

John Fredy Gil-Bonilla

Complutense University of Madrid, Spain

CRITICAL DISCOURSE ANALYSIS OF TRUMP ACROSS TIME

Summary. This study explores the discourse of Trump as a businessman and as a president regarding the topic of immigration. Data for this research were gathered from four speeches and four interviews delivered by Trump in the eighties-nineties and four speeches and four interviews after being elected president. The analysis focuses on the way Trump represents US (ingroup) versus THEM (outgroup) at the local semantic level through the use of pronouns and implicatures and, at the local form through the use of syntax, that is, the formal relationship between clauses and sentences. In particular, I want to shed light on the following research questions: (1) How does Donald Trump represent the topic of immigration as a businessman? (2) How does Donald Trump represent the topic of immigration as a president? On the basis of the results of this research, it can be concluded that the period in which the discourse was uttered seems to have a strong bearing on the discursive strategies employed by Trump. It should be also pointed out that nowadays, the linguistic analysis of Trump's discourses area touchstone issue in political and social affairs. This paper contributes to this volume offering insights regarding the analysis of political discourse. More specifically, research on political discourse is considered as a branch within social science.

Keywords: CDA; stance-taking; representation; ideological structures; discursive strategies.

Introduction

Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) can be used to describe how political discourse is construed (see, for instance, Chilton, 2004; Chouliaraki & Fairclough, 1999; Edelman, 1964; Fairclough, 1993; Hart, 2014; O'Halloran, 2003). In this respect, van Dijk (2001) states that CDA is a type of discourse analytical research that primarily studies the way social power's abuse, dominance, and inequality are enacted, reproduced, and resisted by text and talk in the social and political context (p. 352). As a result, "critical discourse analysts take an explicit stance and, thus, want to understand, expose, and ultimately resist social inequality" (van Dijk, 1998, p. 352). Fairclough and Wodak (1997) and Wodak (2001) argue that CDA sees discourse – language use in speech and writing – as a form of "social practice". Describing discourse as social practice implies a dialectical relationship between a particular discursive event on one hand, and the situations, institutions and

social structures on the other hand. Thus, CDA may be defined as fundamentally concerned with analysing opaque as well as transparent structural relationships of dominance, discrimination, power and control as manifested in language. In other words, CDA aims to investigate critically social inequality as it is expressed, signalled, constituted and legitimised by language use. Van Dijk (1998) further explains that CDA research is often interested in the study of ideologically biased discourses, and the ways these polarize the representation of us (ingroup) versus them (outgroup). It should be noted that one of the main focal points in this investigation is to see how speakers position themselves concerning US vs THEM polarization at the local level of meaning regarding pronouns and implicatures and local level of form regarding syntax. Therefore, we thus often witness an overall strategy of stance taking from the local level of meaning and form.

In political discourse, similar research has been applied in relation to CDA, for instance, Wang (2010) presents an analysis of Obama's discourse, which is mostly based on semantics (i.e. the meaning of words) rather than on form (i.e. syntax/word order). Furthermore, there are other studies concerning Trump's discourse, as in Gil-Bonilla (2018), where the topic of economy is under scrutiny. Therefore, the present paper contributes in the analysis of Trump's discourse in terms of comparing the topic of immigration with Trump as a businessman and as a president, which seems to be still unexplored.

Consequently, the focus of this study is to see how van Dijk's (2001) ideological strategies are used regarding the stance taken by Trump in his discourses before and after being elected president on the topic of immigration. Accordingly, the aim of this research is to examine how a set of political speeches and interviews show the stance taken by Trump and for this, van Dijk's (2001) ideological strategies are used as to find differences from one period to another. In particular the following questions are addressed:

- (a) How does Donald Trump represent the topic of immigration as a businessman?
- (b) How does Donald Trump represent the topic of immigration as a president?

The present paper is structured in the following way: after the introduction, the next section reviews the literature that is relevant to the present investigation. Later, the methodology describes the data employed for the elaboration of this study. After that, the analysis section deals with the presentation and discussion of data in terms of how meaning and form at the local level are used in Trump's discourse regarding the topic of immigration. And finally, the last section shows the main conclusions and implications that are drawn from the analysis.

