Critical Discourse Analysis of Anti-Immigration Rhetoric in US Media Perceptions During Trump's Presidential Campaign

Rajaa Hamid Salih

English Linguistics, Anbar Educational Directorate, Anbar, Iraq

Rajaahamid٣٣٣@gmail.com

Abstract:

As media organizations play central roles in shaping mainstream perceptions of current events, they apply discursive practices that equally humanize and dehumanize subjects from marginalized populations. The discursive techniques and rhetorical maneuvers used by Trump during his ٢٠١٦ presidential campaign illustrated how media organizations had a patriotic duty to frame most issues as possessing humanity yet lacking reverence for traditional American values. Accordingly, the main objective of this article is to highlight the issue of immigration as an issue that has been the focus of media attention in the era of Trump's presidency of the United States.

key words: (CDA, migration/immigration, rhetorical maneuvers, Trump).

تحليل الخطاب الاعلامي في الولايات المتحدة للخطاب المناهض للهجرة خلال حملة ترامب الرئاسية

رجاء حامد صالح

علم اللغة الانجليزية ، مديرية تربية الانبار ، الانبار ، العراق

Rajaahamid٣٣٣@gmail.com

الملخص:

نظرًا لأن المؤسسات الإعلامية تلعب أدوارًا مركزية في تشكيل التصورات السائدة للأحداث الجارية ، فإنها تطبق ممارسات خطابية تضفي على الأشخاص المهمشين طابعًا إنسانيًا وتجردهم من الإنسانية. أوضحت الأساليب الخطابية والمناورات الخطابية التي استخدمها ترامب خلال حملته الرئاسية لعام ٢٠١٦ كيف كان على المؤسسات الإعلامية واجبًا وطنيًا لتأطير معظم القضايا على أنها تمتلك الإنسانية ولكنها تفتقر إلى احترام القيم الأمريكية التقليدية. وبناءً على ذلك ، فإن الهدف الرئيسي من هذا المقال هو تسليط الضوء على قضية الهجرة باعتبارها قضية كانت محور اهتمام وسائل الإعلام في عهد رئاسة ترامب للولايات المتحدة.

الكلمات المفتاحية: (CDA، الهجرة / الهجرة ، المناورات الخطابية ، ترامب).

Introduction

When presidential candidate Donald Trump performed numerous anti-immigration speeches in ٢٠١٦, he knowingly drew from a lack of political experience in appealing to a base audience. However, scholars in critical discourse analysis (CDA) note differently acknowledging the roles played by corporate media organizations. Applying the works of Teun van Dijk (١٩٩١, ٢٠٠٥, ٢٠٠٨), the CDA reveals how Trump's inflammatory anti-immigration rhetoric became so dangerously influential that CDA scholars unpack rich descriptions of how media organizations were responsible for letting the presidential candidate and former President engage in free speech absolutism.

By presenting a detailed analysis of linguistic patterns found in the bulk of Trump's speeches, this paper shows how media organizations aided and abetted a polarizing discourse in which audiences felt prideful for not knowing or caring which history of immigration is accurate. Furthermore, this paper indicates how CDA scholars must consider the role of political psychology in shaping macro-level and micro-level relations between actors.

The specific discursive problem concerns how former President Donald Trump used inflammatory rhetoric that was largely supported by corporate media organizations based in the United States. Although some left-leaning media organizations had anchors and television personalities decrying Trump's rhetoric, most espousing centrist or right-leaning ideological positions claimed neutrality yet broadcast an implicit message that Congress should enact anti-immigration policies (Aswad, ٢٠١٩). As the Trump-era policies echoed those of former President George W. Bush and gained widespread public support from voters who believed in racist and xenophobic conspiracy theories, the key stakeholders of corporate media

organizations, aside from those affiliated with Fox News, Breitbart, One America Network (OWN), and NewsMax, felt it necessary to remain quiet on the issue and let viewing audiences determine how congressional events should unfold (Catalano & Mitchell-McCollough, ٢٠١٩; Rodriguez & Monreal, ٢٠١٧; Tapia-Fuselier, Jones, & Harbour, ٢٠٢١). Concurrently, Trump's anti-immigration rhetoric coincided with claims that so-called liberal media was "fake news" advancing a radical agenda permitting immigrants to enter the US freely with no system of checks and balances in place (Green, ٢٠٢١, p. ٩٦). Despite how the bulk of corporate media organizations presented an impression of not contributing to this problem, those with tight-knit political and financial connections insisted that convincing the American public to support Trump's policies required a considerable degree of finesse.

The significance of this discursive problem reflects how Trumpian anti-immigration policies aimed specifically to overturn those made enacted into federal law by former President Barack Obama. Per López (٢٠٢٠), the problem is significant when media coverage of the Development, Relief, and Education for Alien Minors (DREAM) Act of ٢٠١٠ created a path to citizenship for children of undocumented immigrants. As media organizations play central roles in shaping mainstream perceptions of current events, they apply discursive practices that equally humanize and dehumanize subjects from marginalized populations. Similarly, the discursive techniques and rhetorical maneuvers used by Trump during his ٢٠١٦ presidential campaign illustrated how corporate media organizations had a patriotic duty to present Muslims as possessing humanity yet lacking reverence for traditional American values (Kadim, ٢٠٢٢; Khan et al., ٢٠١٩; Khan, Qazalbash, Adnan, Yaqin, & Khuhro, ٢٠٢١). As media organizations pretended to overshadow the concerns of Muslims and refugees from Muslim-

