

Liberal Journal of Language & Literature Review

Print ISSN: 3006-5887

Online ISSN: 3006-5895

<https://llrjournal.com/index.php/11>

**GENDER, IDEOLOGY, AND PERSUASION: A CRITICAL
DISCOURSE ANALYSIS OF DONALD TRUMP AND
KAMALA HARRIS 2024 PRESIDENTIAL DEBATE**



¹Sabahat Sultan

² Hafsa Noor

³Fatima Inam

sabahatsultan455@gmail.com

hafsanoor132003@gmail.com

fatimainam2004@gamil.com

¹²³Government Post Graduate College for Women,
Mardan

Abstract

The study scrutinizes the discursive strategies used by Donald Trump and Kamala Harris in a single 2024 presidential debate, focusing on the use of positive self-representation and negative other-representation through hyperbole, consensus, and actor description. This study also explores how Democrats and Republicans use different strategies in the portrayal of different issues to influence public opinion. This research utilizes mixed methods, qualitative and quantitative, and the data is collected from the primary source. Tuen Van Dijk's Socio-cognitive model is applied as a theoretical framework to analyze the debate. The analysis reflects that, while both politicians utilize different persuasive strategies to appeal to their audiences, their languages mirror different patterns associated with male and female communication tactics. The analysis also reveals that Donald Trump's arguments are mostly based on facts, figures, and strong claims, which suggests that male politicians are logical. On the other hand, Kamala Harris shares personal stories and emotional examples, which show that female politicians are more emotional and empathetic.

Keywords: *Positive Self-representation, Negative Other-representation, Actor Description, Consensus, Hyperbole, Kamala Harris, Donald Trump*

Introduction

The most important function of language is considered as the 'referential function', which means the transmission of information. It is, of course, a crucial function of language to inform one another about the states of affairs in the world. Apart from communication, it also assists people in achieving other goals beyond informing people. Cook (1989) defined plethora of language functions including emotive function (expressing emotions), directive function (impact behavior), phatic function (inter-personal relations), poetic function (aesthetic and creative aspect of language), metalingual function (self-referential, and function contextual (pragmatics), but Gee (1999) talked about only three main functions of language in his book 'An Introduction to Discourse Analysis' which are: saying things (informing), doing things (actions), and being things (identity). By saying things, he means communicating information that is common worldwide. But people also make promises, hold table meetings, make proposals, argue politically, and pray, which are undoubtedly different actions performed through language. Individuals construct and negotiate their social identities by assuming and performing various roles, such as expert, professional, or layperson, within social settings. This assists them in creating and negotiating their identity among people. These functions of language lay the foundation for discourse, allowing people to engage in a well-formed and organized communication.

Discourse simply means discussions, speech, or conversation. The word was coined by Zellig Harris (1952) in his article titled 'Discourse Analysis'. It is a conversation that goes beyond the level of a sentence. According to Leech and Short (1992), discourse is an active process that occurs between individuals, focusing on social interaction and relationships. A discourse refers to a specific way of speaking, writing, or communicating that is guided by certain rules, conventions, and shared meanings within a particular context or community [Renkema (2009), Jorgensen and Phillips (2002)]. Discourse can be differentiated from a sentence through grammar. A sentence follows strict rules of grammar and is used for teaching or learning the grammatical rules of a language. Cook (1989) calls it artificial language because it is constructed through the rules of grammar. On the other hand, discourse conforms to the rules when it needs to and departs from them when it does not. Cook (1989) calls this type of language 'communicative language'. Discourse examines larger units of language, that is, texts, conversations, and genres. It is the totality of all the stretches of language interacting. Grammar may not be important in discourse, but what makes a speech or conversation discourse is its coherence. Cook (1989) defines discourse as the utilization of language to convey a coherent message, and does not necessarily adhere to grammatically correct sentences. Speaking of discourse, context is one of the important tools that influences the interpretation of language within a discourse, as well as sets boundaries for what is communicated. Logicians are of the view that words and propositions have meanings in themselves, apart from context. Firth (1957) suggests that a text should not be departed from the context in which it functions, and that modern spoken language has implications in a generalized context. His view is of the 'context of situation' that can be used as suitable schematic constructs to be applied to language events. According to Hymes (1962), context serves as a dual function in interpretation: constraining potential meanings while simultaneously facilitating the intended understanding. As discourse needs to be coherent, Cook

(1989) remarks that the search for what gives discourse coherence is discourse analysis.

Discourse Analysis is the in-depth study of language use, highlighting the aspects of social life. It is a research approach that examines spoken or written material of a language, and sometimes other material such as pictures and films as evidence of phenomena beyond the person (Taylor, 2013). Linguistics, traditionally referred to as 'the study of grammar', is considered inseparable from social context by sociolinguists. They study how language variations across contexts, children's acquisition of language competence, and differences in spoken and written texts are linked to class, identity, and social differences. Discourse Analysis may examine words, expressions, and arguments communicated by language users, or it may analyze historical material, the construction and function of speaking style, and the dramatic aspects of language in different social and cultural contexts. For the analysis of discourse, Gee (1999) has given six tools of inquiry which are: situated meanings, social languages, figured world, intertextuality, discourses, and conversations that asks questions about the seven building tasks: significance, practices, identities, relationships, politics, connections, and sign system and knowledge. He explains how each tool of inquiry is employed to establish the seven building tasks within a particular context. Discourse Analysis further develops into Critical Discourse Analysis, influenced by scholars like Norman Fairclough, Albert Bandura, and Tuen Van Dijk, focusing on the critical examination of language.

Van Dijk (2008) calls Critical Discourse Analysis 'Critical Discourse Studies (CDS)' because he considers it not only critical analysis, but also critical theory and application. He is of the view that beyond just a method, Critical Discourse Studies is a critical perspective, position, and attitude within the vast field of discourse studies. He characterizes three properties of CDS: analyzing social problems, evaluating abusive language practices through international human rights, and advocating for marginalized groups against discursive oppression (2008). Similarly, Norman Fairclough (2010) also describes three features of CDS including relational (focuses on social relations), dialectical (the dynamic, contradictory and struggles-based nature of social life and language), and transdisciplinary (integrating insights from various disciplines to understand the complex relationships between language, power, and society). The main contribution of Van Dijk to CDS is his Socio-cognitive model, in which he introduces 25 discursive strategies which can be applied to any political discourse to identify politicians' tactics of influencing people (2000). A strategy involves human action, that is, goal-oriented, intentional, conscious, and controlled behavior (van Dijk, 1977a, 1980b). As strategy is related to actions, the agent is concerned with achieving some goal through the action. Moving to a specific form of strategy, which is discourse strategy, the agent acts as speaking in the production and comprehension of speech to achieve a goal in the use of language. Furthermore, the model consists of positive self-representation and negative other-representation to highlight the positive aspects of an individual's in-group, or negative aspects of their opponents' party, which van Dijk calls the outgroup.