Theoretical Background

The present paper draws on a Critical Discourse Analysis approach in order to examine the most frequent communicative strategies in Trump's discourse. In particular, this paper employs van Dijk's (2001) theories about ideology and ideological discourse structures. Critical discourse analysis (CDA) is defined as a rapidly developing area of language study. It regards discourse as 'a form as social practice' (Fairclough & Wodak, 1997, p. 258), and takes into consideration the context of language use as crucial to discourse (Wodak, 2001). Freedden, Sargent & Stears (2013) explain that CDA is not a method of analysis but a social movement. These methods may include analysis of the lexicon, syntax, local and global meaning (semantics), speech acts and other relations with the context (pragmatics), style, rhetoric, argumentation, narrative structures or other conventional organization of discourse (p. 176). Van Dijk (1995) asserts that CDA has become a special approach for the study of texts and talk, emerging from critical linguistics, critical semiotics and in general from a socio-politically conscious and oppositional way of investigating language, discourse and communication. Fairclough (1993) defines CDA in a similar way to van Dijk (1998) as:

<...>discourse analysis which aims to systematically explore often opaque relationships of causality and determination between (a) discursive practices, events and texts, and (b) wider social and cultural structures, relations and processes; to investigate how such practices, events and texts arise out of and are ideologically shaped by relations of power and struggles over power; and to explore how the opacity of these

relationships between discourse and society is itself a factor securing power and hegemony (p. 135).

As has been argued, ideology favours the social order of class dominance and subordination, or privilege and disadvantage. Stance taking “becomes a force of social, cultural, political, and economic control and class inequality—a hegemony” (Jaffe, 2009). Therefore, stance taking and ideology are two intertwined concepts.

Van Dijk’s Socio-Cognitive Approach: The Role of Ideology and Ideological Discourse Structures

Discourse is a very complex matter, involving many levels of structures with their own categories and elements. In this paper, some of the structures that exhibit underlying ideologies are explored. Two levels are applicable in this investigation, that is, the semantic meaning level and the level of form.

The Level of Meaning

In accordance with van Dijk (1998, 2001), one of the typical features of discourse meaning is coherence: The meanings of the sentences, that is, their propositions must be to some extent interconnected. Such coherence may be global or local.

Despite the fact that it is not easy to define the notion of local coherence very precisely, van Dijk (1980) defines local meanings as the meaning of words, a term that may be understood as “lexis,” depending on one’s perspective (p. 103). Later on, van Dijk (2000) puts forward that a sequence of propositions is locally coherent if it is about a sequence of actions, events or situations that are mutually related (p. 47). For instance, by relations of causality or enablement. In brief, we may say that a discourse sequence is coherent if it has a mental model. Van Dijk (2009) defines mental models as a ‘mental interface’ considered as the missing ingredient for traditional approaches accounting for the social influence of language use and discourse.

It should be acknowledged that in accord with van Dijk (2001) a model of a situation may very much depend on one's opinions, attitudes or ideologies. That is to say, local meanings are the result of the selection made by speakers or writers in their mental models of events or their more general, socially shared beliefs. At the same time, they are the kind of information that (under the overall control of global topics) most directly influences the mental models, and hence the opinions and attitudes of recipients.

Van Dijk (2001) identifies various categories¹ concerning the local meaning; however, we will merely explain those categories which are useful for the purpose of this investigation:

i. Implicatures: information that is implicit may be inferred from the meaning of a text. In theoretical terms, this means that implicit information is part of a mental model of the users of a text but not of the text itself. That is, implicit meanings are related to underlying beliefs, but are not openly, directly, completely or precisely asserted, for various contextual reasons, including the well-known ideological objective to de-emphasize our bad things and their good things. All propositions that appear in a model but not in the discourse may thus be called the "implied" meaning of a discourse. According to van Dijk (2000), it is easy to predict that within our general schema people tend to leave information implicit that is inconsistent with their positive self-image. On the other hand, any information that tells the recipient about the bad things of our enemies, or about those we consider our outgroup will tend to be explicitly expressed in text and talk. For instance, a speaker may be sometimes quite explicit about refugees and their alleged crimes. But in many other fragments his negative propositions about immigrants are only implicit—and hence his racism or xenophobia deniable.

ii. Propositional structures: the structures of propositions have some interesting properties; in this ideological analysis we deal with actor and pronouns. Some arguments of the propositions according to van Dijk (2001) are the role of actors and pronouns which may take various roles, namely as agents, patients, or beneficiaries of an action (p. 51). Similarly, Jaffe (2009) explains that pronouns position social actors as members or aspiring

¹ For further information about other categories used in van Dijk (2001), see Table 1.

members of particular groups (p. 222). In other words, pronouns help social actors to take a stance.

