Political Public Relations Agenda-Building: A Content Analysis of the US 2016 Presidential Campaign Speeches, Tweets and News Stories

Emmanuel Nwachukwu

Follow this and additional works at: https://aquila.usm.edu/dissertations

Part of the American Politics Commons, Mass Communication Commons, Public Relations and Advertising Commons, Social Influence and Political Communication Commons, and the Social Media Commons

Recommended Citation

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by The Aquila Digital Community. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations by an authorized administrator of The Aquila Digital Community. For more information, please contact Joshua.Cromwell@usm.edu.
POLITICAL PUBLIC RELATIONS AGENDA-BUILDING: A CONTENT ANALYSIS
OF THE US 2016 PRESIDENTIAL CAMPAIGN SPEECHES, TWEETS AND NEWS
STORIES

by

Emmanuel O. Nwachukwu

A Dissertation
Submitted to the Graduate School,
the College of Arts and Sciences
and the School of Communication
at The University of Southern Mississippi
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Approved by:

Dr. Jae-Hwa Shin, Committee Chair
Dr. Christopher Campbell, Committee Member
Dr. David Davies, Committee Member
Dr. Cheryl Jenkins, Committee Member
Dr. Fei Xue, Committee Member

Dr. Jae-Hwa Shin
Committee Chair

Dr. John Meyer
Director of School

Dr. Karen S. Coats
Dean of the Graduate School

May 2020
ABSTRACT

This study investigated the role of political agenda building of political speech and tweet in the 2016 U.S. presidential elections and the relationships between the campaign messages and the news cycle during the election campaign period. It also used functional theory of political campaign discourse to evaluate the speech and tweets of the presidential candidates. The study utilized content analysis and analyzed 5303 units of speech, Tweets, TV (CNN, FOX and NBC news) and news stories from New York Times and Washington Post to derive its conclusions.

The result of the study showed how tweets shaped the media agenda and coverage during the elections period and how Donald Trump used that to his advantage to set the daily media agenda during the elections cycle and to reach out to the audience. The study supported the hypothesis that the salience of issue attributes in campaign speech and tweets will be positively correlated with the salience of issue attributes in news media coverage of the 2016 U.S. presidential elections cycle with $\chi^2 (1, N = 5304) = 306.422, p < .000$.

The study revealed that the candidate’s speech and Tweets are associated with the news media (both TV and Newspaper) coverage of the 2016 U.S. presidential elections cycle, with $\chi^2 (2, N = 4788) = 19.944, p < .000$. The study also showed a significance in the news media tone regarding the candidate’s speech and Tweets during the 2016 U.S. presidential election cycle, with $\chi^2 (8, N = 516) = 221.093, p < .000$.

Both Trump and Clinton had over 40% positive tone in their Tweets, although Hillary had a little edge of positive tone more than Trump. She had a more optimistic outlook for the country than Donald Trump. Regarding negative tone, Trump Tweets
were more to negative tone than Clinton. However, this study did not support the assumptions of functional theory of political campaign discourse that candidates will use more acclaim over attack, incumbents will use more of past deed and less attack and candidates will talk more on policy or issue than personal character.
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CHAPTER I – Introduction

Political leadership and succession are crucial in every country, whether through election or coup d’état (Bunce, 1980). Abdullah (2018), contends that there cannot be leadership in any democracy without campaigns and elections. Campaign or campaigning is an essential element of election process. The campaign exercise gives political candidates competing for political offices the opportunity to ingratiate their personalities, their intended policies, and party ideologies with the electorates. Brady et al (2006) suggests that communication is indispensable during elections, and an enormous amount of communications happens during the campaign period (Abdullah, 2018). The combinations of different campaign endeavors have a great impact on the success or failures of a political candidate during election (Abdullah, 2018).

The idea of mass media as a national living room for political ceremony and spectacle emerged from ritual models of communication (Carey 1989; Katz and Dayan 1988; Peters 1995), but the idea of media as a public forum for establishing shared priorities was most clearly articulated in agenda-setting theory and more particular, agenda building theory in shaping the media and public agenda during an election campaign. In its earliest incarnation, the oft-quoted central tenet of news media agenda setting was that “the press may not be successful much of the time in telling people what to think, but it is stunningly successful in telling its readers what to think about” (Cohen 1963, 13). In other words, the news media were thought to focus public attention and concern on a limited set of public priorities, to set the public agenda.

Media scholars Max McCombs and Donald Shaw (1972) demonstrated the news media’s agenda-setting effects beginning in the late 1960s. Although it was difficult to
find evidence that campaign communication altered vote choice (Abdullah, 2018; Berelson, et. al. 1954), study after study would demonstrate that if news paid attention to an issue or a person, people thought the issue or person was important (Lazarsfeld & Merton 1948; McCombs & Shaw 1972; Jill & Meirick 2019).

Individuals who hold political leadership in any society are the ruling class Seligman, (2013), and political elites who govern the undertakings of the people in that society (Abdullah, 2018). The speeches of the political candidates during elections campaign period communicate invaluable knowledge. The U.S. presidential electoral campaign happens in a series of rituals. From announcement speech, travel, stump speeches, town halls pressing-the-flesh, and within party debates; caucus, and primaries winning and losing speeches, Foreign policy, and issues oriented speeches to distinguish themselves from other contenders vying for the office of the presidency; to convention speeches and televised inter party debates, and appearances in the media for the voters to evaluate them. The president of the United States is the most powerful politician in the world. Therefore, the process of choosing a president is important both to the U.S. and the world. Since at least the 1870s, only candidates of the Democratic and Republican parties have been elected president (Glantz et al 2013).

The announcement speech (AS) is the first official public act of presidential hopefuls and the political purpose of the address is to launch the campaign; and there are, however, a purely rhetorical purpose: to establish common ground with the audience (Bloomfield & Katula 2012). The announcement speech, according to Bromley (1993); Lodge, et.al. (1995), provides political candidates with their initial opportunity to introduce themselves to the electorates, voters, constituents and the news media as a
candidate for office, revealing the themes (policy and character) on which they intend to base their campaign. The announcement speech is also an important opportunity for the candidates to create an initial impression with the voters that could impact how he or she is perceived throughout the remainder of the campaign. Bromley (1993) noted that while it is possible to change the candidates’ initial impressions, first impressions can have considerable effect on the voters’ perception.

Communication between politicians and the public has always been mediated by the news media (Bimber & Davis, 2003). Beniot et al (2011), asserts that political campaign must have one, and only one constant message to communicate to the voters. That theme should remain consistent throughout the campaign. Shea (1996), suggested that the theme of the message is the central reason why a candidate should be elected, and if it is the foremost reason, it should rarely change (Shea, 1996; Beniot et al 2011). That theme must be communicated in all messages, speeches and comment through the media. Beniot et al (2011), and Carville & Begala (2002), also opined that the mantra of communicating is all about repetition, repetition, repetition. They also stressed the need for politicians to repeat the message “because we’re not hanging on their every word and for the moment when we do pay attention to them, they want to say exactly what will get them elected. They’re not sure when that moment will come, so they repeat their message. (p. 123). We can see this in the speeches of Donald Trump about his stances on immigration and the wall building with Mexico and in the speeches of Hillary Clinton with her attack on the wall building idea floated by Trump as not American in nature.

Serazio, M (2014), highlights how strategies are developed, practices are executed, and messages are encoded given increasing fragmentation and narrowcasting. It
examines these consultants’ roles in managing the news agenda and political discourse by expanding partisan spaces online for content creation and narrowcasting more nuanced, flexible messages to targeted niches. Serazio (2014) traces the history of media and how it has helped shaped the content creation of campaign messages (from the telegraph and newspaper to radio and television, advances in communication media have long prefigured changing campaign practice. Since the 1990s, the Internet has radically altered campaigning, offering a variety of new avenues for communicating with voters). Also, highlighting the role of data, segmentation, and targeting played in the 2008 and 20012 presidential elections in message creation and delivery.

Gainous, et al (2013), explored ways social networking online may stimulate political participation and the potential for the Internet to dissipate traditional cleavages in participation that tend to reflect the imbalances in the availability and use of technology. They also highlighted how social capital results from the interconnectedness between people and how social interaction is related to civic engagement. They argue that the effect of social interaction on political participation is largely determined by the amount of political discussion that occurs in social networks. Also, they contend that individuals with a higher socio-economic status (SES) are more likely to generate politically relevant social capital through online social networking than their disadvantaged fellow citizens. This imbalance they argue varies the effect of online social networking on the propensity for civic engagement and on online political participation.

Kent, (2013), examined how technology and abundance of information, are affecting democracy, and the role of public relations professionals in a post mass media society. He contends that the Internet changed things, and that technology is
transforming democracy. He contends that the Internet is the greatest communication tool of all time: “The Information superhighway,” capable of linking remote parts of the world, and transforming democracy and education.” He argues that Americans now obtain information of value directly from organizations via social media, hand-held devices, etc. and that the Internet has opened up new sources for news and information, enabling special interest groups to reach potential supporters directly. He stresses the fact that citizens have come to rely on a greater diversity of news sources (some more credible than others), and more idiosyncratic voices that appeal to individual citizens’ unique interests which social media provides. Social media, journalism, and new technology have made disengaging from political life easier, and essentially encourage people to ignore information that is ideologically unpleasant.

With the rise of the Tea Party Republicans and perception of a troubled economy presided over by Democrat President Obama, the 2016 election cycle features political ‘outsiders.’ Hillary Clinton was trying to be the first ever female president, which is outside of the norm as U.S. presidents have always been men. Likewise, Donald Trump, a candidate without political experience, clinched the Republican Party nomination after defeating establishment candidates. Senator Bernie Sanders was a Socialist and an independent vying for the Democratic Party nomination against Clinton, the establishment Democrat. The Republican Party was filled with sixteen contenders including a female, Carly Fiorina. While the Democratic Party nominee was contended by 5 people including a female Hillary Clinton.

The U.S. 2016 presidential election documented exceptional singularities in the history of U.S. presidential races in the country. First, a non-career politician, Donald
Trump, defeated career politicians to secure the Republican presidential nominee and eventually won the presidential election (Abdullah, 2018; Donald Trump Biography). Secondly, Hillary Clinton, a woman for the first time became the presidential flagbearer of the Democratic Party (Abdullah, 2018. Democratic Convention, 2016). Before Hillary Clinton, other women ran for presidential election, but they were from small and not the major political parties (Winger, 2007). Given Donald Trump’s background as a non-career politician and Hillary Clinton’s unprecedented emergence as Democratic female presidential flagbearer, this study is interested to ascertain the strategic communication influences surrounding their rise as presidential candidates looking at their speeches, Tweets and the news stories. Also, bearing in mind the interesting environments that created these candidates, the significance is to discover the differences in their speeches that made them stand out to the electorate.

According to CBS news 2016, Americans who are running for federal elective offices spent more than ever -- about $6.8 billion -- in that pursuit, including the nastiest presidential election in recent memory, between Hillary Clinton and Donald Trump. That is more than what consumers spend on cereal ($6 billion), pet grooming ($5.4 billion) and legal marijuana ($5.4 billion). The nonprofit Center for Responsive Politics (2016) estimates spending on the Clinton-Trump contest at more than $2.65 billion, down a bit from $2.76 billion in 2012 when Democratic incumbent Barack Obama defeated Republican challenger Mitt Romney. Trump, a real estate tycoon, bought fewer ads than many experts predicted because he benefited from huge amounts of free press and harnessed social media to reach supporters.
Clinton’s primary rival, Vermont Sen. Bernie Sanders, ran a surprisingly tough campaign and raised more than $228 million, mostly from small donors. Trump defeated more than a dozen GOP primary rivals, including early favorites such as former Florida Gov. Jeb Bush and New Jersey Gov. Chris Christie. As more money flooded into politics, voters’ cynicism becomes more pronounced. According to Gallup (2016), majority of Americans have negative views of both presidential candidates. Only 31 percent thought the election process was working as well as it should, not to mention whether the costs are justified (CBS 2016).

The 2016 U.S. presidential election campaign was bursting with negative, attacks, denials, rebuttal, obscene and derogatory comments, Tweets and speeches from the candidates from both Democrats and Republican. Benoit 2004, agrees that the identity of a message source influences the persuasiveness of that message and clearly no appreciable number of people can learn about the candidates for the presidency from direct contact with candidates. Instead, they learn about candidates through mediated messages from candidates (e.g., television spots, debates, and speeches) and from news media (Benoit & Hansen 2004).

When the candidates discuss campaign issues, the media are often less helpful than they could be. The detailed speeches delivered by the candidates go a long way to define who they are and what they stand for and why they should be elected. Lichter and Noyes (1995) reported that in the 1992 presidential campaign, ”The candidate's own speeches actually discussed policy issues far more frequently and in considerably more detail than did either print or broadcast [news] reports” (p. xvii). They also argued that "voter knowledge does not increase from exposure to day-to-day TV coverage, and
increases modestly with day-to-day newspaper reading. Voters do learn from TV coverage of live campaign events, such as convention speeches and debates" (p. 101.)

Furthermore, after electoral victory and ascending to a public office, a politicians’ prominence and duties come with authority and sway that affect the lives of the public (Abdullah, 2018.). The communication of politicians in a society portends their policy leanings (Wilson, 2013); therefore, it is an essential area of continuous research.

With the increased use of digital communication tools, public relations have been noted to return to a more personal “relationship” with key publics. As outlined in the definition of political public relations by Strömbäck and Kiousis 2011, relationship is a prime aspect of both the definitions of political communication and public relations. Indeed, a focus on relationships may have been even more present in political public relations than general public relations, as political communication has always taken a personal approach to connecting with its publics. That is, political public relations have traditionally sought to make candidates appear more personal through tactics such as wearing less formal attire in certain situations and choreographing campaign events that allow candidates to personally interact with constituents.

From the voter’s standpoint, the rise of digital communication has facilitated an act that has been around as long as elections—the act of talking politics. From connecting with politicians to talking about politics with peers, voters have long engaged in political discourse. So, the evolution of digital political public relations is not surprising when one considers the opportunity campaigns have had to mass produce the process where candidates connect with constituents and the benefits to voters whose circle of friends expanded.
Even the terms associated with digital communication speak to the foundations of public relations. The word interactivity in digital media represents the ability to either contribute to content or create one’s own nonlinear path through information (McMillian, 2002). In public relations, interactivity harkens ideas of dialogic communication where two-way conversations occur between the organization and key publics (Kent & Taylor, 1998). Digital political public relations span the boundaries of more traditional public relations in that it also informs, engages, and has the potential to mobilize publics through the use of digital tools and to take the co-creational approach to the next level (Boton & Taylor, 2004).