Problem Statement

The current study has investigated discursive strategies employed by Kamala Harris and Donald Trump in the 2024 presidential debate, analyzing the differences and similarities in the ways male and female politicians try to influence public opinion.

Liberal Journal of Language & Literature Review

Print ISSN: 3006-5887

Online ISSN: 3006-5895

Additionally, the study will explore how the two candidates utilize positive self-representation and negative other-representation to construct partisan identities, which will in turn shed light on the political ideologies of the Democrats and Republicans.

Research Questions

The present research has found answers to the following questions;

- i. What discursive strategies are used by Kamala Harris and Donald Trump to influence public opinion, and what does it indicate about male and female discursive styles?
- ii. How do Republicans and Democrats use positive self-representation and negative other-representation to portray different issues of national interest, and what does it indicate about their political ideologies?

Significance of the study

The significance of the current investigation lies in its exploration of how gender influences political discourse, thereby contributing to a more inclusive and equitable understanding of political representation. By analyzing the language strategies employed by Kamala Harris and Donald Trump in the 2024 presidential debate, this study offers valuable insights into how politicians construct partisan identities through the use of positive self-representation and negative other-representation. Furthermore, it sheds light on how language serves as a powerful tool for shaping public opinion and reinforcing ideological positions. The findings of this research have broader implications for political communication, media discourse, and voter awareness, making it relevant not only to the field of Critical Discourse Analysis but also to gender studies and political science.

Delimitations of the Study

In the wide range of discourse analysis, the present study will only focus on the Socio-cognitive model of Van Dijk in Critical Discourse Analysis, limited to discursive strategies, excluding other factors that influence public opinion. The study will also concentrate on positive self-representation and negative other-representation in a single 2024 presidential debate between two participants, Kamala Harris and Donald Trump, indicating their larger political ideologies.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The Socio-cognitive model of Van Dijk has been widely used by researchers as a theoretical framework to examine the persuasive power of language. This model has been applied to political speeches or debates to identify discursive strategies, positive self-representation, and negative other-representation. One of these studies is done by Shakoury and Makarova (2021), who analyzed official public talks by Hassan Rouhani and Mahmoud Ahmadinejad, Iranian presidents, using the framework of critical discourse studies. The study focuses on discursal features at the micro-level (25 discursive strategies), and at the macro-level (positive self-representation and negative other-representation) in addresses of these presidents to the United Nations General Assembly. The researchers have transcribed eight speeches and translated them into English language consisting of approximately 9000 words by each president. Applying both qualitative and quantitative methods, the study reveals that a total of 944 discursive practices are used by Rouhani, while Ahmadinejad employed 876 devices. Among these strategies, consensus, hyperbole, illustration, and polarization are excessively used by Rouhani, whereas Ahmadinejad relied upon lexicalization and vagueness. Besides discursive strategies, Rouhani consumed both positive self-representation and negative other-representation 253 times, whereas Ahmadinejad exhibited these strategies 339 times. The semantic macro-level analysis indicates that Rouhani's discourse was marked by more positive self-representation (143) than Ahmadinejad's (108), finding that Rouhani's political stance is more moderate, focusing on promoting a positive image of Iran rather than criticizing Western and other opposing powers. The research further investigates whether differences in the micro and macro structures in the speeches of these Iranian politicians reflect factors such as worldview, personal background, and dissimilarities in political stance. Comparing Nasih's (2020) study with Shakoury and Makarova's (2021), he has not only investigated the discursive strategies, positive self-representation, and negative other-representation, but also concluded that Allawi's speech was characterized by formal tone and language.

Comparison of presidents and heads of state has been extensively undertaken by researchers over the years. One other such study is that of Nasih (2020), who has examined how Iraqi politicians use language to influence public opinion. The researcher has analyzed speeches by Prime Minister Ayad Allawi (2004-2008) and President Barham Salih (2006-2019) using Van Dijk's Socio-cognitive model. He looked at how politicians justify their ideas and persuade their audience, and what role political language plays in reflecting the beliefs and attitudes of the community. The analysis reveals some interesting differences between the two politicians: PM Allawi employed 544 rhetorical devices, whereas President Salih used 423 devices, significantly fewer. Additionally, the study assumes that both speakers, Allawi and Salih, relied upon positive self-representation and negative other-representation, with the former one being more prevalent. It is concluded that embracing more complex discursive strategies is a sign of being more formal, and in this case, Allawi remains formal in his speeches. The third research has been conducted by Wulandari, Afrilesa, and Magria (2022) which share commonality to the present research that both are American politicians' debates in English language, but different from the former two researches as they are speeches of Iraqi Arabic and Persian languages which are

translated to English, utilizing the same theoretical framework.

Yet another study analyzing presidential rhetoric is that by Wulandari et.al. (2022), who have analyzed the final presidential debate between Donald Trump and Joe Biden to see how they represent power employing discursive strategies. The study has looked at two areas: 1) the discursive strategies Trump and Biden have used in the debate, and 2) how these strategies affected the election's results. Based on Van Dijk's Socio-cognitive model (2003), secondary data has been analyzed through a descriptive qualitative method. It has been found in the debate that Trump used 159 strategies, dominantly repetition, while Biden used 140 strategies, with number game as the prominent one. Moreover, the study has found that using these strategies effectively and highlighting the opponent's weaknesses can increase the chances of winning an election.

Saqib Raza et.al. (2024) have analyzed discursive strategies of Van Dijk (2005) in the inaugural speech of Donald Trump, focusing on the lexical choices and linguistic elements in his speech. They specifically focus on positive self-representation and negative other-representation to see their language techniques. The study finds that Trump is focusing more on uniting people, maintaining the priorities and support base of his policy, utilizing qualitative methods, and purposive sampling. He has drawn a contrast between his leadership and the previous government, presenting the American people as sufferers of the elite. Trump has a populist expression in his speech, using figurative language to portray himself as a problem solver, mentioning facts and trusted sources to strengthen his argument. The study has found many techniques, such as metaphors, modality, victimization, lexicalization, authority, evidentiality, number game, polarization, and topicalization, used by Donald Trump to develop a narrative that convinces the public, legitimizing the in-group, while also delegitimizing the out-group.

Another study has been conducted by Bashar Al Maani et.al. (2022) analyzing the use of positive self-representation and negative other-representation used by Syrian president Bashar Al-Assad in his first political speech in March 2011. The study examines how Al-Assad uses language as a tool to state his ideology and attitudes toward the protests and economically advanced countries to win the disputes and gain power. So, this study examines how Al-Assad represents his opponents' party negatively, and what ideologies are mirrored in this speech. It also scrutinizes how Al-Assad's ruling party (Ba'ath) represents itself positively. T. Van Dijk's Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) is used to highlight these positive portrayals reflected in this speech. The analysis goes deep to recognize the different strategies and techniques used in the speech based on Van Dijk's ideological square. The analysis of the study is based on one televised political speech delivered by Al-Assad in the Arabic language in March 2011. The reason behind choosing this speech is that it is delivered purely in Arabic and has not been analyzed by someone through the lens of Van Dijk's Socio-political model.