Last but not least, we should also note the use of overgeneralizations, which according to van Dijk (2006), are regarded as macrostructures and considered as fallacies. Van Dijk (1984) explains that the familiar phenomenon of overgeneralization involves the use of particular situation models as general group schemata (p. 26). In more mundane terms, a single term is taken as a social truth.

Local Forms

Van Dijk (2013) argues that content or meaning is the most obvious discourse level for the expression of ideology. It is here that the general and specific propositions of models and social representations can be most directly exhibited (p. 53). But van Dijk (2001) also suggests that an ideological analysis should not be limited only to semantics. Indeed, ideologies may also affect the various formal structures of text and talk: the form of a clause or sentence, the form of an argument, the order of a news story, the size of a headline and so on. As van Dijk (1980) asserts, those structures of text or talk that are much less consciously controlled or controllable by the speakers are regarded as "forms" which generally do not directly express underlying meanings and hence beliefs, but rather signal "pragmatic" properties of a communicative event (p. 106). For instance, the intention, current mood or emotions of speakers, their perspective on events talked about, opinions about co-participants, and especially interactional concerns such as positive self-presentation and impression formation. In other words, negative opinions about others may be hidden, but indirectly these negative evaluations may be signalled by some features such as, intonation, syntactic structures, propositional structures, rhetorical figures, many properties of spontaneous talk, such as turn taking, repairs, pauses, hesitation, and so on.

As van Dijk's (2001) framework suggests, forms "as such" have no meaning, and therefore, their ideological function can only be exercised together with meaning or interaction. Along this line, there are many types of

discourse forms. In sentence syntax alone there are dozens of possible structural forms that might be used to emphasize or de-emphasize meaning. The same is true for the overall schematic forms of discourse, such as argumentative or narrative structures, or the conventional schemata of a conversation, a news article or a scholarly article.

According to van Dijk's (2001) framework the most relevant formal categories are the following ones:

i. Formal relationships between clauses/sentences: van Dijk (2001) affirms that the most salient "manifestations of this category are for instance the co-referential expressions which denote a permanent discourse referent" (p. 54). Van Dijk (2001) also explains that clauses and sentences are to be connected, and the connection conditions involved are based on relations between facts, e.g. cause and consequence, part and whole. Van Dijk (2001) further describes that sentences are not only directly, linearly coherent but also relative to the topic of discourse, which indicate in which respect two sentences are connected. This relationship between sentences gives rise to a subcategory called "sentence syntax", which according to van Dijk (2000) suggests that many sentence structures are not contextually variable, and hence cannot be used to ideologically "mark" discourse sentences. However, others do allow at least some variation, such as word order, active and passive sentences, and nominalizations (p. 54). Van Dijk (2001) further explains that word order usually has two types of political functions: the emphasis or mitigation through more or less prominent placement of words and phrases, and the focusing devices used for syntactic topicalization (e.g. fronting a word so that special attention is drawn to such word). Some propositions may be expressed in sentences that are put up front, and others in sentences at the end of text or talk. That is, this kind of sentence order has the function of providing extra emphasis to the sentence since the information is expressed in the beginning of the text and therefore, it is read first and the interpretation will have more control over the text than the information expressed last. Sentences that express positive meanings about us, and negative meanings about them, will typically appear up front, for instance in headlines, leads, abstracts, announcements or initial summaries of stories. And conversely, meanings that embody information