majority countries claiming political asylum, they shifted public attention primarily to the U.S.-Mexico border where Trump to have a multi-billion dollar impenetrable wall constructed (Dávila & Doukmak, ٢٠٢٢; Galindo, ٢٠١٩; Lorenzetti, ٢٠٢٠; Mohammadi, ٢٠١٧). Furthermore, corporate media organizations emphasized the relationship between anti-immigration policy proposals and presidential campaign speeches targeting Democratic rival Hillary Clinton (Kanwal & Maldonado García, ٢٠١٩). As these contextual factors intertwined to foment chaos during the electoral cycle, their significance in relation to the problem indicates that audiences knew media organizations were responsible for who became the future President yet needed scapegoats that required not one modicum of critical thinking to dehumanize. Because of this need, media organizations allowed the political landscape to become dangerous.

Audiences who either internalized or dismissed Trump's inflammatory anti-immigrant rhetoric will find this problem relevant when the American populace is dangerously polarized. While the audiences who accepted Trump's discursive techniques uncritically were predominantly white and ideologically conservative, those who dismissed anti-immigration policy proposals as shams were also white yet embraced some features of liberal ideology, at a minimum (Aperocho, Ates, & Corias, ٢٠٢٢; Catalano & Mitchell-McCollough, ٢٠١٩; García, ٢٠١٨). However, audiences who felt ambivalent toward the state of immigration in the US recognized how media organizations hold enough political power to shift public opinion.

Zhao, Rodriguez, and Monzó (٢٠١٩) noted how political power demands audiences exercise caution when using new technologies capable of providing real-time information reinforcing dominant power structures. Knowing how Trump was notorious for using the social media platform Twitter at any time to communicate

brief anti-immigration messages containing less than ١٤٠ characters each, the former presidential candidate and President took advantage of an opportunity to use technological innovation for self-serving purposes (Green, ٢٠٢١; Lorenzetti, ٢٠٢٠; Zhao et al., ٢٠١٩). Consequently, the ability of Trump to gain mass support for anti-immigration policies illustrates how audiences receiving messages broadcast from corporate outlets and social media platforms accepted new discursive techniques that were equally authoritarian and democratic (Green, ٢٠٢١). The broader ideological implications of these media perceptions are such that a CDA framework informed by mental models is appropriate for explaining how discursive strategies anchored in political psychology contributed to the problem. By emphasizing the role played by political psychology, the analysis of this problem accounts for the relationships between multiple discursive strategies.

Literature Review

The research findings establish how media perceptions of Donald Trump's anti-immigration rhetoric largely reflected his privileged background as an Ivy League school graduate. Although Trump, as Gil-Bonilla (٢٠٢٠) noted, did not expand his economic background to politics until the early ٢٠٠٠s, he initially registered as a Democrat until only one year before his Republican presidency. Initially, media presentations of interviews with Trump featured him vocalizing support for immigrants and other marginalized people. Since Trump drew from his professional background as a business mogul, he gave the impression of insisting that everyone who came to the United States deserved equal opportunity.

However, Trump presupposed that immigrants, particularly those from Latino and Muslim-majority countries, ruined the fabric of American democracy (Gil-Bonilla, ٢٠٢٠; Kadim, ٢٠٢٢). Trump previously defined immigrants as in-group members whose rights and concerns mattered to him. Yet, his presidential candidacy revealed that hyperbolic words like "tremendous" often accompanied Trump's discursive strategies apparently quantifying the magnitude of the danger posed by immigrants (Gil-Bonilla, ٢٠٢٠, p. ١٢). By soon treating immigrants as the abject Other, Trump maintained a strong media presence as a controversial figurehead whose recurrent use of words like "criminals," "rapists," and "bad people" were frequently repeated in media sources (Catalano & Mitchell-McCollough, ٢٠١٩, p. ١٤). In turn, media organizations allowed Trump to continue betraying his previous interests because the presidential candidate was more concerned about ratings.

Notwithstanding how Trump appealed to mostly white and conservative voters, media organizations allowed the presidential candidate and former President to make compassionate moves by courting in people who represented the lowest possible common denominator. Aperocho et al. (٢٠٢٢) explained how appeals to base emotions were prevalent while the media took a passive stance in granting Trump absolute free speech rights. The media also stood quietly in granting Trump a platform that allowed him to use inflated metaphors when making the case for ridding all immigrants from the United States (Aperocho et al., ٢٠٢٢; Kadim, ٢٠٢٢; Khan et al., ٢٠١٩; Khan et al., ٢٠٢٢). Interestingly, the findings indicate that few media sources emphasized how Trump supported Indigenous rights by claiming Native peoples were victimized by illegal immigrants (Aperocho et al., ٢٠٢٢). If Trump's claims were true, they reflect a deliberate subversion of history such that white colonial settlers were the illegal immigrants who stole their land

and subsequently forced them to live on reservations. However, Trump's inflammatory rhetoric displaced such a historical relationship by using emotional appeals to reinforce how little people representing the lowest possible common denominator knew about their own country. By appealing quite literally to the base, Trump relied on media organizations to make negative comparisons by which fake news claims were rampant when journalists and television personalities decried his proposed border policy (Dávila & Doukmak, ٢٠٢٢; Galindo, ٢٠١٩; Green, ٢٠١٩; Lorenzetti, ٢٠٢٠; Mohammadi, ٢٠١٧). Since Trump and his base audience maintained that all immigrants were bad people, media perceptions of these claims resulted in journalists expressing dismay and issuing condemnatory statements. Of course, the statements issued by a small handful of media organizations only fueled Trump's fire.