The same analytical framework of Van Dijk (2005) has been used by Muhammad Kamran Abbas Ismail et.al. (2019) to analyze positive self-representation and negative other-representation in Punjab Textbook's Board (PTB) School English textbooks. These are the textbooks of Grade 9 and 10 taught in government and non-elite English medium schools at the secondary level, which are religious, nationalistic, anti-Israel, anti-Hindu, and anti-Christian. It has a total of 25 chapters that consist of

Liberal Journal of Language & Literature Review

Print ISSN: 3006-5887

Online ISSN: 3006-5895

poems, narratives, letters, autobiographies, and articles, but the researchers have only analyzed 7 chapters. The chapters are analyzed at the sentence level with content related to culture, religion, nationalism, society, and 'us' vs 'them'. The findings show that these textbooks are filled with positive self-representation and negative other-representation, helping in developing new teaching material and a symmetrical educational system.

The present study will use the same framework to analyze the most recent political discourse, that is, the one between Kamala Harris and Donald Trump, as it would be interesting to see how the political ideologies of their parties have evolved, if at all.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Research Design

The study employed a mixed-method approach to address the research questions and to provide a comprehensive understanding of the rhetorical devices and discursive strategies used by male and female candidates. By integrating qualitative methods, the research analyzed how Kamala Harris and Donald Trump used language to influence public opinion. At the same time, the quantitative approach was applied by counting and comparing the number of rhetorical and discursive strategies used by both candidates in the 2024 presidential debate. This combination of methods enabled a more detailed and in-depth investigation into gender-based differences in political discourse.

Data Collection

Maxwell (1992: p 285) stated, "All qualitative projects get their claim to be trustworthy from the ability of the researcher to account for the outcome." A systematic approach to data collection was essential for obtaining reliable data. In this study, the initial data collection involved downloading the complete video from the official YouTube channel of ABC News, a renowned American media outlet, and thoroughly reviewing the entire debate multiple times. The transcript was then cross-verified with the same source to ensure accuracy. This research utilized the observational method as proposed by Maxwell (1992, 293), employing a non-participant technique.

Theoretical Framework

The research applied Van Dijk's Socio-cognitive model as a theoretical framework to comparatively analyze the discursive strategies, positive self-representation, and

negative other-representation used by male candidate, Donald Trump, and female candidate, Kamala Harris, in the 2024 presidential debate. Some of these strategies are defined here: ‘consensus’ (political strategy) **is** one of the political strategies that **is** often used in debates on issues of "national importance", and immigration **is** often defined as such--**is** the display, claim or wish of "consensus". This means that racist ideologies often combine with nationalist ones, in which the unity and the interests of the nation is placed before any internal, political divisions within the US. Another well-known rhetorical figure of ‘euphemism’, a semantic move of mitigation, plays an important role in talk about immigrants. ‘Hyperboles’ **is** semantic rhetorical devices for the enhancement of meaning. Within the overall strategy of ‘positive self-presentation’ and ‘negative other-presentation’, we expect in parliamentary debates about immigrants that the alleged bad actions or properties of the Others are expressed in hyperbolic terms (our bad actions in mitigated terms), and vice versa. In political discourse, positive self-representation is routinely implemented by various forms of national self-glorification: Positive references to or praise for the own country, its principles, history, and traditions. Van Dijk summarizes the characteristics of ‘positive self-representation’ and ‘negative other-representation’ in the following way:

1. Emphasize positive things about us (in-groups)
2. Emphasize negative things about them (outgroup)
3. De-emphasize negative things about Us (ingroup)
4. De-emphasize positive things about them (outgroup)

DATA ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

This chapter aims to analyze the use of language by two politicians, Donald Trump (Republican) and Kamala Harris (Democrat), in their first-ever debate held in Philadelphia on 10 September 2024. The analysis will look at how both the candidates utilize positive self-representation and negative other-representation through minor strategies such as actor description, consensus, and hyperbole to examine the different ideologies of the two parties_ Democrats and Republicans to get insight of how these politicians deal with national issues of economy and abortion which are discussed in the debate. By analyzing the similarities and differences in these discursive strategies between the two politicians, the study delves into the particular analysis of how males and females in general use discursive strategies to influence public opinion. The researchers will try to analyze the issues of economy and abortion under separate headings that will show the quantity of the usage of discursive strategies by each candidate to look at how these politicians deal with different national issues of their country. In the entire debate, the candidates are asked the same questions and are given only two (2) minutes to share their views on these particular issues. The ABC News Moderators include David Muir and Linsey Davis, who ask their first question about the economy.

4.1 The Use of Positive Self-representation and Negative Other-representation in the Issue of Economy:

The first question was asked by the ABC News Moderator about the economy, which he calls the number one issue according to the voters. He has inquired about the comparison of the previous regime and the current regime, stating whether America's economy was better four years ago, which was under Republicans, or is it better today, under Democrats.

The first answer is given by Vice President Kamala Harris, followed by the answer of Former President Donald Trump, in which both the candidates use positive self-representation and negative other-representation through the use of other discursive strategies that are actor description, consensus, and hyperbole.

4.1.1 Positive Self-representation:

4.1.1.1 Kamala Harris:

The first strategy Harris uses in the issue of the Economy is Positive Self-representation, which refers to mentioning one's good qualities to hold control over a huge public. According to Van Dijk (2000), it is an ingroup favoritism in which the speaker emphasizes the positive characteristics of their group, such as their party or their own country. Harris positively represents herself through actor description, as its name represents it is a strategy that describes a character either in a good way or a bad way. Actor description— “introduces detailed and complete information of an entity such as place, person, thing, and the manner this entity plays its role in a social or political context, etc., either positively or negatively” (Van Dijk, 2005:736). The arguments of a proposition may be about actors in various roles, namely as agents, patients, or beneficiaries of an action. All discourse on people and action involves various types of actor description. Thus, actors may be described as members of groups or as individuals, by first or family name, function, role, or group name, as specific or nonspecific, by their actions or (alleged) attributes, by their position or relation to other people (Van Dijk, 2000).

Liberal Journal of Language & Literature Review

Print ISSN: 3006-5887

Online ISSN: 3006-5895

4.1.1.1.1 Actor Description:

Throughout the issue of the economy, Harris describes herself as the best leader for the American people, specifically for the middle class and working people who are suffering under bad economic conditions. Similarly, she talks about her economic plans that will augment America's economy. This is clear from her utterances:

- i. I was raised as a middle-class kid. And I am actually the only person on this stage who has a plan that is about lifting up the middle class and working people of America.
- ii. I imagine and have a plan to build what I call an opportunity economy.
- iii. I am offering what I describe as an opportunity economy.
- iv. Mine would strengthen the economy.

