the truth also about how radical Islam is coming to our shores. And it's coming ... With these
11	despite so many attacks, repeatedly refused to even say the words radical Islam until I challenged her yesterday. And, guess what, she
12	and Christians and all people then we need to tell the truth about radical Islam and we need to do it now. We need to tell the truth also
13	The bottom line is that Hillary supports policies that bring the threat of radical Islam into American and allow it to grow oversees, and it is
14	was a slaughter, Hillary Clinton explained her refusal to say the words 'radical Islam." Here is what she said, exact quote, "Muslims are
15	our country and our borders. She has no clue, in my opinion, what radical Islam is and she won't speak honestly about it if she does, in
16	incompatible with Western values and institutions. Remember this, radical Islam is anti-woman, anti-gay and anti- American. I refuse to
17	same thought process as this savage killer. Many of the principles of radical Islam are incompatible with Western values and institutions.

Figure 1. The keyword RADICAL in Trump's 2016 Orlando speech

Here, Trump seems to present these pentadic terms as different types of agents whose attributes are the same, i.e., being radical and Islamic; and thus he sets up a terministic screen of terror. It is therefore highly likely that Trump's audience would conceptualize a particular type of agent – irrespective of their tokens – due to its constantly negative scenic effect of terrorization. Even more scenically expressive is the second case, where the keyword TERRORISM becomes the agent – at least metaphorically – for the type of agent presented here is inherently negative (lines 7 and 8). Thus, in this context, the **scene:agent** ratio is reinforced in pentadic force: The negative meaning of the agent heavily emphasizes the negative attribution of the scenic terms *radical* and *Islamic*. Perhaps, the **scene:agent** ratio becomes even more established with the third case where the keywords RADICAL and ISLAM are so remarkably reiterated in a fixed pattern (lines 10-17). Islam stands as an agent that is characterized as being "radical"; and, with the same scene of dramatic terror, such an agent is menacingly (i) "coming to our [i.e., American] shores" (line 10), (ii) standing as a "threat" (line 13), (iii) "anti-woman, anti-gay and anti-American" (line 16), and (iv) "incompatible with Western values and institutions" (line 17).

At this point, the keyword GAY may be relevant to the keyword linkage RADICAL ISLAM, but a seemingly different ratio may emerge here as shown in Figure 2. With the current political situation, GAY represents the pentadic element of scene, for it stands as the root (tacitly religious) cause of shooting. The political situation may then be rhetorically distilled into the **scene:act** ratio, where gay culture has been the target of shooting due to the radical-Islamic ideology lying behind. The manifestations of this ratio can be captured in the concordance lines in Figure 2; but, crucially, it should be added that Trump has maximally expanded the scope of the pentadic scene to include other elements that may encounter the same crisis: (1) "… all Americans – women and children, gay and straight, Jews and Christians and all people …" (line 1); (2) "… violence of any kind against gay and lesbian Americans" (line 2); (3) "… execute gay and lesbian citizens" (line 4); (4) "… radical Islam is anti-woman, anti-gay and anti-American" (line 5); and (5) " … a place where gay people, Christian people, and Jewish people are targets of persecution and intimation …" (line 6). Thus, building on the foregoing ratio, one may gather that Trump deploys a terministic screen of scenic dramatization, which brings into effect the "persuasive rhetoric of amplification" (Salama, 2011) in the main scene against which the act of Orlando shooting has taken place; this may be an attempt on his part to globalize a local crisis and aggravate the threat of radical Islam.

N	Concordance
1	protect the quality of life for all Americans — women and children, gay and straight, Jews and Christians and all people then we need
2	anyone into our country who supports violence of any kind against gay and lesbian Americans. The burden is on Hillary Clinton to tell
3	violent hatred? Hillary Clinton can never claim to be a friend of the gay community as long as she continues to support immigration
4	only because he wanted to kill Americans, but in order to execute gay and lesbian citizens, because of their sexual orientation. It's a
5	and institutions. Remember this, radical Islam is anti-woman, anti-gay and anti- American. I refuse to allow America to become a
6	anti- American. I refuse to allow America to become a place where gay people, Christian people, Jewish people are targets of

Figure 2. The keyword GAY in Trump's 2016 Orlando speech

Such a terministic screen of scenic dramatization has been persistently adopted by Trump when speaking of other pentadic elements; more specifically, the keyword ORLANDO and the keyword linkage SAN BERNARDINO. For example, the keyword ORLANDO, as exhibited in Figure 3, is the focal scene where the shooting took place: Orlando is the Florida-based city where the attack on the Pulse gay nightclub was launched (line 4). Here, the same **scene:act** ratio continues with Trump dramatizing certain aspects of the scene itself: (1) surveying the history of the Orlando shooter (line 1), (2) extending the consequential impact of shooting to the point of forcing a change of the American foreign policy (line 2), (3) popularizing the whole event at national levels of the American society (lines 3 and 5), (4) describing the attack in superlative terms as being "the worst terror strike on our [America's] soil since September 11th" (line 4), and (5) featuring other cases that are similar to the Orlando shooting (line 6).