The findings indicate even further that media perceptions of Trump's anti-immigration discourse involved blaming victims for not choosing to enter the US illegally or claim political asylum from what was infamously described as "shithole countries" (Dávila & Doukmak, ٢٠٢٢, pp. ٩-١٠). Researchers specifically noted how Trump made international headlines in January ٢٠١٨ by asking why immigrants and refugees came from places like El Salvador, Haiti, and various parts of Africa. Accordingly, Trump's perceptions of people from these countries as racially inferior allowed media organizations to highlight the controversy but quickly shifted focus to seemingly more important issues (Dávila & Doukmak, ٢٠٢٢; Galindo, ٢٠١٩; Lorenzetti, ٢٠٢٠; Mohammadi, ٢٠١٧). As Trump blame the victims of historically rooted political corruption for letting their countries deteriorate, his audiences were polarized in such a Machiavellian fashion that media organizations could not fathom the possibility of reconciling different viewpoints. In effect, Trump acted as a mastermind of sowing political divisions by

using the media to his benefit while journalists had few tools with which they could practice self-defense. Trump described himself as an actor and entertainer who assumed that appealing to what he knew most Americans believed would secure a public following (García, ٢٠١٨; Kadim, ٢٠٢٢; Khan et al., ٢٠١٩; Khan et al., ٢٠٢٢). Similarly, media organizations permitted Trump to espouse venomous anti-immigration rhetoric as an "off the spectrum" presidential candidate and President who relied on his lack of political experience to capitalize on base emotional appeals (García, ٢٠١٨, p. ٦٨). Trump's inexperience furthered media and public interest when the formality of American politics became a complete joke.

Furthermore, the numbers game played by Trump aligned with the use of hyperbolic statements claiming that a higher percentage of immigrants were responsible for letting the US infrastructure crumble. Regarding the anti-Muslim rhetoric used by Trump, the findings presented by Khan et al. (٢٠١٩) indicated that all speeches made by the presidential candidate and former President increased anti-immigrant sentiment. In turn, media organizations conducted push polls in which the questions were intentionally biased toward Republican interests and the respondents vehemently opposed all new immigration into the country. The media played along with Trump's numbers game and stated all poll results were nationally representative. Consequently, media perceptions of anti-Muslim and anti-immigration rhetoric allowed Trump to further inflate his ego by declaring that "Islam hates us" (Khan et al., ٢٠١٩, p. ١١٨). The numbers game then turned into a metaphor from which Trump appealed to the white Christian sentiments of rural Americans with low education levels. Based on Trump's speeches, appealing to the pride Americans take in their anti-intellectualism is not the least surprising when political actors regularly championed exceptionalism. Tapia-Fuselier et al. (٢٠٢١) noted how metaphors used in Trump's anti-immigration speeches reinforced how

corporate media favored white audiences as having more rights to occupy space as they please. As white audiences believe they are the "real" Americans, corporate media stakeholders allowed Trump to showcase how anyone disagreeing with the candidate was immediately ejected (Tapia-Fuselier et al., ٢٠٢١, p. ٧). Corporate media permitted Trump to repeat this vicious cycle in ways considered unprecedented to left-leaning Americans yet dated back to the proto-fascist era of Benito Mussolini.

Next, the findings indicated that repetition was a powerful psychological force when both Trump and corporate media consistently valorized the interests of in-group members while simultaneously demonizing those expressed by out-groups. López (٢٠٢٠) explained how illegality was a prevailing discursive term allowing media organizations like Cable News Network (CNN) to broadcast Trump as an off-the-spectrum presidential candidate and represent an out-group for criticizing what appeared to represent mainstream American interests. By making repeated references to illegal immigration in his campaign speeches, Trump also lambasted CNN for daring to ask questions about what potential effects his policy proposals would have on the children of undocumented immigrants (López, ٢٠٢٠; Trujillo-Pagan, ٢٠١٩). Similarly, the use of pronouns fomenting ideological and political divisions was easily noticeable to audiences who either supported or opposed Trump's anti-immigration rhetoric. By using pronouns like "we" to denote how supporters of anti-immigration policy proposals represented a common base, the presidential candidate used the pronoun "they" in demonstrating how opponents were reportedly unqualified to state an opinion on this controversial matter (Kadim, ٢٠٢٢, p. ٣). Yet, corporate media organizations other than Fox News, Breitbart, One America Network (OWN), and NewsMax furthered this polarizing discourse by quietly participating in campaign events. Since Trump remains an extreme

figurehead of contemporary politics who revels in any public attention received, he invited the media to manipulate public opinion and ensured that immigrants, as well as political opponents, would represent an out-group.

Methodology

The research design and methodology are based on the problem identified above, which indicates the important work specified in the field of CDA. CDA is the cornerstone of my analytics and is a powerful tool to explore power and ideology in discourse to investigate important narratives of American media perceptions of anti-immigration rhetoric during the Trump presidential campaign. Data collected through the results of the research showed how CDA scholars can deconstruct media politics by focusing closely on how presidential campaign rhetoric reflects the use of political psychology by media organizations, which examines various newspapers articles for anti-immigration rhetoric during the Trump presidential campaign.