These examples show how Harris positively describes her character, ideas, and plans to persuade the public. She describes her background and her policy plans to portray herself as a helpful and inclusive leader. Controlling the contexts and structures of text and talk is a first major form of the exercise of power; controlling people's minds through such discourse is an indirect but fundamental way to reproduce dominance and hegemony (Van Dijk, 2015).

4.1.1.1.2 Consensus:

Another strategy that Harris uses is consensus, which means when a politician considers himself/herself a part of the public by showing that he/she share the same issues as the public. In other words, when a politician uses collective pronouns to refer to the public and himself/herself as a member of one united group who agree on a single idea. Harris portrays herself positively to show that she advocates for the benefits of the public through the following words;

- i. We know that we have a shortage of homes and housing.
- ii. We know that young families need support to raise their children. And I intend on extending a text cut for those families of \$6000, which is the largest child text cut that we have given in a long time.
- iii. What we have done and what I intend to do is build on what we know are the aspirations and the hopes of the American people.
- iv. The best economists in our country, if not the world, have reviewed our relative plans for the future of America.

Harris uses the pronoun 'we' to clarify that these are the issues of America on which we together agree. Similarly, she refers to the 'economists' who collectively agree on her plan as the best for the future of their country.

4.1.1.1.3 Hyperbole:

Harris uses hyperbole, a strategy through which someone exaggerates his/her positive qualities. Hyperbole is an intentional use of exaggerated language that in political discourse often serves to highlight positive self-representation and negative other-representation (VanDijk, 2005, p.737). People mostly try to express their good actions in hyperbolic terms. It represents how Harris is trying to strengthen her control over the public and shows how she exaggerates her good qualities while suppressing others' good qualities. Here are the examples of how Harris utilizes positive self-representation through hyperbole:

- i. The best economists of our country, if not the world, have reviewed our relative plans for the future of America.

Harris's use of positive self-representation through hyperbole is limited as compared

Liberal Journal of Language & Literature Review

Print ISSN: 3006-5887

Online ISSN: 3006-5895

to actor description, which may imply that she is more interested in describing herself and her ideas as good instead of exaggerating them.

4.1.1.2 Donald Trump:

4.1.1.2.1 Actor Description:

Trump has also used positive self-representation in the same issue of the economy through actor description, consensus, and hyperbole to highlight his positive qualities. He uses actor description in the issue of the economy to present himself as the most perfect politician. Trump wants to prove that he is the one who played a crucial role in the development of the economy of America. He utilizes Actor description to prove that he led America in a good way as compared to the politicians. Trump uses this strategy in such words;

- i. I was the only president ever—China was paying us hundreds of billions of dollars.
- ii. I created one of the greatest economies in the history of our country. I will do it again and even better.

Trump describes himself as the only person who has a greater plan for the development of America's economy. He

4.1.1.2.2 Consensus:

The positive self-representation is again achieved through consensus on the issue of the economy by Trump to show that their party has collectively made plans for the good economic conditions of the country. He expresses it in the following way;

- i. We are imposing tariffs on other countries. Other countries are going to finally, after 75 years, pay us back for all that we've done for the world.
- ii. I took in billions and billions of dollars, as you know, from China.
- iii. Everybody knows I'm an open book. Everybody knows what I'm going to do.
- iv. And people give me credit for rebuilding the military. They give me credit for a lot of things.

Trump's use of the pronouns like 'we', 'everybody', and 'people' shows how he has made a plan which is accepted by everyone.

4.1.1.2.3 Hyperbole:

Trump employs positive self-representation through hyperbole, which means to exaggerate in-group positive qualities. Trump uses this strategy to increase the quality of his positive actions to prove himself as a unique politician. He excessively exaggerates his good qualities to lessen the range of his negative qualities. Trump's another purpose for using this strategy is, he wants to present his opponent (Harris) negatively to get full credit for himself. Trump implies hyperbole in the Presidential Debate of 2024 in the following words;

- i. We did things that nobody thought possible.
- ii. And create a great economy like I did before.
- iii. We did a phenomenal job with the pandemic.
- iv. I went to the Wharton School of Finance, and many of those professors, the top professors, think my plan is a brilliant plan, it's a great plan.

The words of Trump show that he is presenting himself as a perfect and unique politician who has dedicated his whole life to the welfare of his country (America).

4.1.2 Negative Other-representation:

4.1.2.1 Kamala Harris:

Advancing towards Negative Other-representation, both the candidates, Harris and

Liberal Journal of Language & Literature Review

Print ISSN: 3006-5887

Online ISSN: 3006-5895

Trump, attack the negative and bad sides of their opponent through actor description, consensus, and hyperbole. When someone directly points to the inefficiency, incompetence, or unprofessional qualities of another person, he/she is negatively presenting him/her to create a bad image of his/her character in the minds of people. In politics, negative other-representation also refers to the negative categorization of the outgroup.

4.1.2.1.1 Actor Description:

Harris presents Trump's negative characteristics using another strategy, which is actor description. She describes Trump as a person who is responsible for America's economic breakdown by implementing the following claims on him;

- i. My opponent, on the other hand, has a plan to do what he has done before, which is to provide a tax cut for billionaires and big corporations, which will result in \$5 trillion in America's deficit.
- ii. My opponent has a plan that I call the Trump sales tax, which would be a 20% tax cut for goods that you rely on to get through the year.
- iii. Donald Trump has no plan for you. And when you look at his economic plan, it's all about tax breaks for the richest people.
- iv. Donald Trump actually has no plan for you, because he is more interested in defending himself than he is in looking out for you.
- v. But what Donald Trump did, let's talk about this, with COVID, is he actually thanked President Xi for what he did during COVID. Look at his tweet. "Thank you, President Xi" exclamation point. When we know that Xi was responsible for lacking and not giving us transparency about the origins of COVID.

Harris claims Trump as a person who burdens working-class people while cutting taxes for upper-class people (billionaires), which represents how Trump is in favor of billionaires, and letting them improve their financial status day by day, while making the lower class worse day by day. She further describes his character by clarifying that he is a self-serving person who only wants to be president for his benefit. She criticizes President Xi and Trump for being responsible for the destruction of COVID-19.

4.1.2.1.2 Consensus:

The third strategy through which Harris highlights the negative qualities of her opponent is consensus. From her statements, it is evident that she is trying to manipulate the crowd while proving that Trump is the wrong person. Harris uses consensus in such words to prove that the majority of people are accepting of her opinions.

- i. What we have done is clean up Donald Trump's mess.
- ii. Sixteen Nobel Laureates have described his economic plan as something that would increase inflation.
- iii. Donald Trump has no plan for you.

Harris is trying to marginalize Trump's plans by referring to them as a mess for all Americans. She proves herself by illustrating an example, 'Sixteen Nobel Laureates' who are well-respected and authoritative people, and sees Trump's economic ideas as harmful for the country. These are common ideas that appeal to the people of America and strengthen Harris' perception of Trump as divisive, harmful, and regressive. By highlighting the 'mess', she tries to position herself as someone who can solve the problems created by the former President Donald Trump.