N	Concordance
1	charged in an assassination plot. This shooter and amazingly in Orlando was the child of an immigrant father who supported one of the
2	based on their backgrounds or sexual orientation, as you just saw in Orlando. It also means we must change our foreign policy. The
3	my remarks today by again expressing our solitarily with the people of Orlando who have come under this horrific attack. When I'm president I
4	of terrorism inside of our borders. The attack on the Pulse nightclub in Orlando, Florida, was the worst terror strike on our soil since
5	you. Our nation stands together in solidarity with the members of Orlando's LGBT community. They have been through something that
6	devastating, and all you have to do is take a look at what happened in Orlando and what happened in other cases. Just a single event. And

Figure 3. The keyword ORLANDO in Trump's 2016 Orlando speech

Perhaps, the last aspect of the scenic dramatization of Orlando – featuring comparable cases of shooting – can be realized in the way Trump used the keyword linkage SAN BERNARDINO, which is demonstrated in Figure 4. San Bernardino is a California-based city in the US that witnessed a terrorist attack of mass shooting on 2 December 2015. Notably, here, Trump brings in this past tragic event as a scene with an act of terror similar to the Orlando act; and as such the same **scene:act** ratio persists in the rhetorical situation. Again, as shown in Figure 4, Trump has dramatized the San Bernardino scene by using terms of dramatic exaggeration (italics for emphasis): (1) "I called for *a ban* after San Bernardino and was met with *great scorn and anger*" (line 1), (2) "the male shooter … *whose name I will not mention*" (line 2), (3) "… San Bernardino, *the slaughter*, *that's all it was was a slaughter*" (line 3), (4) "… the people in San Bernardino were *bad*" (line 4), and (5) "In San Bernardino … people who knew what was going on … but they used *the excuse of racial profiling for not reporting it*" (line 5).

N	Concordance
1	. We have to address these issues head-on. I called for a ban after San Bernardino and was met with great scorn and anger but now many
2	bombers came here through political asylum. The male shooter in San Bernardino again whose name I will not mention was the child of
3	. I don't know if you know this, but just a few weeks before San Bernardino, the slaughter, that's all it was was a slaughter, Hillary
4	going on. They know that he was bad. They knew the people in San Bernardino were bad. But you know what? They didn't turn them in. And
5	complete investigation into every single aspect of the assault. In San Bernardino, as an example, people who knew what was going on, they

Figure 4. The keyword linkage SAN BERNARDINO in Trump's 2016 Orlando speech

Another pentadic structure can be found in Figure 5, with the keywords CLINTON and HILLARY cemented together as a keyword linkage, reifying the proper noun *Hillary Clinton*. The concordance lines in Figure 5 present the **agent:purpose** ratio in a way that reveals the plans or intentions of Clinton. In using terms such as *plan*, *wants* and *want* (lines 2, 3, 5, and 6), Trump emphasizes aspects of the future vision of his Democratic rival in presidential election. One such aspect is Clinton's purpose of bringing more radical Islamic immigrants to America (line 2); and with this purpose in the mind of Clinton, Trump seems to steer the attention of his audience to the term "catastrophic immigration plan" – seeing the agent's way of thinking as perilous; almost the same meaning is reiterated in lines 5 and 6, with Clinton's willingness and desire to do so, being stressed by using the terms *want* and *wants*. Indeed, Trump has further extended the dangerous vision of Clinton to the economic realm: "Hillary Clinton wants to empty out the Treasury …" (line 3). As such, it can be said that here Clinton is being filtered through a terministic screen of disastrous administration.

N	Concordance
1	San Bernardino, the slaughter, that's all it was was a slaughter, Hillary Clinton explained her refusal to say the words "radical Islam." Here is
2	American and allow it to grow oversees, and it is growing. In fact, Hillary Clinton's catastrophic immigration plan will bring vastly more radical
3	them in. And you know what? We had death, and destruction. Hillary Clinton wants to empty out the Treasury to bring people into the country
4	on earth. Why would we admit people who support violent hatred? Hillary Clinton can never claim to be a friend of the gay community as long as
5	does this kind of immigration make our country better? Why does Hillary Clinton want to bring people in in vast numbers who reject our values?
6	administration is a disgrace to that community, I will tell you right now. Clinton wants to allow radical Islamic terrorists to pour into our country.

Figure 5. The keyword linkage HILLARY CLINTON in Trump's 2016 Orlando speech

Thus, the **agent:purpose** ratio presented by Trump in Figure 5 juxtaposes Clinton and radical Islamic immigrants in a way that rhetorically demonizes the latter. At this point, it may be analytically interesting to examine the same purpose-specific term *want* as a keyword (see Table 1) with a view to analyzing its pentadic structure in Trump's speech. A quick glance at the keyword WANT in Figure 6 demonstrates Trump's tendency to use it in collocation with the first-person pronoun "I" in the fixed pattern *I want*, except for the last line in the concordance wherein the cognitive verb of desire is negated (*I don't want*). Obviously, the same **agent:purpose** ratio applies here, but this time it relates to Trump, whose subjective presence seems to be dominant when expressing his desire for making a *new* America; or at the pentadic level of analysis, *America through Trump's terministic screen*: (a) making America great again (line 1), (b) fixing America's bridges (line 3), (c) doing group work (line 7), (d) protecting American citizens (line 8), (e) fixing American schools (line 10), and (f) urging the success of all Americans (line 11). Here, a different terministic screen appears with Trump himself acting as a purpose-bound agent; that is, a terministic screen of visionary leadership.