Theoretical Framework

Van Dijk's works followed CDA to provide mental models of how political psychology allows media organizations to manipulate audiences to accept anti-immigration policies. Accordingly, Van Dijk's Ideological Square establishes how media discourse is rarely accidental or neutral when key stakeholders hold racist and xenophobic views of immigrants entering the US legally or illegally. Since corporate media consistently frame immigration as an urgent social problem warranting intervention, stakeholders insist that anchors and television personalities ostensibly espouse a similar position. Applying Dijk's theory, Aswad (٢٠١٩) stated that news content privileges the dominant discourse catering to white, suburban,

older, and middle-class interests while treating people from marginalized communities as criminals. Institutional media sometimes features individuals from these communities but only when their behaviors advance the interests of the dominant audiences. Yet, political psychology maintains its sweeping influence on how audiences respond to anti-immigration policy proposals made by presidential candidates.

Van Dijk's theoretical framework also stresses the micro-level processes of political discourse in the media by highlighting an inextricable relationship between style, meaning, and rhetoric. Examples of discursive strategies anchoring this triangulated process refer to implication, presupposition, hyperbole, compassion move, negative comparison, blaming the victim, contrast and division, actor description, number game, metaphor, repetition, and pronouns (Kadim, ٢٠٢٢). While media organizations and political actors rely on implication as an effective strategy for communicating ideologically driven messages, presupposition emphasizes what speakers know is true or known already by audiences (Kadim, ٢٠٢٢; Rodriguez & Monreal, ٢٠١٧). The same theoretical context treats hyperbole as the tendency to exaggerate ideological statements for humorous or political aims, whereas compassion move is a discursive strategy by which speakers empathize perceived victims of flawed policies (Galindo, ٢٠١٩; Kadim, ٢٠٢٢). Meanwhile, the strategy of negative comparison involves how speakers emphasize criminal behaviors and other wrongdoing for political interests while blaming the victim is strikingly common when speakers attribute to the level of responsibility for a problem to ideological opponents (Kadim, ٢٠٢٢; Lorenzetti, ٢٠٢٠; Mohammadi, ٢٠١٧). Taken together, these first six discursive strategies are evident in media perceptions of Trumpian anti-immigration policies by guiding inflammatory

rhetoric to shape how individual audience members shifted their opinions on this controversial issue in mitigating accusations of fence-sitting.

The selected theoretical framework defines how strategies like contrast and division are frequently applied during election campaigns. Given that Trump banked on an anti-immigration policy stance before launching his ٢٠١٦ presidential bid, he applied this discursive strategy to make his country great again by demonizing most immigrants while assuming that only some were good people (Kadim, ٢٠٢٢; Khan et al., ٢٠١٩; Khan et al., ٢٠٢١). Concurrently, the strategy of actor description applies to how speakers define in-groups as including members whose ideological views are exemplary (Kadim, ٢٠٢٢). When media organizations and presidential candidates rely heavily on statistical information, regardless of accuracy, to persuade audiences accept anti-immigration policy rhetoric, they engage in the number game discursive strategy to build public credibility (Kadim, ٢٠٢٢; Khan et al., ٢٠٢١). Similarly, the strategy of metaphor allows speakers to represent marginalized groups as public enemies unless at least one member internalizes the inflammatory rhetoric (Khan et al., ٢٠١٩). By relying on the strategies of repetition and pronouns, speakers communicating anti-immigrant policy rhetoric maintain in-group/out-group divisions by distinguishing "us" and "them (Kadim, ٢٠٢٢, p. ٣). Overall, these discursive strategies illustrate how the micro-level factors of political discourse have psychological and behavioral consequences when media organizations allowed Trump to influence his audiences.

Discussion of the Findings

The research findings demonstrated how CDA scholars may deconstruct media politics by closely focusing on how presidential campaign speeches reflect the use of political psychology by media organizations. Rayroux (٢٠١٤) noted how

ambiguity found in presidential campaign speeches is a powerful vehicle for change when policy proposals for banning immigrants stress how relations between presidential candidates and media organizations reflect hegemonic interests. While ambiguity suggests that the discursive functions of presidential campaign speeches travel in multiple directions, the concept remains distinct from vagueness when political actors express broad ideological interests despite having no political experience and appealing to audiences with extremely base opinions (Buhler, ٢٠٢١; Rayroux, ٢٠١٤). Here, deconstructing media politics is an ambitious task whereby Dijk's Ideological Square applies to how actors define their linguistic and psychological relationships with immigrants.

Media organizations may prefer to enhance the public image of presidential candidates by intentionally distracting attention away from speech content. Accordingly, media stakeholders believe that brief samples of speeches provide enough contextual information to shape public opinion (Aperocho et al., ٢٠٢٢; Kadim, ٢٠٢٢; Khan et al., ٢٠١٩; Khan et al., ٢٠٢٢). Although media organizations often provide the space for journalists and television personalities to analyze speech content, they emphasize key highlights and invite experts to weigh in on issues. In turn, media organizations profit enormously by interpreting the words used by presidential candidates as shaping political agendas within discursive frameworks (Catalano & Mitchell-McCollough, ٢٠١٩; Rodriguez & Monreal, ٢٠١٧; Tapia-Fuselier et al., ٢٠٢١). As media organizations tout themselves as beacons of political progress, CDA scholars must express skepticism toward the methods used to frame analyses of metaphorical phrasings found in speeches made by Trump as a presidential candidate and President. Furthermore, the research findings established how mainstream media organizations are responsible for constructing the

emotionally-driven norms controlling how audiences perceive tentative relationships with immigrants.

