

Critical Discourse Analysis on Donald Trump's Strategy Against His Addressee to Win the US Election

Sujito¹, Indriana² & Wildan Mahir Muttaqin³
^{1,3} English Department, IAIN Surakarta,³
English Department, Universitas Kanjuruhan Malang
corresponding author: sujitodoktor@gmail.com

Abstract

Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) deals with long term analysis of fundamental causes and consequences of issues. This paper is an attempt to explain how a single issue, that is the US presidential election, is correlated by the existence of jihadist militant, and manipulated using political ideology. This study also examines the persuasive strategies of Donald Trump to win the US 2016 Election. In this study, van Dijk's (2004) frameworks of *Politics, Ideology and Discourse* is used to detect discursive structure within the transcript of Donald Trump's speech and analyze the manner in which language can be a tool at the hands of speakers to persuade and create agreement toward the hearer. The macro strategy of positive self-representation and negative other representation, plus the other 25 more subtle strategies has become one significant way in the creation and neutralization of ideology and personal opinion. The application of this dichotomous categorization in CDA of Donald Trump's strategy toward his addressee to win the US election has asserted the fact that ideological manipulations are used, expressed, enacted and implanted through discursive structures to persuade the audiences. The findings of this study can be conducive to expand students' critical thinking abilities in comprehension and production of language and also in revitalizing the neglected construct of language proficiency.

Key-words: Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA), Political Discourse, Discursive Structures

1. INTRODUCTION

The political figures' ability to persuade and impress their audience becomes one of the key factors that determine their success in reaching their goals and winning the public consensus in the era of continuous power struggle. Based on Teittinen (2000:1), the winner of a public consensus is the party whose language, words, terms and symbolic expressions are based on the reality, and the context is defined in proper discourses. This multilayers concept creates a discursive structure of language, in which, the deep understanding for critical listening and reading is needed, to realize what the reality is and how it is distorted through delicate and skillful use of language.

Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) is the proper subject to uncover the discursive structure of discourse, spoken or written, in order to find out the underlying ideologies within it. As an important branch of Discourse Analysis (DA), CDA tries to focus on the relation between ways of talking and ways of thinking. Wodak and Meyer (2009:7) argue that CDA emphasizes the need for interdisciplinary work in order to gain a proper understanding of how language functions constitute and transmitting knowledge in organizing social institution. Therefore, it requires an account of detailed relationships between text, talk, society, and culture.

This paper provides a critical discourse analysis of Donald Trump's addressee relating to the existence of *jihadist* militant, as the strategy to deliver a concept of making America safe. This addressee is delivered during the campaign era of the US 2016 presidential election, in which it is used as a tool to win the presidential election. Using van Dijk's (2004) framework, this study investigates the uncover ideology of Donald Trump behind his addressee entitled *Making America Safe* and how does he use the ideology to persuade the audiences.

Critical Discourse Analysis deals with the hidden ideology inside language. Supporting this idea, Van Dijk (2008) states that CDA emphasize the basic intention of the authors and speakers which includes the manipulative and ideology beyond language. This theory then is implemented as socio-cognitive analysis, which concerns not only on the text, but also on the social structure, power domination, social cognition and other factors in discourse. This analysis includes three dimensions, which are text, social cognition, and social context analysis. The dimension of text related to the structural aspect and the discourse strategy that is used to deliver the theme. Furthermore, social cognition related to the individual cognition of the writer during the process of producing discourse. On the other hand, social context concern with the social discourse that develops in society (van Dijk, 2004:6).

Van Dijk (1998) reveals that text consists of some levels that support each other. Relating to these levels, he divides a text into three structures. First, macro structures that related to the global meaning of a text, which can be analyzed by observing the topic and theme of a text. Second, superstructure analysis that related to the design and structure of a text. Third, micro structure analysis, which related to the meaning of a text that can be analyzed by observing the micro structure of a text, such as the words, phrases, sentences, preposition, and other. The entire structures have different unit of analysis, based on van Dijk (1998:57) as shown in figure 1.