N	Concordance
1	. I want to do the right thing. I want to straighten things out and I want to make America great again. The days of deadly ignorance
2	leadership in which case they're out of here. What I want... What I want is common sense. I want a mainstream immigration policy
3	to do it, and they have to do it forthwith. I want to fix our schools. I want to fix our bridges. And our jobs market, we're going to have it
4	your safety, and above all else. I refuse to be politically correct. I want to do the right thing. I want to straighten things out and I want
5	else. I refuse to be politically correct. I want to do the right thing. I want to straighten things out and I want to make America great
6	and proper leadership in which case they're out of here. What I want... What I want is common sense. I want a mainstream
7	not an act of offense against anyone. It's really an act of defense. I want us all, all of us, to work together. We have to form a
8	that include individuals who preach hate against our citizens. I want to protect our citizens, all of our citizens. The terrorist attack
9	they're out of here. What I want... What I want is common sense. I want a mainstream immigration policy that promotes American
10	know it. And they have to do it, and they have to do it forthwith. I want to fix our schools. I want to fix our bridges. And our jobs
11	to have it rocket again, we're going to make great trade deals. But I want every American to succeed including Muslims. But the
12	our country. They enslave women, and they murder gays. I don't want them in our country. Immigration is a privilege, and we should

Figure 6. The keyword WANT in Trump's 2016 Orlando speech

Thus, comparing Trump's **agent:purpose** ratio with that of Clinton explained above, the rhetorical situation may get clearer. In Trump's terms, whereas Clinton's overall purpose is to allow radical Islamic terrorists to come to America, Trump's sole purpose is the large-scale interests of America itself; and here one may assume the presence of clashing terministic screens: disastrous administration versus visionary leadership. Both terministic screens call the attention of Trump's audience to how the two agents (Clinton and Trump) are at cross purposes on the issue of what serves America best; crucially, Trump's purpose has been asserted in the last concordance line (line 12), where he categorically negated any desire on his part to have radical Islamic immigrants in America (compared to Clinton's desire). Further, the terministic screen of visionary leadership has been forged in Figure 6 with Trump's moralistic terms; this is readable from both line 2, where the purpose of the agent Trump is "common sense," and line 4 with Trump explicitly expressing his intent to "do the right thing."

In Figure 7, in continuation of the terministic screen of disastrous administration, the **agent:act** ratio seems to be rhetorically enacted by Trump who commits Clinton to the act of telling, and thus presents her as an accountable agent. It is through such a pentadic ratio that Trump causes Clinton to face a showdown with his American audience on the issue of immigration from what he describes as "dangerous countries" (line 3). Note here Trump's pentadic shift from the emotionally "expressive" speech-act keyword WANT (Figure 5) to the verbally "assertive" speech-act keyword TELL (Figure 7); this offers full-scale accountability of CLINTON, who becomes responsible for "catastrophic immigration" in terms of both cognition and diction. Interestingly, in Figure 7, the same **agent:act** ratio proceeds in lines 4 and 5, yet the agent changes from Clinton to the inclusive personal pronoun "we," with both Trump and the American people committed to the act of telling the truth about the status of radical Islam in America; and with this pentadic shift, the terministic screen of visionary leadership re-appears. As such, Trump, rhetorically again, sets up the two clashing terministic screens of disastrous administration versus visionary leadership, with two opposing pentadic agents, Clinton versus Trump and the American people, whose interests seem to be at cross purposes again.

N	Concordance
1	gay and lesbian Americans. The burden is on Hillary Clinton to tell us how she will pay for it, her plan will cost hundreds of billions
2	laughed at all over the world. The burden is on Hillary Clinton to tell us why we should admit anyone into our country who supports
3	we don't know what's happening. The burden is on Hillary Clinton to tell us why she believes immigration from these dangerous countries
4	the truth about radical Islam and we need to do it now. We need to tell the truth also about how radical Islam is coming to our shores.
5	and straight, Jews and Christians and all people then we need to tell the truth about radical Islam and we need to do it now. We need

Figure 7. The keyword TELL in Trump's Orlando speech

Indeed, the inclusive personal pronoun "we" has been further rhetorically utilized by Trump in relation to the keyword ADMIT; the pentadic structure of this keyword process may be revealing at the level of using the expression *we admit*. As demonstrated in Figure 8, the meaning of the verb *admit* in this context is simply "to allow somebody to enter a particular place"; the place here is certainly America, where all referential aspects of meaning are concerned with undesirable immigrants with radical-Islamic attitudes. At this point, the terminological combination of *we* and *admit* can be said to constitute the **agent:act** ratio, which seems to be motivated by Trump's terministic screen of shared or collective blame: We collectively admit those undesirable radical elements into our country. This message is rhetorically running all through the concordance lines in Figure 8.

N	Concordance
1	over the world. The burden is on Hillary Clinton to tell us why we should admit anyone into our country who supports violence of any kind against
2	supported one of the most repressive regimes on earth. Why would we admit people who support violent hatred? Hillary Clinton can never claim
3	, because we don't even know who's coming in. And we continue to admit millions more with no real checks or scrutiny. Not surprisingly,
4	percent of the people in Afghanistan support oppressive sharia law. We admit many more, and that's just the way it is. We admit many more
5	sharia law. We admit many more, and that's just the way it is. We admit many more from other countries in the region. And I'll tell you what

Figure 8. The keyword ADMIT in Trump's 2016 Orlando speech

Perhaps, this pentad-induced message of collective blame should bring to light one of the most important keywords in Trump's speech – IMMIGRATION. As shown in Figure 9, there seem to be two terminological senses of IMMIGRATION; one is general and relates directly to the generic process of immigration into America (lines 1, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, and 9), and the other is specific in its pentadic scope and is therefore more interesting in the present context of analysis. The latter terminological sense of IMMIGRATION is argued here to make up the **agency:agent** ratio, whereby the term *immigration* is presented by Trump as a rhetorical instrument, or agency, which is pentadically associated with two agents, Hillary Clinton (lines 2 and 10) and President Obama (line 5).