that is bad for our image will typically tend to appear at the end or be left implicit altogether. It should be furthermore noted that sometimes, the most important information comes last, for instance as a summary, as conclusions or as recommendations. The canonical order in English is to match semantic agents with syntactic subjects, which are typically in first position as, for instance, in "The police arrested the demonstrators." However, we may make the agency of the police in this example less prominent, by moving the expression "the police" towards the back of the sentence, for instance by using a passive construction: "The demonstrators were arrested by the police," or by using a cleft sentence that topicalizes the demonstrators: "It was the demonstrators who the police arrested". Indeed, the agent may be completely left implicit, for instance in such sentences as "The demonstrators were arrested," or using the nominalization (verb turned into a noun): "The arrest of the demonstrators." In other words, by using different sentence forms, the order of words may signal whether the meaning expressed by some words is more or less emphasized, and it needs little argument that such emphasis or lack of emphasis has ideological implications, as shown above.

In the following table (Table 1), a summary of the local meaning and local form will be presented as an illustration of van Dijk's (2001) ideological structures.

Table 1

Summary of van Dijk's ideological structures

	Meaning	Form
Local	i. Lexicalisation ii. Implicatures iii. Examples and illustrations iv. Contrast v. Disclaimers vi. Propositional structures vii. Clarity and vagueness	i. Formal relationship between clauses/sentences

It should be noted that Table 1 presents all van Dijk's ideological discursive strategies. However, not all of these categories are under scrutiny in this paper. We will only deal with those strategies previously explained, that is, implicatures and propositional structures regarding meaning and formal relationship between clauses and sentences regarding form. Now that the ideological discursive strategies proposed by van Dijk have been presented, the next subsection describes the data employed for the elaboration of this study.

Method

Donald Trump's Profile

According to Blair (2005) and Trump & Schwartz (1987) Trump was born in a wealthy family. He attended Wharton School at the University of Pennsylvania, where he received a bachelor's degree in economics. Therefore, his background helped him acquire his business knowledge and made him the businessman that he currently is. Finnegan (2016) provides more details explaining that Trump's deal-making skills allowed him to secure construction loans, which allowed him to build an empire in real estate. He is a proven master at commanding media exposure and criticizing others publicly and exploits his "know it all" persona. In addition, Johnston (2016) affirms that Trump has built and renovated numerous hotels, casinos, and office towers during his business career, accumulating a net worth of billions (p. 150).

Expanding the horizons of his ambitions, Trump's interest in national politics began in the early 2000s, and soon he set his eyes on the presidential office (see for instance, Zwick, 2010). That is why the speeches and interviews as a businessman were selected from the 80s-90s since he started his career as a politician in the early 2000s.

Trump, at one point a registered Democrat, announced his presidential candidacy as a Republican in 2015 (see Blair, 2005), eventually winning the party's nomination and becoming the 45th president of the United States of America.

The Data

The corpus compiled consists of a set of eight speeches and eight interviews, four speeches and four interviews from the 80s–90s, that is, when Donald Trump was only a businessman, and four speeches and four interviews from 26 January 2017 onwards when he was elected president. The speeches were broadcast on the CNN, NBC and C-SPAN and the interviews came from the CNN, ABC news and The Economics. The topic of immigration was chosen since it is a hot topic in Trump’s discourse, that is, a current issue that is of relevance for society.

The following tables (Tables 2 and 3) show the speeches and interviews of Trump as a businessman and as a president, where the dates appear chronologically and the number of words of each text is presented.

Table 2

Trump’s speeches and interviews as a businessman (1980-1999)

SPEECHES			INTERVIEWS		
	date	number of words		date	number of words
Donald Trump on economic recovery	Nov 21, 1991	2.659	Ronna Barret	Oct 6, 1980	830
Donald Trump, chairman and president, Trump organization, New York	Oct 5, 1993	1.200	Oprah’s interview	Nov 12, 1988	720
Statement by Trump	Oct 5, 1993	1.800	Larry King	Nov 15, 1989	550
To the Cuban American National Foundation	Nov 15, 1999	1.800	Larry King	Oct 8, 1999	10.633