Liberal Journal of Language & Literature Review

Print ISSN: 3006-5887

Online ISSN: 3006-5895

4.1.2.1.3 Hyperbole:

Harris considers Trump's former regime highly flawed in an exaggerated manner. She wants to prove that Trump is the worst president who has been destroying America, causing many economic deficiencies, joblessness, etc. Harris claims his regime is the worst in such words.

- i. Donald Trump left us the worst unemployment since the Great Depression.
- ii. Donald Trump left us the worst public health epidemic in a century.
- iii. Donald Trump left us the worst attack on our democracy since the Civil War.
- iv. Well, let's be clear that the Trump administration resulted in a trade deficit, one of the highest we've ever seen in the history of America.

From the above references, it is clear that Harris exaggerates Trump's plans in a negative way, which he implemented in the past. She is trying to prove to him that a person who made America's economy destroyed. She considers his plans a destruction of America. Harris considers Trump the worst politician ever seen in history. She considers him responsible for the bad condition of America.

4.1.2.2 Donald Trump:

4.1.2.2.1 Actor Description:

Donald Trump, on the other hand, uses negative other-representation to bring Harris' bad qualities in front of the people. He employs an actor description to describe Harris as an incapable leader who cannot lead a country. These are shown in the examples below;

- i. She doesn't have a plan. Take a look at her plan. She doesn't have a plan.
- ii. She's a Marxist. Everybody knows she's a Marxist. Her father is a Marxist professor of economics. And he taught her well.
- iii. I don't say her because she has no policy. Everything that she believed three years ago and four years ago is out of the window. She's going to my philosophy now.
- iv. They are going in violently. These are the people that she and Biden let into our country.
- v. They are criminals. Many of these people coming in are criminals. And that's bad for our economy, too.

Trump believes that Harris is an inconsistent and untrustworthy leader who has no policy of herself, but is imitating his policy. Trump calls Harris a Marxist, which is also extended to her family; her father is a Marxist professor, which is a negative term in political contexts, portraying him as an extremist. Trump debases the immigrants by referring to them as criminals and blames Harris and Biden, who allow them to enter their country, which is a threat to the economy of their country. Overall, all the actors are described by Trump in a negative way and through personal attacks on their characters.

4.1.2.2.2 Consensus:

The last strategy used by Trump to highlight the negative qualities of Harris is consensus. He uses general agreement to create a shared understanding between his audience and him. He persuades the people to believe in his perspective, which is the same as the people of America. He frames things in such a way that every reasonable person will be on his side. The examples of using consensus in his speech are as follows;

- i. The only jobs they got were bounce-back jobs. And it bounced back, and it went to their benefit. But I was the one who created them. They know it and so does

everybody else.

- ii. The polls say that their economy was terrible.

Trump implies that the jobs gained by Harris and Biden are 'bounce-back jobs', which is the benefit of his work and not the hard work of themselves. He mentions the 'polls' to strengthen and create a widespread agreement with his statement. The polls are surveys and questionnaires that are based on an investigation about a particular issue to know whether people agree with it or not.

4.1.2.2.3 Hyperbole:

Moving toward the strategy of hyperbole, which Trump uses to exaggerate the negative qualities of his opponent to make her a dangerously incompetent and harmful person for the country. The following examples demonstrate the negative representation of his opponent through hyperbole;

- i. They had the highest inflation, perhaps in the history of our country, because I've never seen a worse period of time.
- ii. They've destroyed the economy.
- iii. They are destroying our country. They're dangerous. They are at the highest level of criminality. And we have to get 'em out. We have to get 'em out fast.
- iv. But if she ever got elected, she'd change it. And it will be the end of our country.

Trump uses extreme statements claiming Harris's leadership will lead to a catastrophic end to this country, but he does not give any evidence that proves that her leadership will truly destroy this country. He describes the current situation as the worst under the leadership of Harris. Though inflation has been high in recent years, it is not at the highest level in the history of America. He says this to threaten the people of America with the leadership of Harris, and may imply that everything is terrible under her.

	Positive Self-representation		Negative representation		Other-representation
	Harris	Trump	Harris	Trump	
Discursive Strategies					
Actor Description	10	23	23	14	
Hyperbole	14	12	18	10	
Consensus	07	05	09	06	
Total	31	40	50	30	

Analyzing the similarities and differences between the use of discursive strategies by the two politicians, Harris and Trump, both the candidates use positive self-representation and negative other-representation through actor description equally, which may imply that the way a male candidate describes himself positively, in the same manner, he is described by the female candidate negatively. Putting this scenario in a general context where males and females describe one another, it is likely possible that if one gender describes himself/herself positively, the other may describe them negatively in almost equal degrees. This can influence public opinion, but they may be confused whether the male speaks the truth or the female, but this can be clarified from the previous leadership abilities of both candidates. Similarly, the use of hyperbole and consensus by both the male and the female candidate is almost equal, which implies that both male and female use strong shreds of evidence and examples,

and exaggerate their positive qualities and others' negative qualities for their views to be trusted. The total amount of the usage of positive self-representation and negative other-representation is different. Harris uses positive self-representation less than Trump, while negative other-representation is greater than Trump, which may imply that males are more conscious of proving themselves positively than negatively proving others. On the other hand, the female candidate can be seen as focusing more on the negative qualities of others than on her good qualities. As seen in the analysis, the female candidate negatively describes her opponent excessively, which shows the general ratio of women describing others negatively than men. This may also help them to influence public opinion by implementing more negative things about their opponent in their audience's minds.

4.2 The Use of Positive Self-representation and Negative Other-representation in the Issue of Reproductive Rights:

The debate has progressed to the second issue, which is about the reproductive rights of women. Vice President Harris is of the view that Donald Trump is not trustworthy regarding the reproductive rights of women because he has changed his position many times about the abortion law in which he was not in favor of six weeks ban on abortion, and wanted more time for abortion, but again he ends up supporting the six weeks ban.

Former President Donald Trump answers the question by proving himself a careful person who cares about the reproductive rights of women. He utilizes positive self-representation by describing himself positively, exaggerating his actions, and giving examples through strategies like actor description, hyperbole, and consensus.

4.2.1 Positive self-representation:

4.2.1.1 Donald Trump:

4.2.1.1.1 Actor Description:

Trump uses actor descriptions to strengthen his positive qualities. Actor description is a strategy in positive self-representation, which refers to describing oneself/herself a character who has good qualities. Trump utilizes this strategy to describe himself as a person who has made good decisions for the reproductive rights of women. His use of actor description is shown in the following utterances;

- i. I did something that nobody thought was possible. The states are now voting.
- ii. But what I did is something, for 52 years they've been trying to get Roe v. Wade into the states.
- iii. I didn't discuss it with J.D., in all fairness. J.D.—and I don't mind if he has a certain view, but I think he was speaking for me, but I really didn't.

