

# Negative Other-Representation in American Political Speeches

Noor Falah Hassan Akbar<sup>1</sup> & Nawal Fadhil Abbas<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> College of Education for Women, University of Baghdad, Iraq

Correspondence: Nawal Fadhil Abbas, PhD, College of Education for Women, University of Baghdad, Iraq.  
E-mail: nawal\_fa71@yahoo.com

Received: October 5, 2018    Accepted: November 22, 2018    Online Published: February 24, 2019

doi:10.5539/ijel.v9n2p113    URL: <https://doi.org/10.5539/ijel.v9n2p113>

## Abstract

The present study has two aims: First, to investigate the way knowledge has been expressed in relation to the negative representation of the two categories, namely, immigrants (especially illegal ones) and Syrian refugees, in two of Donald Trump's pre- and post-presidential speeches. Second, to examine the local ideologies that can be identified in relation to the negative representation of the two categories in the selected data. Consequently, four extracts have been selected to be critically examined by means of adopting eight selected strategies out of Van Dijk's fourteen Strategies of Critical Epistemic Discourse Analysis (2011b) in combination with Van Dijk's Ideological Square (2011a). The results have shown a lack of credibility in many of the statements Trump has made in order to support his negative representation of the two categories. Besides, the two extracts taken from the selected post-presidential speech boldly reflect his discriminatory tendency towards the two categories. Thus, these two points lead to the conclusion that Trump's negative representation of the two categories is actually out of the discriminatory ideology he adopts against them rather than a mere persuasive strategy to win the (2016) presidential elections of the United States of America (henceforth the U.S.).

**Keywords:** critical discourse analysis, critical epistemic discourse analysis, knowledge, ideology, negative-other representation, political speech

## 1. Introduction

Trump's political discourse has attracted the attention of rhetoric scholars as they have found that his political discourse (especially his political speeches) is characterized with an abnormal aggressive tendency towards certain minorities (Mendes, 2016). Furthermore, Widyawardani (2016) has found that hatred occupied the highest percentage among the emotions Trump raised in his announcement speech. Thus, Trump's rhetoric encourages the idea of excluding minorities as the out-groups from the American society. According to Roberts-Miller (as cited in Mendes, 2016), as the president of The U.S., Trump's aggressive tone besides other properties such as his flamboyant personality, irresponsible statements, demagogue and misogyny are all critical phenomena that should be highlighted since they can dangerously shape the American policy and affect the social opinion and behavior.

In this respect, Cherkaoui (2016) has identified eight main points that shape Trump's pre-presidential political discourse. Two out of these eight points are concerned with Trump's xenophobic rhetoric towards the two categories, namely, immigrants and Syrian refugees. Therefore, the researchers intend to select two pre- and post-presidential speeches delivered by Trump from the year 2016 till the year 2017, as the fundamental sources of data in the present study in order to examine how Trump's negative representation of the two categories, has been developed.

## 2. Literature Review

### 2.1 An Overview of Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA)

CDA is labeled as a specific approach for studying and investigating text and talk (Van Dijk, 1995). It aims to present a full critical investigation and analysis of the implicit and explicit structures and relations of 'dominance', 'discrimination' and 'power' and how they are approached throughout language (Tenorio, 2011). It also investigates the ties between language use and the political and social contexts in which it is used and functions as a tool to construct and reflect society (Paltridge, 2012).

CDA is both "problem-oriented and issue-oriented rather than paradigm-oriented" and "inter or multidisciplinary"

in nature (Van Dijk, 1995, p. 17). Moreover, it labels a variety of approaches that aim for the social analysis of discourse. Those approaches differ in theory, methodology, in addition to the kind of issues they investigate and attempt to make them prominent (Wodak & Meyer, 2001).

Surveying the recent annals of literature in CDA displays that political discourse has increasingly attracted the attention of critical discourse analysts in which there are some considerable studies that inspected various political discourses to discern multiple strategies utilized by rhetoricians and statesmen as well as to show how politicians make the text/talk persuasive, significant, appealing and obscure etc. In this respect, Horvath (2009) investigated the covert ideologies in Obama's *Inaugural Address* in order to reveal his persuasive strategies by means of adopting Fairclough's assumption *ideologies reside in texts*. The findings revealed that five main concepts can be considered as the fundamental ideological structures in this speech, which are 'Liberalism', 'unity', 'pragmatism', 'inclusiveness' and 'accepting ethnic and religious diversity'. Moreover, Dastpak and Taghinezhad (2015) conducted a similar study by adopting the same speech and the same model of analysis which make the results of this study approximately the same as (Horvath, 2009). Wang (2010) examined Obama's *Victory speech* and *Inaugural Address* by means of adopting CDA and Halliday's (SFL). He focused on inspecting the aspects of 'modality' and 'transitivity' in order to understand how language functions to serve the intended ideology and power to present an understanding of the overall political goal of constructing these two speeches. However, these studies differ from the present study in terms of methodology and data of analysis although they represent good samples in analyzing political discourse. Moreover, Darweesh and Abdullah (2016) critically investigated Trump's sexist ideology in some of his quotes from his political presidential campaign by means of adopting two frameworks; Van Dijk (2006) and Mill (2008). The results reflected an anti-feminist ideology (especially towards his rival Hillary Clinton). Although both of the present study and Darweesh and Abdullah's (2016) dealt with negative other-representation in Trump's political discourse, but each one of them adopted different aspects, methodology and data. Furthermore, Mcclay (2017) presented a descriptive analysis of Trump's *Announcement Speech* (2015), *RNC Speech* (2016) and *Inaugural Address* (2017) by means of employing Van Leeuwen's (2008) Social Network of actors in order to show how Trump used representations of social actors to construct reality for his audience. The results revealed a sort of consistency between the underlying ideology in these speeches and the polarized structure of 'US' versus 'THEM'. In relation to the present study's topic, there is also a focus upon the strategic pattern of 'US' versus 'THEM' in Mcclay (2017), but the adopted analytical framework differs from the one adopted in the present study different perspectives in both analysis and findings have been presented. Finally, Khalil and Abbas (2018) critically examined three American presidential debates (held by Hillary Clinton and Trump about the war on Iraq in 2003) by means of employing 'topics', 'local semantics' and 'speech acts' according to Van Dijk's Socio-cognitive Approach. The findings of analysis showed that both of the two participants shared particular ideologies in relation to this topic, but with different orientations and purposes. Though the aforementioned studies have concentrated on some other genres and discourses, the present study is the first in the sense that it struggles to narrow the gap among previous studies by **studying Negative Other-Representation in American Political Speeches**. Four extracts have been selected to be critically examined by means of adopting eight selected strategies out of Van Dijk's fourteen Strategies of Critical Epistemic Discourse Analysis (2011b) in combination with Van Dijk's Ideological Square (2011a).

## 2.2 Knowledge

Knowledge is considered as an essential and decisive factor of context models. It is also known as 'Pragmatic Knowledge Device' or simply the 'Knowledge Device' (henceforth the K-Device). It continuously influences all the linguistic structures of the discourse and consequently defines the common ground that language users have in their interaction. The knowledge of the speakers about something is not necessarily explicitly expressed but it could be simply presupposed or inferred. This K-Device functions as a manager of various sources of knowledge and information so that they completely suit the current text or talk and consequently the whole communicative situation or event (Van Dijk, 2003; 2004; 2014; 2016).