The use of Twitter in the 2016 election was unlike anything we have seen in U.S. politics in terms of the volume of citizen participation via social media and of candidate ability to speak directly to their followers at any time and to attack their competitor in real time. The 2016 U.S. presidential elections season brought social media, namely Twitter and Facebook, into the political mainstream for the first time in a presidential election. Allcott and Gentzkow (2016) wrote that American democracy has been repeatedly buffeted by changes in media technology in ways that make it more challenging for the fourth branch to hold power accountable. They credit cheap newsprint in the 19th century with the spread of partisan balderdash, radio with reducing substantive policy debates to sound bites, and television with debasing the quality of political candidates by elevating those who are “telegenic.” The advent of online news sources in the early 2000s and social media in the mid-2000s pose a threat to democratic discourse and citizen ability to make informed electoral decisions. (Heldman, et al. 2018).
Over the course of the general election, various news outlets referred to the race as the “Twitter Election” (Twitter, 2016a). The race earned this title because Hillary Clinton and especially Donald Trump frequently took to Twitter to communicate with their followers. Twitter users were highly engaged with election news and content on the digital platform during the election, Tweeting the hashtag #Election2016 more than 1 billion times during the election and 75 million times on Election Day (Twitter, 2016a). Both candidates used Twitter to criticize each other. The most retweeted Tweet during the campaign was a Clinton Tweet telling Trump, “Delete your account,” in response to his Tweet, “Obama just endorsed Crooked Hillary. He wants four more years of Obama—but nobody else does” (Heldman, et al. 2018). As of May 2018, Clinton’s Tweet had been retweeted 550,000 times and liked by 708,500 Twitter accounts. Both candidates targeted one another on multiple occasions on Twitter, but Trump also extended criticism to the overall legitimacy of the election process. He frequently using the term “rigged” to imply that his loss would indicate the election was a fraud. For example, in late October Trump Tweeted, “The election is absolutely being rigged by the dishonest and distorted media pushing Crooked Hillary-but also at many polling places-SAD” (Heldman, et al. 2018).

**Purpose and Significance of Study**

Harmon and White, (2001) suggested that agenda building involves the power of crafted messages by political and economic elites to shift public opinion in their desired direction. Also, Miller, (2010) suggests that Agenda building encompasses more than agenda setting concept of telling the media audiences what issues to think about and how to think about the issues. Ghanem (1997) contends that agenda building can be achieved
by laying emphasis on certain characteristics of a public issue, involving cognitive elements (such as ideologies) and affective elements (such as positive and negative tones).

Conventional agenda-setting and agenda-building research uses opinion polls where respondents are asked to rank or rate issues of importance to them from the news to decide if the media has influenced publics’ agenda (Miller, 2010). A fundamental hypothesis of agenda-building study contends that the media do not function in a vacuum. Shoemaker and Reese (1991) argues that agenda building can come in form of information subsides, like news releases, editorials, PSA issue advertising and news conference. These messages that the news media disseminates are laced with prejudices of the message creator, advertisers and public relations practitioners and political candidates and politicians. Although a bulk of agenda-building study has explored public relations’ influence on media content like information subsidy produced by public relations practitioners, as in the case of this study the political campaigns.

This study shall examine the campaign speeches of Hillary Clinton and Donald Trump speeches as one of major presidential campaign public relations tools and intertwine those with news stories as traditional media sources, Tweets as one of widely used social media campaign tools, news sources and public engagement platforms.

This study also grapples with the norms of using negative speeches and attacks on political opponents, using campaign speeches to engage in self-praise, and address specific policy or issues and character or image concerns. The tone and prominence given to the candidate’s speech, Tweet by the newspapers and television news outlets.
This study attempts to updates research on presidential election campaigning and communication by applying the functional theory of political campaign discourse (Benoit, 2007) to speeches and Tweets from the 2016 U.S. presidential elections. Also, this study updates research on the role of political public relations in elections campaigns.

Since Twitter has become one of the preferred sources for consuming political news and a tool of political engagement. This study will examine how tweets were used to set media agenda during the 2016 presidential campaign cycle as Ku et al. (2003), and Curtin and Gaither (2003), suggested that political actors may use the web’s ability to bypass media and build the public’s agenda directly. This study also will contribute to Agenda building in political public relations literature by employing an innovative method of measuring media salience of issues.
CHAPTER II - Literature Review

Political Public Relations

Political public relations is defined as the activities used in by modern political parties and governments as a political marketing or propaganda fusion (Baines, 2011). Sometimes political parties and campaigns seek to persuade people to believe in their policies by using one way, scheming communication process, and sometimes using two-way relationship communication process O’Shaughnessy (1990). Also, Stromback and Kiousis, (2011), opined that political public relations is an acceptable form of communication endeavor used to explain policy and inform voters, citizens, and other stakeholder groups and to make a political party and its candidates differentiate themselves and clarify their positions on the certain issues.

If political public relations is about building beneficial relationships and managing reputations with key publics for political purposes according to Strömbäck and Kiousis (2011), then, political public relations in election campaigns and campaigning is about winning electoral support by influencing public opinion and voting behavior (Baines 2011). This can be achieved by defining one’s own ideology, policies and those of his political party, differentiating his political leadership team and ultimately, strive to damage the credibility of his or her political rivals’ ideology and policies and electoral aspirations Strömbäck and Kiousis (2011). Political parties and candidates running for political office must communicate with various publics/stakeholders to grow their likeability and acceptance, these stake holders including the general voting publics, other rivals, internal political party stakeholders, and those in the external environment (Ormrod, 2005; Strömbäck, 2007).
Baines (2011) and Kotler and Kotler, (1981), contends that political strategist and politicians running for office must communicate with six key publics, the electorates or voters, the political parties, other political candidates, interest groups, contributors, and most especially, the media. It is worth nothing that the media plays an important role in shaping and communicating with the other five key publics. Baines (2011), suggests that media relations is not the only tool of political PR, political parties and candidates can speak to the voters directly using a variety of paid media channels. Sweeney (1995); and Baines (2011), argued that political candidates running for office have primary and secondary audiences they strive to reach. The intended primary audience is the voter who casts the elections vote and decides which candidate gets elected while the secondary audiences are the political candidates’ campaign staff and volunteers, organizations, opinion leaders, political party, contributors, allies and friends, and the media. Perhaps, the only other group missing are other political parties (Baines 2011).

In communicating with the voters and citizens during elections, political parties and political candidates running for office are required to propose specific policy, and ideologies they will use to govern or rule the country if they are elected to the position sought. Also, they will need to offer their ability to govern by highlighting their past public good deeds by showing how they have served in past government (local, regional, and internationally) and by offering explanation about what they will do differently while in government Strömbäck and Kiousis (2011).

**Presidential Campaigns Speeches**

Political campaign speech helps to brand, rebrand, recreate, destroy, criticize and shape the political discourse by candidates. The announcement speech, according to
Beniot (2013), provides candidates with their initial opportunity to introduce themselves to voters and the news media as a candidate for office, revealing the themes (policy and character) on which they intend to base their campaign. This is an important opportunity to create an initial impression of the candidate with voters that could influence how he or she is perceived throughout the remainder of the campaign. Although it is possible to change the electorate’s initial public impressions of the candidates, these public impressions most of the times have substantial effect on electorate’s perception of the candidates (Bromley, 1993, p. 36), (Beniot et al., 2008).

Presidential campaigns speeches offer an important window for the electorate to know more about the candidates and to make informed voting decisions. The political campaign speeches start with the candidates’ announcement speech, indicates the underlying candidate’s intention of running for political office, discourage rivals politicians, and establishes the premises of the campaign messages. A political candidate’s speech, especially the campaign speeches are elements of the democratic process that affect everybody’s lives (Abdullah, 2018; Wilson, 2013). Wilson (2013) and Abdullah, (2018) claims that speech is a pointer to how democratic liberty can be a crystallization of the mind, of speech, and our imaginations, and how these constructions have policy consequences in our lives.

Announcement speeches happens before the political primary activities, it falls under the preprimaries activities of the political campaign (Trent, 1978, 1994, 1998). Trent and Friedenberg (2004), Beniot et. al. (2008), argued that there are seven functions of the surfacing phase of a political campaign. First, announcement speeches are a vehicle for indicating a candidate fitness for officel (p. 25). Second, this is the actual start
of the political ritual of running for office. The third function helps to disseminates the candidate purposes, potential programs and proposed changes, or initial positions, viewpoints on critical electoral issues to voters (p. 28). Fourth, it avails the electorates opportunity to learn more about the political candidate’s personal style. The fifth function is to distinguish and create the political campaign’s central themes or issues. Sixth, the political rivals are identified are branded as not worthy opponents. Finally, relationships between political candidates and the news media world are established and nurtured. It is worth to note that the surfacing phase represents more beyond the announcement speech, it is fair to say that the candidates’ speeches or messages are some of the most critical components of presidential campaigns.

Political campaign speeches as a form of political campaign discourse have the following characteristics. Political speeches are addressed to an active audience; these direct and active audience usually are members of the media, other political actors small group of the public. The main political audience, made up of the voting electorate is typically not present or available when the speeches are delivered. These key audiences will hear, see, read the political speech at a later time (usually through the media) (Laughren & Mushin, 2007). Political campaign speeches are delivered in formal speech making style different from ordinary conversation. These political speeches are written by professional speech writers and sometimes by the political candidates themselves. These speeches are followed by other political discourse type, public debates, press releases and sometimes, press conference. Political campaign speeches include the use of rhetorical languages like alliterations, imagery, play of words, simile, metaphor, the three-part statement and contrastive pairs (or antithesis). Politicians also pair words
together to create contrast, using words like ‘us’ (the candidate and his political party) and ‘them’ (to represent the opposition party) (Laughren & Mushin, 2007).

The key function of campaign speeches is to persuade, and hopefully they also inform (Brewer & Lichtenstein 1982). The political speaker aim is to achieve and accomplish a politically tactical purpose; words are judiciously and sagaciously written to achieve a political purpose. In political campaign discourse, personal connection and relationships is the new persuasion (Laughren & Mushin, 2007). As politics becomes more personal driven than ideologically-driven, politicians craft, build and present their messages to identity with those the electorates (Wilson, 1990; Pearce, 2001). The persuasive purpose of political speeches is facilitated by the exhibition, adhering and aligning with individual and groups which the electorates identifies with by the political candidates and this will enhance the support of the electorates with their votes. The political candidates must present themselves as multi-faceted to appeal to diverse groups of political audiences (Laughren & Mushin, 2007)

A political campaign speech is crafting a cohesive argument on a specific topic or topics, campaign speech, is a crucial part of the campaign process, as it allows a political candidate to gather together all their policy, ideologies and position into a well-crafted statement. According to Pinkleton et al., (2002), negative campaign tactics and dubious media election coverage continue to attract the attention of citizens, journalists, and researchers. Citizens commonly complain about the negative tone of political campaigns, especially, negative political advertising and in the case of 2016 presidential election, the speeches. Candidates have looked for ways to create “intermedia agenda setting” that works in their favors. Sweetser et al. (2008) argued that televised political spots have
long been a way to set the news media’s agenda. Political speeches create news coverage, helping the political campaign ads create the desired agenda-setting effect from the “earned media” as the speech is televised free and helps to support the ads.

Prior studies have shown that presidential candidates have adopted a variety of strategies to connect with audiences, including appearing as preachers (Smith & Smith, 1994; Jarvis, 2004), leaders (Gronbeck, 1978), and "incumbents," "challengers" and "incumbent/challengers". The strategic use of words in campaigns has been noted by scholars and campaign professionals, alike (Jarvis, 2004). All the speeches in this analysis are public and uttered by nominees of the Democratic and Republican parties, it stands to reason that these speeches have been taken seriously by the campaigns that have produced them, in their attempts to secure the nation's highest office (Jarvis, 2004). The 2016 presidential campaign speeches cover a whole range of issues, starting from the running for president speech, to speech addressing foreign policy by Donald Trump and the reply by Hillary Clinton.

Political observers and commentators have called out the electronic broadcast media for providing horse-races-centered political campaign coverage that spotlights more on who leads or trails in political polls rather than recognizing, addressing and discussing political candidates' stands on issues and policy proposals that are relevant to voter (Jarvis, 2004). These political commentaries have motivated substantial political scholarship, especially on the relationship between political tone and voter turnout. There is no solid agreement, regarding the use of negative campaigns, if they are good, bad, or irrelevant (as all sides cites relevant evidence to justify their claims) (Jarvis, 2004; Lau & Pomper, 2004). Several scholars have found positive correlations between cynicism and
political involvement like voter turnout and mobilization (de Vreese & Semetko, 2002; de Vreese, 2005). But little has been done in areas of analyzing the candidates stump speeches, issues speeches, theme of the speeches and the tone of the speeches, unless to motivate their bases. Such issue speeches were given by both candidates in the wake of the Orlando shooting, and speeches addressing the exit of Britain from the European Union, to speech given about the terrorist attack in Belgium, Paris and Germany. These campaign speeches also come in the form of Tweets and Facebook posts.

**Digital Online Communication in Elections Campaign**

Since the earliest political campaigns, candidates running for political offices have looked for ways to connect with electorates and spread information. Previously, such dissemination of information usually occurs through public relations-planned events like televised public speech, press coverage, meet the press events or even through public relations-arranged media coverage viz town halls meeting, stump speeches and even attending community country fairs. Candidates could host a political rally where the electorate will have the opportunity to meet with the political actor one on one which enhances relations building. With technological developments, politicians and campaigns have begun using telephones and airwaves, broadcasting political events through the use radio or television (Kaid, 2004; Selnow, 1998). With the ubiquitous adoption of the Internet, politicians have integrated digital communication tools and successively developed their use to a much more interactive and engaging style of communication.

Using online political communication as a tool of political public relations Foot and Schneider (2006), point out that “the adoption and strategic use of information and communication technologies precedes the digital era” (p. 7). To this point, Tedesco
(2004) suggests that political campaigns can benefit from Grunig and Hunt’s (1984) two-way symmetrical model, and that public relations used in political campaign communications represent the greatest areas for potential and development. The creation of digital presence requires tactical and deliberate efforts about how to link this online tool with other publicity tools. The political messages and candidate image should support the content and the goals of the political communication plan.

Benoit and Hansen (2004) suggested that “new communication technologies offer another channel of information source about political & presidential campaign that competes favorable with newspapers and television news” (p. 168). Political campaigns can communicate easily with the wider constituents or electorates without the filters of the traditional media. The first use of the Internet in a political campaign in the United States was used to supplement the traditional public relations efforts. The 1996 Clinton campaign used the first-ever presidential campaign Web site to post press releases and general interest information (Whillock, 1997). Campaign Web sites were first introduced during the 1996 presidential election cycle, it was used to bolster campaign messages delivered through other media sources (Bimber & Davis 2003). The early incorporation of digital communication tools into political campaign started when campaigns started to experiment with new technology at lower-level election cycles (midterm elections) or delay the introduction of these new medium till the electorates have acquired these newer models of communication.

The Bill Clinton campaign of 1996, was the first to distribute text over the Internet (Tedesco, 2004; Whillock, 1997), employed e-mail to some degree during the election cycle (Casey, 1996). In the 1994 election, Senators Dianne Feinstein and Edward
M. Kennedy were the first candidates running for congressional offices to incorporate web sites in their campaigns (Foot & Schneider, 2006). Web use grew during the next campaign cycle, which Kaid and Bystrom (1999) termed the electronic election. Not only did all “serious candidates” (Tedesco, 2004) running for president have a digital presence, one even announced his candidacy online (LaPointe, 1999). According to D’Alessio (1997), nearly half of Senate and around 15% of House candidates had Web sites in 1996. Even with this wider adoption, scholars suggest political campaign web sites uses were extensions or versions of political campaign brochures (Foot & Schneider, 2006; Tedesco, 2004).

This “virtual billboard” approach dominated campaign approaches to Web sites until the 2000 election. As Foot and Schneider (2006) suggest, that candidates in 1996, were just present on the web, to show that they understand the workings of using the Web to campaign. Evolving from that election cycle, political campaigns in the United States and abroad grew with every other election series, offering more content, interactivity, donation, and mobilization opportunities. The 2004 election cycle in the United States saw greater gains in integration, capitalizing on the lessons learned in the previous cycles. The focus in 2004 was on what is now called social media, as campaign blogs were introduced and more tailored content was offered to Web site visitors. Notable milestones of digital adoption are the use of blogs in the 2004 election, social networks during the 2006 midterm election, as well as better integration of viral video sharing, and the multiple platform approach taken during the 2008 election.

During the 2004, Democratic primary in the United States, presidential candidate Howard Dean became well-known for mobilizing his supporters through a series of
grassroots initiatives. According to Hull (2006), the Dean campaign decentralized the involvement process by pushing it into local hands rather than managing it within the campaign. That is, Dean transferred the power to get involved directly to his supporters to let them manage the process and they did so on the local level nationwide in record numbers, mainly by connecting through MeetUp.com (Hull, 2006). Gibson and McAllister (2008) suggest that the Dean campaign ignited a spark that then spread around the globe, as more international campaigns saw the benefit of e-campaigning after his use of digital tools.

The Obama campaign experimented with mobile communication during the 2008 election. That campaign established mobile phone applications that allowed supporters to download ringtones or custom wallpapers, and to receive text messages from the campaign (Hendricks & Denton, 2010; Mackay, 2010). The campaign also created an iPhone and iTouch application that would classify contacts in users’ address books as to whether that contact resided in a battleground state (Hendricks & Denton, 2010). Some campaign rallies during the 2008 election also featured opportunities for attending supporters to text in messages that would appear on screens at the rally. This text-to-screen interactivity not only made the rally attendee feel associated to the event and the campaign, but the campaign then had contact information (mobile phone number) for that supporter (Mackay, 2010).

This database of supporters could then be used by the campaign to send campaign information (Mackay, 2010). This suggests that the use of mobile technology may afford campaigns great opportunities to create a rather detailed database of supporters, and the ability to instantly mobilize voters into action. A host of interactive tools can be used for
political public relations. Under the backdrop of the 2008 presidential election, Schnably (2009) found that both campaigns used 7 of 41 possible digital tools, including Facebook, an official blog, LinkedIn, Action Center, MySpace, YouTube, and an official Web site. Among these, social networking tools were the most common digital tools for the candidates. These sites not only allowed the campaigns the opportunity to connect with their constituents, but for the first time created that opportunity to connect within spaces the prospective voters were already hanging out. That is, constituents did not have to go to a candidate Web site but could be connected via social platforms. With each election cycle, the numbers of consumers of online political information have steadily increased (Sweetser, 2011). The evolving of new communication technologies, such as Twitter, Facebook, and Snapchat have reshaped patterns of communication among individuals, societies, and organizations (McCombs, 2005). The introduction of social media has achieved a revolution and a giant leap in the communication environment and political agenda building.

**Twitter Use in Politics and Government**

Twitter, while only in existence since 2006, Twitter currently is ranking among the leading social media platforms with 328 million monthly active users and a daily 500 million Tweets (Aslam, 2018). This increasingly growing audience of Twitter demonstrates the virality of events initially originated on this medium. Twitter is more so a public sphere that allows people to stay informed about relevant topics and events. Messages on Twitter are called Tweets, which can directly be posted from the Twitter website, mobile application, or short message service. Tweets, the information subsidy or agenda building (campaign messages) examined in this study, are Twitter messages of
140 characters, however, in 2017 the limit has increased to 280 character. These Tweets or short messages that are sent using hand held devices like smartphones or tablets and computers. The short messages or Tweets can be images, phrases, short comments, or videos. Eighty-five percent of Twitter users use their mobile phone to access their accounts (Salem, 2017). Twitter accounts that users are interested in can vary from friends to private individuals, celebrities, journalists, organizations, or companies, politicians to political parties and other ideological groups.

The popularity of Twitter is attributed to the ease of usage and its several communication features, such as retweet, like, reply, mention, and hashtag that help agenda building as in the case of the 2016 elections cycle where the Tweets of Donald Trump forms the agenda for the next the day news cycle to information diffusion. Retweeting is an act of reproducing another user’s Tweet. Boyd et. al. (2010) define retweet as “the Twitter-equivalent of email forwarding where users post messages originally posted by others.” (p. 1). Users can retweet a message by clicking the retweet button that appears below the posted message. Retweeting allows the content of the message to reach a broader audience on Twitter. Mention and reply with @username sign are used in posts when a user wants to start a conversation with other users, or reply to a Tweet. Users can also “like” others’ Tweets by clicking on the like button below the posted tweet. Users might as well use the like feature to gather topics of interest in a special page to read it later.

On twitter, users can include hashtags on their Tweets by simply using the pound # character in front of an un-spaced word. The hashtag includes all messages that are tagged with the hashtag that reference a theme. Therefore, hashtags that are well
promoted by users become popular and trendy topics that appear on users’ homepages based on geographic area. Hashtags include Tweets from numerous users that a user is either following or not. Thus, hashtags smoothly help events and issues go viral. Once a Twitter user accessed a hashtag that is assigned to a given issue, he/she can follow up with numerous information and conversations from media channels, journalists, or ordinary users. Hashtags, such as #BringBackOurGirls and #J’SuisCharlie have internationalized incidents happening in other countries and seized the world’s attention toward this issue. In fact, #BlackLivesMatter has inspired the establishment of the Black Lives Matter organization that interested in organizing marches around the U.S. to raise the awareness of anti-black racism.

Tweets, over the years have a history of being persuasive in nature. Political parties in the US (Democrats and Republicans), and other affiliate groups use political tweets to influence public opinion. Studies analyzing congressional elections use of Tweet revealed that politicians use Tweets to disseminate information on issues the politicians deems relevant and as ‘vehicles for self-promotion’ (Golbeck et al., 2010). Also, U.S. federal and state agencies use Twitter to promote their activities and raise public awareness of issues they deem important. For example, the US Environmental Protection Agency tweets about public safety issues, and the US Department of Agriculture tweets about actions it is taking to fight childhood obesity (Howard, 2010).

In the US, Twitter is frequently used by the president, many members in Congress, most governors and mayors, as well as candidates and political operatives (Parmelee & Bichard, 2012). Millions of individuals, including journalists, ‘follow’ political leaders on Twitter, meaning they choose to receive leaders’ Tweets. In-depth
interviews with political Twitter users found that Twitter is the most popular form of social media for engaging in political persuasion (Parmelee & Bichard, 2012: 141–166). Issues that are emphasized in Tweets, often are subsequently discussed in blogs, talk radio, television and newspaper stories. As one participant, a political insider, put it: ‘Twitter has the ability to drive traffic across all platforms’ (Parmelee & Bichard, 2012: 163). For instance, #CrookedHillary was a frequently used hashtag by those who opposed Clinton during the 2016 race; users who searched for the hashtag would be taken to a unique feed of Tweets that mention it. Feeds surrounding hashtags can be organized chronologically or by popularity, where the “top” tweets are mentioned first. Users can also filter hashtagged Tweets to feature only those that include photos or videos, or posts from verified news organizations (McGregor et al. 2017)

Researchers argue that political candidates and political parties’ use Twitter to reach the electorates directly by going around or bypassing the news media, (McGregor et al. 2017; Parmelee & Bichard, 2012; Stromer-Galley, 2014). On the other hand, Kreiss (2014), discovered that political campaign staffers employ Twitter in precise ways to sway the agendas and frames of professional journalists (McGregor et al. 2017). Electoral candidates and politicians employ Twitter to summon and energize the base (Kreiss, 2014) and to attain broader attention (Parmelee & Bichard, 2012; McGregor et al. 2017). Candidates incorporate their Tweet with conventional communication styles to personalize their policies, campaigns messages and ultimately themselves in varying degrees (McGregor et al. 2015; Meeks, 2016). The movement of communication from production to consumption, has made Twitter an important mode of communication for political campaigns. During elections campaigns, candidates and their campaigns counter
and reply to an almost unending flow of Tweets from their rivals instantaneously. Political leaders employ emotion on Twitter as a tool for shaping public opinion (Baldwin-Philippi, 2015; Chadwick, 2013).

Twitter provide avenues for individuals in the society to express their political opinions. There is an increase to the number of Americans using social media for political communication activities McGregor et.al., (2015). Pew Research Center (2016) reveals that almost half (about 44%) of adults in the U.S. used social media 2016 presidential election to learn more about the campaign and the candidates. Also, about a third of adults in the U.S. have engaged in one political action or civic duty prompted by social media use (Pew Research Center, 2012a; McGregor et.al,2015). McGregor et.al., (2015), suggests that the use of social media for interpersonal purposes can lead one to express themselves politically on social media. Almost half of Twitter users in the US got their news from the site (Pew Research Center, 2015; McGregor et.al.2015). Some twitter users supplement the television news they get with Twitter second-screening particularly to get in-depth information about certain issue and to have discussions on said issues in the news (Gil de Zúñiga, Garcia-Perdomo & McGregor, 2015). According to McGregor et.al.2015, use of Twitter spikes around political events (Jang & Pasek, 2015). McGregor et.al. (2015), suggested that during the first debate between Mitt Romney and President Barack Obama in 2012, 1 in 10 people second-screened the debate (Pew Research Center, 2012b; McGregor et.al., 2015).

Twitter can be all-encompassing of nontraditional political voices the public can uses Twitter both as a channel to express their individual political opinions and as a
means of gaining useful political information. The news media outlets, political leaders and actors, and the public all have varying uses and interactions with Twitter.

**News Coverage of Presidential Campaigns**

Pew Research Center (2012), suggests that there is a growing public dependence on television news as an importance channel of electoral information, notwithstanding the increasing importance of the Internet. This justifies research into the agenda-building functions of tv news in the 2016 U.S. presidential elections campaign. Hyun, & Moon (2016), explored the consequences of partisan and biased news environment for agenda-setting theory, they investigated the influence of attribute agenda-setting and its connection with successive candidate evaluation by investigating the prowess of broadcast and cable television news and their viewers. They assert that TV news requires research and investigations as it has undertaken substantial partisan self-selection and polarization (Hyun & Moon, 2016).

Selective exposure to likeminded news and political information is the key causes for the rise of biased compositions of television news viewership today. TV viewers strive to escape cognitive dissonance, when they meet information that conflicts with their belief (Hyun, & Moon 2016;). Television viewer search for news channels that are friendly to their political ideologies. In competitive television news market, TV stations are driven to exploit the awareness by tactically associating their news content with the political ideologies of their viewers. It is not surprising that conservative leaning viewers and republicans are attracted to Fox News, while liberals leaning viewers and democrats are attracted to CNN and MSNBC (Pew Research Center, 2009).
The recognized partisan and ideological viewpoints and perspectives of some news outlets is a source of worries among commentators who contends that the partisan slant of these news erodes the standard duty and practice of objective journalism. Criticism of biased news is aimed more at Fox News (Alterman, 2004; Brock, 2004; Kitty, 2005), while CNN and MSNBC (Bozell, 2004; Stanley, 2012) also gets accused of projecting bias news too. Other researches support the criticism of partisan news coverage in cable news. Baum and Groeling, (2008) reported that Fox News disseminates more news items linked or associated with conservative leaning positions and republican ideologies more than others news outlets. Also, Aday, (2010), concluded that Fox News reported more politically divisive issues, and had a more favorable and positive coverage of the war efforts in Iraq by the Bush administration’s than NBC, CNN, or MSNBC. Also, FOX news coverage of climate change issues is more suspicious than CNN and MSNBC (Hyun, & Moon, 2016).

Partisan television news coverage of presidential elections campaigns were also evaluated in terms of tone of news coverage related to political competing candidates. (Project for Excellence in Journalism, 2004, 2008, 2012), discovered that Fox News is more favorable to Republican candidates than their Democratic counterparts and this is the reversed-on CNN and MSNBC which are more likely to be more favorable to Democratic candidates than their Republican counterpart. There was a slight change to this pattern by Fox news during the 2008 U.S. presidential elections as they covered the McCain campaign negatively than Obama’s campaign.

There is an increasing evidence which points to growing partisan and ideological divergence television news content and viewership. Morris & Francia, (2010), Smith and
Searles, 2014; Stroud, 2010), contends that so much research interest is arising from this partisan and ideological divide in television news contents as it pertains to shaping public opinion, and political attitudes of television news viewers.

Heldman et al. (2018) defined “Old” or legacy media to be print publications (which today often also have an online presence) that follow professional journalistic ethics, norms of fact checking, and a multilayered editorial process. The journalism code of ethics used today was developed by the Commission on Freedom of the Press, also known as the Hutchins Commission, a group formed during World War II by a group of publishers to determine how media should operate in modern democracy. Victor Pickard notes that the formation of the Hutchins Commission was a response to public criticism about consolidation of media ownership. The commission developed five specific guidelines for the press to follow:

1. Present meaningful news, accurate and separated from opinion;
2. Serve as a forum for the exchange of comment and criticism and to expand access to diverse points of view;
3. Project a representative picture of the constituent groups in society by avoiding stereotypes; 4. Clarify the goals and values of society; implicit was an appeal to avoid pandering to the lowest common denominator; and 5. Give broad coverage of what was known about society.

Also, society of professional journalists has developed multipoint guidelines for journalists to follow that address fact-checking standards, plagiarism, sourcing, permissions, and myriad other topics. These guidelines are taught in journalism school and enforced in legacy media organizations. Examples of legacy media include the
Washington Post and the New York Times. Print newspapers are a dying breed, so most legacy media sources have moved online and now use paywalls to continue to pursue high-quality journalism. Paywalls make legacy media less accessible than new media. Pew Research Center (2016), contends that online is where 93% of United States adults get their news, and most political information is consumed and disseminated via social media platforms like Facebook and Twitter. Although much of the political content that is shared on these platforms is from legacy press, which are more reputable than new media, the personal commentary that goes along with legacy media articles opens the door for misinformation, rumors, conspiracy hawking, and unsolicited and unsavory commentary.

Pew Research Center (2012) finds that individuals are less discerning of the quality of the news sources they post, so long as this information confirms their political bias. On Twitter, filter bubbles affect whom users are recommended to follow, the Tweets displayed on the Twitter “discover” option and “search” tab, and the Twitter “moments” that are displayed. Elanor et.al. find that users on Twitter are more likely to interact with other ideologically similar users than users with different ideologies. Similarly, Patterson (2016) find significant ideological segregation in retweets but ideologically crosscutting interactions in tweets that mention other Twitter users. Twitter users do engage people with dissimilar political beliefs but do so in critical ways. These researchers find that “the content of political discourse on Twitter remains highly partisan. This new political reality is more hostile to all political candidates than was the previous environment shaped mostly by legacy news organizations.
According to Patterson (2016b), Hillary Clinton was criticized all through the 2016 election cycle. She received more “bad press” coverage than “good press”. Every aspect of her campaign was criticized – be it her speaking style, her dress style, her deleted emails, and to her use of private server. On the other hand, as Hillary Clinton was the on the receiving end of media criticism, the media was being attacked by Donald Trump. Donald Trump criticized the media of being biased toward him and was favoring Hillary Clinton by rigging the elections to her benefit. Donald Trump’s received more negative media coverage during the general election than Clinton’s. The U.S. 2016 Us presidential election was rife with negative news coverage. It was negative coverage all through. (Patterson 2016b). It was in mid-October that the candidates received a little bit “good press” when the media was engaged horserace reporting about which candidates is wining in the polls and why they are winning (Patterson 2016a).

Donald Trump was the heart of media attention during the early stages of the 2016 presidential campaign right from when he announced his intention to run for office till when he became the Republican nominee. Trump was the most media covered candidate in the 2016 U.S. presidential and he got more media time than his opponents (Patterson 2016b). Also, this pattern continued through the general elections. This media coverage availed him the opportunities to define his opponents more than they could define him. Trump was the loudest voice seen and heard in the news talking about Clinton, (Patterson 2016b). When the news talked about Trump, they are echoing his voice and showing clips of him talking. Messages and chants like “Lock her up” and “make America great again” were heavy in news stories that chants like “he’s unqualified” and “stronger together.” Patterson (2016), contends that media people
opined that Donald Trump was readily available to the press hence their keen focus on him and his campaign rhetoric’s. Trump’s dominant presence in the news stemmed from the fact that his words and actions were ideally suited to journalists’ story needs. The news is not about what’s ordinary or expected. It’s about what’s new and different, better yet when laced with conflict and outrage. Trump delivered that type of material by the cart load. Both candidates utilized twitter in their speech and communications during the campaign period but media practitioners were more focused on Trumps tweets more than Hillary’ Tweet (Patterson, 2016b). Likewise, both candidates delivered numerous speeches during the campaign period but media practitioners were devoted to Trump’s speeches more intently because he met their need for story which is different from the political norms of the day needs (Patterson, 2016b).

Political polls give report on the electorate choice of candidates and provide the media practitioner with a constant supply of fresh news material to discuss on. Hence the love media practitioners have for polls. Political poll influence on election news materials and political discussions by media practitioners goes far even after the news stories that describe the poll results has faded. Poll results helps to shape the makeup of other news stories, journalists use poll results to explain changes in elections strategy or the influence of the newest changes in the political race. (Patterson 2016b) contends that when the FBI director, nine days to the election, announced that they had discovered a new batch of Hillary Clinton emails, the news story were more about what will the impact of the revelation do to Clinton’s polls numbers. The news stories days after the FBI revelation showed that Hillary Clinton support was slipping via polls conducted after the said revelation.
Controversies by political candidates have been a core of elements in U.S. presidential election coverage since 1976 when Jimmy Carter, the democratic nominee said he had looked at a lot of women with lust at a Playboy interview that he had. Political controversies vary and they can be of different natures and sometimes they have no connections as to which political candidates will make a better leader and not based on what makes for better news stories. Controversies makes better news stories because they’re a deviation from the norms in the news cycle and could hinder a political nominees’ changes of winning an election. Patterson (2016b), citing political scientist Larry Sabato observed that the news media, print and broadcast, go after a wounded politician like sharks in a feeding frenzy. The wounds may have been self-inflicted, and the politician may richly deserve his or her fate, but the journalists now take center stage in the process, creating the news as much as reporting it.

Although controversies are a political nominee’s nightmare, the news media and their opponents enjoys keeping the controversial news alive and the candidates only hope is that the news disappears gradually from the news cycle When it’s in the news, there’s no upside for the candidate. During the 2016 US presidential election news cycle general election, a bulk majority of controversial news coverage of had a negative tone.

Trump’s speeches on controversial policy issues got coverage during the general election as did his attack on the Gold Star parents Khizr and Ghazala Khan after they criticized him in a speech at the Democratic convention. Other notable Trump’s controversies include the Trump Foundation, his refusal to release his tax returns, his assertion that the political system was rigged against him, and his refusal to say that he would accept the election outcome. Trump’s most notably news covered controversy was
the release of a hot mike video of him bragging about groping women without their consent, saying that “when you’re a star, they let you do it.” It was made public in early October as part of the legendary October surprise (Patterson, 2016).

**Political Public Relations Agenda Building**

Parmelee, (2013), contends that agenda-building is closely related to agenda-setting functions of the media. Agenda setting theory claims that the public learns the relative importance of issues from the mass media (Parmelee, 2013). Journalists and media practitioners makes choices to cover certain issues instead of others and that has an impact on the level of importance the viewers attach to certain issues over others. Since news coverage of certain issues have potential impact on the public, agenda-building research strives to explore who influences media coverage. Agenda-building scholarships assess how outside forces helps shape public opinion through media stories told by journalists. Lancendorfer and Lee, (2010) argues that agenda building investigates how news coverage is influenced by many types of objects, issues, and (Kiousis et al., 2007) talks about how corporate reputation also shapes news coverage. While Manheim and Albritton, (1984), talks about how political candidates and foreign countries shapes the news agenda.

Wanta and Foote, (1994), contends that many individuals in politics tries to shape media coverage. Kiousis et al., (2006) & Huckins, (1999), also argues that elected officials and political leaders, Zhang & Cameron, (2003), candidates for office political think tanks, interest groups foreign governments and political bloggers strive to shape what issues news media outlets will prominently feature over other issues. Wanta and
Foote, (1994) contends that political leaders and journalists influences each other when political actors respond to media coverage.

Agenda building occurs at two levels, first-level agenda building happens when media practitioners are influenced to report certain issues by political actors which they otherwise might have not covered. Research at first level observe linkages between object salience on the part of media coverage and those attempting to influence journalists. Lancendorfer and Lee, (2010), contends that the second level agenda building refers to how media practitioners are persuaded to use certain characteristics to depict issues and other objects According to Kiousis et al. (2011), second-level agenda building lays emphases on attribute salience links between news coverage and those who influence the news. Also, attribute salience is usually observed in terms of substantive and affective dimensions. Substantive attributes, refers to conflict and human interest stories, provide structure to topics, while affective attributes include the positive, negative, or neutral tone being used to narrate the news coverage. Chyi & McCombs, (2004) contends that frames can also be objects attributes, as salience is a main element of framing theory.

Parmelee (2013) opines that information subsidies are central component in agenda building. While Marland (2012), argues that press releases and digital handouts, with photos and videos of pseudo-events are information subsidies journalists receives from political leaders. Information subsidies can be in in the form of Facebook post, tweets and YouTube videos Also, Ragas & Kiousis, (2010) and Wigley and Fontenot, (2009) argues that political leaders hope that the information subsidies they give to journalist will help draw attentions to the issues the leaders wants the media to pay attention to and if possible journalist will tout the leaders’ point of view concerning those

Political candidates running for office in states such as Florida and Michigan have used press releases to shape news story content (Kiousis et al., 2006; Lancendorfer & Lee, 2010). Also, Turk (1986) states that state agencies in Louisiana used press releases to influence the type of newspaper coverage the agencies had. However, there are no uniform effects of agenda-building across various media channel in every situation. Marland, (2012) contends that political leaders’ ability to shape news coverage is more noticeable at small news outlets rather than at large, nationally renowned news organizations. Also, journalists who are operates far from political centers of power, such as state capitols, tend to be the most influenced by information subsidies from political leaders. Other factors like economic conditions can increase some newspaper use of information subsidies. Information subsidies varies in value depending on the availability of other information and the level of perceived credibility of the news source and

Kiousis and Strömbäck, (2010) suggests that agenda-building research examines how certain groups, such as those in politics and business, influence what issues journalists cover as well as how the public views. Those intending to shape journalists’ news stories and public perception often disseminate information subsidies, which include speeches, videos, and press releases. During the agenda-building process, Kiousis
et al., (2009) argues that with the rise in social media usage by journalists and politicians, researchers have been called upon to study how information subsidies via social media is used by political actors to shape news coverage. Twitter is a remarkably noteworthy tool of social media to be researched on because journalists use Twitter to perform their duties (Parmelee, 2013).

Agenda building is an aspect of agenda setting research (McCombs, 2004), although Cobb and Elder (1971) first used the term agenda building to question why some issues get attention from decision makers while others fail to do so. While the original agenda setting effect explores relationships between issue salience within mass media content and issue salience among the mass audience, agenda building explores the sources that make up news content and influence the mass media agenda. In “Political Power through Public Relations,” McKinnon et al. (2001) acknowledge that throughout history public relations strategies and tactics have witnessed widespread application in political contexts.

From staging political events (protests, rallies, whistle-stop tours, speeches) to developing or disseminating promotional materials or information subsidies (advertisements, posters, fliers, press releases, campaign brochures, and leaflets), and from creating campaign logos and slogans (for example, Eisenhower’s 1952, “I Like Ike”; Reagan’s 1984, “Morning Again in America”; Obama’s 2008, “Change We Can Believe In” and “Hope”) to packaging, promoting, and spinning political information for media, public relations strategies and strategists are so widespread in politics that it is impossible to list all the various ways public relations tactics are strategically employed in political contexts.
Despite this, political public relations is a relatively new research area within both the political communication and public relations academic communities. As Strömbäck and Kiousis (2011) acknowledge in the opening chapter of this volume, the role of media is central to both political communication and public relations research and theory. Strömbäck and Kiousis (2011) define political public relations as follows: Political public relations is the management process by which an organization or individual for political purposes, through purposeful communication and action, seeks to influence and to establish, build, and maintain beneficial relationships and reputations with its key publics to help support its mission and achieve its goals.

In an analysis of the president and public relations, Tedesco (2003) asserts that consideration of the president as the chief public relations officer in the United States is not too much of a stretch, especially considering that the president is charged with forging mutually beneficial relationships between his administration and the other branches of government, foreign governments, and the U.S. and international media and citizens. As with any other high profile public relations position, president–press relations are a critical dynamic in the success of the presidency. In this context, the president’s platform as one of the most influential leaders in the world provides him with a critical advantage for influencing the media agenda. In fact, scholars argue that no other “figure dominates the news like the president of the United States” (Johnson, Wanta, & Boudreau, 2004, p. 178).

In one of the initial investigations of presidential power to influence the media agenda, Iyengar and Kinder (1987) demonstrated that a presidential speech delivered on energy increased the public concern about energy by more than 4%. However, for other
issues, the president was not as successful at shifting the public agenda, but instead the public agenda shifted after the media agenda shifted. Yet other researchers suggest that presidential personality may be an intervening factor in the president’s ability to set the media agenda (Wanta, Stephenson, VanSlyke Turk, & McCombs, 1989). Along this line, Wanta (1991) found that the president–press–public relationship was interdependent, but that the president was more likely to influence the media and public agendas in times of favorable public approval or high popularity.

Carpini (1994) examined the president–press relationship in the electronic age and identified three prominent relational shifts. The first period, which spans the 1920s up to the 1960s, was characterized by supportive relationships between presidents and the press as a relatively “neutral conduit for White House news” (Carpini, 1994, p. 172). Kaid (1976) also found that personal information and campaign announcement were more likely than issue content to get picked up by the press.

The variability of candidates to influence the media agenda was the result in three related studies of press releases and their influence on both media and opposing candidates’ agendas. Using official press releases appearing on presidential primary candidate and presidential candidate Web sites, Tedesco (2001, 2005a, 2005b) explored the ability of a candidate’s agenda to influence not only the media agenda but also his or her political opponent’s agenda (Strömbäck & Kiousis, 2011).

**Functional Theory of Political Campaign Discourse**

Relative few studies have used content analysis to examine U.S. presidential campaign speeches. Benoit et al. (2008) analyzed presidential announcement speeches from 1960-2004, Beniot et al. (2014) analyzed the 2012 presidential primary TV spots,
Roberts (2013) analyzed a comparison of Web only advertisements and traditional Television advertisements from the 2004 and 2008, Beniot et al. (2011) analyzed staying “on message”: consistency in content of presidential primary campaign messages across media using the functional theory of political campaign discourse theory. Also, Beniot et al. 2000 analyzed nominating convention keynote speeches.

Benoit and his associates have developed the Functional Theory of Political Campaign Discourse through a series of studies (see, e.g., Benoit, 1999, 2007; Benoit, Blaney, & Pier, 1998; Benoit & Brazeal, 2002; Benoit & Harthcock, 1999; Benoit, Pier et al., 2002, Benoit, Stein et al., 2007; Glantz, Benoit, & Airne, 2013; Benoit & Compton, 2014). This theory posits that voting decisions are essential comparative: Each candidate strives to win by persuading voters that he or she is preferable to other candidates. He or she only must appear better for this office than opponents for enough voters.

First, a candidate can employ acclaims, engaging in self-praise. The more desirable a candidate appears to a voter, the more likely that candidate will receive a citizen’s vote (Benoit & Compton, 2014). E.g. Trump using his business experience to show he understands the economy and he can create while Hilary Clinton is using her past political experience as Senator and former Secretary of State to show that she is a better candidate than Trump. Second, candidate messages can criticize or attack opponents. An attack (if persuasive to the audience) can increase the attacker’s net favorability by reducing the apparent desirability of the opponent. Third, when a candidate is subjected to an attack, he or she can attempt to defend, or refute, the accusation in the attack. A defense may be able to restore some preferability lost to an attack
Functional theory posits that campaign discourse can address two potential topics: policy and character. Ultimately, a candidate can campaign on two basic topics: what they do and who they are. Other scholars utilize the terms “issue” for policy and “image” for character (Benoit & Compton, 2014). Character or image can be considered an issue in the second sense of the term. Furthermore, because discourse concerns perceptions of reality, it is possible to speak of the “image” a candidate projects on policy, or the issues. To avoid these possible pitfalls, functional theory uses the word “policy” rather than “issues” and “character” instead of “image” (Benoit & Compton, 2014).

Functional theory identifies three forms of policy (past deeds: record of accomplishments or failures in office, future plans: means for solving problems with governmental action, and general goals: ends for governmental action) and three forms of character (personal qualities: personality traits of candidates, leadership ability: executive or administration experience and ability, and ideals: values and principles) (Benoit & Compton, 2014). According to Benoit (2012), the ads from 2012 employed attacks at the same rate as acclaims functions of presidential primary television spots over time. In the past, acclaims always outnumbered attacks. As opposed to 2008 Republican primary spots, 82% of themes were acclaims.

Like the functional dimension, topic (policy/character) is a common approach to analyzing campaign messages. Scholars in both communication and political science have argued that party, policy and character are the three major grounds for voting decision in the U.S. elections (Benoit, Blaney, & Pier, 1998; Bibby, 2000; Levine, 1995). Among the three voting grounds, Bibby (2000) found that party affiliation is unlikely to undergo frequent changes, and therefore is different from campaign issues and candidate
images that can vary from election to election. Benoit, Blaney and Pier (1998) maintained: “Candidates occasionally switch parties, but policy and character are better sources for inventing a wide range of arguments for voters to prefer one candidate over another” (p. 24). They also argued that candidates need to use policy and character to win the votes of undecided and independent voters which are crucial in the outcome of an election. In short, the topics of policy and character are an important dimension of campaign messages.

Benoit, Blaney, and Pier (2000) analyzed the U.S. nominating convention keynote speeches from 1960 to 1996. They found that both acclaim (51%) and attacks (48%) were common in the messages of keynote speeches, whereas defenses (1%) were rare. Valley (1974, 1988) also conducted a longitudinal analysis of U.S presidential nomination acceptance speeches. Focusing his study on Democratic presidential nomination acceptance speeches from 1868 to 1932, he found that 65% of utterances were references to the Democratic Party, including past party achievements, present party activities and personalities, party pledges and goals for the future. In other words, nearly two-thirds of utterances in these acceptance speeches were employed to “praise their own party” (Valley, 1974, p. 60; Valley, 1988, p. 161). Valley (1974) also reported that 23% of the utterances in these acceptance addresses were devoted to references to the opposition; most of these references concerning the opposition's failure in the past. Thus, although Valley’s studies do not analyze defending utterances, his analyses do indicate that acclaiming (positive)/attacking (negative) are major functions of acceptance speeches and that acclaims outnumber attacks. Overall, the previous analyses of campaign messages in
the form of television advertisements and speeches show functions are an important
dimension for analyzing campaign messages.

The 2012 U.S. presidential elections is currently the most expensive presidential
election ever in American history. Spending for the U.S. 2012 presidential election has
greatly surpassed other elections held in the past. When combined, president Obama
campaign team and Governor Romney campaign team together with their individuals’
sponsors, Super PACS collectively spent roughly $2 billion on electronic media
advertising, making the total sum spent above the neighborhood of $4 billion. Some
election analyst estimates that close to $6 billion was spent on the U.S. 2012 presidential
elections when you add up the amount governor Romney spent on his primaries. This
large-dollar spending, in political campaign, came about because of a 2010 Supreme
Court decision in Citizen vs. Federal Elections Commission (558 U.S. 310, 2010). In a
five-to-four decision, the Court overturned century-old restrictions on corporations,
unions and other interest groups from using their vast treasuries to advocate for a specific
candidate. The conservative members of the Court ruled corporations have First
Amendment rights and that the government cannot impose restrictions on their political
speech and their contributions can't be limited.

Research Questions and Hypothesis

These research questions and hypothesis were developed from previous
researches on agenda building and functional theory of political campaign discourse.

RQ 1: What messages are being utilized in the campaign speeches by the two
competing presidential candidates in terms of issues (agendas), themes, tones, functions
and styles?
RQ2: What messages are tweeted from the speeches of the two competing presidential candidates in terms of issues (agendas), themes, tones, functions and styles during the presidential election?

Agenda-building research focuses on the correlations between the agendas or strategies of certain political actors, like parties or candidates, and the media agenda, with the level of prominence given by the media to certain issues the candidates deems importance. (Sheafer & Weimann, 2005). Also, as a campaign strategy, press releases and in this study, campaign speech and Tweets by the candidates (Walters et al., 1996). Also, the tone of the media coverage of the issues raised by the candidate is also important component of media coverage as Evers (2016) pined that tone is an important part of media coverage. Based on this premise, research question 3 and 4 is formulated.

RQ 3: What is the prominence of news coverage given to the candidates speeches and Tweets?

RQ4: What is the tone of the news media regarding the candidates speeches?

Miller et al. (1998) while researching the 1996 presidential primaries, argued that the candidates successfully influenced the issues covered by three elite newspapers. Also, Walters et al. (1996) suggests that it is important to study the sources that influence the media agenda because these sources are motivated by different philosophies, raise distinctive issues, lay emphasis on different aspects of a story, and prefer to disseminate certain views and opinions. The news source not only decides whose issues will be given voice but also in what ways and manner the issue will be talked about will be allowed to say Based on this premise,
RQ 5: Are the candidates’ speeches/Tweets associated with news coverage on the presidential elections?

H1: The salience of issue attributes in campaign speech and Tweets will be positively correlated with the salience of issue attributes in news media coverage.

Based on the assumptions of the functional theory of political discourse, there are three fundamental functions of campaign discourse: acclaiming, attacking, and defending. The following research hypothesis based on past studies including Benoit, Blaney, & Pier, (2000), and Benoit, Hansen & Stein (2004), has been designed to explore the functions of the three forms of campaign discourse and possible differences among them:

H2a: The presidential campaign speeches/Tweets will be full of acclaim as against negative remarks and attacks on opponents

H2b: Candidates will discuss policy in their speeches/Tweets more often than individual character or image

H2c: The incumbent party candidate will use past deeds more for acclaims, and less for attacks, than the challenger in the speeches/Tweets of the 2016 presidential election (Benoit &Sheaf er (2006).

H2d: Candidates Tweets will discourse more on results of actions (past deeds) than about their private lives.
CHAPTER III - Methodology

This study applied Benoit’s functional theory of political campaign discourse (Benoit, 1999, 2007) and Agenda Building theory to test the hypotheses and answer the outlined research questions. This section explains the specific procedure of the analysis. This study will employ the content analysis method. Content analysis is a quantitative research technique for measurement of objective, in a systematic way, and description of the manifest content of communication (Berelson, 1952). Abdullah (2018) defines content analysis as important non-intrusive research method and a technique for gathering and analyzing the media text and artifact. The ‘content’ in content analysis refers to speech, meaning, pictures, symbols, ideas, themes, or any message that can be communicated. The ‘text’ is anything written, visual, or spoken that serves as a medium for communication.

Neuendorf (2002) recently defined content analysis as a method of summarizing, quantitative analysis of media messages backed by scientific method… and is not limited to the types of variables that may be measured or the content in which the messages are created or presented” (p.10). Neuendorf's definition highlights that content analysis should be scientific and quantitative in its procedure, with reliance to objectivity, scope, a reliability, generalizability, priori design, validity, hypothesis testing and replicability, and (Abdullah, 2018).

Political campaign speeches are products of personal communications or human communications while political Tweets are computer mediated communications. They can be categorized under public communication which occurs when a speaker addresses an audience in person (Beebe, Beebe, & Redmond, 2017), and likewise, political Tweets
which are direct messages from political actors trying to differentiate themselves and position themselves and the best candidates to lead the country. While television and newspaper news stories are the creation of media practitioners to shape the public opinion about candidates and garner support for certain issues. This study uses speech content, Tweets and media reports for content analysis reported as used in previous studies Benoit 2007; Evers, 2016; Abdullah, 2018.).

**Sampling Frame**

In this study, the researcher uses television (CNN, FOX and NBC) news and newspaper *(The New York Times and Washington Post)* reportage of Trump and Clinton’s campaign together with the candidate’s speeches and Tweets for content analysis.

The data for this research was drawn from an online source (http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/2016_election.php). The website is a resource of the nonprofit, non-partisan, and non-governmental organization known as The American Presidency Project. The site is an inventory of speeches, statements, and press releases of American public office holders, both past and present. The site was used because of the high level of and the quantity and quality of material it offers this research project. Also, the researcher selected CNN Anderson Cooper 360 and Fox news Bill O’ Reilly, because they were both primetime airing at the same time to showcase the polarity and partisan nature of cable news and NBC nightly news with Lester Holt to add as a balance to the cable news program.
Unit of Analysis and Sample

A total of 5,303 units will be analyzed for this study. Each campaign speech was delivered by either of the two political candidates, Tweets, newspaper article and television news clip during the time frame for this study will be analyzed. To make the research manageable, Speeches that are solely interviews and news conferences were not used because journalists have influence on the political candidates’ speeches in such instances. The result was that there were 73 speeches left for Donald Trump and 64 speeches for Hillary Clinton.

Speeches delivered by Trump and Clinton before they emerged as presidential candidates of their various political parties during the campaign period were eliminated. By this action, after removing speeches delivered before the Republican Party Convention (July 18, 2016 – July 21, 2016), Donald Trump’s speeches were further reduced to 67. Hillary Clinton’s speeches were reduced to 36 after eliminating speeches delivered before the Democratic Party convention (July 25, 2016 – July 28, 2016). Since both candidate emerged as the official party flag bearer for the main elections, the researcher added their announcement or running for office speech which made Donald Trump to have 68 speeches in total and Hillary Clinton 37 speeches in total.

Also, another site (https://twitter.com/search-advanced?lang=en; https://www.tweetarchivist.com/) is used to search for the candidates’ Tweets that were posted within the time frame of the study which came down to be 1470 Tweets for Donald Trump and 3211 Tweets for Hillary Clinton. Fourthly, the researcher used Lexis-Nexis to search for newspapers stories from The New York Times (which accounts for 89 units for analysis) and Washington Post (which accounts for 94 units for analysis)
about the campaign speech, Tweets or any news related comments emerging from the elections campaign and finally, news clips transcript were selected from CNN.com (83 news clips transcript for Anderson Cooper360), NBC.com/achieves (183 video news stories) and billoreilly.com (68 news clips transcript) as Bill O’ Reilly is no longer with FOX News after the elections.

Texts of televised speeches were analyzed. The unit of analysis was a full speech. According to the functional theory of political discourse (Benoit, 1999, 2001; Benoit, Blaney & Pier, 1998; Benoit, Pier & Blaney, 1997), each unit of the speech and Tweet addresses a coherent idea about the candidates and/or their parties. Also, the units (speech, Tweet, television and newspapers articles were analyzed to show a dominate theme or utterances that address a coherent idea and sub theme as the case might be. Berelson (1952) explained that a theme is “an assertion about a subject” (p. 18). Holsti (1969) defined a theme as “a single assertion about some subject” (p. 116).

Categorization

After unitizing each unit into themes, each unit was coded into functions (acclaim/attack/ defense), topics (policy/character), three sub-forms of each topic (past deeds, future plans and general goals for policy utterances; personal qualities, leadership abilities and ideals for character utterances). For messages coded as attacks, the targets of attacks were also identified. Benoit (1999) defined the three functions of political utterances as follows. Themes that portrayed the sponsoring candidate or the candidate’s party in a favorable light were acclaims. Themes that portrayed the opposing candidate or opposing candidate’s political party in an unfavorable light were attacks. Themes that explicitly responded to a prior attack on the candidate or candidate's political party were
defenses, (p. 20, emphasis original) He also divided the policy/character topics according to the following rules: Themes that concern governmental action (past, current, or future) and problems amendable to governmental action were considered policy themes. Some of the coding categories for the variables are listed below.

Themes that concern characteristics, traits, abilities, or attributes of the candidates (or their parties) were considered character themes, (Benoit, 1999, p. 21). Benoit (1999) further categorized policy into past deeds, future plans, and general goals and character into personal qualities, leadership ability and ideals. The next step in the coding procedure was to classify each paragraph to reflect which traditional political activity the paragraph represents. Then the paragraph is coded to reflect the dominant tone, and if the paragraph deals with issues with reference to women or minority issues and finally the paragraph was coded to reflect if it is a response to an issue.

For each unit, dominant theme was identified for coding. The dominant theme within the unit is the information that is emphasized most or made most salient within paragraph. The lead sentence may be useful in determining the dominant theme. The dominant theme of the unit was analyzed: (1) Economy, (2) Foreign Trade, (3) Foreign Policy, (4) Taxes, (5) Terrorism (6) Race relation, (7) Immigration, (8) Wages/Income inequality, (9) Religion, (10) Gun control, (11) Social Security (12) Election/campaign financing, (13) Social Issues, (14) Abortion/Female issues, planned parenthood, (15) Education, (16) Past records, (17) Human rights, (18) National security, (19) Health care/Medicaid, (20) Environmental/Global warming, (21) Military/Defense/Veterans, (22) Others
The tone of the unit was analyzed, using the following categories: (1) Negative: Accusatory remarks, gloomy outlook for the country, attacking opponent or opposition party, attack on individuals, country, religion, race etc., (2) Positive: Praise of on individuals, country, religion, race, praise of self, political party etc., (3) Neutral more balanced approach to issues or theme of unit

The unit is analyzed if an attack on an opponent is identified or not, and whether the unit has an attack on a political party or not.

On the other hand, the unit is coded for the presence of a praise of self. The unit is analyzed for the presence of a defense of past deed or statement, future plans or policy discussion than individual characteristics. Finally, the unit is analyzed to identify the source, date and candidate(s).

The unit is analyzed for the level of prominence given to the issues addressed by the candidates by the media outlet: (1) High: Did it make the headlines speech read by the news anchor, the front page based on the page and number it appeared in the newspaper; Did the news anchor see it as important to open a debate on it (For CNN and FOX news), (2) Median: Did it make the headlines speech read by the news anchor, the front page based on the page and number it appeared in the newspaper; Did the news anchor see it as moderate to open a debate on it (For CNN and FOX news), (3) Low: Did not make the headlines speech, just the anchor comment on it, no debate, did not appear on the front page of the newspaper

The unit was coded if the news story is dealing with a specific issue or policy; who is winning or losing; rumors and sensational gossip; an evaluative tone regarding the
media; two opposite viewpoints; feelings of empathy; the results of action; candidates’ private lives.

**Intercoder Reliability Test**

One graduate student and the researcher conducted an intercoder reliability agreement test. We checked the intercoder reliability on 10% of the sample. However, two coders coded 10% of Fox News Bill O'Reilly (7 units) as it is subscription-based. For Categories 1 and 2 it is just number and date. So, the coders tested the intercoder reliability test from category 3. For category 3, the coders agreed 527 times which makes it 100% agreement. For category 4, the coders agreed 527 times which makes it 100% agreement. For category 5, the coders agreed 469 times, which makes 89% agreement. For category 6, the coders agreed 468 times, which makes 89% agreement. For category 7, the coders agreed 527 times, which makes 100% agreement. For category 8, the coders agreed 527 times, which makes 100% agreement. For category 9, the coders agreed 478 times, which makes 90% agreement. For category 10, the coders agreed 527 times, which makes 100% agreement. For category 11, names of who was attacked was clear to draw consensus. For category 12, the coders agreed 527 times, which makes 100% agreement. For category 13, names of political parties that were attacked was analyzed. For category 14, the coders agreed 527 times, which makes 100% agreement. For category 15, the coders agreed 527 times, which makes 100% agreement.

For category 16, the coders agreed 527 times, which makes 100% agreement. For category 17, the coders agreed 488 times, which makes 93% agreement. For category 18, the coders agreed 495 times, which makes 94% agreement. For category 19, the coders agreed 486 times, which makes 92% agreement. For category 20, the coders
agreed 476 times, which makes 90% agreement. For category 21, the coders agreed 483 times, which makes 92% agreement. For category 22, the coders agreed 491 times, which makes 93% agreement. For category 23, the coders agreed 527 times, which makes 100% agreement. For category 24, the coders agreed 527 times, which makes 100% agreement. For category 25, the coders agreed 493 times, which makes 94% agreement. For category 26, the coders agreed 518 times, which makes 98% agreement.

The range of agreement is 89-100, and the mean is .96, however, the coders had to revise the instructions on category 5 and 6 and re-conduct the intercoder reliability test. After the revision, 94% agreement was reached on both categories.
CHAPTER IV – Results

This chapter presents the result of the content analysis on the 2016 U.S. presidential campaign speeches, Tweets and news stories from July 19 to November 9, 2016. The chapter is organized based on each research question. A total of 5303 units were analyzed comprising of campaign speeches of Hillary Clinton and Donald Trump, Tweets of Hillary Clinton and Donald Trump, TV transcripts from NBC Nightly News with Lester Holt, CNN Andersen Cooper AC360 and Fox news Bill O’ Reilly, newspaper articles from Washington Post and The New York Times. The breakdown of the sample is presented in Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Speech</th>
<th>TV</th>
<th>Newspaper</th>
<th>Tweet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hillary</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>1470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trump</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>3211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NBC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NYT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trump</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5,303</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 Summary of Sample Data employed in Content Analysis

RQ 1: What messages are being utilized in the campaign speeches by the two competing presidential candidates in terms of issues (agendas), themes, tones, functions and styles?

The candidate’s speeches could not be statistically calculated because the counts of themes were more than 3 and the total number was 105. But a majority \((n=29, 78\%)\) of Hillary Clinton’s speech was spent talking about the economy, which is the same case with Donald Trump \((n=34, 46\%)\).
RQ2: What messages in relation to the speeches are tweeted by the two competing presidential candidates in terms of issues (agendas), themes, tones, functions and styles during the presidential election?

The result of the study revealed that there was a small statistically significance between the 2016 U.S. presidential candidates Tweets of their campaign messages in terms of themes, tones, function and style with $\chi^2 (21, N = 4678) = 351.32, p < .001$, Cramer's $V = .27$.

About a half ($n=1771, 55\%$) of Hillary Clinton’s Tweets were devoted to campaigning. Hillary Clinton spent ($n=138, 4\%$), of her Tweets talking about the economy, ($n=260, 8\%$), social issues ($n=98, 3\%$), abortions ($n=98, 3\%$), female related issues, ($n=73, 2\%$), education ($n=103, 3\%$), global warming, ($n=66, 2\%$), military/veterans, and other issues ($n=88, 3\%$). On the other hand, two-thirds ($n=1083, 74\%$) of Donald Trump tweet were devoted to campaigning. Donald Trump used his Tweets talking about the economy ($n=60, 4\%$), social issues ($n=32, 2\%$), foreign policy ($n=49, 3\%$), national securities issues ($n=35, 2\%$), healthcare/medicaid issues, and other issues ($n=76, 5\%$).

This study supports Fico and Cote (1999), assertion that an election issue was identified as a contention by either candidate (or those speaking on their behalf), or reports that involved public policy issues in the election, or more general assertions about their opponents or themselves relative to the election which is related but not limited to the candidate’s character, credibility, or fitness for office.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th><strong>Hillary Clinton</strong></th>
<th></th>
<th><strong>Donald Trump</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economy</td>
<td>138*</td>
<td>4.30%</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2.18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Trade</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.50%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Policy</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>2.20%</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>2.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxes</td>
<td>92*</td>
<td>2.90%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terrorism</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>1.20%</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race Relation</td>
<td>89*</td>
<td>2.80%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigration</td>
<td>70*</td>
<td>2.20%</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wages/Income Inequality</td>
<td>47*</td>
<td>1.50%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.40%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gun control</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.30%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Security</td>
<td>17*</td>
<td>0.50%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Election/ Campaign financing</td>
<td>1771</td>
<td>55.20%</td>
<td>1083</td>
<td>73.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Issues</td>
<td>260*</td>
<td>8.10%</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>4.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abortion/ Female Issues</td>
<td>98*</td>
<td>3.10%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>73*</td>
<td>2.30%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past Record</td>
<td>28*</td>
<td>0.90%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Rights</td>
<td>28*</td>
<td>0.90%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Security</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>1.20%</td>
<td>49*</td>
<td>3.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Care/ Medicaid</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>1.70%</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>2.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental/ Global warming</td>
<td>103*</td>
<td>3.20%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military/ Defense/ Veterans</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>2.10%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>2.70%</td>
<td>76*</td>
<td>5.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>3208</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1470</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Summary of Messages Utilized in the Campaign Tweets by Hillary Clinton and Donald Trump in terms of Issues (Agendas), Themes, Tones, Functions and Styles.

*Represents Individual significant differences
The study revealed that there was a statistical significance between the 2016 U.S. presidential candidates Tweets of their campaign messages in terms tones, with $\chi^2 (2, N = 4678) = 21.943, p < .000$, Cramer's $V = .068$. Hillary Clinton Tweets, were positive ($n=1530, 47.7\%$), negative ($n=1102, 34\%$), and neutral ($n=576, 18\%$). Similarly, Donald Trump Tweets ($40.8\%$) were positive ($n=599, 40.7\%$) negative ($n=600, 40.8\%$) and neutral ($n=271, 18.4\%$).
Table 3 Summary of Positive, Negative and Neutral Tweets by the two Presidential Candidates

*Represents Individual significant differences Tone of Tweets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Hillary Clinton</th>
<th></th>
<th>Donald Trump</th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>1102</td>
<td>34.4%</td>
<td>599*</td>
<td>40.7%</td>
<td>1701</td>
<td>36.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>1530*</td>
<td>47.7%</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>40.8%</td>
<td>2130</td>
<td>45.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>576</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
<td>847</td>
<td>18.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1678</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>871</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>467</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RQ 3: What is the prominence of news coverage given to the candidate’s speech and Tweets?

The study revealed that there was a statistical significance in the prominence level given to the candidate’s speech and tweets by the newspapers and TV station during the 2016 U.S. presidential election cycle, with $\chi^2 (8, N=516) = 78.201, p < .000$, Cramer's $V = .275$. NBC coverage placed the candidates' speech and Tweets in high prominence $(n=98, 38\%)$, median prominence $(n=43, 34\%)$ and low prominence $(n=42, 31\%)$. CNN covered the candidates’ speech and Tweets in high prominence $(n=11, 4\%)$, median prominence $(n=22, 18\%)$, and low prominence $(n=50, 37\%)$. Fox news reports them in high prominence $(n=47, 18\%)$, median prominence $(n=12, 10\%)$, and low prominence $(n=9, 7\%)$. The coverage of New York Times places high prominence $(n=50, 20\%)$, median prominence $(n=26, 21\%)$, and low prominence $(n=13, 10\%)$, while Washington
Post had them reported in high prominence ($n=49$, 19%), median prominence ($n=23$, 18%), and low prominence ($n=21$, 16%).

This study support the agenda-building research which lay emphases on correlations between the media agenda, and political elites agenda, e.g. political parties or political candidates, and with the level of prominence given by the media to certain issues the candidates deems importance (Sheafer & Weimann, 2005). Also, as a campaign strategy, using campaign speech and Tweets by the candidates emphasize campaign messages and agendas by the candidates, as Walters et al., (1996) suggests that agenda building will heighten campaign issues, messages and images stressed by the campaign, and in turn perhaps encourage the media to promote those issues and images.
Table 4 Level of Prominence given to the Issues Addressed by the Candidates by the Media Outlet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Unit</th>
<th>NBC</th>
<th>CNN</th>
<th>FOX</th>
<th>NYT</th>
<th>WP</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>38.4%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEDIAN</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>34.1%</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>31.1%</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>37.0%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>35.5%</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Represents Individual significant differences
Q4: What is the tone of the news media regarding the candidate’s speech?

The study revealed that there was a statistically significance in the news media tone regarding the candidate’s speech and Tweets during the 2016 U.S presidential election cycle, with \( \chi^2 (8, N = 516) = 221.093, p < .000 \). NBC had the coverage of negative tone \((n=12, 7\%)\), negative tone \((n=40, 22\%)\), and positive tone neutral tone \((n=131, 72\%)\). CNN coverage involved negative tone \((n=21, 25\%)\), positive tone \((n=54, 65\%)\) and neutral tone \((n=8, 10\) FOX News coverage was in negative tone \((n=31, 46\%)\), positive tone \((n=26, 38\%)\) and neutral tone \((n=11, 16\%)\). New York Times had 41 (46%) negative tone, 43 (48%) positive tone and 5 (6%) neutral tone. While, Washington Post had 30 (32%) negative tone, 51 (56%) positive tone and 12 (13%) neutral tone. According to Evers, “tone is an important part of media coverage” (Evers, 2016, p.10).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of unit</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NBC</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>131*</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNN</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>54*</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOX</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NYT</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>51*</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>135</strong></td>
<td><strong>214</strong></td>
<td><strong>167</strong></td>
<td><strong>516</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5 Tone of Media towards Candidates’ Speeches and Tweets
RQ 5: Are the candidates’ speeches/Tweets associated with news coverage on the presidential elections?

The study revealed that there was a statistical significance regarding how the candidate’s speech and Tweets are associated with the news media (both TV and newspaper) coverage of the 2016 U.S. presidential elections cycle, with $\chi^2 (2, N = 4788) = 19.944, p < .000$. For speech, there was a statistical difference with $\chi^2 (1, N = 104) = 31.740, p < .000$ where more than a half of Hillary Clinton speech were of high prominence ($n=22, 60\%$), but all of Donald Trump speech were of high prominence ($n=67, 100\%$).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Hillary Clinton</th>
<th>Donald Trump</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6 Level of Prominence of News Stories from Candidates’ Speeches

For Tweets, there was a statistical difference with $\chi^2 (2, N = 4684) = 30.798, p < .000$ where 55\% of Hillary Clinton Tweets were of high prominence ($n=1749, 55\%$), but Donald Trump tweet were of high media prominence ($n=691, 47\%$).
This study supports Miller et al. (1998) which argued that presidential primary candidates were effective in influencing three elite newspapers news coverage of issues during the 1996 presidential primary as we see in the 2016 presidential election campaign.

Based on agenda building theory the following hypothesis was developed.

H1: The salience of issue attributes in campaign speech and Tweets will be positively correlated with the salience of issue attributes in news media content.

The study supported the hypothesis that the salience of issue attributes in campaign speech and Tweets will be positively correlated with the salience of issue attributes in news media coverage of the 2016 U.S. presidential elections cycle with $\chi^2 (1, N = 5304) = 306.422, p < .000$, with Cramer V of 0.258.

For the candidates, there was a statistical difference between the candidates in terms of addressing policy or issues with $\chi^2 (1, N = 4788) = 318.275, < .000$, where 22% ($n=1030$) of the candidates’ messages covered policy or issue, and 78% ($n=3758$) of the candidate’s messages did not talk about policy or issue. While for the media, there was a

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Hillary Clinton</th>
<th></th>
<th>Donald Trump</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1749</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>691</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>1047</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>523</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3208</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1476</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7 Level of Prominence of News Stories from Candidates’ Tweets
huge statistical difference with $\chi^2 (2, N = 516) = 3.250, p < .071$ where the media’s messages covered policy or issue ($n=90, 17\%$), but the media’s messages did not cover policy or issue ($n=426, 83\%$). Miller et al. (1998) argues that the 1996 presidential primary candidates were successful in shaping the news coverage of three elite newspapers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Salience of Issue Attribute</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidates</td>
<td>1030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1120</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8 Salience of Issue Attribute

Based on the assumptions of the functional theory of political discourse, there are three fundamental functions of campaign discourse: acclaiming, attacking, and defending. The following research hypothesis based on past studies (Benoit, Blaney & Pier, 2000) and Benoit, Hansen, & Stein, 2004), has been designed to explore the functions of the three forms of campaign discourse and possible differences among them:

H2a: The 2016 U.S. presidential campaign speech/Tweets are full of acclaim as against negative remark and attacks on opponents.

The study did not support the hypothesis that the 2016 U.S. presidential campaign speech/Tweet sis full of acclaims as against negative remarks and attacks on opponents with $\chi^2 (1, N = 4788) = 1.983, p < .159$ with yes to praise of self ($n=373, 8\%$) and no to
praise of self (n=4415, 92%), with Cramer V of 0.240. For candidate’s speech, there was statistical difference with χ² (1, N = 104) = 5.980, p < .014. Hillary Clinton praised of self (n=10, 27%), but her speeches did not praise of self, while Donald Trump’s speeches praised of self (n=6, 9%). For the candidates’ Tweets, there was also statistical difference with χ² (1, N = 4684) = 1.548, p < .0213 Hillary Clinton Tweets were praise of self (n=255, 8%), and (n=2953, 92%), while Donald Trump praised of self (n=102, 7%).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Praise of Self</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Speech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillary Clinton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donald Trump</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9 Praise of Self By the candidates Speech/Tweet

The study also shows that the candidates’ speech and tweets include attacks on opponents in differences between candidates with χ² (1, N = 4788) = .060 p < .807. For candidate’s speech, there was difference with χ² (1, N = 104) = .524, p < .469. Hillary Clinton’s speech (n=32,87%) attack opponents while Donald Trump’s speeches (n=61, 91%) involved more attacks of opponents. For the candidates’ Tweets, there was also difference with χ² (1, N = 4684) = 2.565, p < .0109. Hillary Clinton’s tweets (n=1069, 33%) vs. Donald Trump’s tweets (n=457, 31%)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attack of opponent</th>
<th>Speech</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillary Clinton</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1069</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donald Trump</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>93</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1526</td>
<td>3158</td>
<td>4788</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10 For attack of opponent by speech and Tweets.

Although a there is little study done with campaign acceptance speeches, and none with Tweets, the result of the study did not support Benoit & Compton (2014) in general, which found that a candidate can employ acclaims, engaging in self-praise. The more desirable a candidate appears to a voter, the more likely that candidate will receive a citizen’s vote. Also, the study deviated from previous study the ads from 2012 employed attacks at the same rate as acclaims functions of presidential primary television spots over time. In the past, acclaims always outnumbered attacks. As opposed to 2008 Republican primary spots, 82% of themes were acclaims (Benoit & Compton, 2014).

H2b: Candidates discussed policy in their speech/Tweets more often than individual character or image.

The study did not support the hypothesis that the 2016 U.S. presidential candidates discussed policy in their speech/Tweets more often than individual character or image with statistical difference of $\chi^2 (1, N = 4788) = 4.432, p < .035$. About a third of speech/tweets ($n=1450, 30\%$) cover specific issues or policy. There was a statistical
difference with Cramer V of .30. \( n=1014, 31\% \), where Hillary Clinton Tweets discussed policy \( n=2231, 69\% \), but Donald Trump’s Tweets discussed policy \( n=436, 28\% \). This is another deviation from Benoit (1999; 2001)’s analysis of presidential television spots from 1952 to 2000 showed that 61% accounted for policy utterances while 31% accounted for character utterances of television ads. Also, Kaid and Johnston (2001) and West (1997) all found previously that U.S. presidential spots emphasize policy over character.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specific issues or policy</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1014</td>
<td>2231</td>
<td>4788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillary Clinton</td>
<td>1014</td>
<td>2231</td>
<td>4788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donald Trump</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>1107</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1450</td>
<td>3338</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11 Specific Issues or policy

H2c: The incumbent party candidate will use past deeds more for acclaims, and less for attacks, than the challenger in the speech/Tweets of the 2016 presidential election (Benoit & Sheafer, 2006).

The study did not support the hypothesis that the 2016 U.S. presidential incumbent party candidate will use past deeds more for acclaims, and less for attacks, than the challenger in the speech/Tweets of the 2016 presidential election with a
statistical significance of $\chi^2 (1, N = 4788) = 1.576, p < .0209$. Only 5 speeches and 77 Tweets of Hillary Clinton involved defending her past deed. The result is different from previous study with analysis of 1960 to 1996 keynote speeches that incumbents had more acclaims (58%) than attacks (39%), whereas challengers had 58% of attacks and 42% acclaims (Kaid & Holtz-Bacha, 1995).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Speech</th>
<th>Tweet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillary Clinton</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donald Trump</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 12 Defense of Past deed

H2d: Candidates’ Tweets will discourse more on results of actions (past deeds) than about their private lives.

The study supports the hypothesis that the U.S. 2016 candidate’s Tweets will discuss more of actions than their private lives with a statistical difference of $\chi^2 (1, N = 4788) = 14.748, p < .000$. Hillary Clinton’s Tweets discussed about result of action ($n=804, 25\%$), while Donald Trump’s tweets discussed about result of action ($n=305, 32\%$).
20%). Both Benoit (1999) and West (1997) reported that past deeds (or domestic performances) are the most common form in the policy utterances.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Is this about candidates’ private life</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillary Clinton</td>
<td>804</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donald Trump</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1109</td>
<td>3679</td>
<td>4788</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 13 Result of past deed or candidates’ private lives.
CHAPTER V – Discussion

This chapter discusses the results reported in Chapter 4, to extend the political public relations agenda building functions of political speeches, Tweets and news stories from the 2016 U.S. presidential elections campaign messages and functional theory of political discourse.

The first section discusses the functions of the two forms of campaign discourse (Speech and Tweets) in the 2016 U.S. presidential elections, the differences or similarities of use of functions across message forms or the related factors of campaign functions, and the targets of attacks, the patterns of using negative speeches and attacks on political opponents, using campaign speeches to engage in self-praise, and address specific policy or issues and character or image concerns.

The second section addresses the agenda building function of political campaign messages as regards to the tone and prominence given to the candidate’s speech, Tweets by the newspapers and television news outlets. The third section discusses the role of Twitter as one of the preferred sources for consuming political news and a tool of political engagement in the 2016 U.S. presidential elections.

Furthermore, this chapter also highlights the general implications and provides suggestions for candidates. The final portion of this chapter addresses limitations and suggestions of future research.

Functions of Campaign Discourse

During the 2016 U.S. presidential elections campaign, all the three forms of campaign utterances used in this study were replete with acclaims and attacks, with acclaims or praise for self (n=373, 8%). The candidate’s speech, we have 27% or 10 of
Hillary Clinton speech account for praise of self \((n=10, 27\%)\), while Donald Trump’s speeches were devoted to praise of self slightly less \((n=6, 9\%)\). For the candidates’ Tweets, Hillary Clinton’s Tweets were praise of self \((n=255, 8\%)\), while Donald Trump praised \((n=102, 7\%)\).

Whereas this study was filled with attack, as against negative remark and attacks on opponents with yes to attack of opponent making up 34\% (1619) and 66\% (4415) no to attack of opponent. For the candidate’s speech, we have Hillary Clinton 87\% (32) yes to attack of opponent and 13\% (5) of her speeches were not attack of opponent. While, 91\% (61) of Donald Trump’s speeches were yes to attack of opponent and 9\% (6) were not devoted to attack of opponent. For the candidates’ Tweets, we have 33\% (1069) of Hillary Clinton Tweets were attack on opponent and 68\% (2139) were not attack on opponent while Donald Trump 31\% (457) were attack on opponent and 69\% (1019) no to attack on opponent.

In other words, each one of these two functions 1, (acclaims) accounted for less than 10 percent utterances in the campaign (speech or Tweet) campaign discourse. And 2, (attack) accounted for one third of the campaign discourse. According to Benoit (1999, 2001), elections are comparative: Voters decide who to vote for based on the perceived favorability among candidates. To establish a favorability over their opponents, candidates need to either increase their own favorability by using acclaims or praise of self, and decrease their opponents’ favorability by using attacks, or reduce damage to their favorability from opponents’ attacks by employing defenses. The fact that all these three forms of campaign discourse were found in the 2012 U.S. presidential elections.
campaign at disproportion with the candidates deploying more of attack than praise of self-shows how this election cycle was different from several other elections of the past.

Although less common than acclaims and attacks, defenses did exist across the two modes of communication of campaign message in this study viz. speech and Tweet. This study adds the Tweet as a form of campaign discourse. The result of this study is different and negates most of the assumptions of functional theory of political discourse. The study did not support the assumption of the theory that political actors will use more of acclaims or praise of self than negative remarks or attacks, we had more attacks than acclaims. Also, the study did not support the assumptions that candidates’ speech will talk more about policy or issues and that the incumbent will use past deeds more than the challenger. Previous research using functional theory to U.S. political discourse, has researched television-spots, speeches, debates, and other campaign remarks, and the findings concluded that most U.S. candidates performed three functions in their campaign discourse (Benoit, 1999, 2000, 2001; Benoit, Blaney, & Pier, 1998, 2000; Benoit, Pier, & Blaney, 1997). Based on their analyses of various campaign discourse in the 1996 U.S. presidential election, Benoit, Blaney, and Pier (1998) noted:

We do not argue that these three political campaign communication functions occur with equal frequency; nevertheless, they are all options that candidate can use, and we argue that they all occur to some extent in political campaign discourse. We also argue that a complete understanding of political campaign communication must consider all three functions, (p. 16,)

The current study, which analyzes campaign discourse in the 2016 US presidential elections campaign, confirms that, acclaiming, attacking, and defending are all valuable options for candidate utterances and therefore should not be ignored in the analysis of campaign messages, speeches, Tweet, television ads and even candidates debates. In
contrast to the common negative/positive dichotomy tone of the candidate’s messages, the understanding of acclaiming, attacking, and defending types of speech or utterances provides a more complete structure for analyzing the functions of campaign discourse. In contrast to the prevalence of attacks, defense utterances across speech and Tweet message forms in the 2016 U.S. presidential elections campaign were sporadic, with 8% in televised speeches and 2% for Tweets. The candidates each used 2% of their Tweets to defend their past deed or actions while Hillary Clinton used 16% of her speech to defend her records and past deed and Donald Trump used 6% of his speech for same. This study result is similar to previous research in various forms of U.S. campaign discourse as the candidates use less of defense in their campaign discourse than acclaim or attack in their utterances (Benoit, 1999, 2000, 2001; Benoit, Blaney & Pier, 1998, 2000; Benoit, Pier & Blaney, 1997).

Thus, this study suggests that political candidates, are more reluctant to defend themselves. To explain this pattern further, although defenses is used to decrease the damages caused by opponents’ attacks, using defenses may be come with certain risks. First, when candidates defend themselves, they need to mention the opponents’ original attacks before refuting them. This may remind (or inform) electorate of opponents’ attacks. Furthermore, defenses may force candidates to play into the opponents’ agenda (which favors the opponents) and place the candidates on the defensive (Benoit, 1999, 2000; Benoit & Wells, 1996). Due to these possible disadvantages, candidates are generally reluctant to defend themselves frequently. As we see in the case of the Trump Grab them by the p**** comment and Hillary defense of her use of private servers during the campaign cycle. This unique characteristic of defense utterances or speeches,
acknowledging attacks and following opponents’ agenda, also elucidate the importance of differentiating defenses from acclaims and attacks in the analysis of campaign discourse.

Even though defenses were the least common function used in the campaign speech and Tweets, attacks were quite common in all message forms, the two forms of campaign messages had different emphases of acclaims and attacks. These differences of functions can be explained by the general advantage of using more attack over acclaims. The use of acclaiming and attacking functions in political speech will help increase candidates’ favorability over their opponents (by either making candidates themselves appear more desirable or making opponents seem less desirable), attacking may alienate voters from the source of attacks (Benoit, 1999, 2001; Merritt, 1984; Stewart, 1975). In other words, because extensive use of attacks may incur backlash, it is reasonable that campaign discourse tends to stress acclaiming over attacking but this was not the case in the 2016 U.S. presidential elections campaign discourse as we saw a whole lot of chants and name calling introduced by the candidates, “Lock Her Up”, Crooked Hillary”, “Deplorables” in their speech and Tweets.

Previous research reveals that the functions of campaign discourse may be influenced by multiple factors, and may influence the outcomes of elections and they are not limited to including incumbency, race positions, election outcomes, sequence of speech forums, and candidacy. One key factor that functional theory of political discourse takes into consideration is the role of Incumbency. Previous research shows that incumbents tend to use acclaim more than challengers, whereas challengers tend to use
more of attack than the incumbent (Benoit, 1999, 2001; Benoit, Blaney & Pier, 2000; Benoit, Wells, Pier & Blaney, 1999; Kaid & Holtz-Bacha, 1995).

This pattern of challengers using attack more was confirmed in the functions of the campaign speeches, 61 out of the 67 Donald Trump speeches were more of attack of Hillary Clinton’s record as secretary of state and the policies of Obama presidency. Although, there some references of Hillary Clinton’s touting her successes as a senator and secretary of state as the incumbent politician, since incumbents have records of their time in office before contesting in another election, and it is reasonable that incumbents want the voters to perceive their records positively (acclaiming). Just a third of Donald Trump Tweets performed attack functions same goes for Hillary Clintons Tweets. The challengers, Donald Trump new to politics need to portray the status quo negatively by attacking Hillary Clinton and the whole political elites and the media so that voters will wish a change in the occupant of the office.

Another key factor was timing. timing was an influential factor in the functions of speech/Tweet utterances. In other words, candidates’ emphasis of the three campaign functions of acclaiming, attack and defense changed when the election was getting closer with the issues of October surprise on both candidate: for Hillary Clinton, it was the re-opening of the email probe by the FBI and the release of the hacked Hilary Clinton campaign chairman Podester’s emails and Democratic National Committee by WikiLeaks. This period gained a whole lot of attack Tweets by Donald Trump. Same timing issue was displayed when the NBC program Bus comment with Billy Bush and Trump “locker room comment”, we saw Trump speech of defense and a lot of Hillary Clinton attacks on the character of her opponent.
Previous studies on U.S. presidential campaign speech reveals that winners tended to emphasize policy or issues over character, whereas losers tended to emphasize character over policy (Benoit, 1999, 2001). The campaign discourse in the 2016 U.S. presidential election campaign messages followed the pattern as we see how Donald Trump raised all the policy differences between himself and Hillary Clinton. In both campaign speech and Tweets, there was significant difference in the topics of the winner and the losers. Hillary Clinton candidates emphasized more on Donald Trump’s character and how ridiculous his policy proposals sound. She attacked him on his comments on Mexicans, people of color, women’s look and even the issue with the gold star family. Donald Trump’s winning of the election showed that U.S. voters considered policy a more important voter determinant than character (Benoit, 2001).

**Agenda Building of Candidate’s Speech and Tweets**

This section addresses the agenda building function of political campaign messages with regards to the tone of the candidate’s speech and Tweets, tone and prominence given to the candidate’s speech, Tweets by the newspapers and television news outlets.

It is true that agenda-building studies examine the degree to which journalists’ stories and public opinion can be shaped by outside forces. It is worthy to note that announcements of speech via Tweets and the speech and Tweet itself sets the builds the media agenda. Agenda building studies how political actors, elites, political candidates, other outside factors like corporations, and foreign government influences news coverage paying special attention to types of objects, and issues. This study supports Wanta & Foote, (1994); Huckins, (1999); Zhang & Cameron, (2003); and
Kiousis et al., (2006), arguments that political leaders or elected officials’, political candidates running for office, interest groups, foreign governments and political think tanks attempts to influence media coverage.

In terms of the campaign message speech and Tweet themes, it is worthy to note that about 50% of Hillary Clinton’s Tweets were devoted to campaigning. Hillary Clinton spent 4% of her tweets talking about the economy, 8% to social issues, 3% on Aboritions and Female related issues, 2.3% on Education, 3% on global warming, 2% on military/veterans and almost 3% on other issues. On the other hand, 70% of Donald Trump Tweets were devoted to campaigning. Donald Trump spent 2% of his tweets talking about the economy, 4% to social issues, 2% on foreign policy, 3% on National securities issues, 2% on healthcare/Medicaid issues, and 5% on other issues. This study supports Fico & Cote (1999) pertaining election issue identified as a contention by either candidate (or those speaking on their behalf) or reporters that involved public policy issues in the election or more general about campaigning and how they present their position on issues and position their opponents or themselves relative to the election which include but not limited to the candidate’s character, credibility, or fitness for office.

Also, for the tone of the U.S. 2016 presidential candidates Tweets of their campaign messages, Hillary Clinton’s Tweets, were positive ($n=1530, 47.7\%$), while Donald Trump’s Tweets were positive ($n=599, 40.8\%$). The variable of tone were used to assess the tonal qualities of the campaign speeches and Tweets of the 2016 U.S. presidential candidates. In positive campaign, both Trump and Clinton had over 40% positive tone in their Tweets, although Hillary had a little more edge of positive tone than
Trump. She had a more optimistic outlook for the country than Donald Trump. Regarding negative tone, Trump’s Tweets were leaning more toward negative tone than Clinton.

However, Trump’s campaign seemed overwhelmingly negative because he raised more issues, controversial tweets, brash comments, proposed outlandish policy reforms, and not a career politician, not ‘politically correct’, and finally a candidate from a challenging party seeking change of the status quo. The outcome of the election showed and added to previous studies that supports the use of negative tone may lead to successfully winning election.

The result of this study regarding the neutral tone indicates that both candidates employed in similar amounts of positive and negative since there is no statistically difference between the two of them. It further demonstrates that both candidates did not run solely positive or negative campaign, although Trump ran a notably negative campaign. This study indicates that a mixture of negative tone with positive tone may help disseminate political campaign message to the electorate and persuade them to vote or not to vote for a candidate.

There is an ongoing debate on the effects of campaign tone on voters’ participation and cynicism (Desposato, 2007). Some scholars are in the camp that believes negative campaign results in low in voters’ participation, erosion of trust, and heightened cynicism during the election cycle (e.g., Ansolabehere, Iyengar, Simon & Valentino, 1994; Ansolabehere & Iyengar, 1995; Ansolabehere, Iyengar & Simon, 1999). While others, contends that campaign tone does not influence voters' participation (e.g., Wattenberg & Brians, 1999; Goldstein & Freedman, 2002; Finkle & Geer, 1998). And some suggest that negative campaign tones increase political participation because using
attack helps to clarify issues and candidates’ stances on issues of the day, thereby intensifying keen competition (Wattenberg & Brians, 1999).

For the news media tone regarding the candidate’s speech and tweet during the 2016 US presidential election cycle, NBC had the coverage of negative tone \((n=12, 7\%)\), negative tone \((n=40, 22\%)\), and positive tone neutral tone \((n=131, 72\%)\). CNN coverage involved negative tone \((n=21, 25\%)\), positive tone \((n=54, 65\%)\) and neutral tone \((n=8, 10\%)\). FOX News coverage was in negative tone \((n=31, 46\%)\), positive tone \((n=26, 38\%)\) and neutral tone \((n=11, 16\%)\). New York Times had 41 (46%) negative tone, 43 (48%) positive tone and 5 (6%) neutral tone. While, Washington Post had 30 (32%) negative tone, 51 (56%) positive tone and 12 (13%) neutral tone.

As stated by Evers, (2016) tone is an important part of media coverage. Since the era of party press till date, the 2016 U.S. presidential elections campaign tone by the cable media matches closely to that of party press times. Although news reporting was acerbic during the Vietnam and Watergate era, it has continuously been growing progressively rancorous with the rise of partisan 24-hour cable news cycle. The 2016 U.S. presidential election supports the media saying that bad news is good news, as the media were quick to report all the negative comments and fallout of the candidate’s speech and Tweets. According to Patterson (2016) the media was spiraling out of control during the 2016 U.S. presidential elections, and sarcasm is rampant undermining the electorate’s confidence in politics and elected officials, and it erodes both the values and principles of journalism.

Paterson (2016), also noted that journalism incentives today lies in getting a story that will go viral and acquiring a reputation as a hard-hitting reporter which encourage
journalists to engage in criticism and attack; and that it’s gotten to the point where the toughest story for a…reporter to write about a politician is a positive story. He contends that hyper-criticism in news reporting and presentation has reached a point where many reporters and journalists have difficulty imagining what a constructive form of journalism would look like as we can see from CNN and Fox news coverage of the 2016 U.S. presidential elections campaign.

Agenda building also considers salience of issue attributes. This study also explored and discovered that the salience of issues attributes in campaign speech and Tweets was positively correlated with the salience of issue attributes in news media coverage of the 2016 U.S. presidential elections as (n=1030, 22%), of the candidate’s messages talked of policy or issue and (n=3758, 78%), did not talk about policy or issue. Which is statistically close to media messages (n=90, 17%), talked about policy or issue, and (n=426, 83%), did not talk of policy or issue.

The candidate’s speech and Tweets influenced the news media (both TV and Newspaper) coverage of the 2016 U.S. presidential elections cycle, (n=22, 60%), of Hillary Clinton speech were of high prominence and (n=15, 40%), were of median prominence while, (n=67, 100%), of Donald Trump speeches were of high prominence. For the candidate’s Tweets, (n=1749, 55%), of Hillary Clinton were of high prominence, (n=1047, 33%), 33% were of median importance and (n=412, 13%), were of low prominence. Whereas, (n=691, 47%), of Donald Trump Tweets were of high media prominence, (n=523, 35%), 35% Tweets were of median prominence and (n=262, 18%), Tweets were of low importance. This is evident with all the breaking news and news agenda during the election cycle being more of what Donald Trump said. Donald trump
used his Tweets and speech to set the media’s agenda and it paid off for him as he got a whole lot of media coverage which is earned media and the popular adage in public relations says all media coverage both negative or positive is good, he capitalized on it. While Hillary Clinton was avoiding the media, Donald Trump on the other hand was courting the media and manipulating the media for his personal gain.

**Twitter as Preferred Sources for Political News**

Adams and McCorkindale (2013), contend that social media tools have tremendously influenced political campaigns, and changed the way online information flows. They also supported previous research that believes that social media use by political candidates can be transparent if they disclose who is managing the social media account; set up a social media policy; answer and respond to all inquiries; be open, honest, and forthright; and finally, be real. They argued that the use of Twitter has increased the relationship building between candidates and voters. The study tried to answer three research questions bordering on how Twitter was used by the candidates, were the candidates transparent with their use of Twitter and were the candidates creating meaningful discuss with Twitter.

Also, Frame and Brachotte (2015), argue that understanding the use of Twitter by different politicians and their “Twitter styles” is to consider their activity on the platform, time spent reading and writing Tweets, whether the account is managed alone or also by the parliamentary attachés. There is evidence that most of the Tweet by Donald Trump were made by him because of the odd hours and the errors found in the Tweets.

According to Persily (2017), Donald Trump during the 2016 U.S. presidential elections showed how the Internet can enable an outsider contest and win the presidential elections.
by adapting a nontraditional media campaign despite being outspent two-to-one by an establishment opponent.

Due to the legacy media slip, Trump campaign utilized social media (Twitter and Facebook) to help fill the void and to reach out to the audience as noted by Persily (2017) the Trump campaign was in the right place at the right time, with traditional campaign mediators fading badly and no alternative institutions to fill the void. The Trump campaign’s effective and overwhelming use of Twitter is illuminating in this regard Twitter is a key tool for political communication as we saw more than over 1 billion Tweets connected to the U.S. 2016 presidential elections campaign period appeared on Twitter (Twitter blog 2016). According to CBS news, Trump had thirteen-million Twitter followers as compared to ten million for Hillary Clinton as on elections day (CBS 2017). Retweeting of Tweet from Trump’s account or from one of his campaign surrogates was rife during the period. Trump’s Tweets were retweeted three times more than Hillary Clinton’s, and his Facebook posts were re-shared five times more than Clinton (Pew, 2016).

During the 2016 U.S. presidential elections campaigns, twitter played an important role in information subsidy to other media. Persily (2017), described the role of Twitter role as a feeding ground for other media. As other media outlets (CNN, FOX and NBC) twitter handles mentioned or retweeted Donald Trump Tweets three times more than Hillary Clinton.

**General Implications**

From the discussions above, the basic functions of political campaign discourse include but not limited to acclaiming (using positive utterances about self) and attacking
(using negative utterances to describe opponent), but also defending self-refuting opponents' attacks. All these three functions when used in political campaign discourse appropriately, may help increase a candidate’s favorability and likeability over his/her opponent(s), and these three functions are performed in campaign discourse (speech and Tweet).

The functional theory of political campaign discourse of acclaiming, attacking and defending provides a much deeper analytic framework to understand and examine a political campaign messages than just the common distinction of positive and negative campaign frames. Also, the 2016 U.S. presidential candidates generally emphasize attacking more than acclaiming, and they sparingly used to defend function in their campaign speech and Tweets. these campaign functions do not occur with equal frequency. It is worthy to note that political candidates should not ignore the advantageous nature of defenses. Benoit (1999) noted, if candidate can effectively dissipate attacks, threats to their desirability can be reduced or eliminated with defense.

A good understanding of the purpose of campaign discourse will help candidates grow their preferability and likeability over his/her opponents (Benoit, 1999, 2001). Similarly, a good use of attacks will help to reduce the desirability of one’s opponents so that electorates are more likely to prefer the candidate to his/her opponents.

The emergence of Donald Trump as the winner of the U.S. 2016 presidential election may indicate that his victory was hinged on issue campaign as the results show that Trump raised up more controversial issues than Clinton. Trump used more attack and negative tones. One can conclude that the times are changing and the use of negative tone and having negative press coverage is not bad as it may generate a positive reaction in
some members of the electorate who may have been waiting for someone to voice their thoughts and concerns.

Political actors build media agenda via their speeches, Tweets and other information subsidies and Donald Trump used that to his advantage to set the daily media agenda during the elections cycle. The prominence given to the candidate’s speech and tweet will also resonate to the prominence the electorate will associate to such issues. The role and tone of news reporting about the candidates and the political system plays a long way in how the public views the media. Too much use of negative news erodes the public trust in the press, which currently is at its lowest. Finally, there is no one-size-fits-all solution for political campaign messages.

**Limitations of Study and Suggestion for Future Research**

There is a limitation in the size of speech date used for the content analysis. The research only considered the candidates announcement speech and other speeches delivered by the candidates from the period they won the primaries in their different political parties. The other speeches and Tweets delivered by the candidates during the primaries will report some different findings.

Given the peculiarity of the 2016 U.S. presidential election campaign, the discourse may vary from other elections, therefore the findings of this study may be limited and the finding needs to be retested or amended for future analyses.

Functional theory of political discourse theory has been used to research newspaper and television ads and candidates debates, but this study did not use data from those area, which hence is a major limitation to the study and the future direction of study.
The study did not consider the retweet of the candidates’ messages to find out the effect on their messages to the electorate but mainly analyzed the campaign message itself. Also, Facebook played a key role in the 2016 elections and this study did not analyze Facebook data and the study did not examine the visual elements, pictures and illustration of the 2016 U.S. presidential elections campaign messages.

The audiences effect of political campaign messages in the era of social media would make an interesting future study. A combination of framing theory and functional theory of political campaign discourse will also be a good future study.

The role of negative attack in the 2016 U.S. presidential elections and media framing of the campaigns should be studied to add to the body of knowledge. The U.S. 2016 presidential campaign ads and the patterns of party affiliations and campaign functions, topics, and ideologies will also be nice areas to study.

This study not only extends the functional theory of political discourse and agenda building functions of political campaigns messages from public relations perspective but it gives insight into what happened in the 2016 U.S. presidential elections campaign cycle. It showed that certain factors influencing elections campaign and that political campaign discourse may vary from election to election.

This study investigated the agenda building function of political actors in shaping the media agenda and the level of prominence the media gave to the different campaign messages, candidates tone and the media tone. It is worthy to note that Hillary Clinton had more Tweets than Donald Trump but the media reported more of his Tweets than hers as Trump’s tweet were controversial, and odd yet he was setting the media agenda daily. Donald Trump ran a divisive campaign alienating certain minority groups with his
campaign speeches yet he won the election while Hillary Clinton included all minority groups. Trump’s presented a gloomy look for the state of the country economy and promised to bring change to the status quo by “draining the swamp” while Hillary ran a more elitist campaign based on what the societal norm should be.
APPENDIX A– Code Sheet for Speech/Tweets

1. Number of unit

2. Date of unit

3. Source (1) H.C Speech (2) H.C Tweet (3) D T Speech (4) D.T Tweet (5) NBC (6) CNN (7) Fox (8) NYT (9) WP

4. Type of unit (1) Speech (2) TV (3) Newspaper (4) Twitter


6. What is the overall tone of the unit? (1) Negative (2) Positive (3) Neutral

7. Is this a reply to a Tweet? (a) Yes (b) No

8. Is this a reply to a speech? (a) Yes (b) No

9. Is this a reply to News story? (a) Yes (b) No Is the unit an attack on an opponent?
   (a) Yes (b) No

10. If yes, give name of an opponent

11. Is the unit an attack to a political party? (a) Yes (b) No

12. If yes, name of a political party

13. Is the unit a praise of self? (a) Yes (b) No

14. Is the unit a defense of past deed or statement? (a) Yes (b) No
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15. Is the unit about future plans? (a) Yes (b) No

16. Is the unit related to policy discussion than individual characteristics? (a) Yes (b) No

17. What was the major source of the news material/unit? (1) Tweet (2) Speech (3) News Story (4) Others

18. What level of prominence was given to the issues addressed by the candidates by the media outlet (1) High (2) Median (3) Low

19. What is the news message about?

- dealing with a specific issue or policy;
- is about who is winning or losing;
- shows feelings of empathy;
- is about the results of action; or is about candidates’ private lives.
- is about rumors and sensational gossip;
- presents an evaluative tone regarding the media
presents two opposite viewpoints
APPENDIX B-Coding Instruction

1. Record the unit number

2. Record the date

3. Mark each source (1) Hillary Clinton Speech (2) Hillary Clinton Tweet (3) Donald Trump Speech (4) Donald Trump Tweet (5) NBC (6) CNN (7) Fox (8) NYT (9) WP

4. Record the Type of unit (1) Speech (2) TV (3) Newspaper (4) Twitter

5. For each unit, identify and code for dominant theme. The dominant theme within the unit is the information that is emphasized most or made most salient within paragraph. The lead sentence may be useful in determining the dominant theme. On the coding sheet circle the dominant theme in the article. (1) Economy (2) Foreign Trade (3) Foreign Policy (4) Taxes (5) Terrorism (6) Race relation (7) Immigration (8) Wages/ Income inequality (9) Religion (10) Gun control (11) Social Security (12) Election/campaign financing:

**Election/Campaign financing** covers campaigning, campaign finance reform or soliciting for funds. (13) Social Issues (14) Abortion/Female issues, planned parenthood (15) **Education**, student loans etc. (16) **Past records**: Past deeds, Scandals, achievements, etc. (17) Human Rights (18) National Security (19) Health Care/Medicaid, (20) Environmental/Global warming. (21) Military/Defense/Veterans (22) Others

6. Identify and code the tone of the unit using the following category according to the degree of (1) **Negative**: Accusatory remarks, gloomy outlook for the country, attacking opponent or opposition party, attack on individuals, country,
religion, race etc. (2) **Positive**: Praise of on individuals, country, religion, race, praise of self, political party etc. (3) **Neutral**: more balanced approach to issues or theme of unit

7. If the unit referred to a Tweet mark (1) Yes and (2) No

8. If the unit referred to a speech mark (1) Yes or (2) No

9. If the unit referred to News story Mark (1) Yes (2) No.

10. Identify and code **Yes** if the unit an attack on an opponent and **code No** if the unit is not an attack to opponent.

11. If yes give name

12. Identify and code **Yes** if the unit is an attack on a political party and code **No** if the unit is not an attack on a political party

13. If yes give name of Political party

14. Code **Yes** if the unit is a praise of self and **No** if not a praise of self

15. Identify and code **Yes** if the unit is a defense of past deed or statement and **No** if the unit is not a defense of past deed or records

16. Identify and code **Yes** if the unit if the unit is about future plans and **No** if the unit is not about future plans

17. Identify and code **Yes** if the unit is related to policy discussion than individual characteristics and **No** if the unit is more about individual character than policy statements

18. Identify and code from the unit the major source of the news material/Unit? (1)

   **Tweet** (2) **Speech** (3) **News Story** (4) **Others**

19. Identify and code from the unit the level of prominence given to the issues addressed by the candidates by the media outlet (1) **High**: Did it make the headlines speech read by the news anchor, the front page based on the page and
number it appeared in the newspaper; Did the news anchor see it as important to open a debate on it (For CNN and FOX news), (2) Median (3) Low: Did not make the headlines speech, just the anchor comment on it, no debate, did not appear on the front page of the newspaper

20. Identify and code from the unit Code Yes or NO if the news story is dealing with a specific issue or policy; Code Yes or NO is about who is winning or losing; i Code Yes or NO s about rumors and sensational gossip; presents an evaluative tone regarding the media; Code Yes or NO presents two opposite viewpoints; Code Yes or NO shows feelings of empathy; Code Yes or NO is about the results of action; o Code Yes or NO r is about candidates’ private lives
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