

Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research
University of Babylon
College of Education for Human Sciences
Department of English



A Critical Discourse Analysis of Xenophobia in Selected English Speeches

A Paper

Submitted to the Department of English, College of Education for Human sciences,
University of Babylon, as a Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for B.Ed Degree in
English language

Submitted by

Maitham Aqeel Kareem Saadoun

Supervised by

Dr. Masouma Aba Dhaar

2023/2024

Dedication

To Thy Knowledge

Acknowledgments

The journey wasn't short. The dream wasn't near, nor was the road paved with ease, but I did it and achieved it. After years of an academic journey filled with many difficulties, hardships, and fatigue. Here I stand today on the threshold of my graduation, reaping the fruits of my effort and I lift my hat proudly. I believe in the saying that every beginning has an end. Here I see my university journey nearing its completion indeed. Thanks and gratitude to God for His blessings; I wouldn't have done this without God's grace. So, praise be to God for the beginning and for the end. First: I give this success to myself, who struggled, worked hard, and fought for this day. And to my beloved family and friends, They are my constant support. Thanks to their love and continuous encouragement, I have reached this stage. Thank you from the deep of my heart. To my supervisor, Dr. Masouma Aba Dhaar, I express appreciation and gratitude for her faithfulness, guidance, and continuous support. She encouraged me throughout my research journey. All love, respect, and appreciation to her.

Table of Contents

Subject	Page
Dedication	II
Acknowledgments	III
Table of Contents	IV
Chapter One: Introduction	
1.1 The Problem	1
1.2 The Aims	1
1.3 The Hypotheses	1
1.4 The procedures	2
1.5 The limits	2
1.6 The Value	2
Chapter Two: Theoretical background	
2.1 Critical discourse analysis	3
2.2 Xenophobia	5
2.2.1 Definition of Political Xenophobia	5
2.3 The selected samples	6
Chapter Three: Methodology	
3.1 Methodology	8
3.1.1 qualitative	8
3.1.2 quantitative	9
3.1.3 Mixed	9
3.2 Theoretical Model	10
3.2.1 Macro Analysis	10
3.2.1.1 Ideological Square	10
3.2.2 Micro Analysis	11
3.2.2.1 Ideological Discourse Analysis	11
3.2.2.1.1 Norm and Value Violation	12
3.2.2.1.2 Negative Lexicalization	12
3.2.2.1.3 Hyperbole	12
3.2.2.1.4 Compassion Move	12
3.2.2.1.5 Warning	12
3.2.2.1.6 Apparent Altruism Move	12
3.2.2.1.7 Generalization	13
3.3 Data collection and selection	13
Chapter Four: Data Analysis and Results	
4.1 The Macro–Level Analysis	14
4.1.1 Ideological Square	14
4.2 The Micro Level Analysis	15
4.2.1 Ideological Discourse Analysis	15
4.2.1.1. Norm and Value Violation	15
4.2.1.2 Negative Lexicalization	16
4.2.1.3 Hyperbole	17
4.2.1.4 Compassion Move	17

4.2.1.5 Warning	18
4.2.1.6 Apparent Altruism Move	18
4.2.1.7 Generalization	19
4.3 The Results of Ideological Square Analysis	19
4.4 The Results of Ideological Discourse Analysis	20
Chapter Five: Conclusions	
5.1 Conclusions	21
Bibliography	22

Chapter One

Introduction

1.1 The Problem

The problem of this study is that to the researcher's best knowledge no one has investigated the ideological strategies used by Donald Trump for spread the ideology of xenophobia among the American people. This issue needs serious consideration and investigation.

So, this study tries to answer the following questions:

- 1-** What are the ideological discursive strategies used by Donald Trump for spreading the ideology of xenophobia among the American people?
- 2-** How does Donald Trump use ideological discursive strategies to pass this ideology among the American people?
- 3-** How does Donald Trump use positive self-presentation and negative other presentation to pass this ideology among the American people?

1.2 The Aims

Based on the above questions, this study attempts to fulfill the following aims:

- 1-** In this getting the ideological discursive strategies used by Donald Trump for spreading the ideology of xenophobia among the American people.
- 2-** Shedding the light on how Donald Trump uses ideological discursive strategies to pass this ideology among the American people.
- 3-** Identifying how Donald Trump uses positive self-presentation and negative other presentation to pass this ideology among the American people.

1.3 The Hypotheses

To achieve the above aims it is hypothesized that:

- 1-** Donald Trump uses a number of ideological discursive strategies in the micro level according to van Dijk analysis such as norm and value violation, negative lexicalization, hyperbole, warning and generalization.
- 2-** Donald Trump doesn't use the ideological discursive strategies of the compassion move and Apparent Altruism move.

3- Donald Trump uses the macro level strategies of the ideological square to present the ideology of xenophobia in his speeches by using positive self-presentation and negative other presentations.

1.4 The procedures

In order to fulfill the aims of the current study, the following procedures are followed:

- 1- Presenting a theoretical background of CDA as well as a brief account of the selected political speeches and their speaker Donald Trump.
- 2- Developing an eclectic model of analysis based on Van Dijk (1998) and (1995).
- 3- Analyzing Donald Trump's selected speeches qualitatively based on the eclectic model.
- 4- Presenting results and conclusions based on the analysis of Xenophobia in selected speeches by Donald Trump.