Knowledge in discourse is subjected to particular processes of arrangement and management in order to suit the intentions of the discourse initiators who shape it in a certain form to erect the needed influence they aim to make to the discourse receivers (readers and listeners) (Van Dijk, 2016).

Moreover, language users are not mere 'individuals' but 'social actors' as well. Their membership can be categorized into three levels: firstly, they are members of 'linguistic communities' who share a natural language. Secondly, they are members of 'epistemic communities' who share common and generic sociocultural knowledge about the world. Thirdly, they are also members of 'social groups' who tend to share common values

and norms and consequently base and constitute their attitudes and ideologies on this shared knowledge (Van Dijk, 2014).

### 2.3 Ideology

The concept of 'ideology' is rather vague and elusive (Van Dijk, 1998). It somehow sounds as an 'oxymoron' and this might refer to the "largely pejorative interpretations of it" which have been provided by several scholars within the social sciences (Beaugrande, 2006, p. 42).

Ideology is described as a 'complex phenomenon' that needs a multidisciplinary approach (Van Dijk, 1998; 2015a, p. 1). It should be investigated from (social) psychological perspectives, since ideology is considered as "a form of social cognition" (Van Dijk, 2015b, p. 1). The account and interpretation of ideology should be done within a politico-logical and sociological framework. This is due to the fact that the usage and development of ideology(s) are performed by social groups and members (Van Dijk, 2013).

Moreover, ideologies are not mere negative, but can also be positive. They can function as instruments to the legitimization of power abuse (as in racist discourses) as well as the possibility to use ideologies as tools to show resistance in the cases of domination and racism (anti-racist ideologies). It is noteworthy that in any of these two cases ideologies function as guiding lines that direct the interests and political and social practices of the social groups/communities who share them (Van Dijk, 2015b).

### 2.4 Attitude

In CDA, attitudes are somehow interlinked with ideologies. They can be considered as "forms of social representations" or "socially shared opinions" (Van Dijk, 2001, p. 16). As an example on the relation between ideologies and attitudes; ideologies (which are systems of beliefs that are developed and shared by various groups of people) such as sexism, socialism, racism, feminism, etc. may function as bases for constructing attitudes. In a similar sense, people's attitudes about certain issues such as immigration may be based on a(n) anti-/racist ideology (Van Dijk, 2001; 2015b).

### 2.5 Positive Self-Presentation versus Negative Other-Presentation

The main concern of these two strategies is to investigate participants as social groups rather than being mere individuals and presenting the participants in terms of Us versus Them (Van Dijk, 2015b). In relation to the core of the present study, Van Dijk (2006a, p. 373) has made a statement about the operation of these two complementary strategies in terms of the ideological square and how they influence the structure of the various levels of a discourse, as quoted below:

The overall strategy of positive self-presentation and other-presentation is very typical in this biased account of the facts in favor of the speaker's or writer's own interests, while blaming negative situations and events on opponents or on the others (immigrants, terrorists, youths, etc.) as this strategy can be applied to the structure of many discourse levels in the usual way.

### 2.6 The Ideological Square

The Ideological Square constitutes a "manifestation of the group relations category of the ideology schema" (Van Dijk, 2011a, p. 396). It examines the representations of 'in-groups' and 'out-groups' within text and talk, which are given in prototypical terms of expression by means of using the ideological pronouns 'We versus They' or 'Us versus Them', that refer to the polarized structure of the ideology(s) which are underlying the discourse (Van Dijk, 2011a). It consists of four moves that form the ideological communication within a discourse. These four moves are as the following:

- a- To emphasize the positive and good (things/information/qualities) about US (in-groups);
- b- To emphasize the negative and bad (things/information/qualities) about THEM (out-groups);
- c- To de-emphasize the negative and bad (things/information/qualities) about US (in-groups); and
- d- To de-emphasize the positive and good (things/information/qualities) about THEM (out-groups) (Van Dijk, 2006c, p. 734; 2011a, p. 396).

The employment of positive self-presentation versus negative other-presentation in discourse appears at its peak within Van Dijk's ideological square. This 'self' always refers to the language user's group/community of membership, which can be (political, racial, etc.). The typical semantic macro-strategies that have been captured to be used for positive self-presentation include 'self-glorification' and 'national rhetoric', especially in argumentative situations (discourses), where the main concern is to enhance the positive self-image and at the same time to emphasize the negative other-presentation. This presupposes that the positive properties of the

other group will be exposed and subjected to the processes of hedging, omission and mitigation as they define these out-groups as their enemies/opponents or competitors since these others are captured to be different from the in-groups (Van Dijk, 2006c; 2011a). This in its turn reflects the core of the topic of the present study and makes the ideological square as the perfect choice for the researcher in order to conduct the analysis.

### *2.7 Van Dijk's Strategies Towards Critical Epistemic Discourse Analysis*

By presenting these strategies and structures, Van Dijk (2011b) has illustrated the role of knowledge in shaping and constructing a discourse. Accordingly, large amounts of knowledge of the world should be activated by language users so that they will be able to process text and talk. Moreover, the acquisition of this knowledge about the world is not only achieved through our non-discursive daily experiences but is rather mostly acquired by means of discursive communication and interaction. This illustrates that there is a close link between the study of discourse and the study of knowledge (Van Dijk, 2011b).

Critical epistemic analysis intends to concentrate on the way knowledge is abused in order to control discourse and also the way the knowledge of the recipients can be manipulated so that they serve the needs or goals of the elites (powerful groups). This case is obvious through the strategies of positive self-representation and negative other-representation (Van Dijk, 2011b).

Van Dijk (2011b, pp. 37–39) has identified some of the most common strategies and structures of critical epistemic discourse analysis that are particularly influenced by the management of knowledge. These strategies are fourteen in number but only eight of these strategies will be investigated in the present study due to their suitability to the selected data, as they meet the strategies of negative other-representation and consequently suit the topic of the present study. However, the following is a detailed account of the eight selected strategies and structures investigated in the present study:

- **Topics:** Also known as (themes) represent the most important information in the discourse that is intended by the producer of the discourse (speaker or writer and control the organization of the overall coherence of the discourse as they control its local meanings (Van Dijk, 1980; Van Dijk & Kintsch, 1983; Louwse & Van Peer, 2002) (as cited in Van Dijk, 2011b). In the present study, this strategy is of a crucial importance as the topics figured out in the selected data contribute in reflecting the negative representation of immigrants and Syrian refugees;
- **Local Coherence:** This strategy presents insight into the way the producer of a discourse can manage explicating political and social situations (Gernsbacher & Givon, 1995; Van Dijk, 1977) (as cited in Van Dijk, 2011b). In general, the cohesive devices that signal the local coherence of a text include: Appraisal (adjectives and adverbials), coordinating and subordinating conjunctions, prepositions, disclaimers, comparisons, generalizations and cause and effect relations in the text (Wang & Guo, 2014). In relation to the present study, this strategy serves to show how the negative representation of immigrants and Syrian refugees is locally constructed in the selected data;
- **Actor Description:** This strategy is concerned with the way people described in discourse and what roles, identities, relations, gender, age, ethnicity, class, memberships, organizations, etc. are used to describe those people. This strategy represents the core of the ideological polarization of US VS THEM in racist, discriminatory and prejudiced discourses (Van Leeuwen, 1996) (as cited in Van Dijk, 2011b). In relation to the topic of the present study, this strategy is very crucial. Its employment is based on Van Dijk's (2006c) speculation that the description of the participants in a discourse is rather based on the ideology(s) of the discourse producer. Consequently, there is an identification of the participants in terms of in-groups versus out-groups in terms of this strategy;
- **Levels, Details and Precision of Description:** This strategy refers to the semantic variations in describing actors, actions, social and political situations, for instance, 'granularity', 'preciseness' and 'vagueness', according to the intention of the producer of the discourse and his/her interests (Van Dijk, 2006b; 2011b). Thus, this strategy serves to identify the negative representation of immigrants and Syrian refugees in the selected data depending on the amounts of information given about these two categories in the selected data;
- **Implications and Presuppositions:** This strategy refers to the fact that the common shared knowledge is generally presupposed in the discourse and not explicitly expressed. In this sense, certain implications of knowledge do not serve the interests of the speaker may remain implicit or hidden (Kadmon, 2001; Krashmer, 1998) (as cited in Van Dijk, 2011b). This strategy is of a profound significance in the present study, since the implications about the two categories in the selected data reinforce their negative representation;

- **Evidentiality:** This strategy is concerned with the credibility of discourse. Hence, knowledge discourse and its forms are injected with experts' evidences, references and other linguistic ways of legitimization. These respected sources provide the discourse with a sense of reliability (Chafe & Nichols, 1986) (as cited in Van Dijk, 2011b). In this respect, this strategy contributes to reflect the negative representation of immigrants and Syrian refugees as it helps to define the information given about the two categories, whether it is out of knowledge or mere opinions. However, this strategy can be identified throughout certain linguistic tools including, active versus passive voice (agency), titles of well-known organizations and institutions, reported speech, 'number games' and stories (Van Dijk, 2006c);
- **Modality:** This strategy is based on the intentions of the discourse producer (Facchinetti et al., 2003) (as cited in Van Dijk, 2011b). Thus, it is somehow influential in the present study since it expresses the mode in which the knowledge about the two categories is expressed, that is in terms of probability, possibility and necessity, which can be identified throughout the use of modal expressions, modal verbs and pronouns as well (Van Dijk, 2011a); and
- **Lexicon:** The choice of the lexical items depends basically on the context of the discourse, its participants, aims, settings as well as the ideologies and knowledge of the producer of the discourse and his/her dominated group (Sinclair & Carter, 2004) (as cited in Van Dijk, 2011b). This strategy is very efficient in the present study since it can be signaled through a variety of lexical items in the selected data including nouns, verbs, appraisal adverbials and adjectives which all reflect the semantic level of the negative representation of the immigrants and Syrian refugees in the selected data.

Consequently, the eight epistemic strategies adopted from Van Dijk (2011b) perfectly match and meet the four strategies of Van Dijk's ideological square since they both reflect the negative representation of immigrants and Syrian refugees. Consequently, the researchers intend to combine both of these two notions to construct an analytical framework in order to conduct the analysis in the present study.

### 3. Methodology

#### 3.1 Scope of the Study

The scope of the present study consists of the transcripts of two speeches delivered by the American president Trump within two periods (pre- and post-presidency) between the years (2016 & 2017). The following Table 1 presents key information about these speeches as the following:

Table 1. Scope of the study

Title of the Speech	Pre-/Post-Presidency	Date of Delivery	The Link of the Website
Trump's Acceptance speech at the RNC	Pre-Presidency	21/7/2016	<a href="https://www.vox.com/2016/7/21/12253426/donald-trump-acceptance-speech-transcript-republican-nomination-transcript">https://www.vox.com/2016/7/21/12253426/donald-trump-acceptance-speech-transcript-republican-nomination-transcript</a>
Trump's speech at the CPAC	Post-Presidency	24/2/2017	<a href="https://www.vox.com/policy-and-politics/2017/2/24/14726584/transcript-donald-trump-cpac-speech">https://www.vox.com/policy-and-politics/2017/2/24/14726584/transcript-donald-trump-cpac-speech</a>

#### 3.2 Research Design and Data Selection

The present study is conducted according to the basics of the qualitative approach of researching. In qualitative analysis, text is used as a means in order to present an interpretation of social phenomena (Bricki, 2007). Besides, qualitative research is concerned with presenting words rather than numbers as data of analysis (Mason, 2002). Thus, the qualitative approach of research is rather appropriate for the nature of the present study, since it aims to elaborately present a detailed account of the investigated topic. Despite the fact that the researchers intend to adopt the qualitative method in conducting the analysis in the present study, some tables will be included by the researchers for elaborative purposes.

The selection of data in the present study is based on to what extent the chosen data reflect Trump's negative representation of immigrants and Syrian refugees. The two speeches which were delivered across two periods of time (pre- and post-presidency) can be used as representative samples of how Trump linguistically represent the two categories mentioned earlier; how he employed knowledge in his discourse in order to attack them and what ideologies are reflected within this discourse. The purpose out of selecting speeches that belong to both pre- and post-presidential periods is to determine whether this bigoted attitude towards the two categories is merely an electoral persuasive strategy to win more votes or there is a possibility to be guided by a discriminatory ideology that he adopts against the two categories. The researchers have selected two representative extracts from each of

the two selected speeches in the present study, that are of direct relevance to the topic of the present study. Each of the four selected extracts will be analysed in terms of a sequence of utterances which will be stated before starting the analysis.

#### 4. Data Analysis

##### 4.1 Analysis of the Selected Pre-Presidential Speech (Trump's Acceptance Speech at the Republican National Convention, RNC)

###### 4.1.1 Speech Summary

On the 21st July (2016), Trump delivered this speech when he was officially declared to be accepted as the official nominee of the Republican Party. This speech was delivered in Cleveland, Ohio and the audience to whom this official speech delivered included members of the Republican Party and most importantly the whole American nation (Mcclay, 2017). In this speech, Trump tackled several sensitive issues of direct influence upon the well-being and safety of the U.S.; such issues including immigration, the economic situation of the U.S., the failure of the current political system of the U.S. and terrorism (Donald Trump's Republican Nomination Acceptance Speech, n.d.).

###### 4.1.2 Analysis of Extract [No.1]

- (1) The number of police officers killed in the line of duty has risen by almost 50 percent compared to this point last year.
- (2) Nearly 180,000 illegal immigrants with criminal records, ordered deported from our country, are tonight roaming free to threaten peaceful citizens.
- (3a) The number of new illegal immigrant families who have crossed the border so far this year already exceeds the entire total of 2015.
- (3b) They are being released by the tens of thousands into our communities with no regard for the impact on public safety or resources.
- (4a) One such border-crosser was released and made his way to Nebraska.
- (4b) There, he ended the life of an innocent young girl named Sarah Root.
- (4c) She was 21 years old and was killed the day after graduating from college with a 4.0 grade point average.
- (4d) Her killer was then released a second time, and he is now a fugitive from the law.
- (5a) I've met Sarah's beautiful family.
- (5b) But to this administration, their amazing daughter was just one more American life that wasn't worth protecting.
- (5c) One more child to sacrifice on the altar of open borders.