Concerning the linguistic turn in CDA scholarship, researchers advanced the notion that shifting from an epistemological to an ontological challenge is crucial for deconstructing how media organizations draw from political psychology when interpreting speeches made by presidential candidates. For example, Aydin-Düzgit and Rumelili (٢٠١٩) argued that an ontological view of presidential campaign speeches encourages CDA scholars to emphasize how media organizations participate in ideological discourse by assuming a rational stance. As media organizations rarely consider how political actors shape individual and group relations with powerful institutions, scholars have multiple opportunities to demonstrate how shared meanings between audience members produce ideological consequences when public opinion of illegal immigration is overwhelmingly reactionary (Aydin-Düzgit & Rumelili, ٢٠١٩; Kadim, ٢٠٢٢; Khan et al., ٢٠١٩; Khan et al., ٢٠٢١). Notwithstanding how public audiences typically lack the resourcefulness to access complete speech transcripts, CDA scholars must clarify how presidential candidates presuppose their words will create unifying emotional ties when people adhere to vague ideas (Buhler, ٢٠٢١; Hussein & Ahmed, ٢٠٢٠; Kadim, ٢٠٢٢). Public audiences with varying ideological persuasions understand further how presidential candidates rarely disclose their full intentions when delivering speeches.

For Hussein and Ahmed (٢٠٢٠), the ability of media organizations to produce shared meanings often depends on how audiences receive speech-language. Audiences viewing, reading, or listening to how corporate news organizations interpret speeches may also derive meaningful sociological insights into how actors situate language in different institutional settings. Such insights

may also lead scholars to deconstruct speech texts as reinforcing asymmetrical relationships (Aydin-Düzgit & Rumelili, ٢٠١٩; Buhler, ٢٠٢١; Hussein & Ahmed, ٢٠٢٠). However, applying Dijk's Ideological Square to the deconstructionist project requires attention to how actors perceive subjective opinions as inherently objective. While media organizations maintain the power to shape public opinion through political psychology, CDA scholars must explain how visual and print formats, as well as audio recordings, of presidential campaign speeches, cement public support for hegemonic governmental interests (Aydin-Düzgit & Rumelili, ٢٠١٩; Langan, ٢٠١٧). The research findings offered by McCloskey-Gholikhany (٢٠١٩) confirmed how media organizations generally support governmental views on immigration and refugee policies. Despite how the US mostly enjoys the freedom of the press, political actors maintain close ties with media organizations to help audiences locate, perceive, name, and label emerging events confirming biases about asymmetrical power relations with immigrants (McCloskey-Gholikhany, ٢٠١٩; Khan et al., ٢٠١٩, Khan et al., ٢٠٢٢). Although media organizations in the US have stakeholders claiming objectivity, CDA scholars must continue applying Dijk's Ideological Square to unpack how visual and print media shape asymmetrical relations between presidential candidates, audiences, and ideological targets.

Researchers highlight the potential benefits of CDA scholarship to address the tensions between political actors when presidential campaign speeches risk maintaining asymmetrical power relations characterized by marginalized, hybrid, or ambivalent language. Haapakoski and Stein (٢٠١٨) explained how CDA is appropriate for examining the impacts of discursive transformations related to epistemological claims and ontological goals. When political actors deliver speeches on how to improve the American political landscape by disallowing all

immigrants from entering the country, they invite media organizations to tap into the broader psychological view that nativism will support long-term economic growth without fearing strains on government resources (Aydin-Düzgit & Rumelili, ٢٠١٩; Haapakoski & Stein, ٢٠١٨; Hussein & Ahmed, ٢٠٢٠). By performing textual and linguistic analyses of presidential campaign speeches, CDA scholars emphasize how national-level strategies represent the normative frameworks that media organizations depoliticize when appealing to base emotions in audiences. Here, Terzi (٢٠٢١) shows how political actors present their arguments as guided by objective epistemological claims by which audiences treat emotional appeals as evidence. The underlying assumption is that subjective opinions must correspond to socially constructed reality when interlocutors define a problem without necessarily providing thoughtful reasons about its significance (Aydin-Düzgit & Rumelili, ٢٠١٩; Terzi, ٢٠٢١). Because CDA scholars are members of professional academic communities, they remain obliged to derive insights from political psychology to illustrate how epistemological claims have no correlation to ontological goals.

For instance, Krzyżanowski (٢٠١٧) suggested that the tensions between subjectivity and objectivity have their basis in how mainstream media organizations capitalize on emotional appeals. As the stakeholders of media organizations prefer to sensationalize controversial topics and decontextualize critical statements made in presidential campaign speeches, CDA scholars are responsible for closing knowledge gaps when epistemological claims risk operating in vacuums (Krzyżanowski, ٢٠١٧; Terzi, ٢٠٢١). Indeed, the subjective reasons for participating in a discursive landscape should reflect ideological orientations that also determine political consequences. While CDA scholarship anchors the psycholinguistic implications of language use in ideological space, the practice further demonstrates how Dijk's Ideological Square should extend to explaining why presidential

candidates encode discursive techniques into campaign speeches (Kadim, ٢٠٢٢; Khan et al., ٢٠١٩; Khan et al., ٢٠٢١). By addressing where tensions between internal and external political actors lie, CDA scholars can address how conceptual metaphors shape immigration policy relations between the media and their audiences.