1.5 The limits

This study is limited to investigating the ideology of Xenophobia in Donald Trump's political speeches and analyzing them critically.

1.6 The Value

This study is important since it sheds light on the xenophobic nature of Donald Trump's speeches and his aims to pass the ideology of xenophobia to his audiences. This study aims to make audiences, or people in general, more conscious about xenophobic speeches

Chapter Two

Theoretical background

2.1 Critical discourse analysis

A select group of scholars, including Teun van Dijk, Norman Fairclough, Gunter Kress, Theo van Leeuwen, and Ruth Wodak, participated in a symposium in Amsterdam in 1991, coinciding with the appearance of the term "critical discourse analysis" at the beginning of the 1990s. Researchers in critical discourse analysis began publishing in *Discourse and Society* (1990), a journal introduced by van Dijk. Subsequently, several other journals, such as *Critical Discourse Studies* and *The Journal of Language and Politics*, were established, contributing to the consolidation of the cultural discourse analysis paradigm in linguistics. Across the globe, numerous university departments have integrated critical discourse analysis into their curricula, selecting it as their primary area of study (Wodak and Meyer, 2008: p.3).

Three guiding principles—problem-oriented, interdisciplinary, and eclectic—define critical discourse analysis as a school or paradigm. It adopts a multidisciplinary and multi-methodological approach to studying complex social phenomena, which is the focal point of critical discourse analysis. Furthermore, critical discourse analysis aims to demystify ideologies and power by examining semiotic evidence. Unlike discourse analysis, critical discourse analysis is more problem-oriented and multidisciplinary. Emphasizing that "critical" does not always imply a negative connotation and can be interpreted from a different perspective is crucial. (Wodak and Meyer, 2008: p.2)

In discussing the relationship between form (including grammar, morphology, semantics, syntax, and pragmatics) and function (how people use language in different situations to achieve specific goals), CDA is not solely descriptive; it is also interpretive and explicative. Fairclough asserts that critical thinking requires an specified approach and aims to uncover "ideologies and interconnections revealed through analysis," challenging the connections between "textual properties, social processes, and power relations not immediately apparent to text producers and interpreters." By employing this method, critical discourse analysis relinquishes its objectivity and delves into the concealed influence within discourse concerning broader social and cultural structures (Fairclough, 1992a, 1995) (Rogers, 2004: p.31-48).

According to Jorgensen and Phillips (2011), discourse analysis (DA) is a branch of linguistics that examines language at the context level from a grammatical perspective. According to Yule DA studies how language users decipher and comprehend social and contextual cues conveyed through language text. (Yule, 1997:p.139).

Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) examines language use in both written and spoken communication, particularly in relation to evaluative processes. According to Fairclough, CDA investigates how texts are intertwined with the discursive practices and dynamics of social and cultural systems, marked by the interplay between ideologies and power dynamics. Additionally, Wodak posits that CDA analyzes various overt and covert structural interactions involving dominance, control, discrimination, and power inherent in language (Fairclough and Wodak, 1995, p. 258).

In conclusion, a critical discourse analysis aims to achieve the following:

- 1- CDA seeks to establish clear power relationships, which are typically muddled and concealed, and to identify outcomes with significant application.
- 2- The idea of context is crucial to CDA since its methodologies make reference to extralinguistic elements like culture, society, and ideology.
- 3- CDA employs concepts of intertextuality and interdiscursivity, analyzes relationships with other texts, and applies interdisciplinary in many ways.
- 4- CDA refers to the concept of mediation rather than a deterministic relationship between language and society.
- 5- The majority of CDA scholars use linguistic categories into their work, albeit with varying degrees of emphasis, intensity, and scope.
- 6- A wide range of ideas, including discourse theories, linguistic theories, micro-sociological theories, general social theories, middle-range theories, and socio-psychological theories, serve as the foundation for CDA. Nevertheless, it lacks a clear empirical methodology and offers no guidance or explanation on how to collect data. The hermeneutic tradition serves as a stronger foundation for CDA methodology than the analytical-deductive one. Nonetheless, in terms of CDA's linguistic nature, it depends on linguistic categories, in contrast to other text and discourse analysis methodologies. (Idem, 28).

2.2 Xenophobia

Xenophobia refers to an excessive fear, dislike, or hostility towards anything considered “foreign” or anyone from outside one’s own social group, nation, or country. It is a term used to express hate and fear towards the "other" who is foreign. There is a long history of xenophobia, and it continues to influence the political discourse today. There are two types of fear: "xenos" and "phobos," which are linked to phobias. Xenophobia is the fear or hatred of strangers or foreigners. It can manifest in different ways, including discrimination, prejudice, or hatred towards individuals or groups that are perceived as being different or foreign. (Hjerm, 1998, 2009:p.1) (McEvoy, 1995:p.1) (Orenstein, 1985:p.1).

Xenophobia is the term used to describe the fear or dislike of foreigners or anything perceived as being foreign or strange. It's a complex issue with deep-rooted historical and psychological factors, often fueled by misinformation, prejudice, and negative stereotypes. (Lexico, 2019:p.1)

According to Reynolds and Vine define xenophobia as a psychological condition characterized by hostility or fear towards individuals from outside one's own group. The term originates from the Ancient Greek words "phobic," meaning fear, and "xenos," meaning strange. Van Amersfoort (1982) asserts that the conflict between immigrants and the host society during economic downturns is the root cause of xenophobia. From the perspective of the locals, the immigrants are rivals for employment or housing. Xenophobia is associated with nationalism and ethnocentrism, as they both share the conviction that one's own nation state is superior to all others. (Reynolds and Vine,1987: p. 28). (Licata & Klein, 2002; Schirmer, 1998).