Utterance (2) summarizes the thematic topics Trump tackles in the arguments created about illegal immigrants. Accordingly, the explication of the knowledge expressed in this extract concentrates on the negative impact of illegal immigrants upon the national security of the U.S. He opens the argument by creating a comparison between the numbers of crimes committed to police officers in the years (2015) and (2016) which witnessed a high increase that rose to 50%. Also, this utterance presupposes that Trump is going to review the reasons that stand for this abnormal increase. Immediately in (2), he indirectly relates this increase of crimes to the large numbers of illegal immigrants inside the U.S. who came for several reasons including the rising global crises in the recent couple of years. The use of the vague word *almost* in (1) may reveal that Trump is not accurate in giving these percentages and statistical rates about the real exact numbers of illegal immigrants inside the U.S. This means he does not attribute the knowledge he expresses in his argument to a reliable and trustful source. Thus, the knowledge expressed in (1), (2) and (3a) about the numbers of illegal immigrants could be merely his beliefs rather than facts. Thus, he may use such examples of (number game) to exaggerate the negative influence of illegal immigrants upon the well-being of the American citizens. The identification of (number game) suggests the ideology of **fact-checking**. Besides, by using (number game), Trump achieves two aims: First, to present an argument supported with statistical facts in order to make it sound more reliable, convincing and acceptable, and second, to grant the argument a sense of objectivity and distance any doubt carries a personal opinion or attitude. By giving examples of (number game) in terms of facts, Trump distracts the audience's attention from a serious weakness point in this argument, which is its lack for a credible source to support it.

The verb *threaten* in (2) suggests that Trump's argument about illegal immigrants is based on the shared cultural knowledge about immigrants which represents them as a source of threat upon the in-groups (the American people). Moreover, in (2) the adverb *nearly* implicitly generalizes the negative viewpoint he expresses *18,000 illegal immigrants with criminal records* to all illegal immigrants inside the U.S. Subsequently, there is a strong ideological polarization in terms of the description of the participants in this extract. It is formulated through, on the one hand, the use of possessive pronoun 'Our' to emphasize the positive self-image of the in-groups (the American nation). On the other hand, the pronoun 'They' refers to the out-groups (illegal immigrants in the present extract) who constitute a source of threat and therefore must be out casted from the American communities. Additionally, this ideological polarization of participants can be figured out through the negative lexical items used to describe illegal immigrants as a source of threat *criminal records*, *deported*, *roaming free* and *threaten* which in their turn reflect the ideologies of **insecurity** and **criminalization**. The positive lexical items that refer to in-groups are *peaceful citizens* which suggest the ideology of **victimization**. Moreover, (3a) suggests the ideologies of insecurity and **apprehension** in:

*with no regard for the impact on public safety or resources*

Accordingly, Trump predicts the problems that could happen out of admitting illegal immigrants to stay in the U.S. (4a), (4b), (4c) and (4d) view another argument to enhance his negative opinions about illegal immigrants. Nearly, more than half of this extract describes a story of a crime committed by an illegal immigrant to a victim named (Sarah Root), as an example of the danger that illegal immigrants represent upon the American nation. Trump's descriptions of the in-group (Sarah Root) and the out-group (the criminal illegal immigrant) are rather unequal in terms of the amount of information given about each of the two actors. Similarly, the precise expressions he uses in describing the two actors. In (4a) Trump uses *one such border-crosser* to refer to the criminal instead of giving his name. Contrastively, the victim's name is given in (4b) in addition to information that emphasizes her good qualities as a member belonging to the in-groups. This serves the positive self-presentation of the in-groups and in the same time evokes the audience's sympathy for the victim and hatred and anger for illegal immigrants as the out-groups (since the agent of the incident is an illegal immigrant). Trump employs certain lexical items that support the positive self- presentation of the in-groups including *innocent young girl* and *amazing daughter*. While, all what is given about the criminal are lexical items that reflect crime and violence such as *ended the life an innocent young girl, killer* and *fugitive*.

There is a notable use of modality reflected in the shift of tenses he makes. (1), (2), (3a) and (3b) are given in past tense as he gives the details of the crime. Then, he shifts to the present tense in the second part of (4d) in order to emphasize the bad result of having illegal immigrants inside the U.S., reflected throughout the adverb "now" which emphasizes the present critical situation the U.S. encounters in terms of immigration.

The recurrent uses of the prepositions 'of', 'in', 'by', 'with', 'from', 'into', 'for' and 'on' serve to build the local coherence of the given utterances.

A final word to be said is that, most of the arguments expressed in this extract about illegal immigration are presented without attributing them to formal institutions or authorities. This may show that they are employed according to Trump's personal opinions or beliefs, although the audience quite accepted them and reacted to them.

#### 4.1.3 Analysis of Extract [No.2]

(1a) Lastly, and very importantly, we must immediately suspend immigration from any nation that has been compromised by terrorism until such time as proven vetting mechanisms have been put in place

(1b) We don't want them in our country

(2a) My opponent has called for a radical 550 percent increase—think of this, this is not believable, but this is what is happening—a 550 percent increase in Syrian refugees on top of existing massive refugee flows coming into our country already under the leadership of president Obama

(2b) She proposes this despite the fact that there's no way to screen these refugees in order to find out who they are or where they come from

Here, Trump sheds light upon the expanding existence of two categories, namely, immigrants and Syrian refugees. He constitutes an argument that reflects these two categories as sources of unknown danger and consequently builds the needed justifications for his statement expressed in (1b), which reflects the guiding topic that this extract goes about.

As he emphasizes the danger that immigrants may represent upon the American community in several parts in the whole speech, Trump re-mentions it again in this extract to attract attention to this sensitive issue that threatens the security of the U.S. He re-emphasizes this point by the appraisal adverbials *very importantly* accompanied with the modal *must* which expresses the necessity to suspend all immigrants who come from nations compromised by terrorism, regardless of their conditions or reasons that have urged them to migrate. Also, the modal adverbial *immediately* serves to emphasize that this action should be taken in the very soon time.

However, two local ideologies can be identified in (1a), namely, **skepticism**, reflected through the verb *suspend* and the ideology of **determinism** reflected through the modals and adverbials that emphasize the necessity to take an action. The ideological polarization of ‘Us’ versus ‘Them’ appears in (1b) throughout the pronoun *we* and the possessive pronoun *our* to refer to the in-groups (American people) and ‘Them’ which refers to the out-groups (immigrants and Syrian refugees). The pronoun ‘we’ here serves two functions: First, to shorten the distance between him and the audience and second to show a public consensus upon the refusal of the two categories’ existence inside the U.S. and consequently to distance himself from the responsibility of expressing any personal discriminatory beliefs or attitudes. Similarly, the words *our country* in (1b) reflect unity and nationalism and re-emphasize the necessity to exclude the two categories as being strangers.