Trump describes himself as the only person who did something that was unable to happen for 52 years. It was actually a case called Roe v. Wade, which was about abortion law in 1973 by the Supreme Court, which stated that abortion would be a nationwide case. But the people of America wanted the case to be statewide, and Trump made this possible after 52 years in 2022 by overturning the Roe v. Wade case and replacing it with Dobbs v. Jackson Women's Health Organization, which states that abortion is statewide law. Overall, Trump uses actor description to portray himself as an effective leader who has enabled states to pass a law regarding abortion.

4.2.1.1.2 Consensus:

Consensus is one of Van Dijk's strategies, which means that when a person takes support from the public to prove his/her argument. Trump implies this strategy to

Liberal Journal of Language & Literature Review

Print ISSN: 3006-5887

Online ISSN: 3006-5895

present his positive qualities to get more votes than his opponent. Trump uses consensus in such words;

- i. Eighty-five percent of Republicans do, exceptions.
- ii. Every legal scholar, every Democrat, every Republican, liberal, conservative, they all wanted this issue to be brought back to the state where the people could vote.
- iii. Democrats, Republicans, and everybody else, and every legal scholar, wanted it to be brought back into the states.

Trump is presenting himself as a politician who caused a positive change that 'everybody' wanted for 52 years. He says that 'everyone' agrees with his decision. He supports his claim using consensus, as even 85 percent of Republicans want the abortion law across the states instead of the country.

4.2.1.1.3 Hyperbole:

Hyperbole is another discursive strategy that Trump employs to highlight his good qualities. He exaggerates his actions to maintain his status in public. He uses hyperbole to prove himself a person who sacrifices his life for the well-being of America. His claims are given below;

- i. We did something that everybody said couldn't be done.
- ii. And through the uh genius and heart and strength of six Supreme Court justices, we were able to do that. Now I believe in the exceptions for rape, incest, and life of the mother. I believe strongly in it.
- iii. I did a great service in doing it. It took courage to do it. And the Supreme Court had great courage in doing it. And I give tremendous credit to those six supreme justices.

Trump says that whatever he did is something that people of America cannot even imagine. He is showing himself as a leader who has given power and strength to the United States of America. He is considering himself a person who has brought great achievements to the state of America. Trump talks about the Supreme Court justices as being strong, expressing them in hyperbolic terms. He praises their power in the issue of abortion, which highlights the importance of the supporters of Trump's success. Trump approves himself for making a big change in the policy of abortion. He takes credit by stating himself as a person who did something significant in the issue of abortion. This may help him in gaining political success. Trump emphasizes his actions as more successful, which, according to him, were unachievable.

4.2.1.2 Kamala Harris:

4.2.1.2.1 Actor Description:

As a woman, Harris is more conscious about protecting the reproductive rights of women. She presents herself as an advocate for women's rights, showing a deep sense of moral conviction and personal freedom. Harris has very few chances to share her views on the reproductive rights of women, and does not often talk about her positive qualities, but focuses on her opponent's negative qualities. One of her utterances is;

- i. I support reinstating the protections of Roe v. Wade.

As previously stated, Roe v. Wade was a case of nationwide abortion law that was changed under Trump's regime to a statewide law in 2022. Harris supports the case of Roe v. Wade, and she wants to bring it back to America.

4.2.1.2.2 Consensus:

This strategy is utilized by Harris to appeal to the public, positioning herself as a leader who agrees with the public's needs, specifically the women who want the right to freedom on their bodies. Harris says;

Liberal Journal of Language & Literature Review

Print ISSN: 3006-5887

Online ISSN: 3006-5895

- i. I have talked with women around our country.
- ii. The American people believe that certain freedoms, in particular the freedom to make decisions about one's own body, would not be made by the government.
- iii. The majority of Americans believe in a woman's right to make decisions about her own body.

Harris is of the view that American women want full freedom about their bodies, and whatever they desire to do with them, is not a matter of government. She proves her stance by saying that she has talked with the women around, and they too have a similar perspective.

4.2.1.2.3 Hyperbole:

Harris uses hyperbole to strengthen her self-image in front of the public by elevating her role as a leader who fights for justice and women's rights. She uses rhetorical techniques to portray herself as a champion of the reproductive rights of women. It is clearly stated in her utterances.

- i. And as you rightly mentioned, nowhere in America is a woman carrying a pregnancy to term and asking for an abortion. That is not happening. It's insulting to the women of America.
- ii. Couples who pray and dream of having a family are being denied IVF treatments.
- iii. What you are putting her through is unconscionable.

Harris uses exaggerated terms such as 'nowhere in America' to dismiss the idea entirely, and makes her argument more authoritative. Moreover, she says, 'it's insulting to the women of America,' which adds an extra level of vulnerability to her argument. The broad praising, like 'pray and dream' and 'unconscionable', reinforces emotional extremes in her statement.

4.2.2 Negative Other-representation:

4.2.2.2 Donald Trump:

4.2.2.2.1 Actor Description;

Trump uses the first strategy to describe his opponent negatively is an actor description. He says that his opponent is continuously lying to prove herself a person who does care about the women of America. He describes his opponent negatively in such words;

- i. What she says is an absolute lie.
- ii. Because they are radical. The Democrats are radical in that. And her vice presidential pick, which I think was a horrible pick.
- iii. But her vice presidential pick says abortion in the ninth month is absolutely fine.
- iv. And then her—I think probably her boss, if you call 'em a boss, he spends all his time on the beach—but look, her boss went out and said we'll do it again, we'll do it a different way. He went out, got rejected again by the Supreme Court.
- v. Excuse me, I have to respond. Another lie. It's another lie.

Trump describes his opponent as extremely negative by calling their stance radical. He calls him a revolutionist. Trump directly attacks his opponent by claiming her statement as a lie. He uses actor description to weaken his opponent's reliability and defame the argument. He not only criticizes Kamala but also the former president, Biden, saying that he spends all his time on the beaches and claims that he will bring changes, but when he goes to the Supreme Court, it rejects his stance.

4.2.2.2.2 Consensus:

Consensus is another strategy that Trump uses against his opponent to strengthen his

Liberal Journal of Language & Literature Review

Print ISSN: 3006-5887

Online ISSN: 3006-5895

negative opinion. She presents her opponent as widely rejected, while he has a plan that is accepted in the entire nation. He says;

- i. We've gotten what everybody wanted.
- ii. Look, we don't have to discuss it because she'd never be able to get it.
- iii. They couldn't get student loans. They didn't even come close to getting student loans.
- iv. They taunted young people and a lot of other people who have loans.
- v. They can never get this approved.

Trump clarifies that there is no debate left because the policy has already been decided, which is a national abortion ban, and that the majority of people agree with it. He exemplifies his stance by mentioning the student loan, which was a Student Loan Forgiveness Program announced by President Joe Biden in August 2022, but it was rejected by the Supreme Court. He criticizes his opponent by saying that the Democrats taunted students and voters with the promises they knew would fail.