Table 3*Trump's speeches and interviews as president (2017)*

SPEECHES			INTERVIEWS		
	date	number of words		date	number of words
To the major cities' chiefs police association	Feb 8, 2017	3.486	David Muir	Jan 26, 2017	8.222
Remarks by President Trump in press conference	Feb 16, 2017	13.925	To the Congress of the United States	Feb 28, 2017	4.800
Announcement that the United States would withdraw from the landmark Paris climate agreement	June 1, 2017	3.246	The Associated Press	Apr 23, 2017	8.033
To address the national rifle association's annual gathering	Apr 28, 2017	6.722	The Economist's interview	May 11, 2017	6.401

As can be seen in the previous tables, the discourse of Trump as a president is longer than as a businessman. It should be noted that despite this difference in his discourse from one period to another, Trump as a president deals with many different topics that are not relevant to the purpose of this investigation. The speeches and interviews of Trump as a businessman are shorter, though more monothematic and thus, dealing more in detail with the topic used for this research, that is, the topic of immigration.

Most of the speeches and interviews of Donald Trump as a president were found online, but others had to be transcribed by the author of this paper, mainly those which belonged to the period of Donald Trump as a businessman, that is, the 80s-90s. These speeches and interviews were selected given the relevance of their content, that is, they were thoroughly read and the information was categorized and chosen in accord with the topic under scrutiny in this paper.

Results

Pronouns

Trump as a businessman represents immigrants positively through the use of the pronoun "they," reinforcing this use with the help of a positive lexicon since they are regarded as great people and, therefore, depicting immigrants as an ingroup showing concern and interest for them. It should be furthermore noted that this positive representation is emphasized with the use of the intensifier "tremendous." In other words, Trump makes use of the adjective tremendous followed by a positive noun, as in the case of "spirit" (see example 1), and therefore, the whole proposition shows some affinity towards foreigners. We can argue that Trump also makes use of the adjective "great" to intensify the degree of the noun "people." In other words, the noun receives positive features as Trump refers to these people (foreigners) as "great people." Nevertheless, Trump as a president makes a constant use of the pronoun "they" referring to immigrants as criminals and bad people, and, in this way he treats immigration as an outgroup. In other words, Trump excludes immigrants from his interest and concern (see example 2). Specifically, Trump as a president makes a recurrent use of the concepts "criminality" and "bad people" when referring to immigrants.

(1) I've gotten to know and become friends with a lot of Cuban immigrants today. One of great people. A lot of people with tremendous spirit...I know more Cuban immigrants than I knew existed and *they are great people* and now I'm friends. And I'm going to be here whenever you need me and I just wanna end by saying very good deals, see you very soon (S. Nov 15, 1999).

(2) Now *we have criminal* that are here. *We have really bad people* that are here. *Those people have to be worried 'cause they're getting out. We're gonna get them out. We're gonna get 'em out* fast. General Kelly is – I've given that as his number one priority (I. Jan 26, 2017).

Another relevant aspect of pronouns is the case of "those." Trump as a president makes use of this pronoun as a way of treating immigrants

derogatorily regarding them as an outgroup (see examples 3). In other words, Trump overgeneralizes the condition of immigrants considering all of them as criminals and bad people.

(3) So we are moving criminals out of our country and we are getting them out in record numbers and *those are the people we are after*. We are not after the dreamers, we are after the criminals (I. Apr 23, 2017).

To sum up, Trump as a businessman regarded immigrants positively as "great people" with a "tremendous spirit" up to the point of considering them as "friends." However, Trump as a president regards immigrants derogatorily and therefore, treating foreigners negatively. For this purpose, Trump makes a recurrent use of overgeneralizations referring to all immigrants as criminals and bad people who will be getting out.

Implicatures

In this section, we are dealing with the way speakers say something implicitly. In other words, speakers do not need to say everything they know or believe. More specifically, the implicatures used in Trump as a businessman and as a president are under scrutiny. Trump as a businessman presents immigrants positively (see example 4), implying on the one hand, that Cuban immigrants have such a good spirit that makes them different to the others and, on the other hand, that he will not accept business with Cuba until Cuba is free (see example 5). In other words, these examples suggest that Trump gave more prominence to immigrants at that time than to business. However, the opposite happens in Trump as a president in terms of implying that immigrants are criminals, murderers, and people who spread violence and terror in the country (see example 6). We can see again that Trump as a president overgeneralizes the condition of immigrants, as in the example 6. Specifically, Trump regards all immigrants as gang members who spread violence and terror in the country. Therefore, Americans, who are again the victims, should be protected from these immigrants.