(2a) signals a shift in the argument from immigrants to Syrian refugees as he continues till the end of the current extract to expose the large and increasing numbers of Syrian refugees who entered and keep on entering inside the U.S. regions. The strategy of (number game) as in *550 percent increase* and the hyperbolic expression *massive refugee flows* both emphasize the large numbers of refugees who may threaten the safety of the U.S., since he metaphorically represents them as *flows* which are largely and strongly destroy everything around.

(2a) reflects two local ideologies, namely, **skepticism** about the two categories, the ideology of **fact-checking** and the ideology of apprehension towards the two categories. In (2b), Trump implicitly criticizes Clinton as he disapproves her proposal of allowing large numbers of Syrian refugees to enter into the U.S. The discourse connector *despite the fact* denotes this contrastive situation of allowing the entrance of Syrian refugees in spite of the lack of screening mechanisms, (as he inaccurately claims), to insure the safety of the U.S. citizens. Trump’s claim *there’s no way to screen these refugees* have no reliable basis. This is due to that refugees’ vetting system has been founded since (1980), with its multiple security agencies that its processes are directed by the United Nations itself. Besides, the refugees’ vetting mechanisms last from one and several months to two years (Graves, Sanders, & Sharockman, 2017).

In (2b) Syrian refugees are implicitly presented as a source of an unknown threat upon the U.S. as it can be derived from the statement *who they are or where they come from*. The local coherence of the utterances can be identified throughout the repetitive use of the prepositions *by, in, for, on, into, under* and *of*. Besides, the knowledge expressed in this extract about the danger expected out of the coming of the two categories is given in terms of generalizations without any effort to elaborate that not all immigrants and Syrian refugees are harmful, but many of them have left their homelands because of the serious conditions that threaten their safety and come to the U.S. to seek for a better life.

#### 4.2 Analysis of the Selected Post-Presidential Speech (Trump’s Speech at the Conservative Political Action Conference, CPAC)

##### 4.2.1 Speech Summary

On Friday 24th of February (2017), President Trump delivered this speech at the (CPAC) which is considered as the biggest annual national assembly in which conservative activists gather in Gaylord National Resort and Convention Center in National Harbor, Maryland, U.S.A. (Gore, Kiely, Robertson, & Farely, 2017a; Gore et al., 2017b). In this speech, he tackled several issues including his dissatisfaction with media, criticism of Obama’s administration, boasting his actions and the fulfillment of his campaign promises in addition to several comments related to national security, border security and immigration.

##### 4.2.2 Analysis of Extract [No.1]

(1a) We fully understand that national security begins with border security.

(1b) Foreign terrorists will not be able to strike America if they cannot get into our country.

(2a) And, by the way, take a look at what’s happening in Europe, folks.

(2b) Take a look at what’s happening in Europe.

(2c) I took a lot of heat on Sweden.

(2d) And then a day later I said, has anybody reported what's going on? And it turned out that they didn't—not too many of them did.

(2e) Take a look at what happened in Sweden.

(2f) I love Sweden.

(2g) Great country, great people, I love Sweden.

(2h) They understand I'm right.

(2i) The people there understand I'm right.

(2j) Take a look at what's happening in Sweden.

(2k) Take a look at what's happened in Germany.

(2L) Take a look at what's happened in France.

(2m) Take a look at Nice and Paris.

Here, the negative representation of immigrants and (Syrian) refugees is given in terms of an argument that shows their negative impact upon the national security of the U.S. and the whole western world as well.

In (1a), by using the pronoun *we* and the appraisal adverb *fully*, Trump attempts to reflect a sort of consensus on one point that, border security is the first step for national security as it can be sensed from the verb *begins*. This statement may function as a logical **justification** for his Executive Order (henceforth EO) that he keeps on alluding to it in this speech and then he actually issued later on the 27th of January (2017), (exactly after one week of his inauguration), which in its turn reinforces its stance in order to acquire more public acceptance. In this (EO), Trump's directed the authorities to suspend the entrance of immigrants and non-immigrants coming from seven countries, namely, Iran, Iraq, Syria, Sudan, Libya, Yemen and Somalia, which are suspended to be convicted in issues of terrorism and violence and banning their entrance for 90 days from the day it is signed and banning the entrance of Syrian refugees (in specific) into the U.S. indefinitely (Guild, Bigo, & Carrera, 2017).

(1a) paves the way for his next statement in (1b). In (1b), he reaches to the core of the argument that guides the whole extract, which is the banning of foreign existence inside the U.S., as he finds it the only means to protect the U.S. from terrorism, as this conditional situation is denoted by the discourse connector 'if'. The words *foreign terrorists*, presupposes that terrorism is mainly coming from foreign sources outside the U.S. Thus, he suggests that the prevention of the entry of foreigners into the U.S. cancels the possibility of having any terrorist attacks inside the U.S., as denoted by the negated modal expression *will not be able* and the negated modal verb *cannot*. This suggestion is perfectly represented in his (EO). Thus, the use of the adjective *foreign* here serves to refer to (illegal) immigrants, (Syrian) refugees and travelers in general who are coming out from the seven banned countries listed in this (EO).

So, the ideology of **accusation** against the two categories of being responsible for the terrorist attacks inside the U.S. can be identified in (1b). The remaining part in this extract views Trump's incidents that he presents to reinforce his argument.

In (2a), Trump shifts the argument from the U.S. to Europe as it can be denoted by the discourse connector *by the way*. He extends the danger of the two categories to the whole western world. Repeating the same statement in (2a) and (2b) and using the present continuous tense serve to emphasize the current global danger that these two categories represent (as his words assume). In (2c), he starts with Sweden as a first instance in order to support his Argument. In (2c), (2d) and (2e), Trump may refer to the clashes that happened between police officers and gunned individuals in a northwestern suburb that is mostly inhabited by immigrants (Anderson & Chan, 2017). In the utterances mentioned above, he exaggerated these clashes as an incident or a proof to support his implied hypothesis that, crime inside Sweden has risen due to the influx of refugees and immigrants into the country. So, this is an implicit criticism that he directs against the liberal policy of immigration in Sweden and in the same time an implied **incitement** against immigrants and (Syrian) refugees.

Trump highly exaggerates this incident as a means to generalize crime to immigrants and (Syrian) refugees. In this respect, the Swedish Prime Minister (Stefan Lofven) has criticized Trump for exaggerating this incident, as he based the comments he made on a report presented on Fox News, which was mainly referring back the crime surge in Sweden to immigrants and refugees coming out from Muslim countries. Besides, Trump's comments have been confronted by a wave of anger and dissatisfaction from the Swedish people (Anderson & Chan, 2017).

So, in (2e), he repeats his invitation to contemplate about the reason behind this incident. This repetition reflects his exaggeration of such incidents. Then, this exaggerated comment is followed by a sequence of glorifying

expressions in (2g) as a means of reflecting the positive image of the Swedish people such as, *great people*, *great country* and *I love Sweden* and in the same time reflect the ideology of **victimization**, since he attempts to show the Swedish people as the victims of criminal immigrants and refugees who inhabit the Swedish community.

The statements in (2h) and (2i) are rather inaccurate and controversial. He repeats the phrase *they understand I'm right* twice successively as a means to show the Swedish people's agreement upon his hypothesis, while the truth is that most of them do not show any support for such a false generalization, considering it as a sort of exaggeration. In (2j), he repeats his invitation for the third time which reflects his **determinism** to violate the global view about immigrants and (Syrian) refugees by substituting it with the hypothetical view that they are criminals and trouble-makers. This point can be proved as he extends this invitation to contemplate about incidents happening around the world, specifically in Germany and France.