Specifically, Van Dijk (1998) describes thematic dimension as the global meaning of a discourse. Theme related to the general image of an idea and thought that is delivered by the speaker. This dimension can be understood by reading the whole text. On the other hand, schematic is in the form of the dimension of superstructure that describes the general form of a text. This dimension is the strategy of the communicator to support his main concept by giving some supporting evidence. The schematic structure emphasizes the important part which has to be displayed, and which important information that has to be hid implicitly. Moreover, the semantic dimension concerns with the meaning of a text. The dimension includes some strategies, such as the

background, detail, purpose, and opinion. Background of phenomenon related to the background of a discourse, and the purpose of using that background. Moreover, detail related to the way the actor control information. Basically, communicator will exaggerate in delivering information that useful for them. On the other hand, they will minimize information that harmful for them.

Figure 1. Structure of micro structure of discourse

Discourse Structure	Object of Observation	Element
Macro Structure	Thematic	Topic or theme
Superstructure	Schematic	Schema
Micro Structure	Semantic	Background, Detail, Purposes, Opinion, Nominalization.
	Syntaxes	Sentence form (active and passive), coherence, and pronoun.
	Lexicalization	Key word
	Rhetoric	Graphic, Metaphor, and expression.

Other dimensions of analysis based on Van Dijk (1998) are syntaxes, lexicalization, and rhetoric. Syntaxes dimension related to the process of political manipulation by emphasizing positive self-representation and emphasizing other negative representation. Syntaxes can be applied using the pronouns, words formation, sentences form, activation and passivation, non-finite clause, compound and complex sentences, and others. On the other hand, the form of lexicalization deals with the way an actor does the selection of words using any kinds of possibility. The selection keywords based on the context is not accidentally used, moreover ideologically shows the actors' perspective toward a fact or reality. The last dimension is rhetoric, which related to way the actors deliver their idea and thought. The way in delivering their thought can be in the form of using graphic, metaphor, and using expression (van Dijk, 1998:57).

Generally, the main purpose of CDA is to uncover the implicit ideology inside a discourse. Widdowson (2000) supports this idea by stating that CDA unveils the underlying ideological prejudices and the power in texts. Based on this purpose, the analysis can be conducted using social cognition analysis. Socio cognition is used to understand the text as a whole. This form of analysis is based on a concept that the text itself has no meaning, and then the meaning inside the text is given by the writers using their ideology (van Dijk, 2000).

The selected key terms of the framework based on van Dijk (2000:62-83) are defined in the following:

Actor description: The way to describe actors or members of a particular society either in a negative or positive way.

Authority: Mentioning authorities to support one's claims.

Categorization: Assigning people to different groups.

Consensus: Creating agreement and solidarity.

Disclaimer: Presenting an idea as something positive and then rejecting it by the use of terms such as 'but' in the second sentence.

Evidentially: Using hard facts to support one's ideas.

Hyperbole: A device for enhancing and exaggerating meaning.

Implication: Deducing or inferring implicit information.

Irony: Saying something and meaning something else.

Lexicalization: an overall ideological strategy for negative other representation through the semantic features of the words.

National Self Glorification: A device to create positive self-representation by exalting one's country.

Number Game: Using numbers and statistics to appear credible.

Polarization: Categorizing people as belonging to 'Us' with good attributes and 'Them' with bad attributes.

Presupposition: The common shared knowledge between people or the ideas taken for granted in a proposition.

Vagueness: Creating uncertainty and ambiguity.

Victimization: Telling bad stories about people who do not belong to 'Us'.

Derogatory and Euphemistic Terms

The mechanism of ideological manipulation is materialized through different techniques one of which is the dual classification of derogatory and euphemistic terms. Hornby (2004:339-428) defines 'derogatory' as showing a critical attitude towards others, or insulting, while 'euphemism' as an indirect word or phrase that people often use to refer to something embarrassing or unpleasant, sometimes to make it seem more acceptable than what it really is. Relating to this statement, Rahimi and Sahragard (2007:29) define 'euphemism' as the words and expressions used to soften or mitigate the reality of the ideas transmitted to an audience, while 'derogatory' define as a way of showing a critical attitude towards others, or insulting.

Euphemisms are words and expressions used to soften or mitigate the reality of the ideas transmitted to an audience. They are an indispensable and universal feature of language use and usage. People from different cultures and communities employ euphemistic terms to talk or write about the phenomena they find embarrassing (e.g., gender-related words), terrifying (e.g., death, war, sickness, catastrophes, pestilences), and taboos (e.g., religion). Another application of euphemisms is to elevate and promote the status of some event or phenomenon. However, it is often used to talk indirectly about things whose explicit description is considered especially inappropriate.