(4) (...) inconceivable this can happen especially with the spirit in this room because the spirit of the Cuban immigrants is beyond any spirit that that I've seen by any people and I've been watching it for a long time (S. Nov 15, 1999).

(5) I've met a lot of officers and sadly it's all been very recently to go into Cuba on deals, business deals, real estate and other deals and I've rejected that on the basis that I will go when Cuba is free (S. Nov 15, 1999).

(6) We cannot allow this to continue. We've allowed too many young lives to be claimed—and you see that, you see that all over—claimed by gangs, and too many neighbourhoods to be crippled by violence and fear. Sixty percent of murder victims under the age of 22 are African American. (S. April 28, 2017).

It is also worth noting that Trump as a businessman takes more responsibilities when referring to immigrants since he shows preference for the use of the first person singular pronoun "I" (see example 4 and 5). However, Trump as a president makes use of the inclusive pronoun "we" implying that all Americans have to control the immigration system in order to suffer less violence (see example 6). As already argued, Trump as a president has a negative stance towards immigrants; therefore, this may point to his preference for the use of the inclusive "we" as a way of taking fewer responsibilities in his discourse. However, Trump as a businessman has a more positive stance towards immigrants, which may explain why Trump prefers the use of the pronoun "I" since this stance favours his own personae.

In the following subsection, we are dealing with the formal structures in Trump as a businessman and as a president regarding immigration. More specifically, the local forms will be under scrutiny.

Local Forms

Ideologies may also affect the various formal structures of the text and talk: the form of a clause or sentence, the form of an argument, the order of a news story, the size of a headline, and so on (van Dijk, 2001). As van Dijk (1980) asserts, those structures of the text or talk that are much less

consciously controlled or controllable by the speakers (p. 106). According to him, the actives and passives are two categories within the local forms.

More specifically, Donald Trump uses the actives and passives distinctively depending on the period. In the following examples we will see how it works. The example 7 shows a criminal case in which an act of violence prejudice against immigrants. Trump presents the condition of immigrants in a more salient position as a way of making more prominently his solidarity towards them and thus, treating this immigrant woman as the affected. Nevertheless, Trump as a president makes use of passives with a by-agent. Passives do not always have an explicit agent and Trump uses this strategy recurrently as a way of making clear the agency with the aim of generating in the reader's mind a straightforward negative message concerning immigrants. It should be furthermore noted that the agent of the passives "illegal immigrants" is used as a collocation in Trump's discourse (see example 8 and 9).

(7) I had a case the other day I went to a hospital in Brooklyn, an immigrant woman *was raped, mugged and thrown off a four-story building*, okay? and a reporter asked me whether or not I had any compassion or feeling for the people that did it?

Do I have hatred for them and I said look—this immigrant woman *was raped, mugged and thrown off a building, thrown off a building* on top of everything else, she's virtually, I mean she's got some major problems to put it mildly (I. Nov 15, 1989).

(8) Jamiel's 17-year-old son *was viciously murdered by an illegal immigrant gang member*, who had just been released from prison. This brave man was viciously gunned down *by an illegal immigrant* with a criminal record and two prior deportations (S. Feb 28, 2017).

(9) (...) and you see that, you see that all over—*claimed by gangs, and too many neighbourhoods to be crippled by violence and fear* (S. Feb 8, 2017).

Apart from the prominence that the selection of the passive has in Trump's discourse, Trump also makes use of the active. Trump as a businessman depicts immigrants as deprived of rights which may point to a more positive stance towards them (see example 10). Nevertheless, Trump

as a president makes use of the active voice employing the collocation “illegal immigrant” as the agent suggesting that the victims are a result of the violence caused by illegal immigrants. In other words, Trump presents illegal immigrants as the actors who affect others, as the case of “Americans” and thus, the condition of Americans is presented as the affected (see example 11).

(10) *The problem with our society is that the immigrant has absolutely no rights* and the criminal has unbelievable rights (I. Nov 15, 1989).

(11) Homeland Security dedicated to the forgotten American victims of *illegal immigrant violence*, which there are many. We have taken decisive action (S. Feb 16, 2017).

To put it differently, Trump as a businessman presents immigrants as the affected showing concern and interest for their condition. However, the opposite happens in Trump as a president who depicts immigrants as the agents, who now affect Americans since immigrants are regarded as bad people and criminals.

Conclusion

The starting point of this investigation was the assumption that the discourses of Donald Trump as a businessman and as a president concerning the topics of immigration differed in terms of ideological structures.

At the discursive level regarding meaning, the findings showed that Trump as a businessman represented immigrants with certain empathy and familiarity to the extent of showing concern and interest for the condition of foreigners as mainly shown by the use of the pronouns in terms of not excluding them from his interest. Notwithstanding, as a president, Trump regards immigrants as an outgroup excluding them from his concerns and describing immigrants as a problem for the country. On the other hand, regarding form, the findings support the idea that Trump as a businessman depicted immigration with some air of empathy describing

immigrants as the affected, as shown through the use of the passive constructions. By contrast, Trump as a president portrayed immigrants as the agents affecting the Americans. It should be also noted that Trump as a president sustains his negative positioning towards immigrants through the use of overgeneralizations since he overgeneralizes the condition of immigrants referring to all of them as criminals, bad people and gang members.

One of the main limitations of the study is the length of Trump's discourse. More specifically, his discourse as a president is longer than that as a businessman. However, it should be noted that despite this difference in length from one period to another, Trump as a president deals with many different topics that are not relevant to the purpose of this investigation, and, as a businessman his discourse is shorter and more monothematic dealing more in detail with the topic used for this research, that is, the topic of immigration.

A further line of research could be to continue this study by incorporating more topics following van Dijk's work and thus, trying to see if there are more similarities and differences. This investigation has been mainly focused on Trump as a businessman, that is, the 80s-90s versus Trump as a president although it would be compelling to make a diachronic analysis in terms of how Trump's discourse only as a politician is ideologically constructed, that is, from the 2000s onwards as a way of completing this research paper. Nowadays, the linguistic analysis of Trump's discourse is a touchstone issue in political and social affairs. Therefore, a further study of this nature would be of great help to understand in more detail how the discourse of Trump is constructed.

References

- Blair, G. (2005). *Donald Trump: Master apprentice*. Simon & Schuster.
- Chilton, P. (2004). *Analysing political discourse*. Routledge.
- Chouliaraki, L., & Fairclough, N. (1999). *Discourse in late modernity*. University Press.
- Edelman, M. (1964). *The symbolic uses of politics*. University of Illinois Press.
- Fairclough, N. (1993). Critical discourse analysis and the commodification of public discourse. *Discourse and Society*, 4(2), 133–68.
- Fairclough, N., & Wodak R. (1997). Critical discourse analysis. In T. van Dijk (Ed.), *Discourse as social interaction* (pp. 258–284). Sage.
- Finnegan, M. (2016, September 25). Scope of Trump’s falsehoods unprecedented for a modern presidential candidate. *Los Angeles Times*. <https://www.latimes.com/politics/la-na-pol-trump-false-statements-20160925-snap-story.html>
- Freeden, M. Sargent, T., & Stears, M. (2013). *The Oxford handbook of political ideologies*. Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199585977.001.0001>
- Gil Bonilla, J. (2018). A critical-cognitive analysis of Donald Trump’s discourse across time: Trump as a businessman versus Trump as a president. In M. Díaz, G. Vaamonde, A. Varela, M^a C. Cabeza, & J. M. García-Miguel e Fernando Ramallo (Eds.), *XIII Congreso Internacional Lingüística Xeral* (pp. 409–416). <https://dialnet.unirioja.es/servlet/articulo?codigo=6506563>
- Hart, C. (2014). *Contemporary critical discourse studies*. Bloomsbury.
- Jaffe, A. (2009). *Stance: Sociolinguistic perspectives*. Oxford University.
- Johnston, D. (2016). *The making of Donald Trump*. Melville House Publishing.
- Kitagawa, C. & Lehrer, A. (1990). Impersonal uses of personal pronouns. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 14, 739–759.
- Lyons, J. (1977). Semantics. In C. Ramón (Ed.), *The Spanish translation* (pp. 372–897). Cambridge University Press.
- O’Halloran, K. (2003). *Critical discourse analysis and language cognition*. Edinburgh University Press.
- Trump, D., & Schwartz, T. (1987). *The art of the deal*. Random House.