Although he vaguely refers to the incidents in these two countries as he mentions no details about them whether they are actually terrorist attacks or not, but, the only thing that can be perceived here is that these countries, especially Sweden and Germany have received large numbers of immigrants and refugees in the recent couple years. So, there is a sort of an implicit **incitement** as he indirectly urges the European countries to shut down their doors in the faces of immigrants and refugees, in order to avoid crime and violence. Besides, it supports his (EO) and presents a sort of **justification** so that in the same time he distances any criticisms of carrying a racist impression that he may have towards immigrants and (Syrian) refugees.

In sum, the explication of the information used by Trump in his argument about the negative influence of the two categories upon the U.S. and the western world seems to be unsupported by a credible source of data and in addition to the strong exaggerated impression in it. All these factors lead to conclude that this information is out of a personal belief rather than credible knowledge.

#### 4.2.3 Analysis of Extract [No.2]

(1a) I have a friend, he's a very, very substantial guy, he loves the city of lights.

(1b) He loves Paris.

(1c) For years, every year during the summer he would go to Paris.

(1d) It was automatic.

(1e) With his wife and his family.

(2a) Hadn't seen him in a while.

(2b) And I said, Jim, let me ask you a question, how's Paris doing? Paris? I don't go there anymore.

(2c) Paris is no longer Paris.

(2d) That was four years, four, five years, hasn't gone there.

(2e) He wouldn't miss it for anything.

(2f) Now he doesn't even think in terms of going there.

(3a) Take a look at what's happening to our world, folks.

(3b) And we have to be smart.

(3c) We have to be smart.

(3d) We can't let it happen to us.

(4a) So let me state this as clearly as I can: We are going to keep radical Islamic terrorists the hell out of our country.

(4b) We will not be deterred from this course, and in a matter of days we will be taking brand new action to protect our people and keep America safe.

As in the previous extract, Trump used the clashes in Sweden as evidence to support his argument about the danger that European countries encounter because of receiving influxes of immigrants and (Syrian) refugees; he continues the argument in this extract as he shifts to another country (France-Paris). From the very beginning of (1a) till the end of (2f), he tells the audience a story about a friend of his, as evidence to show how Paris has been changed because of the existence of immigrants inside it.

The use of the appraisal adjective *substantial* preceded by the repeated qualifier *very* in (1a) reflects a sort of hyper evaluation of this anonymous source to grant it a sense of credibility. The claim given in this story is not

credible since this source is not an official and reliable one and consequently such an inaccurate claim does not seem to be out of knowledge but rather out of a personal opinion.

In (1b), (1c), (1d) and (1e), Trump shows his friend's love and subsequent visits to Paris which became part of the past as shown throughout the modal verb *would* and the verb *was*, which presuppose that this friend does not go to Paris anymore.

In (2b), Trump asks his friend the question that leads to the hidden purpose of this argument, which is the belief that Paris is no longer a safe place, particularly since it began to receive big influxes of immigrants, as in *I don't go there*. The same idea is repeated in (2c) and (2d), (2e) and (2f) but in different words in order to emphasize the danger that immigrants represent upon the safety of the western societies in general and the American society in particular.

So, in (3a), particularly in *take a look*, Trump invites and urges not only the present audience but generally the whole western societies to contemplate about the recent global conflicts, as if he is implicitly referring back the reason behind these global conflicts to immigrants and (Syrian) refugees, which in its turn reflects the ideologies of **accusation** and **incitement** against these two categories.

Trump uses the pronoun 'we' which expresses his solidarity to the American nation, in addition to the modal verb 'have to' to show the necessity to take action in order to insure the safety and security of the U.S. In (3d), the use of the modal verb 'cannot' expresses Trump's emphasis on preventing any possibility to let the two categories come into the U.S. in order to insure the security of the American nation. The previous utterances reflect a sort of **justification** for the crucial statements that he gives in the next utterances, starting with (4a), as he indirectly **accuses** the two categories to have affiliation or engagement with what he calls as *radical Islamic terrorists* which reflects his determination to end their existence inside the U.S. as it can be derived from (4a). In (4b), he partially announces about the action or the decision that he intends to issue in order to secure the U.S. from the danger of terrorism.

Although he is very precise in giving the information about this action as he gives no title or any details about it, but by comparing the period of time for the official operating of the action, that he mentions in (4b) *in a matter of days*, to the date of delivering this speech (on the 24th of February, 2017), one can conclude that Trump is implicitly referring to the revised version of his Executive order (EO) which he really re-issued later on the sixth of March (2017) (a few days after this announcement). This shows his insistence to prevent the entry of the two categories into the U.S. So, the topics and claims which Trump includes in this extract reflect the negative attitude that he carries towards the two categories.

The local coherence in this extract can be signaled throughout the use of the prepositions 'of', 'for', 'from', and 'in' in addition to the coordinator 'and' which signals the chronological sequence of the statements given in order to build a coherent text.

## 5. Discussion of the Findings

This section views the findings of the analysis conducted upon the selected data. The findings are presented in terms of a comparison between those obtained from the analysis of the two extracts taken from the selected pre-presidential speech and those obtained from the analysis of the two extracts taken from the selected post-presidential one.

Generally speaking, all the **topics** employed in Trump's arguments about the two categories in the two selected pre and post-presidential speeches reflect Trump's emphasis on their negative impact upon the national and social security of the U.S. and consequently serve the negative representation of immigrants and Syrian refugees.

In terms of **local coherence**, the findings of the analysis have shown that this strategy is present with a percentage of 100% in the two selected pre- and post-presidential speeches. It can be signaled throughout the use of coordinators and subordinators, prepositions and appraisal adjectives and adverbials. All these elements contribute to coherently bridge the sentences of the arguments presented by Trump in his negative representation of the two categories.

As for the strategy of **actor description**, generally, all the descriptions of the two categories provided by Trump in the selected data reflect them as the 'out-groups' and 'unwanted'. Derived from the common ground knowledge of the western societies, Trump has conceptualized his negative representation of these two categories into metaphoric images that reflect unknown threat and danger. Thus, Trump usually refers to these two categories as *waves* and *flows* of danger, which in its turn reflect their negative representation in the selected data.

Though the representation of the two categories is given in terms of the out-groups, all the descriptions given about the American citizens emphasize their positive representation and consequently reinforce the ideological polarization of ‘US’ versus ‘THEM’ in the selected data.

In terms of **details and precision of description**, the findings of analysis have shown that the levels of the explication of the knowledge given by Trump about the two categories go in detail (granularity) when the information given tends to support the negative representation of the two categories. Sometimes the expression of knowledge about the two categories tends to show precision and vagueness. Such cases can be observed when Trump tends to dedicate the largest parts of his arguments on the negative consequences of receiving these two categories. Thus, this strategy contributes to the negative representation of the two categories.

As for **implications and presuppositions**, the findings obtained from the analysis have shown that, this strategy accompanies all the four selected extracts, specifically in the extracts that contain his arguments about his (EO).