N	Concordance
1	and beliefs, very simple. We have to control the amount of future immigration into this country and we have to prevent large pockets
2	. The burden is on Hillary Clinton to tell us why she believes immigration from these dangerous countries should be increased
3	any radical mosques or radical activists and what, if any, is their immigration status. We have to know, and we have to know fast.
4	a friend of the gay community as long as she continues to support immigration policies that bring Islamic extremists to our country
5	to comply. President Obama must release the full and complete immigration histories of all individuals implicated in terrorist
6	importing radical Islamic terrorism into the West through a failed immigration system and through an intelligence community held
7	they need to understand the threat. The Senate subcommittee on Immigration has already identified hundreds of immigrants charged
8	catastrophic immigration plan will bring vastly more radical Islamic immigration into this country, threatening not only our society but
9	Arabia through another one of our easily exploited visa programs. Immigration from Afghanistan into the United States has increased
10	oversees, and it is growing. In fact, Hillary Clinton's catastrophic immigration plan will bring vastly more radical Islamic immigration

Figure 9. The keyword IMMIGRATION in Trump's 2016 Orlando speech

Of course, the two agents are presented through a terministic screen of accountability (i.e., the two agents being officially responsible for the radical Islamic immigration into America; and thus, by extension, for the Orlando tragic event about which the whole speech revolves). Suffice it to consider Trump's terms of "dangerous countries" (line 2) and "catastrophic immigration plan" (line 10), which are closely associated with Clinton. However, when it comes to Obama, Trump's terministic screen of accountability is more subtly presented. As can be read in Figure 9, Obama is placed as a deontically responsible agent: "President Obama must release … terrorist activities of any kind since September 11th" (line 5 extended). This is to construct Obama as a President who is need of advice about what he is morally obliged to do in the course of facing this kind of immigration.

At his point of analysis, the pentadic structure of the keyword OBAMA itself may be examined in Figure 10. All concordance lines of OBAMA tend to offer a **scene:act** ratio, which brings the presidential act of OBAMA and his administration into question and simultaneously evaluates their performance on the critical issue of dangerous immigration; for example, putting the negative spin on "Obama's way" as simply "doesn't work" (line 2). The clearest instance of such a ratio can be realized in line 4, which can be extended as follows: "The Obama administration, with the support of Hillary Clinton and others, has also damaged our security by restraining our intelligence … gathering information." The pentad element of scene presented here is so crucial as it reflects how the Obama administration, including Clinton, is a hindrance, rather than an asset, to the intelligence work of gathering information about radical Islamic terrorists and their activities in America.

N	Concordance
1	. Nobody even knows why. They refused to comply. President Obama must release the full and complete immigration histories of
2	we did with communism during the Cold War. We tried it President Obama's way, doesn't work. He gave the world his apology tour.
3	. Nearly a year ago, the Senate Subcommittee asked President Obama's Department of Justice, State and Homeland Security to
4	terrorism, ignorance is not bliss. It's deadly — totally deadly. The Obama administration, with the support of Hillary Clinton and others
5	We don't have the support of the law enforcement system because Obama is not letting them do their job. They are not being allowed

Figure 10. The keyword OBAMA in Trump's 2016 Orlando speech

Now, it is time analytic focus shifted to the second macro level of discussing the significant substances associated with some of the keywords and their pentadic ratios as tackled above; this is the main purpose of the coming subsection.

5.2. Substantiating Trump's Orlando speech

At this point, the corpus-based dramatistic discourse analysis of Trump's speech shifts in focus from describing and interpreting the pentadic ratios based on the keywords used in the speech towards explaining the keyword substances contextualizing the whole speech event; this entails defining the Orlando shooting event from the perspective of Trump; or simply how the speech event is defined in the *terms* used by Trump himself.

To begin, as shown in Table 1, there are keywords with expressly spatial references, namely, ORLANDO and SAN BERNARDINO; both can be said to constitute geometric substance in the Trump speech. It is through such terms of place that Trump has rhetorically substantiated the settings of the shootings executed by radical-Islamic elements over the years 2015 and 2016. As discussed in the above subsection, the Orlando shooting has triggered Trump's current speech; and it is through this setting, and the Pulse nightclub located therein, that Trump managed to frame the whole event as impinging adversely on America as a whole and accordingly he was able to classify radical Islam as being a threat to the country. Likewise, the term *San Bernardino* has been employed in a way that substantiated a tragic event of shooting earlier to that in Orlando on the same geometric plane. Yet, the latter setting of San Bernardino served as a trigger for a narrative instance that emphasizes Trump's conceptualization of radical Islam as a danger to the whole of America.

Also, the keywords HILLARY CLINTON, OBAMA, and GAY constitute a familial substance whereby the speech message to the American people has been rhetorically shaped in Trump's classificatory terms and according to his version of truth. In his speech, Trump classifies Obama and Clinton as members of the same administration that share one and the same responsibility before the American people: admitting radical-Islamic immigrants into America. As such, both members are to be held accountable for the shootings in San Bernardino and Orlando. On the other hand, GAY has been used by Trump as a term that features the hatred and violence of radical Islam; the term has been *familialy* associated with other member terms, namely, lesbians, Jews, Christians, women, and children, which have collectively underscored radical Islam's inimical and hostile stance against the American society as a whole. With this division in family substance, Trump managed to highlight how Obama's administration (including Hillary Clinton) have unwittingly acted against the interests of the American people.