2.2.1 Definition of Political Xenophobia:

The term "xenophobia" has been somewhat ambiguous for a long time, mostly used to describe feelings of hatred, dread, or animosity directed towards "foreigners," primarily "ethnic foreigners". In many ways, particularly in the European context, this phrase has superseded the commonly used idea of racism. In the 1980s, this concept was expanded to encompass the rise of new radical right-wing parties and movements in Europe. (Mudde, 2000: p188) (Van Holsteyn, 1998: p.165-178)

Mudde, broadened the concept of xenophobia to include the view that "anything foreign is threatening," expanding beyond the immigration debate and into a more ideologically expansive field based on Watts' (1996, 1997) claim. These groups are not limited to immigrant populations and should not be characterized exclusively by archaic traits like religion or ethnicity. Homosexuals are one social group that may be the target of xenophobia. (Mudde, 2000-1999: p.188).

2.3 The selected samples:

In this paper, we have chosen three political speeches from Donald Trump, the former U.S. president. Trump initiated his presidential campaign at the Trump Tower in Manhattan, emphasizing the slogan "Make America Great Again." Addressing (illegal) immigration on his political agenda, certain comments made during the campaign were criticized for their perceived racist undertones, as indicated by the following statements:

- 1- “ When Mexico sends its people, they’re not sending their best. They’re not sending you. They’re sending people that have lots of problems, and they’re bringing those problems with us. They’re bringing drugs. They’re bringing crime. They’re rapists. And some, I assume, are good people,” Trump said at his campaign announcement. “But I speak to border guards and they tell us what we’re getting. And it only makes common sense. It only makes common sense. They’re sending us not the right people. It’s coming from more than Mexico. It’s coming from all over South and Latin America, and it’s probably coming from the Middle East. But we don’t know. Because we have no protection and we have no competence, we don’t know what’s happening. And it’s got to stop and it’s got to stop fast.”
<https://www.politico.eu/article/15-most-offensive-things-trump-campaign-feminism-migration-racism/>

In a speech delivered on June 16, 2015, Donald Trump, then a candidate for the Republican nomination for president of the United States, made a number of controversial statements about Mexican immigrants. Trump began his speech by claiming that Mexico is sending "rapists," "criminals," and "drug lords" to the United States. He also said that Mexico is "not sending their best" and that "they're bringing drugs, they're bringing crime, they're rapists." .Trump's speech was widely condemned by both Democrats and Republicans.

Some people accused him of racism and xenophobia. Others said that his comments were harmful and divisive.

- 2- “ Negotiating with Japan, negotiating with China, when these people walk into the room, they don’t say, ‘Oh, hello, how’s the weather, so beautiful outside, isn’t it lovely? How are the Yankees doing ” ?

<https://tnp.straitstimes.com/news/world-news/donald-trump-mocks-chinese-businessmen-broken-english>

This statement was made during a campaign rally in Iowa in 2016, while Trump was running for president of the United States. It was delivered as part of a larger narrative about his business experience and negotiation skills, specifically with Asian countries. As mentioned, Donald Trump shared an anecdote at a campaign rally in Iowa, highlighting the contrast between the American approach and the Chinese/Japanese approach to negotiating deals. He noted that unlike Americans, the Chinese and Japanese did not concern themselves with niceties during meetings.

- 3- “ Black guys counting my money! I hate it. The only kind of people I want counting my money are short guys that wear yarmulkes every day. I think the guy is lazy. And it’s probably not his fault because laziness is a trait in blacks. It really is, I believe that. It’s not anything they can control.” <https://www.politico.eu/article/15-most-offensive-things-trump-campaign-feminism-migration-racism/>.

This speech you provided is attributed to Donald Trump and is controversial due to its racist undertones. In this statement, he expresses discriminatory and racist views towards black individuals, suggesting that they are lazy and incompetent. Trump expresses a prejudiced view about black individuals, making derogatory remarks about their work ethic and perpetuating harmful stereotypes. Such language has been widely criticized for promoting racism and reinforcing negative stereotypes about a particular racial group.

Chapter Three

Methodology

3.1 Methodology

The methodology is commonly defined as "a set of techniques and principles applied in scientific or disciplinary contexts." In contrast, a method is described as "a regular, organized plan or approach to carrying out a task." The term 'method' originates from the Greek word 'methods' (meta+bodos), signifying a way or path. As such, the social research method refers to the systematic approach researchers employ to gather essential data for identifying and elucidating social phenomena under investigation. Within the realm of social sciences, a dichotomy exists, classifying research methods into two main types: quantitative and qualitative. Additionally, various other research methods include pure, applied, evaluation, descriptive, explanatory, experimental, non-experimental, ex post facto, survey, case study, and action research methods.