Merriam Webster dictionary defines Euphemism as “the substitution of an agreeable or inoffensive expression for one that may offend or suggest something unpleasant; also: the expression so substituted. The example is: using “eliminate” as a euphemism for “kill”. Oxford dictionary, on the other hand, define the same term as “a mild or indirect word or expression substituted for one considered to be too harsh or blunt when referring to some something unpleasant or embarrassing, such as the jargon “downsizing” as a euphemism for “cut”.

Derogation is defined as “to cause to seem inferior, disparage” by World English Dictionary, and as “a communication that belittles somebody or something” by Free Dictionary. Some examples are; condescension, disdain, patronage as a communication that indicates lack of respect by patronizing the recipient; darkey, darkie, darky as (ethnic slur) offensive term for Black people; paleface as (slang) a derogatory term for a white person (supposedly used by North American Indians); Oriental, oriental person as a member of an Oriental race; the term is regarded as offensive by Asians (especially by Asian Americans).

Also in educational circles words with derogatory overtones are everything but rare. Consider the following terms in education: ‘dropouts’ = ‘early leavers’, ‘tap-water teaching method’ = ‘traditional teaching methods’, ‘rote-learning’ = ‘parrot-like learning’ = ‘meaningless learning’, ‘back-rowers’= ‘lazy students’, etc. Therefore, dehumanization, racism and violence are the important by-products of media which are materialized through euphemistic and derogatory language (Herman and Chomsky cited in Rahimi and Sahragard, 2007: 38).

Utilizing van Dijk's theory, this study intends to examine Donald Trump's speech during the campaign era of the US presidential election, dealing with the issue of the existence of *jihadist* militant. Particularly, this study tries to answer the following question:

1. What is the underlying ideology of Donald Trump's statement in euphemization and derogatory terms of ‘making America safe’ related to his measure against Islamic radical terrorism?
2. How does Trump use the implicit ideology to justify his statement, persuade and influences the audiences? And how are they represented through the euphemization and derogation?

This study provides knowledge about CDA which readers do not know or have not known about it yet. On the other words, researcher gives contribution to anyone who is interested on discourse study, especially about critical discourse analysis or everything deals with the topic that has been presented in this research. In this research, researcher applies CDA in linguistics study, which is in the case of language, power, and ideology that is contained in Donald Trump's addressee of Making America Safe. However, this thesis can be used as a reference for students who are interested in CDA. Moreover, this thesis adds the variety of CDA research, which until now is scarcely to do.

Practically

a. For Collegian

This thesis provides knowledge for the collegian about critical discourse analysis as well as its theories. Thus, it can be applied in another CDA research.

b. For Lecturer

This thesis provides input for the learning materials for linguistics lecturers, especially about critical discourse analysis. Moreover, the findings of current study in CDA's area especially in uncovering the ideological implications of a combination of texts may be presented to the field of applied linguistics including Teaching Methodology, Curriculum and Materials Development as well as the evaluation measure.

2. METHODS

The main material used in this research is Donald Trump's speech transcription. The researcher gets the data in an article taken from website named 'The Hill' with a theme, 'Donald Trump Addresses Radical Islamic Terrorism'. Relating to the speech transcription, the data sources in this research is in the form of speech video of Donald Trump. The video with 50 minutes duration entitled '*FULL* - Donald Trump Radical Islamic Terrorism'. The data in this research will be in the form of descriptive qualitative data and use qualitative data procedure for the data analysis. In this research, the data will be in the form of words, phrases and sentences which are included in the script of Donald Trump's speech. Then the data will be conducted further action by way of describing and analyzing them one by one according to van Dijk's (2004) theory.

3. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

This part consists of the underlying ideologies of Donald Trump that is covered using his slogan to make America safe, and the way Trump uses the ideology to persuade the audiences. After analyzing using van Dijk's theory, researcher finds three ideologies of Donald Trump behind his addressee. Those ideologies are the ideology to destroy terrorism act, ideology to prevail over Obama and Clinton, and the ideology to win the US 2016 election.