For instance, repeated linguistic patterns can position audiences to believe they have informed opinions on political issues. If audiences presume that objectively epistemological claims lack merit, they will shift attention toward alternative views indicating how presidential candidates should negotiate anti-immigration policies with the key stakeholders of corporate media organizations and other political actors (Calliari, ٢٠١٨; Hussein & Ahmed, ٢٠٢٠). Repeated linguistic patterns used in speeches further establish that the positions on salient political issues taken by audiences are legitimate when interlocutors frame speeches as connected to exigent circumstances (Kadim, ٢٠٢٢; Khan et al., ٢٠١٩). Intertextually, the linguistic patterns embedded in presidential speeches are symbolic when placed within rhetorical traditions informed by nationalist and populist ideological positions (Hussain & Ahmed, ٢٠٢٠). Despite how presidential candidates wish to build bridges with audiences that include potential voters, the general public may recognize that political actors lack the capacity to reach ontological goals upon observing further how new administrations cannot possibly achieve sustainable economic goals. However, CDA scholarship identifies the potential of presidential candidates to delegitimize the arguments made by opponents in politically discursive fields where language conveys asymmetrical power relations (Aydin-Düzgit & Rumelili, ٢٠١٩; Calliari, ٢٠١٨; Langan, ٢٠١٧). Although media organizations may call on audiences to legitimize a widely

accepted ideological vision, their stakeholders must address the reasons why tensions between different sets of audiences remain in place.

Importantly, the discursive frames of presidential campaign speeches demonstrate how spoken words provide intertextual clues pertaining to relationships between historical processes and colonial interests rooted in hegemony. Presidential campaign speeches lacking ceremonial flair may draw critical attention when informed audiences pay close attention to linguistic patterns indicating where interlocutors articulate racist and xenophobic opinions (Aydin-Düzgit & Rumelili, ٢٠١٩; Catalano & Mitchell-McCollough, ٢٠١٩; Langan, ٢٠١٧; Rodriguez & Monreal, ٢٠١٧; Tapia-Fuselier et al., ٢٠٢١). Conversely, presidential campaign speeches may involve interlocutors distancing themselves from epistemological claims and ontological goals by paying lip service to different political projects (Carta & Narminio, ٢٠٢٠; Krzyżanowski, ٢٠١٧). Since the cultural interests of marginalized populations appear distant, they reinforce how presidential candidates express hegemonic interests by treating these populations as exotic (Aswad, ٢٠١٩; Kadim, ٢٠٢٢; Khan et al., ٢٠١٩; Khan et al., ٢٠٢١). However, CDA scholars may legitimately address how economic and political situations contribute to mass influxes of immigrant populations. Given that presidential leaders ideally want to promote inclusion yet create political tensions throughout the US, their anti-immigration speeches will undoubtedly read as lacking substance when media organizations quietly reward baseness.

Conclusion

The future research implications of the findings illustrate how CDA scholars must continuously test assumptions made by presidential candidates embarking on political campaigns. When presidential candidates claim to represent broader

democratic interests, the language used reflects a discursive relationship between individual actors and structural functions (Adscheid & Schmitt, ٢٠٢١; Aydin-Düzgit & Rumelili, ٢٠١٩). More specifically, performing thematic analyses of presidential campaign speeches warrants critical attention to linguistic patterns in which interlocutors relied on vague or ambiguous statements while applying discursive techniques and rhetorical maneuvers (Buhler, ٢٠٢١; Rayroux, ٢٠١٤). As media organizations also capitalize on how interlocutors make epistemological claims and achieve ontological goals, their positions on how presidential campaign speeches inform political relationships with immigrants will depend on how strongly audiences believe in the intentions of their leaders (Adscheid & Schmitt, ٢٠٢١; Carta & Narminio, ٢٠٢٠). However, thematic analyses may reveal the limitations of CDA scholarship when ideological views are racially charged.

While policy interests may correspond to national identity constructions, their applications to presidential campaign speeches will likely require more extensive investigations uncovering how the available platforms for articulating exceptionalist or nationalist views become increasingly available (Aydin-Düzgit, ٢٠١٣; Hussain & Ahmed, ٢٠٢٠; Shojaei et al., ٢٠١٣). Concurrently, thematic analyses may not necessarily provide substantive clues into how presidential campaign speeches fuel tensions within the United States. The discursive interests of corporate media organizations should receive critical attention when presidential candidates assume that banning immigration will somehow ease tensions without reinforcing hegemonic interests or further widening ideological divisions. Because the speeches made by Trump were so inflammatory, they also require emotional distance to understand how the presidential candidate and former President effectively applied discursive strategies.

References

Adscheid, T., & Schmitt, P. (٢٠٢١). Mobilising post-political environments: Tracing the selective

geographies of Swedish sustainable urban development. *Urban Research & Practice*, ١٤(٢), ١١٧-١٣٧. DOI: ١٠.١٠٨٠/١٧٥٣٥٠٦٩.٢٠١٩.١٥٨٩٥٦٤

Aperocho, M. D. B., Ates, L. A. C., & Corias, D. B. P. (٢٠٢٢). A critical discourse analysis of

Donald Trump's rhetorical animosity against illegal immigrants. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary: Applied Business and Education Research*, ٣(٢), ٢٥٨-٢٦٨. DOI: ١٠.١١٥٩٤/ijmaber.٠٣.٠٢.١١

Aswad, N. G. (٢٠١٩). Biased neutrality: The symbolic construction of the Syrian refugee in the

New York Times. Critical Studies in Media Communication, ٣٦(٤), ٣٥٧-٣٧٥. DOI: ١٠.١٠٨٠/١٥٢٩٥٠٣٦.٢٠١٩.١٦٢٨٩٩٦