- van Dijk, T. (1980). *Macrostructures: An interdisciplinary study of global structures in discourse, interaction and cognition*. Erlbaum.
- van Dijk, T. (1984). *Prejudice in discourse: An analysis of ethnic prejudice in cognition and conversation*. Benjamin Publishing Company.
- van Dijk, T. (1995). Discourse analysis as ideology analysis. In C. Schäffner & A. Wenden (Eds.), *Language and peace* (p. 1733). Dartmouth Publishing.
- van Dijk, T. (1998). *Ideology: A multidisciplinary approach*. Sage.
- van Dijk, T. (1998a). *Ideology: A multidisciplinary approach*. Sage Publications.
- van Dijk, T. (2000). *Ideology and discourse: A multidisciplinary introduction*. Pompeu Fabra University.
- van Dijk, T. (2001). Levels and dimensions of Critical Discourse Analysis. Multidisciplinary CDA: A plea for diversity. In R. Wodak, & M. Meyer (Eds.), *Methods of critical discourse analysis* (pp. 99–101). Sage. <http://dx.doi.org/10.4135/9780857028020.n5>
- van Dijk, T. (2006). Ideology and discourse analysis. *Journal of Political Ideologies*, 11(2), 115–140.
- van Dijk, T. (2009). *Society and discourse: How social contexts influence text and talk*. Cambridge University Press.
- van Dijk, T. (2013). *News as discourse*. Routledge.
- Wang, J. (2010). A critical discourse analysis of Barack Obama's speeches. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 1, 254–261.
- Wodak, R. (2001). The discourse-historical approach. In R. Wodak & M. Meyer (Eds.), *Methods of CDA* (pp. 81–115). Sage.
- Zwick, J. (2010, April 10). Donald Trump for President? *The Washington Independent*.
<https://web.archive.org/web/20101008062443/http://washingtonindependent.com/99472/donald-trump-for-president>

John Fredy Gil-Bonilla

Madrido Komplutensės universitetas, Ispanija; jhongil@ucm.es

KRITINĖ DONALDO TRUMPO SKIRTINGŲ LAIKOTARPIŲ DISKURSO ANALIZĖ

Santrauka. Šiuo tyrimu analizuojamas Donaldso Trumpo kaip verslininko ir kaip prezidento diskursas imigracijos tema. Duomenys surinkti iš D. Trumpo keturių kalbų ir keturių interviu, duotų XX a. devintąjį–dešimtąjį dešimtmečiais, ir keturių kalbų bei keturių interviu jį išrinkus prezidentu. Tyrime analizuojama, kaip D. Trumpas vietiniu semantiniu lygmeniu vartodamas įvardžius ir implikatūras bei vietine forma, pasitelkęs sintaksę, t. y. formalųjį ryšį tarp klauzų (angl. *clauses*) ir sakinių, vaizduoja JAV (savas ratas) palyginti su JAIS (kiti). Tyrimu siekta atsakyti į šiuos klausimus: (1) Kaip imigracijos tema vaizduojama D. Trumpo kaip verslininko kalboje? (2) Kaip imigracijos tema vaizduojama D. Trumpo kaip prezidento kalboje? Remiantis šio tyrimo rezultatais galima teigti, jog laikotarpis, kuriuo buvo sakomas diskursas, nulemia D. Trumpo taikomas diskurso strategijas. Taip pat reikia pažymėti, kad šiuo metu lingvistinė D. Trumpo diskurso analizė vaidina svarbų vaidmenį tiek politinėje, tiek socialinėje srityse. Straipsnio išvalgos apie politinio diskurso analizę taip pat papildo šias sritis. Kalbant konkrečiau, politinio diskurso tyrimai yra laikomi socialinių mokslų sritimi.

Pagrindinės sąvokos: KAD; pozicijos raiška; vaizdavimas; ideologinės struktūros; diskursyvinės strategijos.