Nasir, moh, Metode penelitian (Jakarta: Ghalia Indonesia,1998:p.31)

3.1.1 qualitative

Often, qualitative research is defined as exploratory research. This means that it tries to give the reader a guide for understanding of underlying opinions, reasons, motivations and convictions. Furthermore, this type of research is also used to gain a deeper understanding of the problem or thoughts. One can conduct a semi-structured or unstructured qualitative data sample. What applies for all the types of qualitative research is that the sample is typically small. Also, qualitative researchers are often interested in behavior or how people see things (Hammersley, 2013). Therefore, this study is defined as qualitative research. The reactions underneath the posts of Donald Trump are a certain form of behavior and may reflect how one sees the world. Hammersly, M. (2013).

Qualitative research focuses on understanding social phenomena through non-numeric data.

- It employs methods like field observations and in-depth interviews.
- Aims to explore individual experiences, emotions, and perspectives.

Brown, A. (2015:p.72)

3.1.2 quantitative

Quantitative methodology holds a prominent position in social sciences research, encompassing a set of approaches, techniques, and assumptions employed to investigate psychological, social, and economic processes by examining numerical patterns. The gathering of quantitative data encompasses both inherently quantitative information, like personal income, and cases where a numeric structure is imposed, as seen in questions like 'On a scale from 1 to 10, how depressed did you feel last week?' This numerical data collection enables researchers to perform statistical analyses ranging from basic measures like averages and percentages to sophisticated examinations, revealing relationships among data or facilitating comparisons across aggregated information, such as comparing the gross domestic product of the USA and Spain. Quantitative research utilizes methodologies like questionnaires, structured observations, or experiments and contrasts with qualitative research, which involves collecting and analyzing narratives or open-ended observations through methods like interviews, focus groups, or ethnographies. Coghlan, D., Brydon-Miller, M. (2014).

Quantitative research relies on numerical data and statistical analysis.

- It involves methods like surveys, experiments, and statistical tests.
- Aim is to uncover numerical patterns and relationships.

Smith, J. A. (2010:p.45).

3.1.3 Mixed

Mixed methodology is defined as a research design that involves collecting, analyzing, and interpreting both quantitative and qualitative data in a single study, providing a more holistic perspective on the research question. Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2017).

Mixed methodology, often referred to as mixed methods research, is a research approach that integrates both quantitative and qualitative research methods within a single study. This methodological framework enables researchers to gain a more comprehensive and nuanced understanding of a research problem by combining numerical and non-numerical data. The integration of these methods can occur at various stages of the research process, such as data collection, analysis, or interpretation (Creswell & Creswell, 2017).

The purpose of mixed methodology lies in its ability to capitalize on the strengths of both quantitative and qualitative approaches, addressing the limitations of each method while offering a more robust and nuanced understanding of the research problem. Johnson, R. B., & Onwuegbuzie, A. J. (2004:p.14-26).

In this present study, I will use the qualitative method for the analysis in selected samples.

3.2 Theoretical Model

This study focuses on two types of analysis: macro and micro. The micro-analysis consists of ideological discourse analysis, adopting van Dijk (1995). The analysis at the macro level employs Van Dijk's ideological square, comprising positive self-presentation and negative other presentation, as per Van Dijk (1998).

3.2.1 Macro Analysis

Tannen, Hamilton, and Schiffrin (2018: p.468) emphasize that language use, discourse, verbal interaction, and communication are part of the micro level of analysis. Meanwhile, power, dominance, racism, and social inequality between groups fall within the macro level of analysis.

3.2.1.1 Ideological Square

Van Dijk (1998) highlights that the ideological square is a significant element of the socio-cognitive approach. This approach focuses on the tactics employed by various social groups to portray themselves positively and others negatively. It involves the polarization of how individuals, particularly the media, accentuate the positive actions of the in-group and downplay their negative actions. Simultaneously, it downplays the negative actions of the out-group and diminishes their positive actions. The ideological square comprises four distinct moves, which are as follows:

- 1- Expressing or highlighting positive information about “ourselves.”
- 2- Expressing or highlighting negative information about “others.”
- 3- Suppressing or downplaying negative information about “ourselves.”
- 4- Suppressing or downplaying positive information about “others” (Le, 2006:p.211).

Van Dijk (1998:p.33) asserts that the dual approach of this binary opposition is frequently found in discourse through lexical selections and various linguistic devices. Numerous group ideologies revolve around portraying the self versus the other or us versus them, leading to polarized discourse, where "we are good" and "they are bad." This approach is implemented through lexical choices and diverse linguistic devices.

In this study, Van Dijk's (1998) ideological square serves as the macro analysis and concludes the analytical process. Its purpose is to uncover the concealed ideological framework involving positive self-presentation and negative other-presentation within the chosen speeches of the major figure, Donald Trump, in Xenophobia, thereby exposing the underlying ideology.

3.2.2 Micro Analysis

The micro-analysis in the present study consists of Ideological discourse, as presented below:

3.2.2.1 Ideological Discourse Analysis

According to Van Dijk, discourse analysis is a widely practiced method in the humanities and social sciences. Ideological discourse analysis, as emphasized by Van Dijk, involves exposing and clarifying writers' ideologies through in-depth reading and analysis of their discourse. This type of socio-political analysis aims to establish connections between society and discourse by exploring the influence of social factors such as relation, class, gender, or ethnicity on textual and spoken strategies. The discursive strategies are intricately woven into social, cultural, and political contexts, defining language users as members who are expected to communicate in alignment with these social and political aspects (Van Dijk, 1995:p.135).