The careful investigation of the selected extracts has shown that the incidents employed in the selected data cannot be taken as actual instances of the strategy of **evidentiality**. The researchers have found that Trump has employed (number game) and provided his arguments about the negative impact of the two categories upon the U.S. with several instances of numbers and statistics but without referring them to an actual credible source in addition to the use of anonymous sources as in Trump’s Speech at the (CPAC), which weakens the reliability of his claims. Additionally, Trump has made two different claims which have been proven to be inaccurate, across the whole data selected, which serve the negative representation of the two categories.

**Modality** has been employed with a percentage of 100%. This strategy can be detected throughout Trump’s use of the pronouns formulated in terms of ‘US’ versus ‘THEM’. Besides, the use of modal expressions and verbs serve to reflect the strength of the belief he attempts to reflect to the audience in terms facts. Moreover, the researchers have found that the types of modal expressions and verbs that are used most by Trump are those of necessity, specifically when he tends to emphasize his determinism to dislocate the two categories out of the U.S., which in turn serve in their negative representation. **Lexicon** has been present in the whole scope of data in terms of verbs, nouns, adjectives and adverbials that reflect the negative representation of the two categories.

In sum, all of the eight strategies mentioned above serve in one way or another to reflect the negative representation of the two categories, which in turn meet the first objective. The investigation of the eight strategies mentioned above along with the ideological square has led to the identification of ten different local ideologies across the selected data. This in turn meets the second objective of the study.

The local ideologies that have been identified vary in their original orientations as the researchers have identified six negative ideologies and four neutral ones which have been employed negatively and served in the negative representation of the two categories in the selected data. However, Tables 2 and 3 elaborate the employment of the local ideologies in the selected data in relation to the negative representation of the two categories.

Table 2. Identified local ideologies in the two selected extracts from the selected pre-presidential speech

Ideology	Original Orientation	The present use/employment	Percentage
victimization	neutral	negative	50%
justification	neutral	negative	50%
fact-checking	neutral	negative	100%
determinism	neutral	negative	50%
criminalization	negative	negative	50%
apprehension	negative	negative	100%
insecurity	negative	negative	50%
skepticism	negative	negative	50%

The ideology of ‘fact-checking’ scores a percentage of 50% in order to give the information given in Trump’s negative arguments about the two categories a sense of objectivity, in spite of its lack of credibility. Moreover, the ideology of ‘apprehension’ scores a percentage of 100% which serves the negative representation of the two categories. The analysis of the selected post-presidential speech leads to the identification of two negative ideologies, namely, ‘accusation’ and ‘incitement’, which have not been identified in the first selected speech, as shown below in Table 3.

Table 3. Identified local ideologies in the two selected extracts from the selected post-presidential speech

Ideology	Original Orientation	The present use/employment	Percentage
victimization	neutral	negative	50%
justification	neutral	negative	50%
determinism	neutral	negative	50%
incitement	negative	negative	100%
accusation	negative	negative	100%

Each one of the ideologies of ‘accusation’ and ‘incitement’ against the two categories scores a percentage of 100% in the selected post-presidential speech. This reveals that the explication of information in this speech has been totally injected with negative ideologies that reflect the negative representation of the two categories.

## 6. Conclusion

Eventually, the findings obtained from analyzing the selected data lead to the conclusion that Trump’s tendency to negatively represent immigrants and Syrian refugees is actually out of a racist and discriminatory ideology that Trump adopts against these two categories rather than a mere persuasive strategy to win the (2016) presidential elections of the U.S., since the two extracts taken from the selected post-presidential speech boldly reflect his discriminatory tendency towards the two categories. This concluding remark is reinforced by the lack of credibility in most of the statements Trump made in order to support his negative representation of the two categories, as a means to present his personal opinions in terms of facts.

This study is hoped to present a sample on the objective analysis of political discourse and the management of knowledge in relation to the ideology(s) of the discourse producer.

## Acknowledgments

The researchers of the present study are grateful to the College of Education for Women, University of Baghdad, Al-Jadiriyya, for conducting this study.

## References

- Anderson, C., & Chan, S. (2017). Clashes in Stockholm suburb draw attention to Trump’s remarks. *The New York Times*. Retrieved February 21, 2017, from <https://www.nytimes.com/2017/02/21/world/europe/stockholm-sweden-riots-trump.html>
- Beaugrande, R. D. (2006). Critical discourse analysis: history, ideology, methodology. *Studies in Language & Capitalism, 1*, 29–56. Retrieved from <http://semiotics.nured.uowm.gr/pdfs/Beaugrande.pdf>
- Brad, P. (2016). *Full transcript of Donald Trump’s acceptance speech at the RNC*. Retrieved from <https://www.vox.com/2016/7/21/12253426/donald-trump-acceptance-speech-transcript-republican-nomination-transcript>
- Bricki, N. (2007). *A guide to using qualitative research methodology*. Retrieved from <https://cloudfront.ualberta.ca/-/media/science/research-and-teaching/teaching/qualitative-research-methodology.pdf>
- Cherkaoui, M. (2016). *Donald Trump: The rise of the right-wing politics in America* (Report). Al-Douha, Qatar: Aljazeera Center for Studies. Retrieved from [http://studies.aljazeera.net/mritems/Documents/2016/7/21/000b349d851346ac8f2be96a1891eddb\\_100.pdf](http://studies.aljazeera.net/mritems/Documents/2016/7/21/000b349d851346ac8f2be96a1891eddb_100.pdf)
- Darweesh, D. A., & Abdullah, M. N. (2016). A critical discourse analysis of Donald Trump’s sexist ideology. *Journal of Education and Practice, 7*(30), 87–95. Retrieved from <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1118939.pdf>
- Dastpak, M., & Taghinezhad, A. (2015). Persuasive strategies used in Obama’s political speeches: A CDA approach based on Fairclough’s framework. *Journal of Applied Linguistics and Language Research, 2*(6), 13–27. Retrieved from <http://www.jallr.com/index.php/JALLR/article/download/123/pdf123>
- Donald Trump’s republican nomination acceptance speech analysis. (n.d.). Retrieved from <https://www.studienet.dk/donald-trump/republican-nomination-acceptance.../analysis>
- Gore, D., Kiely, E., Robertson, L., & Farley, R. (2017a). Fact-checking Trump’s CPAC speech. *FactCheck.ORG*. Retrieved February 24, 2017, from <https://www.factcheck.org/2017/02/factchecking-trumps-cpac-speech/>
- Gore, D., Kiely, E., Robertson, L., & Farley, R. (2017b). Fact-checking Trump’s CPAC speech. *USA Today*. Retrieved February 25, 2017, from