4.2.2.2.3 Hyperbole:

Trump uses exaggerated terms to show his opponent negatively. As mentioned earlier in the question, the news moderator asked that Trump has changed his position many times. Trump has provided reasons why he changed his position in exaggerated terms as follows;

- i. Well, the reason I'm doing that vote is because the plan is, as you know, the vote is, they have an abortion in the ninth month. He said the baby will be born, and we will decide what to do with the baby. In other words, we'll execute the baby.
- ii. He also says execution after birth it's execution, no longer abortion, because the baby is born, it is ok.
- iii. For 52 years, this issue has torn our country apart.
- iv. She said she'll go back to Congress. She will never get the vote. It's impossible for her to get the vote. She won't even come close to it.
- v. Look, we don't have to discuss it because she'd never be able to get it, just like she couldn't get student loans.

Trump is showing his opponent's view as morally unacceptable. He says that Democrats support abortion in the ninth month, and even after birth, which is not abortion, but execution. He exaggerates, and by making people think that something worse is happening. Trump is describing his opponent as powerless, meant to invalidate her political influence. He considers her disconnected from the real concerns of the American people. Trump says that the issue of abortion across the nation has ruined the country, and still, Democrats want the same law.

4.2.2.3 Kamala Harris:

4.2.2.3.1 Actor Description:

Harris negatively describes her opponent, employing the strategy of actor description to show her opponent as a negative leader to the public. Here is the breakdown of negative other-representation through actor description;

- i. Well, as I said, you're going to hear a bunch of lies. And that's not actually a surprising fact.
- ii. A survivor of a crime of violation to their body, does not have the right to make a decision about what happens to their body next. That is immoral.
- iii. But understand, if Donald Trump were to be re-elected, he would sign a national abortion ban.

Liberal Journal of Language & Literature Review

Print ISSN: 3006-5887

Online ISSN: 3006-5895

- iv. Donald Trump hand-selected three members of the United States Supreme Court with the intention that they would undo the protections of Roe v. Wade. And they did exactly as he intended.

Harris explains Trump as a person who always speaks a lie. She further says that Trump does not have any right to take decisions about women's bodies, because he does not know about women's bodies. Harris says that if Trump is re-elected, he must ban abortion.

4.2.2.3.2 Consensus:

Harris further utilizes Consensus against her opponent, portraying him in a negative light, aiming to appeal to the public in a shared understanding among them. This strategy is evident from her utterance;

- i. Donald Trump hand-selected three members of the United States Supreme Court with the intention that they would undo the protection of Roe v. Wade. And they did exactly as he intended.

- ii. She didn't want that. Her husband didn't want that. They don't want that...

Harris claims that it was the explicit goal of Trump to select the Supreme Court justices for overturning Roe v. Wade, focusing on, he is actively working against women's rights. She directly states that pregnant women and their partners do not want to suffer during abortion care. She frames Trump as an extreme and harmful leader who works against the public will. This shows a broad consensus, which makes these issues not only harmful but also deeply unpopular. Hence, it is clarified that Harris represents Trump and his policies as extreme and incongruous for Americans.

4.2.2.3.3 Hyperbole:

Harris uses hyperbole to show her opponent as a negative person who always takes such steps that can destroy the American people. She exaggerates Trump's negative qualities to show her opponent as a bad person.

- i. And now over 20 states there are Trump abortion bans which make it criminal for a doctor or nurse to provide health care. In one state, it provides prison for life.
- ii. Trump abortion ban that make no exception even for rape and incest.
- iii. Pregnant women who want to carry a pregnancy to term suffering from a miscarriage, being denied care in an emergency room because the health care providers are afraid that they might go to jail, and she's bleeding out in a car in the parking lot?

Harris is presenting her opponent very negatively. She says that Trump's national abortion ban causes many problems for women. She uses exaggerated terms by saying that Trump has banned abortion, due to which doctors do not take care of women's health, even though they are 'bleeding out in the parking lot'.

	Positive Self-representation		Negative representation	Other-
	Harris	Trump	Harris	Trump
Discursive Strategies				
Actor Description	05	09	06	13

Hyperbole	05	11	04	10
Consensus	04	09	03	08
Total	14	29	13	31

4.3 Discussion and Findings:

This chapter presents the key findings of the study and discusses them in light of the literature reviewed in Chapter 2. The analysis was guided by Van Dijk's Socio-cognitive model (2005), with a focus on discursive strategies, particularly positive self-representation and negative other-representation, used by Kamala Harris and Donald Trump in the 2024 U.S. presidential debate. The discussion also explores gender-based patterns in political discourse and the construction of partisan ideologies.

4.3.1. Gender-Based Discursive Strategies:

The analysis of the debate revealed notable differences in how male and female candidates utilized discursive strategies to influence public opinion. On the issue of abortion, Donald Trump employed a greater number of rhetorical strategies, particularly those aligning with positive self-representation and negative other-representation. He presented his policies as beneficial for women and the nation while portraying his opponent's views as extreme and harmful. This reflects the findings of Wulandari et al. (2022), who observed that Trump made dominant use of strategies such as repetition and assertive claims in debates, aiming to reinforce his position and undermine his opponents.

Conversely, Kamala Harris framed the abortion debate through a gendered lens, emphasizing women's rights, bodily autonomy, and her own lived experiences as a woman. Her discourse was emotionally resonant and aimed at appealing to the sentiments of voters, particularly female constituents. This distinction in approach is consistent with Shakoury and Makarova's (2021) findings, where rhetorical choices were found to be influenced by personal and political ideologies. Harris's empathetic appeals are reminiscent of Rouhani's moderate stance, which focused on nation-building and positive representation rather than aggressive critique.

The findings also support the generalization that male politicians tend to use logic-driven, structured arguments, whereas female politicians are more likely to employ emotional appeals. Nasih (2020) observed similar contrasts between Iraqi politicians Ayad Allawi and Barham Salih, noting that Allawi's formal tone and structured rhetoric marked a more logical and deliberate communication style. In the current study, Trump emphasized facts, data, and authoritative language to rationalize his policies, whereas Harris centered her arguments on personal narratives and ethical considerations, especially concerning reproductive rights.

4.3.2. Construction of Partisan Ideologies:

The study further demonstrates that both candidates strategically employed discursive tools to construct and reinforce the ideological stances of their respective political parties. Kamala Harris emphasized support for the working class, middle class, immigrants, and small businesses. Her language portrayed the Democratic Party as inclusive, empathetic, and opportunity-driven. This aligns with Van Dijk's (2005) concept of positive self-representation, whereby a speaker emphasizes the in-group's virtues to gain legitimacy.

Donald Trump, on the other hand, focused on highlighting the achievements of his

previous administration, particularly during the COVID-19 pandemic. His discourse framed immigrants as economic burdens, reflecting a negative other-representation strategy intended to justify stricter immigration policies. These findings are corroborated by Saqib Raza et al. (2024), who found that Trump's speeches often rely on populist rhetoric, portraying the American people as victims of elite misgovernance while casting himself as a reformer and protector of national interest.