This approach relies on the correlation between discourse and society, where the language users' communication is intricately tied to social and political elements. Ideologies, forming the foundation of opinions regarding the out-group, are manifested through syntactic or semantic choices, allowing for the expression of social judgments. The in-group, encompassing friends, allies, and family members, is portrayed positively, while the out-group, consisting of enemies and opponents, is depicted in a negative light (Van Dijk, 1995: p.113). To expose the hidden ideologies, Van Dijk (1995: 147-157) presents a number of discourse structures and strategies as follows:

3.2.2.1.1 Norm and Value Violation

This strategy aims to describe the other group as negatively by showing them as violating the rules and principles of the whole community. It's commonly associated with dictatorship, as dictators use this strategy to promote their authority by describing their enemies as violating the norms and values that they are highly committed to. (Van Dijk, 1995: 147-157).

3.2.2.1.2 Negative Lexicalization

This strategy involves choosing strong negative words or lexical items to characterize the actions of the out-group, such as terms like destroy, terrorism, fear, obsession, hatred, or paralyzed. Dictators use this strategy to describe their enemies negatively, employing unfavorable expressions in describing them.

This strategy is applicable not only to dictators but can also be used by media organizations, politicians, or individuals for purposes of manipulation (Van Dijk, 1995: 147-157).

3.2.2.1.3 Hyperbole

This strategy refers to the description of an event or an action in strongly exaggerated terms. For example, the bomb attack in which only few people died is compared to a nuclear disaster. This strategy refers to dictators, since they use exaggerated terms for viewing their enemies negatively (Van Dijk, 1995: 147-157).

3.2.2.1.4 Compassion Move

This strategy is used to express empathy and compassion for the helpless victims of others. Dictators use this strategy to demonstrate to the public that they empathize not only with their own citizens but also with their enemies (Van Dijk, 1995: 147-157).

3.2.2.1.5 Warning

This strategy involves the speaker using fearful language to warn the in-group about the perceived threat posed by the out-group. Dictators use this strategy as a means to consolidate absolute power, using fearful terms to raise alarm about the dangers posed by their enemies (Van Dijk, 1995: 147-157).

3.2.2.1.6 Apparent Altruism Move

This move is connected to the empathy and to the compassion Move. It involves highlighting understanding for the interest of others. For instance, individuals who are against

a particular group, like anti-Muslims, might interest to care about Muslims while not genuinely doing so. Dictators use this strategy to convey to their audience that they comprehend the perspectives of both their citizens and their enemies (Van Dijk, 1995: 147-157).

3.2.2.1.7 Generalization

Generalization is a strategy used by an individual or a small group to make to refer to the whole population or group (Van Dijk, 1995). Dictators use this strategy to manipulate public opinion by using the actions of one negative individual as a representation for the whole group (ibid). It's worth noting that these strategies can be used by social actors for both positive and negative intentions.

3.3 Data collection and selection

After searching for xenophobic speeches. The data used in the present study was selected from the Donald Trump's speeches. Since the day he declared himself a candidate for the American presidency, reflecting the president's xenophobic ideology. Donald Trump's speeches have been collected and will be used as data for analysis. The speeches of this main character were chosen regardless of the speeches of other characters, because they represent the ideology and the linguistic strategies used by him.

The data was chosen by the researcher because it includes speeches by Donald Trump containing xenophobic ideology. In the first speech, Donald Trump a Republican presidential candidate, made controversial statements about Mexican immigrants, accusing Mexico of sending criminals and drug lords. highlighting his tendency to negatively stereotype Mexican people. In the second speech, during a 2016 campaign rally in Iowa, Donald Trump, then a presidential candidate, shared an anecdote highlighting differences in negotiation styles between Americans and the Chinese/Japanese. The speech, emphasizing his business experience, has since been criticized for reinforcing harmful stereotypes, disrespecting cultural diversity, and potentially fueling racist and xenophobic sentiments. In the third speech, Trump articulates racism views about black individuals, making discreditable statements about their work ethic and perpetuating harmful stereotypes. The language used has faced widespread criticism for promoting racism and reinforcing negative stereotypes associated with a specific racial group.

Chapter Four

Data Analysis and Results

4.1 The Macro–Level Analysis

In Van Dijk's (1998) the macro analysis according to the ideological square, positive-self presentation and negative other presentation in Donald Trump's speeches, we examine how language is used to construct social representations.

4.1.1 Ideological Square

1- In the first speech.

Representation of the Ourselves: Trump describes himself as the protector of American interests, using phrases like "us" and "we" to create a sense of unity among his audience.

Representation of the Others: He describes immigrants, particularly from Mexico and other areas, as undesirable, associating them with negative attributes like crime, drugs, and rapists. This reinforces an "us versus them" mentality.

Evaluation of the Ourselves: Trump describes himself as the voice of reason and common sense, claiming to speak on behalf of border guards and asserting that the current situation requires immediate action.

Evaluation of the Others: Immigrants are described as a threat to American society and competence, suggesting a lack of control over the situation and the need for strict measures to address it.

2- In the second speech.

Representation of the Ourselves: Trump presents himself as someone who prioritizes directness and strength in negotiations, contrasting himself with a hypothetical polite and passive approach.

Representation of the Others: He describes individuals from Japan and China as lacking in directness and assertiveness, this means weakness or inferiority.

Evaluation of the Ourselves: Trump describes himself as confident and honest, suggesting that his approach is more effective in negotiations.

Evaluation of the Others: Individuals from Japan and China are described as unsuccessful or submissive in comparison to Trump's preferred negotiation style.

3- In the third speech.

Representation of the Ourselves: Trump presents himself as someone who values competence and specific qualities in those who deal with his money.

Representation of the Others: He makes discreditable and racially charged statements about black people, perpetuating stereotypes and discrimination.

Evaluation of the Ourselves: Trump presents himself as having intelligent standards and preferences in financial matters.

Evaluation of the Others: Black individuals are described as lazy and lacking in attractive features, promoting negative stereotypes and discrimination.

4.2 The Micro Level Analysis

In Van Dijk's The micro analysis in the present study consists of Ideological discourse analysis:

4.2.1 Ideological Discourse Analysis

In this study, Ideological discourse analysis in the present study deals with the ideological analysis, of three speeches delivered by Donald Trump. The ideological analysis is based on a number of strategies as follows:

4.2.1.1 Norm and Value Violation

In (Van Dijk's,1995:147-157). method of discourse analysis, the strategy of Norm and Value Violation involves examining how a speaker's discourse differs from societal norms and values. I will analyze each of the speeches by Donald Trump according to this strategy:

1. In the first speech, Trump violates norms and values by making broad generalizations and negative stereotypes about immigrants from Mexico and other areas. He describes them as bringing drugs, crime, and being rapists, which violates the norms of tolerance, inclusivity, and respect for diversity.

2. In the second speech, Trump is violating norms of diplomacy and politeness by describing negotiating partners from Japan and China as lacking in social niceties and honesty. This description violates the norms of diplomatic discourse, which typically involve a level of politeness and respect.

3. In the third speech, this speech is full with norm and value violations. Trump makes racist statements by indicating that black people are lazy and that they cannot control their

behavior. Additionally, he expresses a preference for specific people to deal with his money, which promotes stereotypes and discrimination based on race and religion.

In each speech, Trump's discourse differs from accepted norms and values, promoting stereotypes, racism, and disrespect for others, which can have harmful social and political consequences.

4.2.1.2 Negative Lexicalization

In (Van Dijk, 1995:147-157). concept of Negative Lexicalization involves the use of negative language to describe certain groups or individuals in a discreditable manner. I will analyze each of the speeches by Donald Trump according to this strategy:

1. In the first speech, Trump uses negative lexicalization by repeatedly emphasizing negative features associated with immigrants from Mexico and Latin America. He describes them as problematic, bringing drugs, crime, and being rapists. While he does recognize that some may be good people, the overall tone and language used are highly negative towards these groups, contributing to a stereotypical and prejudiced description.

2. In the second speech, Trump uses negative lexicalization by indicating that negotiators from Japan and China lack honesty and instead focuses on the negative aspects of their behavior, suggesting they are not polite or friendly. This description promotes a negative stereotype about these individuals and weakens the possibility of constructive dialogue.

3. In the third speech, Trump engages in negative lexicalization by making derogatory statements about black individuals, involving that they are lazy and useless. By associating specific negative features with a particular racial group, he perpetuates harmful stereotypes and contributes to racial discrimination.

In all three speeches, Trump uses negative lexicalization to paint certain groups or individuals in a negative light, promoting stereotypes and discrimination.

4.2.1.3 Hyperbole

In (Van Dijk's,1995:147-157) concept of hyperbole involves the use of exaggerated language to emphasize a point or context. I will analyze each of the speeches by Donald Trump according to this strategy:

1. In the first speech, Trump uses hyperbole by exaggerating the negative effect of immigrants from Mexico and Latin America. He describes them as bringing a lot of problems such as drugs, crime, and being rapists. By using hyperbolic language such as "they're not sending their best" and "they're bringing those problems with us," Trump exaggerate the perceived threat posed by these immigrants, contributing to a sense of urgency and fear.

2. In the second speech, Trump uses hyperbole in this speech by exaggerating the behavior of negotiators from Japan and China. He suggests that they are lacking basic social niceties and instead describe them as being only focused on business matters. By using hyperbolic language to emphasize their assumed lack of social niceties, Trump promotes a negative stereotype about these individuals and weakens the possibility of positive diplomatic interactions.

3. In the third speech, Trump uses hyperbole by making extreme and exaggerated statements about black individuals. He suggests that only a specific group of people should deal with his money, while indicating that black individuals are inherently lazy. By using hyperbolic language to promote stereotypes and discrimination, Trump exaggerates and perpetuates harmful attitudes towards black people.

In all three speeches, Trump uses hyperbole to exaggerate negative perceptions and stereotypes about certain groups or individuals, thereby shaping public opinion and discourse in a divisive and discriminatory manner.

4.2.1.4 Compassion Move

This strategy used to express empathy and compassion for the helpless victims of others. Dictators utilize this strategy to demonstrate to the public that they empathize not only with their own citizens but also with their enemies (Van Dijk, 1995:147-157).

Note: Donald Trump didn't use Compassion Move.

4.2.1.5 Warning

In (Van Dijk's,1995:147-157) concept of the Warning strategy involves the speaker uses of fearful language to warn individuals about potential threats or dangers. I will analyze each of the speeches by Donald Trump according to this strategy:

1. In the first speech, Trump uses the Warning strategy by describing immigration from Mexico and Latin America as a serious problem. He emphasizes the negative aspects associated with immigrants, such as drugs, crime, and rape, suggesting that these individuals pose a threat to society. By framing immigration in this manner, Trump aims to warn his audience to what he perceives as a pressing issue and emphasizes the need for immediate action to address it.

2. In the second speech, Trump's speech about negotiations with Japan and China does not explicitly employ the Warning strategy. Instead, he uses reject language towards these individuals, indicating that they lack basic social niceties. While this may indirectly convey a sense of warning about the perceived differences in behavior or approach, it is not a direct use of the Warning strategy to alert about specific threats or dangers.

3. In the third speech, Similarly, Trump's speech about black individuals does not explicitly uses the Warning strategy. Instead, he makes discreditable statements and perpetuates harmful stereotypes, suggesting that black people are lazy and incompetent. While these statements may be intended to convey a sense of warning or caution about certain individuals, they are not framed explicitly as warnings about potential threats or dangers.

In all speeches, while Trump's speeches contain elements that could be interpreted as warnings about perceived threats or dangers, they are not consistently framed in a manner that aligns with the Warning strategy as defined by Van Dijk. Instead, Trump often uses inflammatory language and discreditable statements to make his points, which may undermine the effectiveness of any potential warning message.

4.2.1.6 Apparent Altruism Move

This move connected to the empathy and to the compassion Move. It involves highlighting understanding for the interest of others. For instance, individuals who are against a particular group, like anti-Muslims, might interest to care about Muslims while not indeed

doing so. Dictators used this strategy to convey to their audience that they comprehend the perspectives of both their citizens and their enemies (Van Dijk, 1995:147-157).

Note: Donald Trump did not use Apparent Altruism Move.

4.2.1.7 Generalization

In (Van Dijk's,1995:147-157) concept of Generalization is a strategy used by an individual or a small group to make discreditable statements about the whole group of people. I will analyze each of the speeches by Donald Trump according to this strategy:

1.In the first speech, Trump engages in generalization by describing immigrants from Mexico and Latin America as inherently problematic. He makes inclusive statements about the whole group, suggesting that they bring drugs, crime, and are rapists. By failing to recognize the diversity within this population and the myriad of reasons that contribute to immigration, Trump exaggerates the issue and perpetuates negative stereotypes.

2. In the second speech, Trump's speech about negotiations with Japan and China does not explicitly involve generalization. However, his characterization of negotiators from these countries as lacking in social niceties may indicate a generalization about their cultural norms or behaviors. While this statement is not as explicitly broad as the others, it still simplifies and stereotypes individuals based on their nationality.

3. In the third speech, Similarly, Trump's speech about black individuals involves generalization by making discreditable statements and perpetuating harmful stereotypes. He suggests that laziness is a feature inherent in all black people, failing to recognize the diversity and complexity within this racial group. By making inclusive statements about the whole race, Trump promotes prejudice and discrimination.

In all three speeches, Trump uses generalization by making inclusive-statements about groups of people without considering individual differences. This oversimplification of complex issues serves to perpetuate stereotypes and prejudice, rather than fostering understanding or addressing underlying issues.

4.3 The Results of Ideological Square Analysis

1-Donald Trump in three speeches, consistently describes himself in a positive light, highlighting his strengths such as strength, confidence, and intelligence. He contrasts these qualities with perceived weaknesses or negative attributes in others. In the first speech, he

presents himself as the protector of American interests, competent and immediate in addressing threats posed by immigrants. In the second speech, he presents himself as assertive and direct in negotiations, contrasting this with what he sees as a passive approach from others. In the third speech, Trump emphasizes his discerning standards in financial matters while making discreditable statements about black individuals, describing them negatively through stereotypes.

2-In each speech, Donald Trump describes certain groups negatively, highlighting their perceived weaknesses or negative attributes while contrasting them with his own preferred qualities. In the first speech, he characterizes immigrants as a threat to American society, associating them with crime and lack of control. In the second speech, individuals from Japan and China are described as lacking confidence, contrasting them with Trump's negotiation style. In the third speech, Trump makes discreditable statements about black individuals, perpetuating stereotypes and discrimination, and undermining their credibility compared to himself.

4.4 The Results of Ideological Discourse Analysis

Van Dijk's discourse analysis method studying how speakers' discourse differs from societal norm and value violation, Negative Lexicalization, Hyperbole, Warning, and Generalization. Trump violates norms by stereotyping immigrants from Mexico and other areas, going against tolerance. He violates diplomatic norms by criticizing negotiating partners from Japan and China, lacking politeness. In analyzing Donald Trump's speeches through Negative Lexicalization, he consistently describes certain groups, like immigrants and negotiators from Japan and China, in a discreditable light, promoting stereotypes. In Hyperbole, Trump exaggerates the negative impacts of these groups, exaggeration perceived threats. While he uses the Warning strategy in highlighting immigration issues, it's not consistently used in other contexts. Lastly, Trump engages in Generalization by making inclusive statements about groups without considering individual differences, perpetuating stereotypes.

Chapter Five

Conclusions

5.1 Conclusions

The researcher finally arrives at the following conclusions:

1-Donald Trump uses five ideological discourse strategies according to van Dijk's theory of micro-level such as Norm and value violation, negative lexicalization, hyperbole, warning, and generalization to show xenophobia among American people through three major speeches. Firstly, Trump violates norms and values by describing Mexican immigrants as inherently problematic, he uses negative language to promote stereotypes about immigrants. He exaggerates threats posed by immigrants, engages in inclusive generalizations, and instills fear through urgency. Additionally, he denigrates other nations and always described racial stereotypes and racism about Black people, contributing to societal divisions and promoting xenophobic feelings among Americans. Through an analysis of Trump's speeches, it is evident that he describes that certain countries as threats or inferior to American society, thereby promoting xenophobia among the American people.