- <https://www.usatoday.com/story/news/politics/2017/02/24/fact-check-trump-cpac-speech/98379792/>
- Graves, A., Sanders, K., & Sharockman, A. (2017). *Fact-checking president Donald Trump's Florida rally*. Retrieved February 18, 2017, from <https://www.politifact.com/truth-o-meter/article/2017/feb/18/fact-checking-president-donald-trumps-florida-rall/>
- Guild, E., Bigo, D., & Carrera, S. (2017, April 13). *Trump's travel bans harvesting personal data and requiem for the EU-US privacy shield*. Retrieved from [https://www.ceps.eu/system/files/PI%202017-13TrumpExecOrders\\_0.pdf](https://www.ceps.eu/system/files/PI%202017-13TrumpExecOrders_0.pdf)
- Horvath, J. (2009). Critical discourse analysis of Obama's political discourse. *Institute of British and American Studies*, 69, 45–56. Retrieved from [http://www.pulib.sk/elpub2/FF/Ferencik2/pdf\\_doc/6.pdf](http://www.pulib.sk/elpub2/FF/Ferencik2/pdf_doc/6.pdf)
- Khalil, H. H., & Abbas, N. F. (2018). Iraq in the American presidential debate discourse: A critical discourse analysis. *International Journal of English Linguistics*, 8(2), 260–278. <https://doi.org/10.5539/ijel.v8n2p260>
- Mason, J. (2002). *Qualitative researching* (2nd ed.). London: SAGE Publications Ltd. Retrieved from [http://www.sxf.uevora.pt/wp-content/uploads/2013/03/Mason\\_2002.pdf](http://www.sxf.uevora.pt/wp-content/uploads/2013/03/Mason_2002.pdf)
- Mcclay, R. (2017). *Us and them: A descriptive analysis of Donald Trump's campaign speeches*. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from <https://www.birmingham.ac.uk/Documents/college-artslaw/cels/essays/appliedlinguistics/McClay2017.Trump-Speech-Discourse-Analysis.pdf>
- Mendes, A. E. (2016). Digital demagogue: The critical candidacy of Donald J. Trump. *Journal of Contemporary Rhetoric*, 6(3/4), 62–73. Retrieved from [http://contemporaryrhetoric.com/wp-content/uploads/2017/01/Mendes13\\_2.pdf](http://contemporaryrhetoric.com/wp-content/uploads/2017/01/Mendes13_2.pdf)
- Paltridge, B. (2012). *Discourse analysis* (2nd ed.). London: Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Tara, G. (2017). *Full transcript: President Trump's CPAC speech*. Retrieved from <https://www.vox.com/policy-and-politics/2017/2/24/14726584/transcript-donald-trump-cpac-speech>
- Tenorio, E. H. (2011). Critical discourse analysis: An overview. *Nordic Journal of English Studies*, 10(1), 183–210. Retrieved from <http://ojs.ub.gu.se/ojs/index.php/njes/article/view/658/609>
- Van Dijk, T. A. (1995). Aims of critical discourse analysis. *Japanese Discourse*, 1(1), 17–28. Retrieved from <http://discourses.org/OldArticles/Aims%20of%20Critical%20Discourse%20Analysis.pdf>
- Van Dijk, T. A. (1998). Opinions and ideologies in the press. *Approaches to Media Discourse*. Retrieved from <http://www.discourses.org/OldArticles/Opinions%20and%20Ideologies%20in%20the%20Press.pdf>
- Van Dijk, T. A. (2001). Discourse, ideology and context. *Folia Linguistica*, xxxv/1–2, 11–40. <https://doi.org/10.1515/flin.2001.35.1-2.11>
- Van Dijk, T. A. (2003). The discourse-knowledge interface. In G. Weiss & R. Wodak (Eds.), *Critical Discourse Analysis. Theory and Interdisciplinarity* (pp. 85–109). Houndsmills, UK: Palgrave-MacMillan. Retrieved from <http://www.discourses.org/OldArticles/Discourse-knowledge%20interface.pdf>
- Van Dijk, T. A. (2004). Discourse, knowledge and ideology. In M. Putz, J. Neff & T. A. Van Dijk (Eds.), *Communicating ideologies. Multidisciplinary Perspectives on Language, Discourse and Social Practice* (pp. 5–38). Retrieved from <http://www.discourses.org/OldArticles/Discourse,%20Knowledge%20and%20Ideology.pdf>
- VanDijk, T. A. (2006a). Discourse and manipulation. *Discourse & Society*, 17(2), 359–383. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0957926506060250>
- VanDijk, T. A. (2006b). Ideology and discourse analysis. *Journal of Political Ideologies*. Retrieved from <http://www.discourses.org/OldArticles/Ideology%20and%20Discourse%20Analysis.pdf>
- Van Dijk, T. A. (2006c). Politics, ideology, and discourse. In R. Wodak (Ed.), *Elsevier Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics, Politics and Language* (pp. 728–740). <https://doi.org/10.1016/B0-08-044854-2/00722-7>
- Van Dijk, T. A. (2011a). Discourse and ideology. In T. A. Van Dijk (Ed.), *Discourse Studies. A Multidisciplinary Introduction* (2nd ed., pp. 379–407). London: Sage. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781446289068.n18>
- Van Dijk, T. A. (2011b). Discourse, knowledge, power and politics: Towards a critical epistemic discourse analysis. In C. Hart (Ed.), *Critical Discourse Studies in Context and Cognition* (pp. 27–63). Amsterdam:

- Benjamins Publishing Company. Retrieved from <http://www.discourses.org/OldArticles/Discourse,%20Knowledge,%20Power%20and%20Politics.pdf>
- Van Dijk, T. A. (2013). Ideology and discourse. In M. Freeden, L. S. Sargent & M. Stears (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Political Ideologies* (pp. 175–196). Oxford: Oxford University Press. Retrieved from <http://www.discourses.org/OldArticles/Ideology%20and%20Discourse.pdf>
- Van Dijk, T. A. (2014). Discourse-cognition-society: Current state and prospects of the socio-cognitive approach to discourse. *Contemporary Studies in Critical Discourse Analysis*. Retrieved from <http://www.discourses.org/OldArticles/Discourse-Cognition-Society.pdf>
- Van Dijk, T. A. (2015a). *Critical discourse studies: A sociocognitive approach*. Retrieved from <http://www.discourses.org/OldArticles/Sociocognitive%20Discourse%20Studies.pdf>
- Van Dijk, T. A. (2015b). Ideology. *The International Encyclopedia of Political Communication*. Retrieved from <http://www.discourses.org/OldArticles/Ideology.pdf>
- Van Dijk, T. A. (2016). Sociocognitive discourse studies. *Handbook of Discourse Analysis*. Retrieved from <http://www.discourses.org/OldArticles/Sociocognitive%20Discourse%20Studies.pdf>
- Wang, J. (2010). A critical discourse analysis of Barack Obama's speeches. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 1(3), 254–261. <https://doi.org/10.4304/jltr.1.3.254-261>
- Wang, Y., & Guo, M. (2014). A short analysis of discourse coherence. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 5(2), 460–465. <https://doi.org/10.4304/jltr.5.2.460-465>
- Widyawardani, Y. I. (2016). *Rhetorical analysis of Donald Trump's presidential candidacy announcement speech* (thesis). Faculty of teachers training and education, Sanata Dharma University. Retrieved from [https://repository.usd.ac.id/4879/2/111214096\\_full.pdf](https://repository.usd.ac.id/4879/2/111214096_full.pdf)
- Wodak, R., & Meyer, M. (2001). *Methods of critical discourse analysis: Introducing qualitative methods*. London: SAGE Publications Ltd. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9780857028020>

### Copyrights

Copyright for this article is retained by the author, with first publication rights granted to the journal.

This is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).