Finally, the keywords RADICAL, TERRORISM, IMMIGRATION, and ADMIT can be said to construct a directional substance of different sorts. First, the keywords RADICAL and TERRORISM mark what can be described as a given attitude or a trend against some party or group of people. This is precisely the rhetorical purpose for which Trump has consistently used the two terms. The term *radical* has been invariably utilized in a way that defines a particular type of Islam: A version of Islam that targets all Americans, including gays, lesbians, Jews, Christians, women, and children. That is to say, radical Islam is presented by Trump as being *directed* against all Americans. Further, according to

Trump, the term *terrorism* is itself motivated by this type of radical Islam. Second, Trump uses the keyword IMMIGRATION to denote a conscious movement from countries that favour and adopt radical Islam to America; and as such, it is presented as a means to a terrorist end. Third, the keyword ADMIT reflects the official process of allowing radical Islamists to enter America; the process itself enacts and endorses the legal movement of those Islamists from their home "dangerous countries" to America.

All in all, then, with the three types of substance (geometric, familial, and directional), Trump has presented the Orlando speech event in certain terms that steered the attention of the American people into a particular direction; that is, radical Islam is a threat to each and every American and the Obama administration with the aid of Hillary Clinton are to be held accountable for the terrorism arising from this type of radical Islam. Simultaneously, by virtue of avoiding other terms, Trump has deflected the attention of the American people from the possibility that the events of Orlando and San Bernardino are nothing but individual acts of violence that do not represent Islam in any way shape or form. And, eventually, this is what might be described as Trump's own terministic screens of the 2016 Orlando event.

6. Conclusions

The present study has propounded a methodological synergy of Kenneth Burke's dramatistic method of text analysis and the corpus-linguistics techniques of keyword extraction and concordance reading (KWIC). The primary data used for analysis has been Donald Trump's Orlando speech, delivered on 13 June 2016 in the wake of the gay nightclub shooting in the city of Orlando on 12 June 2016. The secondary data represented a historical reference corpus of all US Presidents, starting from George Washington to Barack Obama, counting up to 3.5 million words. The Orlando speech has been compared against the reference corpus of US Presidents for the sake of extracting the keywords used by Trump in the speech; and only fourteen lexical keywords have been considered for analysis based on the criterion of excluding those grammatical keywords that are void of lexical content. The lexical keywords computationally derived by WordSmith Tools (Scott, 2012) have been investigated in their concordances as keywords-in-context, or KWIC, in terms of Burke's dramatistic method of text analysis; that is, in terms of the ratios associated with the pentadic structures of the keywords themselves and the substance types they reflect in the rhetorical process of organizing Trump's speech message.

Since Burke's method of dramatism is rhetorically oriented in approach, the persuasive language of political discourse has been the main focus of analysis; however, it has been through the corpus-linguistic techniques methodologically integrated that such a rhetorical language analysis of political discourse has demonstrated a reliable basis whereupon Trump's terministic screens were shown to be empirically analysable. Had it not been for the corpus techniques of keyword-list automatic generation and the concordance browsing of the lexical patterns surrounding the speech keywords, the dramatistic discourse analysis of Trump's rhetorical language would have undergone the methodological weakness of subjective reading and impoverished empirical investigation. At this point, it may be useful to revisit in more detail the literature applying Burke's dramatistic model to different sets of data and types of discourse (Section 2); this may demonstrate how such literature reflects this methodological weakness of adopting Burke's model as a method of analysis, to the exclusion of any potential for integrating quantitative corpus-based methods into this qualitatively rich model.

The literature utilizing Burke's model – as critiqued earlier above (Section 2) – can be categorized into five broad research strands. First, a number of studies have applied Burke's dramatistic model to uncovering the persuasive rhetoric of political discourse; for example, (i) the rhetorical language of Senator Edward Kennedy's address to the people of Massachusetts (Ling, 1970), (ii) Lincoln's second inaugural address (Hahn & Morland, 1979), (iii) Ronald Regan's language on Lebanon and Grenada

(Birdsell, 1987), (iv) the persuasive language used by Martin Luther King, Jr. (Appel, 1997), (v) the rhetorical language utilized in campaigning (Blain, 2005), and (vi) the different rhetorical language usages by Trump and Hillary Clinton (Bloomfield & Tscholl, 2018). Second, two classical studies have drawn on Burke's model for exploring ideological meanings, namely, describing ideology as a form of symbolic inference (Jameson, 1978) and analysing the ideological language of gay-rights controversial discourse (Brummett, 1979). Third, two studies have applied Burke's dramatistic analytics to media discourse, with an intensive focus on of the rhetorical language of newspapers (Condit & Selzer, 1985) and popular press (Edgar, 2014). Fourth, a number of studies applied Burke's "terministic screens" and/or "pentad" to the analysis of (i) medical discourse on the ethics of euthanasia (Kenny, 2005), (ii) the language of experience (Stob, 2008), and (iii) mythic historiography (Jensen & Ratcliffe, 2017). Fifth, some research has been undertaken on technologically mediated discourse, with a view to (i) examining what has been termed "pentadic cartography" (Anderson & Prelli, 2001), (ii) implementing strategies of rhetorical identification towards demonstrating the interface between Facebook and composition writing (Head, 2016), and (iii) investigating the process of the creative idea generation of graphic communication design (Ebigbagha, 2020).