2-Donald Trump uses positive self-presentation and negative other presentation in the ideological square in his speeches. Throughout these speeches, Trump consistently describes himself positively, emphasizing strengths such as strength, confidence, and intelligence, while contrasting these qualities with weaknesses or negative features in others. In the first speech, Trump presents himself as the protector of American interests against immigrants, whom he characterizes as criminals and a danger to American audience. He evaluates himself as the voice of reason. In the second speech, Trump contrasts his assertive negotiation style with what he describes as the passivity of individuals from Japan and China, positioning himself as the more effective negotiator. He evaluates himself positively while characterizing the others as weak or ineffective. In the third speech, Trump presents himself as having discerning standards in financial matters, contrasting this with discreditable statements about black individuals. He evaluates himself based on his perceived financial intelligence while describing black individuals negatively through stereotypes. And finally, Donald Trump consistently describes himself as a strong, rational figure who prioritizes the interests of America. He contrasts this image with depictions of various "others" who are described as threats or inferior.

Bibliography

- Brown, A. (2015). *Qualitative Inquiry: Understanding and Conducting*. London: Sage, p. 72.
- Coghlan, D., Brydon-Miller, M. (2014). *The SAGE encyclopedia of action research* (Vols. 1-2). London, : SAGE Publications Ltd doi: 10.4135/9781446294406
- Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2017). **Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches.** Sage Publications.
- Fairclough, N. (1992). *Discourse and Social Change*, Oxford: Polity Press/Blackwell.
- Fairclough, N. (1995a). *Critical Discourse Analysis: The Critical Study of Language*, London: Longman.
- Hammersly, M. (2013) *What is Qualitative Research?* London: A&C Black.
- Hjerm, M. (2009). Anti-immigrant attitudes and cross-municipal variation in the proportion of immigrants. *Acta Sociologica*, 52(1), 47–62.
- Hjerm, M. (1998). Reconstructing 'positive' nationalism: Evidence from Norway and Sweden. *Sociological Research Online*, 3(2). Retrieved from <http://www.socresonline.org.uk/socresonline/3/2/7.html>
- Johnson, R. B., & Onwuegbuzie, A. J. (2004). **Mixed methods research: A research paradigm whose time has come.** *Educational Researcher*, 33(7), 14-26.
- Licata, L., Klein, O. (2002) Does European citizenship breed xenophobia? European identification as a predictor of intolerance towards immigrants. *Journal of Community and Applied Social Psychology*, 12, 323-337.
- Le, E. (2006). *The Spiral of "anti-other Rhetoric": Discourse of identity and the international Media echo.* Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamin Publishing Company
- Meijerink, F., Mudde, C., & Van Holsteyn, J. (1998). Right-wing extremism. *Acta Politica*, 2, 165–178.
- Mudde, C. (2000). *The ideology of the extreme right*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Mudde, C. (1999). The single-issue party thesis: extreme right parties and the immigration issue. *Western European Politics*, 22(3), 182–197.

- McEvoy, J. Ch. (1995). A consideration of the sociobiological dimensions of human xenophobia and ethnocentrism. Retrieved from <http://www.pscw.uva.nl/sociosite/TOPICS/xenophobia.html>
- Nasir, moh , Metode penelitian (Jakarta: Ghalia Indonesia, 1998), p. 31.
- Orenstein, D. M. (1985). The sociological quest: Principles of sociology. St. Paul, NY: West Publishing Company. (Report). Vienna: Institute for Advanced Studies.
- Phillips, N., & Hardy, C. (2002). Discourse analysis: Investigating Processes of Social Construction. SAGE.
- Reynolds, V., Vine, I. (1987) The socio-biology of ethnocentrism: Evolutionary dimensions of xenophobia discrimination, racism, and nationalism. London: Croom Helm, p. 28.
- Rogers, R. (Ed.). (2004.). An introduction to critical discourse analysis in education. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.
- Tannen,D., Hamilton, E,H., and Debora Schiffrin.(2018). The Handbook of Discourse Analysis. UK: John Wily & Sons,Ink.
- Van Dijk , (1995). Ideological Discourse Analysis. Web. 8 Nov. 2018.
- Van Dijk, (1998) Ideological Square Analysis.
- Watts, M. W. (1996). Political xenophobia in the transition from socialism: Threat, racism, and ideology among East German youth. Political Psychology, 17, 97–126.
- Wodak, Ruth, Meyer, Michael (2008:p.2-3). „Critical Discourse Analysis: History, Agenda, Theory, and Methodology” inWodak, Ruth, Meyer, Michael (eds) Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis, Second Edition, Sage Publication.
- "xenophobia". [*Lexico UK English Dictionary*](#). [Oxford University Press](#). Archived from [the original](#) on 31 December 2019.
- "xenophobia". [*Dictionary.com Unabridged*](#) (Online). n.d.
- "xenophobia". [*Merriam-Webster.com Dictionary*](#). Retrieved 22 April 2019.
- Yule, G. (2016). The study of language. Cambridge University Press.