The existence of jihadist militant becomes a problem not only for America, but also for most of all countries in this world. This problem becomes public's attention, similarly for Donald Trump. Using his addressee which was delivered in Youngstown, Ohio on August, 15 2016 that entitled 'How to make America Safe', indirectly Trump asserts that jihadist militant is an evil that has to be destroyed. This first ideology can be evidenced toward the way Trump tries to persuade the audiences, such as at the following quotation:

Last December, 14 innocent Americans were gunned down at an office party in San Bernardino, another 22 were injured. In June, 49 Americans were executed at the Pulse Nightclub in Orlando, and another 53 were injured. It was the worst mass shooting in our history, and the worst attack on the LGBTQ community in our history. (P. 3)

Related to that quotation, Trump supports his idea using the confusion made by jihadist militant in America. He uses the application of number game to mention specifically the evidences. Moreover, he emphasizes his idea that jihadist militant is a threat using some lexicalization, such as at 'worst mass shooting' and the 'worst attack' phrases. Using this strategy, Trump creates an idea that jihadist militant is a threat for American safety. Therefore, he tries to persuade his audiences that to make America safe, jihadist militant has to be destroyed.

In Europe, we have seen the same carnage and bloodshed inflicted upon our closest allies. In January of 2015, a French satirical newspaper, Charlie Hebdo, was attacked for publishing cartoons of the prophet Mohammed. Twelve were killed, including two police officers, and 11 were wounded. Two days later, four were murdered in a Jewish Deli. (P. 4)

Trump describes the brutality of terrorism on some countries in this world. He emphasizes his idea by creating audiences' imagination, using the application of number game and lexicalization. The application of number game, in this addressee, is used in order to convince audiences that Trump knows exactly the detail of each case, so audiences will believe him toward the evidence. On the other hand, Trump creates audiences' imagination using some lexicalizations, such as 'carnage and bloodshed'. Using this strategy, Trump creates an idea that terrorism has made a frightening situation, in which, specifically, it has to be solved. Relating to Trump's idea, this frightening problem can be solved only by destroying the act of terrorism.

We cannot let this evil continue. Nor can we let the hateful ideology of Radical Islam, its oppression of women, gays, children, and nonbelievers, be allowed to reside or spread within our own countries. We will defeat Radical Islamic Terrorism, just as we have defeated every threat we have faced in every age before. But we will not defeat it with closed eyes, or silenced voices. Anyone who cannot name our enemy is not fit to lead this country. Anyone who cannot condemn the hatred, oppression and violence of Radical Islam lacks the moral clarity to serve as our President. (P. 8)

Trump asks the audiences to stop the evil of jihadist militant. He emphasizes that they can destroy this act of terrorism, using authority, by comparing America's success in defeating every threat at the previous era. Moreover, he tries to persuade his audiences related to some acts that have to be executed to force the existence of Islamic terrorism in America, using the term of generalization, by mentioning 'anyone', he delivers an agreement to force those whom supports ISIS and its ideology to lead the US. Related to that quotation, Trump applies the use of lexicalization such as 'hateful ideology' and 'lacks the moral clarity' to emphasize his idea that terrorism is an evil, and it has to be destroyed. Moreover, the application of metaphor such as 'closed eyes' and 'silenced voices' is used to create audiences' awareness that this evil cannot be destroyed without doing some strategy to force it.

Another interesting aspect that exists in Trump's addressee on the way to make America safe is the way he emerges his rival in the US 2016 election. Obama and Clinton become the center of attention in this addressee, in which Trump introduces them as the founder of *jihadist* militant. The way Trump emphasizes the negative representation of Obama and Clinton, behind his addressee to make America safe creates an idea that Trump tries to prevail over them, by connecting American safety, the existence of ISIS, and their involvement on the terrorism act.

In short, the Obama-Clinton foreign policy has unleashed ISIS, destabilized the Middle East, and put the nation of Iran, which chants 'Death to America', in a dominant position of regional power and, in fact, aspiring to be a dominant world power. It all began in 2009 with what has become known as President Obama's global 'Apology Tour.' In a series of speeches, President Obama described America as "arrogant," "dismissive" "derisive" and a "colonial power." He informed other countries that he would be speaking up about America's "past errors." He pledged that we would no longer be a "senior partner" that sought to dictate our terms." He lectured CIA officers of the need to acknowledge their mistakes, and described Guantanamo Bay as a "rallying cry for our enemies." Perhaps no speech was more misguided than President Obama's speech to the Muslim World delivered in Cairo, Egypt, in 2009. (p. 12)