One may conclude here that the present form of corpus-based dramatistic discourse analysis – as proposed in the current study – will in all probability afford a methodologically more rigorous version of Burke's dramatism than the one followed in the above literature. Indeed, this is the main contribution the present study claims. This contribution can be explained in the light of the fact that Burke's dramatism is principally based on the key terms used by text producers in shaping their rhetorical messages; Burke's main concept of "terministic screen" may well validate this claim. This is where the corpus-linguistics technique of KWIC has proved substantially significant to the dramatistic analysis of text: Since the keywords computationally identified by corpus software like WordSmith Tools are reliable indicators of what the text is actually about, Burke's textual key terms – and the terministic screens motivating them – can be described and interpreted through such keywords. This is the answer to the overarching question proposed in the present study: How to synergize Kenneth Burke's dramatistic model of text analysis and corpus linguistics in a way that is methodologically useful to the rhetorical analysis of political discourse?

However, besides this main methodological contribution, having applied the current methodology to Trump's 2016 Orlando speech, I am in a position now to present some further research findings and answers to the sub-questions related to the overarching question. First, in an answer to the first sub-question (What is Donald Trump's 2016 Orlando speech mainly about?), a list of fourteen keywords in Trump's speech has been computationally derived with no human intervention or any intuition on the analyst's part. Interestingly, the keywords and keyword linkages automatically generated have collectively demonstrated what Trump's speech is all about. For example, the top keyword RADICAL, alongside its collocating keywords of ISLAM, ISLAMIC and TERRORISM, as well as the keyword IMMIGRATION have revealed Trump's central theme about the threat of radical Islamic immigration to America; so is the case with the keyword linkage of HILLARY CLINTON and the keyword OBAMA as indexing the political actors presumed by Trump to be held accountable for condoning this kind of immigration from what he has described as "dangerous countries"; finally, the keyword linkage SAN BERNARDINO and the keywords ORLANDO and GAY indicate the local setting and trigger for the speech event.

Second, addressing the second sub-question (What are the terministic screens motivating Trump in his rhetorical representation of the speech event?), a thorough analysis of the pentadic ratios of speech keywords has been undertaken as such: There has been an investigation of the speech keywords in their concordances by means of applying Burke's dramatistic method of finding the potential combinations of the pentad elements (act, agent, agency, scene, and purpose) associated with such keywords and their

linkages in the concordances. The pentadic analysis of keywords and their linkages has brought out five terministic screens that can be said to have motivated Trump in his rhetorical representation of the 2016 Orlando event. First, the **scene:agent** ratio associated with the keyword linkages RADICAL ISLAM/RADICAL ISLAMIC TERRORISM has been motivated by the terministic screen of terror; second, the **scene:act** ratio associated with GAY, ORLANDO, and SAN BERNARDINO has been motivated by the terministic screen of scenic dramatization; third, a set of keywords has been motivated by two clashing terministic screens of disastrous administration and visionary leadership: respectively, (a) the **agent:purpose** ratio associated with HILLARY CLINTON and WANT and the **agent:act** ratio with CLINTON and TELL and (b) the **agent:purpose** ratio with the keyword WANT and the pronoun "I" and the **agent:act** ratio with the keyword TELL and the inclusive pronoun "we"; fourth, the **agent:act** ratio with the keyword ADMIT and the inclusive pronoun "we" has been motivated by the terministic screen of shared or collective blame; fifth, the **agency:agent** ratio with IMMIGRATION, CLINTON and OBAMA as well as the **scene:act** ratio with OBAMA alone have been motivated by the terministic screen of accountability.

Third, the third sub-question (How can the whole speech event be explained in relation to Trump's rhetorically motivated terms?) has been addressed by proceeding with Burke's dramatistic method of keyword-substance analysis – or, more technically, the dramatistic substantiation of the Orlando speech event. In this respect, the three types of substance (geometric, familial, and directional) have been reflected by the speech keywords. First, the keywords ORLANDO and SAN BERNARDINO reflect the geometric substance whereby Trump has substantiated the settings of the shootings associated with radical-Islamic terrorists over the time span 2015-2016; second, HILLARY CLINTON, OBAMA and GAY reflect the familial substance that enabled Trump's classificatory system of the "Other": (a) both Clinton and Obama have been lumped together as official mediocrities who failed to protect America against radical-Islamic immigrants and (b) gays and other related terms such as lesbians, Jews, Christians, women, and children in America have been subsumed under the family of victims of radical-Islamic terrorism; third, and last, RADICAL, TERRORISM, IMMIGRATION, and ADMIT reflect the directional substance, which again enabled Trump to manipulate the orientations of certain political actors in his speech in rhetorically subtle ways: (a) the term-complex "radical Islamic terrorism" reflects an attitude of hatred and violence that is *directed* by some immigrants against all Americans, (b) the term "immigration" substantiates the directional movement of evil forces of radical Islamists from their "dangerous countries" into America, and (c) the process "admit" substantiates the mobilization of immigrants across the American borders.

Finally, then, the present form of corpus-based dramatistic discourse analysis can be said to operate methodologically on the rhetorical language of political discourse – particularly political speeches – in such a way that productively combines Burke's qualitative method of dramatistic text analysis and the quantitative methods and techniques of corpus linguistics; the latter does enhance the former's empirical powers of analysis and the former does enrich the latter's heuristic potentials for describing, interpreting, and explaining the rhetorical language of political discourse in general.

7. Ethics Committee Approval

The author confirms that ethical approval was obtained from Kafr El-Sheikh University & Prince Sattam Bin Abdulaziz University (Approval Date:19/01/2021)

Acknowledgements

References

Anderson, Floyd D., & Prelli, Lawrence J. (2001). Pentadic cartography: Mapping the universe of discourse. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, *87*(1), 73-95.

Appel, Edward C. (1993). Implications and importance of the negative in Burke's dramatistic philosophy of language. *Communication Quarterly*, *41*(1), 51-65.

Appel, Edward C. (1997). The rhetoric of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.: Comedy and context in tragic collision. *Western Journal of Communication*, *61*(4), 376-402.

Baker, P. (2006). *Using corpora in discourse analysis*. London/New York: Continuum.

Baker, P. (2010). *Sociolinguistics and corpus linguistics*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Biber, D., Conrad, S., & Reppen, R. (1998). *Corpus linguistics: Investigating language structure and use*: Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Birdsell, David S. (1987). Ronald Reagan on Lebanon and Grenada: Flexibility and interpretation in the application of Kenneth Burke's Pentad. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, *73*(3), 267-279.

Blain, M. (2005). The politics of victimage: Power and subjection in a U.S. anti-gay campaign. *Critical Discourse Studies*, 2(1), 31-50.

Bloomfield, E. F., & Tscholl, G. (2018). Analyzing Warrants and Worldviews in the Rhetoric of Donald Trump and Hillary Clinton: Burke and Argumentation in the 2016 Presidential Election. The Journal of the Kenneth Burke Society, *13*(2), 1-12.

Brummett, B. (1979). A pentadic analysis of ideologies in two gay rights controversies. *Central States Speech Journal*, *30*(3), 250-261.

Brummett, B. (1980). Symbolic form, Burkean scapegoating, and rhetorical exigency in Alioto's response to the "Zebra" Murders'. *Western Journal of Speech Communication*, *44*(1), 64-73.

Burke, K. (1931/1968a). *Counter-Statement*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Burke, K. (1935/1965). *Permanence and change*. Indianapolis, IN: Bobbs-Merrill.

Burke, K. (1941/1973). *The philosophy of literary form*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Burke, K. (1945/1969). *A grammar of motives*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Burke, K. (1961/1970). *The rhetoric of religion*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Burke, K. (1966). *Language as symbolic action: Essays on life, literature, and method*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Burke, K. (1968b). Dramatism. In David L. Sills (Ed.), *The international encyclopedia of the social sciences* Vol. 7 (pp. 445-452). New York: Macmillan.

Burke, K. (1972). *Dramatism and development*. Worcester. MA: Clark University Press.

Condit, Celester M., & Selzer, J. A. (1985). The rhetoric of objectivity in the newspaper coverage of a murder trial. *Critical Studies in Mass Communication*, *2*(3), 197-216.

Cooks, L., & Descutner, D. (1993). Different paths from powerlessness to empowerment: A dramatistic analysis of two eating disorder therapies. *Western Journal of Communication*, *57*(4), 494-514.

Ebigbagha, Sylvester Z. (2020). The Burke's pentad heuristic potentiality for creative idea generation in graphic communication design. *Review of Artistic Education*, *20*(1), 228-242.

Edgar, Amanda N. (2014). R&B rhetoric and victim-blaming discourses: exploring the popular press's revision of Rihanna's contextual agency. *Women's Studies in Communication*, *37*(2), 138-158.

Fairclough, No. (1990). What might we mean by "enterprise discourse"? In R. Keat, & N. Abercrombie (Eds.), *Enterprise culture* (pp. 38-57). London: Routledge.

Fairclough, N. (1992). *Discourse and social change*. Cambridge: Polity.

Hahn, Dan F., & Morland, A. (1979). A Burkean analysis of Lincoln's second inaugural address. *Presidential Studies Quarterly*, *9*(4), 376-389.

Head, Samuel L. (2016). Teaching grounded audiences: Burke's identification in Facebook and composition. *Computers and Composition*, *39*, 27-40.

Hoey, M. (1991). *Patterns of lexis in text*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Jameson, Fredric R. (1978). The symbolic inference; or, Kenneth Burke and ideological analysis. *Critical Inquiry*, *4*(3), 507-523.

Jensen, K. (2018). Rhetorical counteraction in Kenneth Burke's *A Rhetoric of Motives* and *The War of Words*. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, *104*(4), 384-399.

Jensen, K., & Ratcliffe, K. (2017). Mythic historiography: Refiguring Kenneth Burke's deceitful woman trope. *Rhetoric Society Quarterly*, *48*(1), 88-107.

Kennedy, G. (1998). *An introduction to corpus linguistics*. London/New York: Longman.

Kenny, Robert W. (2005). A cycle of terms implicit in the idea of medicine: Karen Ann Quinlan as rhetorical icon and the transvaluation of the ethics of euthanasia. *Health Communication*, *17*(1), 17-39.

Kintsch, W., & van Dijk, T. (1978). Toward a model of text comprehension and production. *Psychological Review*, *85*(5), 363–394.