4.3.3. Language and Leadership Perception:

The study also highlights how discursive strategies impact perceptions of leadership. Donald Trump's assertiveness, clarity, and straightforwardness during the debate appear to have resonated with voters, as indicated by his subsequent political success. This supports the notion proposed by Wulandari et al. (2022) that effective use of rhetorical strategies can influence election outcomes. In contrast, Harris's verbose style and emotionally-driven language may have been perceived as manipulative or indirect by certain segments of the audience. This gendered difference in political communication reveals how stylistic choices can influence public trust and acceptance.

4.3.4. Polarization and Issue Framing:

Finally, the study underscores how the same political issue can be framed in entirely different ways by opposing parties, further contributing to ideological polarization. For instance, Democrats, as represented by Harris, advocate for reproductive rights and immigrant inclusion, while Republicans, as represented by Trump, emphasize traditional values, economic concerns, and national security. Bashar Al Maani et al. (2022) similarly found that political leaders often construct partisan identities by contrasting the virtues of their own parties with the vices of their opponents, using Van Dijk's ideological square.

This dual framing of issues—one emphasizing empathy and inclusion, the other focusing on order and economic preservation—demonstrates how partisan discourse shapes public perception. As seen in the present study, Harris's appeal to marginalized groups positions the Democrats as protectors of social justice, while Trump's focus on immigration control and economic responsibility aligns with Republican ideals of national strength and self-reliance.

CONCLUSION

This research has explored the discursive strategies used by Donald Trump and Kamala Harris specifically how male and female politicians use positive self-representation and negative other-representation to influence public opinion. The Van Dijk's Socio-cognitive model is applied to find out similarities and differences between the discursive strategies used by Donald Trump and Kamala Harris in the 2024 presidential debate. The research revealed that Donald Trump (male) politician is making decisions based on logic and that are beneficial for the nation. On the other hand, Kamala Harris (female) is more leaned to sentiments and has an empathetic

Liberal Journal of Language & Literature Review

Print ISSN: 3006-5887

Online ISSN: 3006-5895

style. Future researchers could explore a similar Debate in other countries to show how male and female politicians use discursive strategies worldwide.

References:

- Van Dijk, T. A. (2000). *Ideology and Discourse*. Pompeu Fabra University, Barcelona [Teun A van Dijk Ideology and Discourse.pdf](#)
- Van Dijk, T. A. (2008). *Critical Discourse Studies: A Socio-cognitive Approach*¹ [Teun-A.-van-Dijk-2008-Critical-discourse-studies-a-sociocognitive-approach.pdf](#)
- Van Dijk, T. A. (2015). *Critical Discourse Analysis*. John Wiley and Sons, Inc. [file:///F:/Research/Teun-A.-van-Dijk-2015-Critical-discourse-Analysis.pdf](#)
- Taylor, S. (2013). *What is Discourse Analysis?* Bloomsbury Academic [What is Discourse Analysis.pdf](#)
- Fairclough, N. (2010). *Critical Discourse Analysis*. Routledge [Fairclough's critical discourse analysis.pdf](#)
- Gee, J. P. (1999). *An Introduction to Discourse Analysis*. Routledge [An Intro. to Discourse Analysis.pdf](#)
- Cook, G. (1989). *Discourse* <https://www.scribd.com/document/463102470/cook-guy-Discourse-pdf>
- Shakoury, K. & Makarova, V. (2021). *Critical Discourse Analysis of Micro and Macro Structures in Talks by Two Iranian Presidents at the United Nations General Assembly: A Socio-cognitive Perspective*. University of Sistan and Baluchestan [Article CDA.pdf](#)
- Nasih, R. K. (2020). *A Critical Discourse Analysis of Two Iraqi Politicians' Speeches in Terms of Van Dijk's Socio-cognitive Model*. Journal of Basra Research for Human Science [1699e7bdfaf956da.pdf](#)
- Wulandari, C. I. & Afrilesa, R. & Magria, V. (2022). *Exploring Discursive Strategies to Represent Power in the 2020 Final Presidential Debate Between Donald J. Trump and Joe Biden: A Political Discourse Analysis*. Krinok Jurnal Linuistik Budaya [debate od Biden and trump.pdf](#)
- Raza, S. & Dr. Imran, S. & Dr. Sabih Ul Hassan, S. (2024). *Critical Discourse Analysis of Discursive Strategies Utilized in Donald Trump's Inaugural Speech*. Journal of Applied Linguistics and TESOL (JALT). <https://jalt.com.pk/index.php/jalt/article/view/166>
- Al Maani, b. & Hadla, L. S. H. & Alqaryouti, M. H. & Alruzzi, K. A. (2022). *The Positive Self and Negative Other Representation in Bashar Al Assad's First Political Speech After the Syrian Uprising*. Theory and Practice in Language Studies. https://dlwqtxts1xzle7.cloudfront.net/92308040/3633-libre.pdf?1665546633=&response-content-disposition=inline%3B+filename%3DThe_Positive_self_and_Negative_other_Rep.pdf&Expires=1744731565&Signature=LXsKO6OqRzLd0-4YwOmFO6eZqSmExt8Lg6l4oMMZY3jZ~z1Xp08u5GP80z8jnydQWroL4OmQH Mv8a4khrJNtKHK4TSv5Ry7ozVpYlgE5ckHIYB4Uz4qXvVHzePlb~6CErIfKF7H6ZK5aI0pi50xHy1n4UYAAUs3KisVHTTrB0u6kHLc1szgHo5l7A6l-Q56ISQjY9ef3ijlw1xVOJwv6lD3egJKQG8de4OeW8met8gcXwpm8B0kdluyn5ZZr3YrBspvcPcsW0rG4dK0moKSz2dOL8mi57oHduWk3kkWkkvsZYm9cJyfbVnz7XyKE6UvR0psvZhmJRFw0r-DTbdvw__&Key-Pair-Id=APKAJLOHF5GGSLRBV4ZA
- Ismail, M. K. A. & Farukh, A. & Ahmad, M. (2019). *Critical Discourse Analysis of Positive Self and Negative Other Representations Through English Language*

Liberal Journal of Language & Literature Review

Print ISSN: 3006-5887

Online ISSN: 3006-5895

Textbooks in Punjab, Pakistan. *Pakistan Journal of Educational Research*.
<http://pjer.org/index.php/pjer/article/view/23>

Van Dijk, T. A. (2015). Critical Discourse Analysis. *John Wiley & Sons*. [Teun-A.-van-Dijk-2015-Critical-discourse-Analysis.pdf](#)

Van Dijk, T. A. (2018). Sociocognitive Discourse Studies. *Routledge*. *John Richardson & John Flowerdew, Eds.* [Teun-A.-van-Dijk-2018-Sociocognitive-discourse-studies.pdf](#)