Aydin-Düzgit, S., & Rumelili, B. (٢٠١٩). Discourse analysis: Strengths and shortcomings. *All*

Azimuth, ٨(٢), ٢٨٥-٣٠٥. DOI: ١٠.٢٠٩٩١/allazimuth.٤٧٧٣٠٠

https://dergipark.org.tr/en/pub/allazimuth/issue/٤٢١٧١/٤٧٧٣٠٠

Buhler, T. (٢٠٢١). When vagueness is a strategic resource for planning actors. *Planning Theory*,

٢٠(٤), ٣٢٥-٣٤٩. DOI: ١٠.١١٧٧/١٤٧٣٠٩٥٢٢١٩٩٥٨٦١

Calliari, E. (٢٠١٨). Loss and damage: A critical discourse analysis of Parties' positions in climate

change negotiations. *Journal of Risk Research*, ٢١(٦), ٧٢٥-٧٤٧. DOI: ١٠.١٠٨٠/١٣٦٦٩٨٧٧.٢٠١٦.١٢٤٠٧٠٦

Carta, C., & Narminio, É. (٢٠٢٠). The human factor: Accounting for texts and contexts in the

 analysis of foreign policy and international relations. *International Studies Perspectives*, ٢٢(٣), ٣٤٠-٣٦٠. DOI: ١٠.١٠٩٣/isp/ekaa٠١٦

Catalano, T., & Mitchell-McCollough, J. (٢٠١٩). Representation of unaccompanied migrant

 children from Central America in the United States: Media vs. migrant perspectives. In L. Viola & A. Musolff (Eds.), *Migration and media: Discourses about identities in crisis* (pp. ٢٣٩-٢٦٣). Amsterdam, The Netherlands: Johns Benjamins Publishing Company.

Dávila, L. T., & Doukmak, N. (٢٠٢٢). Immigration debated: Central African immigrant youth's

 discourses of fairness and civic belonging in the United States. *Equity & Excellence in Education*, ٥٥(١-٢), ١١٨-١٣٢. DOI: ١٠.١٠٨٠/١٠٦٦٥٦٨٤.٢٠٢١.١٩٩٧٣٦٤

Dijk, T. van. (١٩٩١). *Racism and the press*. London: Routledge.

Dijk, T. van. (٢٠٠٥). Contextual knowledge management in discourse production: A CDA

 perspective. In R. Wodak & P. Chilton (Eds.), *A new agenda in (critical) discourse analysis: Theory, methodology, and interdisciplinarity* (pp. ٧١-١٠٠). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Dijk, T. van. (٢٠٠٨). *Discourse and context: A sociocognitive context*. New York: Cambridge

 University Press.

Galindo, S. (٢٠١٩). Words matter: Representation of Mexican immigrants in newspapers from

Mexico and the United States. *Migraciones Internacionales*, ١٠(٢), ١-٢٤. DOI: ١٠.٣٣٦٧٩/rmi.v١i١.٢٠٢٤

García, T. M. (٢٠١٨). Donald J. Trump: A critical discourse analysis. *Estudios Institucionales*,

٥(٨), ٤٧-٧٣. Retrieved from https://scholar.archive.org/work/m٥irgbjpbvb٥bnawmv٢xvphbzy/access/wayback/http://revistas.uned.es/index.php/EEII/article/download/٢١٧٧٨/pdf

Gil-Bonilla, J. F. (٢٠٢٠). Critical discourse analysis of Trump across time. *Sustainable*

Multilingualism, ١٦, ١-١٩. DOI: ١٠.٢٤٧٨/sm-٢٠٢٠-٠٠٠١

Green, B. (٢٠٢١). US digital nationalism: A Habermasian critical discourse analysis of Trump's

"fake news" approach to the First Amendment. In A. MacKenzie, J. Rose, & I. Bhatt (Eds.), *The epistemology of deceit in a postdigital era* (pp. ٩٥-١١٧). Cham, Switzerland: Springer. DOI: ١٠.١٠٠٧/٩٧٨-٣-٠٣٠-٧٢١٥٤-١_٦

Haapakoski, J., & Stein, S. (٢٠١٨). The ethical implications of internationalization for a

knowledge economy: A critical discourse analysis approach to contemporary strategies in Finland and Canada. In V. Korhonen & P. Alenius (Eds.), *Internationalization and transnationalisation in higher education. Studies in vocational and continuing education* (pp. ٤١-٦٧). New York, NY: Peter Land Publishing Group.

Hussein, A. S., & Ahmed, M. H. (٢٠٢٠). Representation, attribution, and perspectivation in EU

diplomatic discourse addressed to Iraq. *International Journal of Linguistics, Literature, and Translation*, ٣(١٠), ١٨٨-٢٠٠. DOI: ١٠.٣٢٩٩٦/ijilt.٢٠٢٠.٣.١٠.٢١

Kadim, E. N. (٢٠٢٢). A critical discourse analysis of Trump's election campaign speeches.

   Heliyon, ٨(٤), e٠٩٢٥٦. DOI: ١٠.١٠١٦/j.heliyon.٢٠٢٢.e٠٩٢٥٦

Kanwal, S., & Maldonado García, M. I. (٢٠١٩). Representation of gender through framing: A

   critical discourse analysis of Hillary Clinton's selected speeches. *International Journal of English Linguistics*, ٩(٢), ٣٢١-٣٣١. DOI: ١٠.٥٥٣٩/ijel.v٩n٢p٣٢١

Khan, M. H., Adnan, H. M., Kaur, S., Khuhro, R. A., Asghar, R., & Jabeen, S. (٢٠١٩). Muslims'

   representation in Donald Trump's anti-Muslim statement: A critical discourse analysis. *Religions*, ١٠(٢), ١١٥-١٣٠. DOI: ١٠.٣٣٩٠/rel١٠٠٢٠١١٥

Khan, M. H., Qazalbash, F., Adnan, H. M., Yaqin, L. N., & Khuhro, R. A. (٢٠٢١, January-

   March). Trump and Muslims: A critical discourse analysis of Islamophobic rhetoric in Donald Trump's selected tweets. *SAGE Open*, ١١(١), ١-١٦. DOI: ١٠.١١٧٧/٢١٥٨٢٤٤٠٢١١٠٠٤١٧٢

Krzyżanowski, M. (٢٠١٧). Ethnography and critical discourse studies. In J. Flowerdew & J. E.

   Richardson (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of critical discourse studies* (pp. ١٧٩-١٩٤). New York, NY: Routledge/Taylor & Francis

Langan, M. (٢٠١٧). Virtuous power Turkey in sub-Saharan Africa: The "Neo-Ottoman"

challenge to the European Union. *Third World Quarterly*, ٣٧(٦), ١٣٩٩-١٤١٤. DOI: ١٠.١٠٨٠/٠١٤٣٦٥٩٧.٢٠١٦.١٢٢٩٥٦٩

López, R. M. (٢٠٢٠, March ٢٣). Discursive de/humanizing: A multimodal critical discourse

analysis of television news representations of undocumented youth. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, ٢٨(٤٧), ١-٢٦. DOI: ١٠.١٤٥٠٧/epaa.٢٨.٤٩٧٢

Lorenzetti, M. I. (٢٠٢٠, Spring/Summer). Right-wing populism and the representation of

immigrants on social media: A critical multimodal analysis. *Iperstoria*, ١٥, ٥٩-٩٥. DOI: ١٠.١٣١٣٦/٢٢٨١-٤٥٨٢/٢٠٢٠.i١٥.٦٦٦

McCloskey-Gholikhany, L. (٢٠١٩, June). *EU foreign policy identity: A case study on the EU's*

engagement of the Islamic Republic of Iran (EU Diplomacy Paper ٠٦/٢٠١٩). College of Europe.

http://aei.pitt.edu/١٠٢٣٧٩/١/edp_٦_٢٠١٩-mccloskey-gholikhany.pdf

Mohammadi, M., & Javadi, J. (٢٠١٧, September). A critical discourse analysis of Donald

Trump's language use in US presidential campaign, ٢٠١٦. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics & English Literature*, ٦(٥), ١-١٠. DOI: ١٠.٧٥٧٥/aiac.ijalel.v.٦n.٥p.١

Rayroux, A. (٢٠١٤). Speaking EU defence at home: Contentious discourses and constructive

ambiguity. *Cooperation and Conflict*, ٤٩(٣), ٣٨٦-٤٠٥. DOI: ١٠.١١٧٧/٠٠١٠٨٣٦٧١٣٤٩٥٠٠١

Rodriguez, S. & Monreal, T. (٢٠١٧). "This state is racist…": Policy problematization and

undocumented youth experiences in the New Latino South. *Educational Policy*, ٣١(٦), ٧٦٤-٨٠٠. DOI: ١٠.١١٧٧/٠٨٩٥٩٠٤٨١٧٧١٩٥٢٥

Tapia-Fuselier, N., Jones, V. A., & Harbour, C. P. (٢٠٢١, April ١٩). Uncovering whiteness as

discourse: A critical discourse analysis of the in-state resident tuition debate for undocumented students in Texas. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, ٢٩(٥٢), ١-٢٥. DOI: ١٠.١٤٥٠٧/epaa.٢٩.٥٨٣٤

Terzi, Ö. (٢٠٢١). Norms of belonging: Emotion discourse as a factor in determining future

"Europeans." *Global Affairs*, ٧(٢), ١٣٩-١٥٥. DOI: ١٠.١٠٨٠/٢٣٣٤٠٤٦٠.٢٠٢١.١٩٢٧٧٩٤

Trujillo-Pagan, N. (٢٠١٩). Self-deportation and forced choice as discursive maneuver: Force and

"voluntary" migration. *Language, Discourse & Society*, ٧(١), ١٩٧-٢١٣. Retrieved from http://cejsh.icm.edu.pl/cejsh/element/bwmeta١.element.desklight-٤٧d٢e٤٦f-b٩٠٢-٤٥f٢-b٨٤٧-٩b٥١٥١٢f٦٤cf/c/Trujillo-Pagan_Language-Discourse-and-Society_٢٠١٩_١٣_V٧_n١.pdf

Zhao, M., Rodriguez, J., & Monzó, L. D. (٢٠١٩). Media discourses that normalize colonial

relations: A critical discourse analysis of (im)migrants and refugees. *Language, Discourse & Society*, ٧(١), ١٢٧-١٤٢. Retrieved from http://cejsh.icm.edu.pl/cejsh/element/bwmeta١.element.desklight-be٦fa٧٠f-٦٧a٧-٤٦٧٨-٨٨١٩-d٠٥٣٧٢ba٧٠٥٣/c/Zhao_Rodriguez_Monzo_Language-Discourse-and-Society_٢٠١٩_١٣_V٧_n١.pdf