The failure to establish a new Status of Forces Agreement in Iraq, and the election-driven timetable for withdrawal, surrendered our gains in that country and led directly to the rise of ISIS. The failures in Iraq were compounded by Hillary Clinton's disaster in Libya. President Obama has since said he regards Libya as his worst mistake. According to then-Secretary of Defense Robert Gates, the invasion of Libya was nearly a split decision, but Hillary Clinton's forceful advocacy for the intervention was the deciding factor. With one episode of bad judgment after another, Hillary Clinton's policies launched ISIS onto the world. (p. 14)

Based on the first quotations, Trump argues that the existence of jihadist militant is the result of President Obama's global 'Apology Tour'. By giving illustration of Obama's speech, Trump applies actor description strategy to emphasize the negative representation of Obama. Supporting this idea, Trump uses lexicalization such as at 'misguided' word, to prevail over Obama. Moreover, at the second quotation, Trump tries to prevail over Hillary Clinton, by connecting the failure of forces agreement in Iraq that affecting the rise of ISIS with her failure in Libya. Using the term of hyperbole by mentioning 'Hillary Clinton's disaster', Trump emphasizes the negative representation of Clinton. On the other hand, Trump supports his idea using evidentiality by mentioning the secretary of defense's statement. Therefore, using this strategy, Trump prevails over Obama and Clinton by putting them as the founder of ISIS. Therefore, he utilizes the moment of US 2016 presidential election to prevail over

Hillary Clinton, whom is his rival in the election, by using the slogan of making America safe and creates Obama and Clinton as the menace of American safety.

In winning the Cold War, President Ronald Reagan repeatedly touted the superiority of freedom over communism, and called the USSR the Evil Empire. Yet, when President Obama delivered his address in Cairo, no such moral courage could be found. Instead of condemning the oppression of women and gays in many Muslim nations, and the systematic violations of human rights, or the financing of global terrorism. President Obama tried to draw an equivalency between our human rights record and theirs. His naive words were followed by even more naive actions. (P. 13)

With one episode of bad judgment after another, Hillary Clinton's policies launched ISIS onto the world. Yet, as she threw the Middle East into violent turmoil, things turned out well for her. The Clintons made almost \$60 million in gross income while she was Secretary of State. Incident after incident proves again and again: Hillary Clinton lacks the judgment, the temperament and the moral character to lead this nation. Importantly, she also lacks the mental and physical stamina to take on ISIS, and all the many adversaries we face, not only in terrorism, but in trade and every other challenge we must confront to turn this country around. (P. 14)

The common ideological strategy which is used by a public speaker is the strategy of emphasizing positive self-representation and de-emphasizes other positive presentation. Trump applies this strategy to prevail over his rival, Obama and Hillary Clinton. At the first quotation, Trump emphasizes the negative presentation of Obama by comparing him with President Ronald Reagan. Trump uses polarization to emphasize the badness of Obama's addressee in Cairo. Supporting this idea, he gives illustration, while uses lexicalization, such as 'naive words' and 'naive actions' to emphasize the negative presentation of Obama. On the other hand, at the second quotation, Trump tries to prevail over Hillary Clinton by emphasizing her negative presentation, in which he describes her as the founder of ISIS and shows her income while become the secretary of state. Behind using evidentiality to support his idea, Trump uses lexicalization such as 'lacks the judgment', 'temperament', 'moral character', and 'lacks the mental and physical stamina' to describe the negative presentation of Hillary Clinton.

The main purpose of a presidential candidate whom delivers a speech during a campaign era is to persuade the audiences in order to win the election, similarly to Donald Trump. Relating to his addressee on ISIS that entitled how to make America safe, Trump tries to get audiences' sympathy by delivering his mission as a presidential candidate. After delivering the previous ideologies to destroy ISIS and prevail over Obama and Clinton, Trump introduces himself as the solution of the problem of American safety.

That is why one of my first acts as President will be to establish a Commission on Radical Islam which will include reformist voices in the Muslim community who will hopefully work with us. We want to build bridges and erase divisions. (P. 38)

The goal of the commission will be to identify and explain to the American public the core convictions and beliefs of Radical Islam, to identify the warning signs of radicalization, and to expose the networks in our society that support radicalization. This commission will be used to develop new protocols for local police officers, federal investigators, and immigration screeners. We will also keep open Guantanamo Bay, and place a renewed emphasis on human intelligence. Drone strikes will remain part of our strategy, but we will also seek to capture high-value targets to gain needed information to dismantle their organizations. