

Valerii Savchuk

Lecturer at the Department of Foreign Philology,
Translation, and Teaching Methodology
Hryhorii Skovoroda University in Pereiaslav
Pereiaslav, Ukraine
<http://orcid.org/0009-0001-6407-2463>
valeriy_savchuk@ukr.net

PERSONALITY TRAITS OF U.S. PRESIDENTS AND THEIR IMPACT ON THE NATURE OF PUBLIC SPEAKING

This article examines how the personal traits of U.S. Presidents Donald Trump, Joe Biden, and Bill Clinton shape the character of their public speaking. The methodological framework combines a psycho-linguistic analysis (based on the personality typology by A. Immelman and A. Griebie), a linguo-rhetorical analysis (lexico-syntactic and stylistic examination), and a prosodic analysis (intonation, tempo, stress, and pausation). The study focuses on the presidents' crisis speeches, which offer insight into how psychological profiles are projected onto rhetorical strategies. The findings show that Donald Trump, identified as a confrontational type, relies on emotionally charged and polarizing rhetoric marked by hyperbole, negative labeling, short slogans, and a pronounced prosodic design. His speech is characterized by shifts in tempo and volume, distinctive nuclear tone patterns, logical structuring, the use of statistics, metaphors, and personal stories, all of which intensify emotional tension and contribute to constructing the image of an "external enemy." Joe Biden, classified as an empathetic type, is inclined to be rhetoric centered and focuses on unity, moral choice, and reassurance. His speeches frequently feature anaphora, antithesis, rhetorical questions, and positively connoted lexical choices. Smooth modulations in intonation contribute to an impression of sincerity and emotional closeness. Bill Clinton, described as a charismatic type, demonstrates a balanced rhetorical style grounded in syntactic parallelism, numerical arguments, personal stories, and optimistic projections. His prosodic delivery is marked by moderate rhythm, steady pacing, and logically accentuated conclusions. The study confirms that presidential rhetorical strategies are shaped not only by political context but also by deep-seated personality traits that define each leader's unique speech style, rhetorical manner, and emotional resonance with the audience. Moreover, the findings suggest that presidential public discourse serves not merely as a tool of political communication, but as a psycholinguistic reflection of the leader's individuality, ultimately influencing their public recognition and communicative effectiveness.

Key words: crisis speeches; presidential discourse; psychological type; emotional and expressive devices; rhetoric; prosodic means.

1 INTRODUCTION

Problem statement. Modern linguistics increasingly pays attention to the study of political speech as a unique phenomenon that reflects both the speaker's personality traits and their strategic priorities. In the context of the presidency, this issue becomes particularly significant, as the rhetoric of a national leader can directly influence the domestic political climate and the country's international image. As A. Bittner (2021) states, contemporary politics is undergoing a process of personalization, whereby public attention is focused more on the figure of the leader than on the party or ideological platform, a trend especially prominent in countries with well-established democratic traditions and high levels of mediatization. Under such conditions, differences in presidents' personality traits become more visible and have a greater impact on the shaping of public discourse. The importance of personal characteristics in public communication is confirmed by a range of interdisciplinary studies. For instance, J. Aichholzer (2020) emphasizes that voters tend to favor politicians whose traits resemble their own but are amplified by leadership qualities. In this context, S. Mayer (2020) draws attention to the relationship between narcissistic tendencies and electoral

appeal, particularly when combined with voters' authoritarian inclinations. This dual dynamic fosters the construction of an "ideal leader" archetype, which in turn influences both the rhetorical style and delivery of political messages. If a candidate or incumbent falls short of these expectations, even substantial professionalism and experience may fail to generate trust or a sense of effectiveness.

Analysis of recent research and publications. Of particular interest are studies that examine political leaders through the lens of personality trait models. Researchers such as S. Mayer (2020) and A. Nai (2021) have analyzed key dimensions including extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, emotional stability, and openness to experience, identifying correlations between these traits and the success of political communication. However, as G. Schumacher (2023) points out, audiences are not homogeneous and in groups with strong populist sentiments, there is often a greater demand for "strong leadership" and emotionally charged, accessible language. In such cases, leaders with pronounced confidence or even narcissistic tendencies may more easily attract supporters of populist ideas.

Another important dimension is emphasized by scholars such as K. Cassell (2020), who underscores the importance of speed and immediacy in globalized digital communication. Social media enable presidents to broadcast messages to massive audiences in real time. Building on this, G. Schumacher and M. Hameleers (2023) highlight the heightened potential for instant criticism, growing polarization, and the spread of oversimplified solutions to complex problems. This underscores the need to understand that a leader's personality is revealed not only in the content of their speeches, but also in how they respond to opposition, manage crises, and build long-term strategies.

At the level of linguistic analysis, there is growing interest in measuring prosodic features such as intonation patterns, rhythm, voice timbre, and pausation. These elements can serve to reinforce semantic emphasis and, at the same time, produce emotional or even manipulative effects. For example, F. Rahayu's (2018) study of Barack Obama's and John McCain's speaking styles demonstrated how mood and tempo shape audience perception and persuasiveness. A similar idea is supported by R. Eissler (2025), who analyzes differences in the rhetorical and prosodic techniques used by Donald Trump and Joe Biden.

The psychological dimension of political communication is further emphasized by A. Nai (2021) and S. Pandey (2024), who argue that a leader's appeal to different voter groups stems from a complex interaction between their personality traits and the audience's value orientations. For voters who prioritize cooperation and compromise, calm and rational communication is more effective; for those drawn to charisma and decisive action, leaders exhibiting high extraversion or assertive, "authoritarian" confidence are more likely to gain support. In this regard, researchers J. Aichholzer (2020) and A. Nai (2021) also stress the importance of external circumstances such as political crises, economic shocks, or international challenges which can alter voters' perceptions of what constitutes desirable presidential traits. This clearly underscores the need to incorporate psychological, linguistic, and prosodic variables into the analysis of political leadership factors that traditional approaches often overlook.

Thus, the relevance of this study lies in the growing influence of leaders' personality traits on political agenda-setting, particularly in an era of heightened societal polarization and digital media expansion. Identifying the connection between a politician's individual characteristics and their communication style provides deeper insight into the mechanisms of rhetorical influence and the principles underlying effective presidential discourse.

The purpose of the article: examining the interaction between a political leader's personality traits and their public communication, with particular attention to linguistic and prosodic aspects. The study also seeks to assess how these factors affect trust-building and public support across different voter segments. To achieve this aim, the following objectives were set: to identify the key personality traits of the analyzed presidents; to trace their connection to specific linguo-rhetorical strategies; to explore the prosodic features of presidential speech; and to evaluate how these elements work in combination to enhance the leader's impact on the audience.

2 METHODS

The methodology for analyzing the personality traits of U.S. presidents and their impact on the nature of public speaking, particularly within the domains of linguo-rhetorical and prosodic analysis, is based on a comprehensive approach that combines both quantitative and qualitative methods. The first stage of the research involved systematizing and analyzing data drawn from three primary sources that offer deep insight into the political personalities and leadership styles of American presidents.

The first source is the work by A. Griebie and A. Immelman (2020), which provides a detailed psychological profile of Joe Biden as the Democratic Party's nominee for the 2020 U.S. presidential election. This study explores Biden's psychological characteristics and leadership style, illustrating how his personality traits influence political behavior and voter interaction.

The second key source is A. Immelman's (1995) article focusing on the political personality of Bill Clinton. It provides an in-depth psychological portrait and outlines Clinton's leadership style, with particular emphasis on his charisma, and capacity for compromise. This source offered essential insights into the core traits that shape President Clinton's political behavior.

The third source is another joint work by A. Immelman and A. Griebie (2020), which analyzes Donald Trump's personality profile and leadership style during his presidency. It identifies key characteristics such as high extraversion, low agreeableness, and a confrontational disposition all of which had a direct bearing on his leadership approach and rhetorical strategies.

These three studies served as the foundation for a comparative analysis and classification of the psychological types of the three U.S. presidents. The data from these sources were used to identify and justify each president's core personality traits, and to examine their leadership styles and communication behaviors. The systematization of this data enabled a cross-comparison of individual traits, revealing how they interact and shape leadership effectiveness.

At the next stage, a corpus of public speeches by Donald Trump, Joe Biden, and Bill Clinton was compiled based on specific selection criteria. The speeches had to correspond to moments of major political events or crises, where the presidents' personality traits played a prominent role in shaping public opinion. The subsequent analysis consisted of two main components: linguistic and prosodic.

The linguistic analysis focused on lexical, syntactic, and phonetic features, especially rhetorical devices such as metaphors, epithets, parallelism, anaphora, rhetorical questions, and other figures of speech. This component was informed by the theoretical works of Y. Boussaid (2022), as well as the broader rhetorical frameworks of R. Bartlett, N. Behnagar et al. (2023), and the principles of critical discourse analysis developed by F. Zappettini and M. Rezazadah (2023). The study also drew on research into communicative tactics by V. Savchuk (2024), which made it possible to classify the identified strategies across lexical, syntactic, and stylistic levels.

The prosodic analysis involved the study of intonation, speech tempo, pausation, accentuation, and rhythm, the elements that play a key role in producing emotional impact on the audience. Identifying prosodic patterns helped reveal how speech features such as stress placement or strategic pausation enhance emotional resonance and contribute to constructing a positive presidential image. This approach was grounded in general prosodic theory (Goupil et al., 2021), as well as more focused research on the relationship between prosodic subsystems and emotionality (Larrouy-Maestri, Poeppel, & Pell, 2024), and their function across different discourse types (Anikin & Lima, 2017). These frameworks explain how variations in tempo and intonation can amplify rhetorical effect.

Abstraction and generalization were used to formulate theoretical conclusions regarding the influence of personality traits on presidential speech structure, allowing for the identification of key linguistic strategies and techniques. Analysis and synthesis served as core tools for segmenting the speeches into structural components and studying how these elements interact to produce effective communication. Comparative methods were employed to identify differences in the use of rhetorical and prosodic techniques across the presidents' speeches, enabling an evaluation of which strategies proved most effective within specific political contexts.

After identifying and classifying the linguo-rhetorical and prosodic elements, each was manually entered into a database and their frequency calculated. To ensure valid comparisons between speeches of different lengths, a standard frequency coefficient was used:

$$F = \frac{n}{N} \times 1000$$

where F is the relative frequency of the element, n is the number of occurrences, and N is the total word count of the speech. Normalization per 1,000 words allowed for accurate cross-textual comparisons.

3 RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Within the U.S. political discourse system, presidential rhetoric plays a pivotal role in constructing and projecting the leader's image into the public consciousness. The generalization of the personality traits of Donald Trump, Joe Biden, and Bill Clinton revealed three distinct psychological profiles: confrontational, empathetic, and charismatic which were clearly reflected in their respective rhetorical strategies.

Joe Biden frequently appeared as a figure of deep empathy, consistently demonstrating high levels of *Agreeableness*. He exhibited a low propensity for confrontation, indicated by low *Hostility* scores and moderate *Extraversion*, levels that were nonetheless sufficient to engage and hold the attention of audiences. His personal tragedies, including the loss of his wife and son, have shaped both his emotional depth and his capacity for compassion.

Bill Clinton, by contrast, exhibits a high degree of *Extraversion* coupled with a strong cognitive orientation, reflected in a pronounced level of *Openness*. This profile helps explain his well-documented propensity for compromise and reasoned argument. B. Clinton appears as a leader with a marked ability to build and sustain relationships.

Donald Trump, by contrast, markedly differed from both of his predecessors. His rhetorical style reflected a business-oriented mindset and a media-driven, performative communication model. His speeches typically relied on a binary division between "us" and "them," and consistently assigned blame to opponents or foreign actors for America's challenges. This approach mobilized his supporters, provoked opponents, and ensured a steady stream of media coverage. Psychologically, it reflected high *Extraversion* combined with pronounced conflict-proneness and impulsivity, traits that, together, manifested as elevated narcissism, a tendency toward self-promotion, attention-seeking, and the denigration of adversaries.

Based on the analysis, each president was characterized by a specific communicative persona: Joe Biden was identified as an empathetic "unifier," who foregrounded themes of morality, love, and hope in contrast to fear and darkness. Bill Clinton emerged as a pragmatic reformer with a human face, who skillfully alternated factual content with personal narratives to foster trust and a sense of collective purpose. Donald Trump was identified as a confrontational showman, who mobilized audiences through sharp statements, hyperbole, and repeated emphasis on threats posed by numerous "enemies."

The results of the syntactic-stylistic analysis confirmed that the presidents' personality traits were systematically projected onto their rhetorical techniques. As summarized in Table 1 which presented typical examples of syntactic and stylistic devices, the president with a narcissistic and confrontational profile employed harsh language and short slogans. By contrast, the empathetic leader relied on inclusive narratives and "we"-centered phrasing, while the diplomatic and rational type drew upon statistical arguments and appeals to logic.

Table 1. Summary of Typical Rhetorical Devices in the Speeches of U.S. Presidents
(Based on Syntactic and Stylistic Analysis)

President	Psychological Type	Dominant Rhetorical Devices	Typical Examples	Communicative Function
Donald Trump	Confrontational, Narcissistic	Short slogans, hyperbole, negative labeling, repetition, binary oppositions	<i>"We will build the wall."</i> <i>"They are destroying America."</i> <i>"America First."</i>	Provocation, polarization, mobilization through emotional intensity
Joe Biden	Empathetic, Unifying	Anaphora, inclusive "we"-language, rhetorical questions, moral contrast, personal stories	<i>"We choose hope over fear."</i> <i>"We choose unity over division."</i> <i>"How would you feel?"</i> <i>"We are in this together."</i>	Emotional closeness, trust-building, ethical appeal
Bill Clinton	Charismatic, Rational	Syntactic parallelism, numerical arguments, metaphor, jokes, cause-effect structure	<i>"I want to build a bridge to the 21st century."</i> <i>"We cut the deficit by 60%."</i> <i>"When I was governor..."</i>	Persuasion through logic, optimism, narrative identification

Source: Author's own analysis based on a selection of State of the Union Address by Donald Trump, Joe Biden, and Bill Clinton.

The analysis of speech transcripts revealed that language means choices, at the levels of lexis, syntax, and prosody, were directly shaped by the presidents' personality traits, most clearly manifested in the degree and nature of emotionally charged language. For instance, Donald Trump's speeches frequently included lexical units conveying strong negative evaluation, such as *"terrible,"* *"disaster,"* *"mess,"* *"losers,"* and *"the worst,"* often embedded in short, semantically loaded phrases. In contrast, Bill Clinton's speeches favored lexical units with positive connotations *"opportunity,"* *"future,"* *"together,"* *"bridge,"* and *"hope"* which tended to form rhythmically structured utterances typically ending in calls to action, e.g., *"Come with me, let's build that bridge to the 21st century"* (Clinton, 1996). Meanwhile, Joe Biden's rhetorical vocabulary, with such typical lexical elements as *"unity,"* *"empathy,"* *"healing,"* *"light,"* *"decency,"* positioned him as distinct not only from a Republican rival but also from a fellow Democratic predecessor, even in comparable communicative situations.

These differences also appeared at the level of syntax. While one president favored short, segmented clauses, another relied on longer, more elaborated sentence structures. Biden's rhetorical style, for instance, tends toward shorter sentences and a frequent use of rhetorical questions; he generally avoids extended explanations and instead "speaks to the heart." This preference is clear in lines such as: *"Light is more powerful than dark. Hope is more powerful than fear. Love is more powerful than hate"* (Biden, 2020). By contrast, B. Clinton's speeches, shaped by his experience as a charismatic governor and later president, often foreground achievements in domestic policy, job creation, economic growth and focus on the lives of ordinary citizens. Rather than using sharply confrontational framing, he favors inclusive formulations such as *"we can do better, we will do better"* (Clinton, 1996), which acknowledge existing shortcomings while still projecting optimism.

Importantly, the influence of personality traits extended beyond word choice or figures of speech. It also manifested in how the presidents structured their speeches, placed logical and emotional emphases, and selected closing strategies such as rhetorical “looping” or religious invocations like “*May God bless America*.” Donald Trump frequently concluded his speeches with stark promises or slogans, e.g., “*Make America Great Again*,” “*Keep America Great*” (Trump, 2016). Bill Clinton often ended with audience-focused farewells such as “*God bless you, and God bless the United States of America*” (Clinton, 1996), typically following a recap and a final call for continued reform. Joe Biden routinely returned to the theme of unity, e.g., “*May God bless America and protect our troops*,” often preceded by reaffirmations of collective resilience such as “*We will get through this together*” (Biden, 2020), emphasizing his self-positioning as a member of the community he addressed.

Donald Trump’s campaign rhetoric in the nomination speech reveals a highly distinctive blend of personality, language, and political strategy that makes his public communication instantly recognisable. He systematically intertwines self-presentation as a strong, decisive leader with emotionally charged depictions of crisis and decline, presenting himself as uniquely capable of reversing that decline. This feature is often reflected prosodically. For example, in *Nobody knows / the system \better than me, / which is \why / I alone can fix it. //* (Trump, 2016), the highest prosodic prominence is concentrated precisely on the segment of the utterance that foregrounds the speaker. The phrasal stress on the pronoun, which is preceded by *which is \why* and isolated in a separate intonation group with an emphatic mid-level rising-falling nuclear tone, further enhances the prominence of the final intonation group. This communicative style not only mobilises supporters who see in him a defender of “ordinary Americans”, but also provokes intense criticism from those who perceive his discourse as divisive and inflammatory, thereby contributing to his profoundly polarising public image.

Personality-based analysis of D. Trump showed his high extraversion combined with low agreeableness, which explains the aggressively assertive tone of this speech. It is characteristic of Trump to present himself as the only person capable of challenging a corrupt elite and a “rigged system.” In the utterance *I have \joined \the political arena / so that the /powerful \can \no longer \beat up / on \people / that \can not \defend them\selvess. //* (Trump, 2016) the high degree of expressivity is achieved through a combination of contrasting prosodic parameters, often by reaching their extremes. The first intonation group *I have \joined*, which provides the background for the subsequent emotional build-up, is realised with a mid falling-rising nuclear tone, allowing the speaker’s intention to be highlighted more clearly. Further segmentation of the remaining material into shorter intonation groups makes it possible to reach a high level of persuasiveness in constructing the opposition “powerful – people.” This effect is additionally reinforced by the combination of a high rising nuclear tone on *powerful* and a high falling nuclear tone on *\people*, together with an increase in tempo and loudness and a marked widening of the pitch range within the intonation group. Also noteworthy is the functional load of the modal verb, isolated in a separate intonation group with a falling-rising nuclear tone, which intensifies the semantics of possibility/impossibility as the semantic core of the entire utterance. Taken together, these rhetorical choices construct the image of a leader who is dominant, strongly self-confident, and largely unwilling to compromise. At the same time, low agreeableness is manifested in his readiness to attack opponents in sharply evaluative, almost morally condemnatory terms: Hillary Clinton is depicted as “*their puppet*,” controlled by “*big business, elite media and major donors*,” and as the embodiment of “*death, destruction and terrorism and weakness*.” In this way, the speech text translates a personality structure geared more toward confrontation than conciliation into stark, uncompromising verbal evaluations.

A further example is D. Trump’s use of antithesis in the following: “*She is their puppet, and they pull the strings... My message is that things have to change, and they have to change right now*” (Trump, 2016). Here he portrays his opponent as weak and dependent while presenting himself as strong and independent, a contrast intended to elicit contempt for her and admiration for his own resolve. Rhetorical questions such as “*Who would have believed that when we started this*

journey...?" (Trump, 2016) draw the audience in emotionally by inviting agreement and a retrospective endorsement of the course his campaign has taken.

This oppositional framing was often accompanied by explicit accusations, realized through lexical units with invective semantics, as in: *We will repeal / and replace / disastrous Obamacare.* || *You will be able to choose your own doctor again.* || (Trump, 2016). Here, negative evaluation was intensified through the word “*disastrous*,” which framed the opponent’s policy as the root of systemic failure. The rhetorical effect was further enhanced by prosodic variation: maximum volume, tightly segmented intonation units, and sharp directional shifts in pitch (*repeal / and replace*). The adjective “*disastrous*” and the politicized eponym “*Obamacare*” were marked by a rising-falling nuclear tone, while the final segment “choose your own doctor again” featured a faster tempo and tonal narrowing, with *choose* and *doctor* highlighted by distinct pitch contours creating tonal contrast and semantic salience.

A central resource of Donald Trump’s persuasive arsenal is his frequent use of repetition and syntactic parallelism. The closing sequence “*We will make America strong again. We will make America proud again. We will make America safe again. And we will make America great again!*” (Trump, 2016), exemplifies how anaphoric repetition of “*We will make America...*” turns a set of policy aspirations into a quasi-liturgical chant. The same mechanism underlies the promise “*I’m with you, and I will fight for you, and I will win for you*,” where a triadic structure with repeated “*for you*” reinforces the impression of personal commitment to the audience. Elsewhere, short parallel clauses such as “*We’re going to win. We’re going to win fast*” compress a complex promise into a memorable, slogan-like line. Such series of statements also frequently began with the fixed phrase “be going to,” as in: *To make life safe / for all of our citizens, / we must also address the growing threats we face / from outside the country.* || (Trump, 2016). This repeated structure created a sense of momentum, decisiveness, and clear sequencing of actions. Each subsequent statement reinforced the previous one, cementing in the audience a perception of confidence and leadership capability. Through this technique the speech establishes a simple rhythmic template that is easy to recall, projects determination, and implicitly frames the promised outcomes as both inevitable and imminent.

In contrast, the rhetorical identity of Joe Biden reflected a markedly different style shaped by his empathetic personality type. His speeches relied on softer, unifying stylistic choices and moral encouragement. For instance, the use of anaphora in “*Give people light and they will find a way. Give people light.*” (Biden, 2020) was not aimed at confrontation or attack, but at offering hope. This rhetorical orientation clearly reflected a desire to emphasize care, empathy, and concern for the public’s well-being. Rather than framing his language in terms of struggle, he focused on inspiration and reassurance, fostering a sense that progress and future stability depended on collective decency and moral resilience.

Accordingly, the central communicative focus in J. Biden’s rhetoric was not “combat” but encouragement. His speeches conveyed a supportive tone that aimed to unite rather than divide, appealing to the shared values and emotional needs of his audience.

A notable example in this context was Biden’s use of epistrophe in the phrase: “*This is our moment. This is our mission.*” (Biden, 2020). The repeated closing structure (“*our moment*,” “*our mission*”) cultivated a sense of collective responsibility and shared purpose. Through this rhetorical device, J. Biden reinforced his central message of unity in pursuit of a greater goal, a strategy fully consistent with the empathetic speaker profile. His consistent preference for “*we*” over “*I*” served to foreground cooperative effort, forming a sharp contrast to D. Trump’s assertive, individualized phrasing such as “*I will fix it*,” or “*I will do it*.”

In this way, Biden positioned himself not as a solitary decision-maker, but as a guide acting alongside the people. Another instance of this unifying rhetoric could be seen in his use of syntactic parallelism: «*I see a different America. || One that is generous and strong. || Selfless and humble. || It’s an America we can rebuild together.* ||» (Biden, 2020). The listing of such adjectives as “*generous*,” “*strong*,” “*selfless*,” “*humble*” evoked a set of shared moral values around which the president sought to rally the nation. The overall effect of this structure was one of smooth progression

and internal coherence, highlighting J. Biden's rhetorical attention to virtue and common good, which lay at the core of his empathetic communication style.

The prosodic analysis of President Biden's speech further confirmed this personality profile. In the quoted passage, the initial intonation group "*I see a different America*" was marked by a narrow pitch range, punctuated by a sudden pitch rise on the adjective "*different*," which pragmatically highlighted the contrastive framing of his vision. This narrowing of pitch served as a prelude to the expanded tonal range in the final portion of the utterance.

The adjectives "*Selfless and humble*" were emphasized with a combination of high and mid-rising nuclear tones, which lent them both moral weight and emotional resonance, projecting an image of national greatness rooted in humility. The phrase "*we can rebuild together*" reached its rhetorical climax with a marked pitch rise on "*rebuild*" and a broadened nuclear pitch contour, followed by a mid-rising terminal tone on "*together*." This prosodic shaping enhanced the persuasive potential of the message by emphasizing cooperation as the foundation of his political appeal. The emotional force of the conclusion, combined with its tonal architecture, conveyed not only aspirational content but also an implicit call for the electorate's support.

The analysis of empirical material revealed that the rhetorical function of "escalating circumstances" was also present in President Biden's speeches. However, unlike Donald Trump's use of this function typically directed at identifying and confronting enemies, J. Biden employed escalation primarily to emphasize the seriousness of challenges and to argue for the need for empathy and unity. This was evident in the graded sequence: "*The worst pandemic in over 100 years. The worst economic crisis since the Great Depression. The most compelling call for racial justice since the 60s.*" (Biden, 2020). Here, Biden successively highlighted the pandemic, economic downturn, and racial injustice to underscore the magnitude of national crises. Still, the communicative goal was not to provoke or blame, but to call people together in search of shared solutions. Empathy functioned as the driving force, manifested in the underlying message: "*Yes, the situation is difficult, but we will get through it together.*"

This empathic orientation was equally reflected in antithetical constructions such as: "*We will choose hope over fear, facts over fiction, fairness over privilege.*" (Biden, 2020). Rather than directly attacking his opponents, as Trump often did, Biden set up broad moral contrasts between good and evil, light and darkness. These rhetorical dichotomies appealed to core values, consolidating society around ethical ideals instead of targeting adversaries. This encapsulated a key feature of the empathic style: encouraging listeners from all backgrounds to believe that collective action in the name of moral good was both possible and necessary.

Rhetorical questions, such as "*So, the question for us is simple: Are we ready?*" (Biden, 2020), served a similar purpose. Rather than forcing listeners into a rhetorical trap, Joe Biden used such questions to invite reflection and offer an opening for positive engagement. The underlying implication was that everyone could and should answer in the affirmative and join the effort to build a better future. This empathic emphasis was often reinforced by personal narratives, such as: "*I met with six-year-old Gianna Floyd... she looked into my eyes and said, 'Daddy changed the world.'*" (Biden, 2020). Such emotionally resonant episodes were designed to evoke compassion and build trust in a leader who took personal stories seriously thus reinforcing an image of moral attentiveness and human concern.

Where Donald Trump relied on confrontation, Joe Biden projected unity and empathy. Meanwhile, the analysis of President Bill Clinton's rhetoric revealed a third distinct type: the "charismatic" profile. Clinton's style was grounded in broad coalition-building, a desire for compromise, and rhetorical craftsmanship aimed at winning over a diverse electorate through polished and structurally elegant speeches. This was exemplified in the use of anaphora: "*Four years ago, you and I set forth on a journey... Four years ago, with high unemployment...*" (Clinton, 1996). The repeated "*Four years ago*" guided listeners back to a difficult past, enabling Clinton to contrast it with the achievements of his presidency. The functional aim was to frame progress over time, while the intentional aim was to convince the public that his leadership had brought real results. Unlike

Trump's adversarial tone, Clinton acknowledged past challenges while emphasizing how they had been overcome collectively.

The use of epistrophe, as in: “*We are on the right track to the 21st century. We are on the right track.*” (Clinton, 1996), exemplified his ability to convey a sense of forward movement and optimism. This was a clear instance of strategic, measured, charismatic rhetoric. By reiterating metaphorical constructs at the close of his statements, B. Clinton reinforced the perception of progress and continuity. In doing so, he positioned himself as a mentor one who reminded citizens of their success and encouraged them to stay the course.

Perhaps the most characteristic marker of Clinton's charismatic style was his use of syntactic parallelism. In statements like “*Let us build a bridge to help our parents raise their children, to help young people... to make our streets safer...*” the repeated structure (“to help..., to help..., to make...”) created a rhythmic, melodic buildup of positive changes. Each phrase introduced a new dimension, enhancing the speech's persuasive force while maintaining a tone of relaxed optimism. This rhetorical pattern effectively shaped the image of President Clinton as a leader who could speak to a wide audience like parents, youth, and society as a whole.

A clear example of rhetorical gradation appeared in: “*Every 8-year-old will be able to read, every 12-year-old will be able to log in... every 18-year-old will be able to go to college.*” (Clinton, 1996). At each stage, greater opportunities were offered to citizens, constructing a verbal “ladder of success.” Functionally, this strategy instilled confidence that the nation was advancing toward a more equitable and promising future. The audience heard the president outline achievable gains for each age group, producing a cumulative narrative of social progress. The result was a circle of positivity in which the “charismatic” leader became a source of inspiration, neither battling enemies like Donald Trump nor dwelling on national pain like Joe Biden, but instead offering a compelling roadmap for national uplift.

This passage was also notable from the perspective of intonational structure, serving as a typical example of President Clinton's prosodic patterning in rhetorical delivery. Consider the following excerpt: *If we do these things, | every eight-year-old ˘ will be able to read, | every twelve-year-old ˘ will be able to log in | on the Internet, | every eighteen-year-old ˘ will be able to go to college, | and all Americans ˘ will have the knowledge they >need | to cross that bridge | to the twenty-first century. ||* (Clinton, 1996).

In this fragment, the dynamic depiction of future opportunities for different generations was articulated through the stylistic device of gradation, occurring in the core intonation groups (*every eight-year-old ... every twelve-year-old ... every eighteen-year-old...*). The rising pitch movement in each clause, with minimal direction shift on the nuclear syllable (*/college*), combined with moderate prosodic parameters, steady rhythmic organization, and an overall accelerated speech tempo, collectively created a prosodic parallelism. This contributed to a neutral, consistent background against which the final segment “*and all Americans ˘ will have the knowledge they >need*” stood out in contrast.

The communicative prominence of the concluding intonation group “*and all Americans*” was heightened through several prosodic mechanisms: a moderate pitch onset, an expanded pitch range in the scale and final contour (relative to the preceding syntagms), a noticeable slowing of tempo, and an emphasized realization of the adjective *all* achieved via a widened, upward pitch interval on the pre-head to nucleus segment. Additionally, the terminal tone on *>need* was delivered as a mid-rising, sustained contour with a broad tonal span, underlining the lexical and pragmatic importance of this final promise.

The distinctiveness of this segment was further marked by the metaphor *cross that bridge* in the subsequent intonation group. Its prosodic realization featuring a slowed speech tempo and narrow rising intervals in the pre-head–nucleus and pre-terminal–nucleus segments contributed to the conceptualization, in the listener's mind, of a logical action chain: OUR (President + People) JOINT EFFORTS → NATIONAL PROSPERITY. This trajectory was anchored in the signified descriptor

KNOWLEDGE, actualized most clearly in the phrase *'all Americans* $\ddot{\wedge}$ *will have the knowledge they need*.

This prosodic configuration subtly echoed the semantic content of the first intonation group (*If we do these things*) of the conditional subordinate clause, where the logical structure of contingency signaled by the conjunction “if” was reinforced by emphatic marking of several prosodic features. In particular, the pronoun *'we* was delivered with a mid-level sustained tone, which made it perceptually salient. The absence of full stress on the words *'do* and *'these* generated a sense of tempo acceleration, further supported by moderate volume, simple rhythmic regularity, and a broadened pitch span in the scale. Together, these features prompted the audience to internalize the speaker’s vision of positive, attainable outcomes.

The findings also demonstrated that the unifying element in the rhetorical manner of the three presidents was, first and foremost, the American rhetorical tradition itself, one in which devices such as anaphora, epistrophe, syntactic parallelism, gradation, antithesis, and rhetorical questions are widely used in public speaking. It was therefore unsurprising that the analysis of the rhetorical practices of D. Trump, J. Biden, and B. Clinton revealed a shared pattern in the use of repetition, both at the beginning of sentences (anaphora) and at the end (epistrophe). All three sought to generate an emotional response from their audiences though the mode of doing so was mediated by their respective personality types.

What they shared was a desire to establish an emotional connection with the audience: Donald Trump, predominantly confrontational, fostered group cohesion through the identification of a common enemy; Joe Biden, the empathetic type, sought to unify the public around shared moral values; and Bill Clinton, the charismatic leader, appealed to collective hope for a better future and the promise of pragmatic compromise.

At the same time, the differences became particularly evident in the content, tone, and functional purpose of these rhetorical devices. D. Trump tended to divide the world into “us” and “them,” using aggressive antitheses and escalating sequences of negativity. His repetitions such as “*We will make America...*” served to emphasize resolution and assertiveness. J. Biden employed similar techniques: anaphora, antithesis, and gradation but used them to elevate the moral dimension of the discourse and promote empathy, as in “*hope over fear*,” “*facts over fiction*,” and “*fairness over privilege*.”

B. Clinton, in turn, directed his repeated constructions such as “*Four years ago... Four years ago... Today...*” toward highlighting his achievements and outlining future plans. These contributed to a charismatic narrative of inclusion and competence. All three addressed urgent social and political challenges, yet their framing was fundamentally different: D. Trump framed problems as battles to be won; J. Biden presented them as moral imperatives requiring shared compassion; B. Clinton offered optimistic roadmaps for broad-based national progress.

These conclusions were further supported by examples involving rhetorical questions, which clearly illustrated how psychological profiles shaped the focus of appeal whether through conflict, empathy, or opportunity. Donald Trump used questions such as “*Who would have believed that when we started this journey...?*” (Trump, 2016) to emphasize the improbability of his own success or the failings of his opponents. J. Biden’s question “*So, the question for us is simple: Are we ready?*” (Biden, 2020) invited reflection and encouraged unity. B. Clinton, in examples like “*Do we really want to make that same mistake all over again? Do we really want to stop economic growth again?*” (Clinton, 1996), focused on comparing past and present policy choices to reinforce the rationale behind his reform agenda.

The comparison between the findings of the present study and those of other scholars made it possible to contextualize the rhetorical strategies of U.S. presidents within a broader empirical framework. For instance, the work of R. A. Russell and R. Eissler (2022) explored how U.S. presidents adjusted their rhetorical priorities depending on the target audience. The authors emphasized that both the content and style of presidential speeches varied, depending on audience expectations, a conclusion that closely aligns with this study’s findings on rhetorical adaptability and functional variation. This pattern is particularly evident in the case of Donald Trump, whose

confrontational rhetoric became more intense when he addressed his core electorate, whereas Joe Biden, by contrast, tended to foreground unity when speaking to a broader national audience.

M. E. Stuckey (2021) provided a detailed analysis of D. Trump's administration rhetoric, underlining its deliberate deviation from traditional presidential discourse. The research confirmed the strategic use of conflict-laden messages designed to destabilize opponents. This conclusion fully supported the findings of the present study, which identified expressive prosodic markers and aggressive lexical constructions as core features of D. Trump's rhetorical style.

Similar conclusions were drawn by I. Clarke and J. Grieve (2019), who conducted a linguistic analysis of Trump's Twitter account. They identified stylistic inconsistency, abrupt tonal shifts, and the frequent use of expressive language as rhetorical tools. These findings not only corroborated the conclusions of this study but also deepened the understanding of how fragmented intonational patterns in Trump's public speeches functioned to intensify semantic pressure and create emotional volatility.

Conversely, the study by J. Aichholzer and J. Willmann (2020) investigated voter expectations regarding desirable personality traits in political leaders. They found that citizens generally preferred politicians who were simultaneously relatable and exhibited strong leadership qualities. This aligned with the image of Bill Clinton as a "charismatic reformer," whose rhetoric combined personal anecdotes with demonstrations of competence through references to data and achievements.

Of particular relevance was the study by M. C. M. Casiraghi and M. Bordignon (2023), which analyzed rhetorical contestations of populism in European parliaments. Although focused on a different geopolitical context, the authors noted that populist rhetoric especially when employed by charismatic leaders relied heavily on simple structures, repeated messages, and conflict-oriented language. This observation confirmed this study's findings regarding the effectiveness of short, rhythmically emphasized syntactic constructions in the speeches of Donald Trump and, to some extent, Bill Clinton.

Lastly, in a comparative study by Nai A., Martínez i Coma F., Maier J. (2019), the authors examined the personality profiles and campaign styles of Trump and other global leaders. They concluded that high extraversion, narcissism, and low agreeableness correlated with aggressive political communication. These personality traits also identified in Trump's psychological profile within this study helped explain the structural aggressiveness of his public rhetoric and the persuasive deployment of prosodic techniques as a tool for emotional impact.

Taken together, these sources not only validated the core conclusions of the present study but also broadened its theoretical foundation. By integrating personality typologies with stylistic and prosodic analysis, the study offered a comprehensive perspective on how U.S. presidents crafted crisis communication strategies shaped by their psychological profiles.

4 CONCLUSIONS AND FURTHER RESEARCH

The comprehensive analysis of the public speaking strategies of Donald Trump, Joe Biden, and Bill Clinton convincingly demonstrated that the U.S. presidents' personality traits were a decisive factor shaping both the content trajectory of their rhetoric and the prosodic realization of their speeches. Despite operating within the shared framework of the American rhetorical tradition, each of these leaders constructed a unique linguistic strategy reflective of their individual psychological profile.

The study, grounded in a combination of quantitative and qualitative methods, confirmed that Donald Trump's confrontational disposition conditioned the polarizing nature of his public discourse. His rhetoric was marked by brief, emotionally charged utterances, hyperbole, slogans, repetitive formulas, and negatively connotated labels. This communicative behavior aimed to mobilize the audience by foregrounding threats and conflict, while the prosodic features sharp intonational shifts, wide pitch variation, and expressive pausation amplified this effect.

By contrast, Joe Biden's empathetic profile supported the development of a softer, morally oriented rhetorical style, in which anaphora, rhetorical questions, positively marked epithets,

syntactic parallelism, and personal stories predominated. His discourse emphasized values such as “*dignity*”, “*hope*”, “*unity*”, and “*light*”, which were prosodically reinforced through smooth intonational contours, emphatic stresses, and a steady rhythm, fostering an atmosphere of support and trust.

Bill Clinton, as a prototypical charismatic leader, employed rhetoric that balanced emotional resonance and rational persuasion. His speeches incorporated metaphors, factual evidence, statistical references, and well-structured syntactic forms. President Clinton’s prosodic style was characterized by logically complete intonation groups, moderate speech tempo, and rhythmic clarity, which enhanced the impression of constructiveness and competence.

Despite these differences, all three presidents relied on a shared set of rhetorical tools anaphora, epistrophe, antithesis, parallelism, and gradation. However, the functional load of these devices varied significantly depending on the speaker’s psychological type: in Biden’s case, to generate empathy and reassurance; in Clinton’s, to foster logical conviction and highlight progress; and in Trump’s, to energize confrontation and create division.

Particularly noteworthy were the findings of the prosodic analysis, which revealed a stable correlation between intonational parameters such as tempo, pausation, stress, and pitch contour and each president’s personality profile. This confirmed the validity of an integrated approach to political communication research that combines linguistic, psychopolitical, and prosodic levels of analysis.

Accordingly, presidential rhetoric emerged not merely as a collection of public speaking techniques, but as a deep reflection of the speaker’s personality, values, and cognitive style. This explains how each of the leaders examined in this study constructed a distinct communicative model that not only shaped their public image in national and international contexts but also determined the efficacy of their political influence.

The results obtained opened up new avenues for further interdisciplinary research particularly within psycholinguistics, political psychology, and rhetorical studies. Future inquiries may focus on the rhetorical practices of other presidents or political figures in international contexts, which would allow for testing the universality of the established links between personality traits and linguistic strategies. Additionally, deeper prosodic analysis, supported by automated acoustic tools, could help refine the patterns of intonational marking in political messaging. A comparative analysis of crisis versus non-crisis speeches also appears warranted, as it would reveal the flexibility or consistency of rhetorical models depending on communicative objectives. Thus, the findings of this study not only provided descriptive insights but also offered predictive value for evaluating the effectiveness of leadership communication in times of heightened societal tension.

REFERENCES

Aichholzer, J., & Willmann, J. (2020). Desired personality traits in politicians: Similar to me but more of a leader. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 88, 103990. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrp.2020.103990>

Anikin, A., & Lima, C. F. (2017). Perceptual and acoustic differences between authentic and acted nonverbal emotional vocalizations. *Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology*, 71(3), 622–641. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17470218.2016.1270976>

Bartlett, R. C., & Behnagar, N. (2023). *Political rhetoric in theory and practice: A reader*. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009367400>

Bittner, A. (2021). The personalization of politics in Anglo-American democracies. *Frontiers in Political Science*, 3, 660607. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpos.2021.660607>

Boussaid, Y. (2022). Metaphor-based analysis of Joe Biden’s and George Washington’s inaugural speeches. *International Journal of English Linguistics*, 12(3). <https://doi.org/10.5539/ijel.v12n3p1>

Casiraghi, M. C. M., & Bordignon, M. (2023). The rhetorical contestation of populism in four European parliaments (2010–2020). *West European Politics*, 46(1), 173–195. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01402382.2021.2013655>

Cassell, K. J. (2020). When “following” the leader inspires action: Individuals’ receptivity to discursive frame elements on social media. *Political Communication*, 37(5), 581–603. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10584609.2020.1829761>

Clarke, I., & Grieve, J. (2019). Stylistic variation on the Donald Trump Twitter account: A linguistic analysis of tweets posted between 2009 and 2018. *PLOS ONE*, 14(9). <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0222062>

Eissler, R., Russell, A., & Theriault, S. (2024). Research note: “Comparing traditional presidential rhetoric: Trump versus Biden.” *American Politics Research*, 53(1), 80–85. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1532673X241276413>

Goupil, L., Ponsot, E., Richardson, D., Reyes, G., & Aucouturier, J.-J. (2021). Listeners' perceptions of the certainty and honesty of a speaker are associated with a common prosodic signature. *Nature Communications*, 12, Article 861. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-020-20649-4>

Griebie, A., & Immelman, A. (2020). The political personality of 2020 Democratic presidential nominee Joe Biden (Working Paper No. 1.0). Collegeville and St. Joseph, MN: St. John's University and the College of St. Benedict, Unit for the Study of Personality in Politics. http://digitalcommons.csbsju.edu/psychology_pubs/130/

Immelman, A. (1995). "All the men's president" – The political personality of Bill Clinton. *The Saint John's Symposium*, 13, 36–46. https://digitalcommons.csbsju.edu/psychology_pubs/22/

Immelman, A., & Griebie, A. (2020). The personality profile and leadership style of U.S. president Donald J. Trump in office. Paper presented at the 43rd Annual Scientific Meeting of the International Society of Political Psychology, Berlin, Germany, July 14–16, 2020. http://digitalcommons.csbsju.edu/psychology_pubs/129/

Larrouy-Maestri, P., Poeppel, D., & Pell, M. D. (2024). The sound of emotional prosody: Nearly 3 decades of research and future directions. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*. Advance online publication. <https://doi.org/10.1177/17456916231217722>

Mayer, S. J., Berning, C. C., & Johann, D. (2020). The two dimensions of narcissistic personality and support for the radical right: The role of right-wing authoritarianism, social dominance orientation, and anti-immigrant sentiment. *European Journal of Personality*, 34(1), 60–76. <https://doi.org/10.1002/per.2228>

Nai, A., Martínez i Coma, F., & Maier, J. (2019). Donald Trump, populism, and the age of extremes: Comparing the personality traits and campaigning styles of Trump and other leaders worldwide. *Presidential Studies Quarterly*, 49(3), 609–643. <https://doi.org/10.1111/psq.12511>

Nai, A., Maier, J., & Vranić, J. (2021). Personality goes a long way (for some): An experimental investigation into candidate personality traits, voters' profile, and perceived likeability. *Frontiers in Political Science*, 3, 636745. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpos.2021.636745>

Pandey, S. (2024). A comparative rhetorical analysis of Trump and Biden's climate change speeches: Framing strategies in politics. *Journal of Technical Writing and Communication*. Advance online publication. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00472816231225932>

Rahayu, F. E. S., Susilo, S., & Sunardi, S. (2018). Persuasive power as reflected by rhetorical styles in political speeches: A comparative study of Barack Obama and John McCain. *CALLs (Journal of Culture, Arts, Literature, and Linguistics)*, 4(2), 115–122. <https://doi.org/10.30872/calls.v4i2.1360>

Russell, A., & Eissler, R. (2022). Conditional presidential priorities: Audience-driven agenda setting. *American Politics Research*, 50(4), 545–549. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1532673x221074359>

Savchuk, V. (2024). Communicative techniques of the U.S. presidents for effective nation leader image formation in social consciousness. *Society. Document. Communication*, 9(2), 51-60. <https://doi.org/10.69587/sdc/2.2024.51>

Schumacher, G., & Hameleers, M. (2023). The personality is political (especially for populists): How political candidates' personality traits resonate with populist attitudes. *European Political Science Review*. Advance online publication. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17457289.2023.2189728>

Stuckey, M. E. (2021). The rhetoric of the Trump administration. *Presidential Studies Quarterly*, 51(1), 125–150. <https://doi.org/10.1111/psq.12699>

Zappettini, F., & Rezazadah, M. (2023). Communication strategies on Twitter: A critical discourse analysis of the US withdrawal from Afghanistan. *International Journal of Strategic Communication*, 18(2), 115-131. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1553118X.2023.2280555>

SOURCES

Biden, J. (2020). Acceptance speech at the Democratic National Convention (August 21, 2020). Retrieved from <https://edition.cnn.com/2020/08/20/politics/biden-dnc-speech-transcript/index.html>

Clinton, B. (1996). Remarks at the Democratic National Convention (August 29, 1996). Retrieved from <https://millercenter.org/the-presidency/presidential-speeches/august-29-1996-remarks-democratic-national-convention>

Trump, D. (2016). Acceptance speech at the Republican National Convention (July 21, 2016). Retrieved from <https://www.vox.com/2016/7/21/12253426/donald-trump-acceptance-speech-transcript-republican-nomination-transcript>

Валерій Савчук. Особистісні риси президентів США і їхній вплив на характер публічного мовлення. У статті досліджується вплив особистісних рис президентів США Дональда Трампа, Джо Байдена та Білла Клінтона на характер їхнього публічного мовлення. Методологічна база дослідження поєднує психо-лінгвістичний аналіз (на основі типології особистості за A. Immelman, A. Griebie), лінгвіориторичне вивчення (лексико-синтаксичний і стилістичний аналіз) та просодичний аналіз (інтонація, темп, наголос, паузаци). Об'єктом стали кризові публічні виступи трьох президентів, що дозволило простежити проекцію психологічного профілю на мовленнєві стратегії.

У результаті встановлено, що Дональд Трамп (конфронтаційний тип) використовує агресивну, поляризовану, емоційно риторику з гіперболами, негативними ярликами, короткими гаслами та виразною просодичною організацією (зміни темпу, гучності, поєднання різних типів ядерних тонів), логічною структурованістю, використанням числових аргументів, метафор, особистих історій, які підсилюють емоційне напруження та покликані забезпечити створення образу «зовнішнього ворога». Джо Байден (емпатійний тип) теж є до риторики єдності, морального вибору та підтримки. У його промовах активно використовуються анафора, антитеза, риторичні питання, лексичні одиниці з позитивно маркованими конотаціями та плавними змінами інтонаційних параметрів, що створює ефект щирості та емоційної близькості. Білл Кліnton (харизматичний тип) демонструє збалансовану риторику з опорою на синтаксичний паралелізм, числову аргументацію, історії з життя та оптимістичні прогнози. Його просодичне оформлення вирізняється помірною ритмічністю, стабільним темпом і логічно акцентованими завершеннями. Доведено, що риторичні стратегії президентів залежать не лише від політичного контексту, а й від глибинних особистісних характеристик, які формують їхній унікальний мовний стиль, риторичну манеру й ступінь емоційного впливу на аудиторію. Також, результати дослідження показали, що публічне мовлення президента США постає не лише інструментом політичної риторики, а й психолінгвістичним відображенням індивідуальності лідера, що визначає його впізнаваність та ефективність у публічному просторі.

Ключові слова: кризові промови; президентський дискурс; психотип; емоційно-експресивні засоби; риторика; просодичні засоби.

Received: November 19, 2025

Accepted: December 5, 2025