Ling, David A. (1970). A pentadic analysis of senator Edward Kennedy's address to the people of Massachusetts, July 25, 1969. *Central States Speech Journal*, *21*(2), 81-86.

Lule, J. (1990). The political use of victims: The shaping of the *challenger* disaster. *Political Communication and Persuasion*, *7*(2), 115-128.

Mahlberg, M. (2007). Lexical items in discourse: Identifying local textual functions of sustainable development. In M. Hoey, M. Mahlberg, M. Stubbs, & W. Teubert (Eds.), *Text, discourse and corpora: Theory and analysis* (pp. 191-218). London: Continuum.

Pearson, J. (1998). *Terms in context*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Phillips, M. (1983). *Lexical macrostructure in science text* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Birmingham, Birmingham, UK.

Prelli, Lawrence J., & Winters, Terri S. (2009). *Rhetorical features of green evangelicalism*. *Environmental Communication*, *3*(2), 224-243.

Rosenfield, Lawrence W. (1976). August 9, 1974: The victimage of Richard Nixon. *Communication Quarterly*, *24*(4), 19-23.

Salama, Amir H. Y. (2011). The pluralist context model in Obama's Cairo speech: A rhetorical cognitive-semiotic approach. *ESP Across Cultures*, *8*, 103-124.

Scott, M. (2004). *WordSmith Tools. Version 4.0*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Scott, M. (2012). *WordSmith Tools. Version 6.0*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Scott, M., & Tribble, C. (2006). *Textual patterns: Key words and corpus analysis in language education*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Simons, Herbert W. (2004). The rhetorical legacy of Kenneth Burke. In W. Jost, & W. Olmsted (Eds.), *A companion to rhetoric and rhetorical criticism* (pp. 152-167). Oxford: Blackwell.

Sinclair, J. (1991). *Corpus, concordance, collocation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Sinclair, J. (2003). *Reading concordances: An introduction*. London: Pearson.

Stillar, G. (1998). *Analyzing everyday texts: Discourse, rhetoric, and social perspectives*. London: Sage.

Stob, P. (2008). "Terministic screens," social constructionism, and the language of experience: Kenneth Burke's utilization of William James. *Philosophy and Rhetoric*, *41*(2), 130-152.

Stubbs, M. (1996). *Text and corpus analysis: Computer-assisted studies of language and culture*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Tribble, C. (2002). Corpora and corpus analysis: New windows on academic writing. In J. Flowerdew (Ed.), *Academic discourse* (pp. 131-49). Harlow: Longman.

Dramatistik söylem analizi ve külli dilbiliminin metodolojik bir sinerjisi: ABD Başkanlarının söyleminden Trump'ın 2016 Orlando konuşmasına

Öz

Bu çalışma, Kenneth Burke'ün (1968, 1969) dramatistik metin analizi yöntemini ve anahtar kelime çıkarma ve uyum okumasının külliyat tekniklerini birleştiren, derlem temelli söylem analizi için yeni bir metodoloji sunmaktadır. Metodolojiyi uygulayarak, Donald Trump'ın 2016 Orlando konuşmasının iki aşamalı bir analizi yapıldı: Birincisi, mikro düzeyde, (i) Trump tarafından kullanılan anahtar kelimeler, ABD Başkanlarının tarihsel referans külliyatıyla karşılaştırılarak konuşmasında belirlendi. WordSmith Tools (Scott, 2012) ve (ii) Trump'ın anahtar sözcük sözcük yapıları, konuşmadaki gey gece kulübü çekim olayının temsillerini seçen ve saptıran "terministik ekranlar" tarafından retorik olarak motive edilen beşli oranlarda tanımlandı ve yorumlandı; ikincisi, makro düzeyde, Orlando'nun tüm konuşma olayını doğrulama süreci, konuşmada kümeleme ve bağlantı anahtar kelimelerinde tanınan geometrik, ailesel ve yönlü - farklı madde türleri açısından uygulandı. Çalışma iki bulguya ulaştı. Birincisi, metodolojik olarak, Burke'ün dramatistik metin analizi yöntemi ve külliyat-dilbilim teknikleri, siyasi söylemin retorik dilinin analizine katkıda bulunan ve sonunda külliyat temelli dramatistik bir söylem analizi sağlayan yeni bir yolla sinerji oluşturmuştur. İkincisi, pratik olarak, konuşma anahtar kelimelerinin beşli oranlarını ve bunların madde türlerini analiz etmek, Trump'ın Orlando siyasi olayının belirli temsillerini belirli bir terministik ekranlar ve kanıtlar topluluğu aracılığıyla seçme ve saptırma retoriğini ortaya çıkardı.

AUTHOR BIODATA

Amir H.Y. Salama is currently Associate Professor of Linguistics in the Department of English, College of Social Science & Humanities in Al-Kharj, Prince Sattam Bin Abdulaziz University, Saudi Arabia. Also, he is a standing Associate Professor of Linguistics in the Department of English, Faculty of *Al-Alsun* (Languages), Kafr El-Sheikh University, Egypt. In 2011, Dr Salama got his PhD in linguistics from the Department of Linguistics and English language at Lancaster University, UK. Since then, he has published at international journals like *Discourse & Society*, *Critical Discourse Studies*, *Pragmatics and Society*, *Cogent Arts and Humanities*, *ESP Across Cultures*, *Semiotica*, and *Corpora*. His research interests are systemic functional grammar, corpus linguistics, discourse analysis, pragmatics, cognitive semantics, and semiotics.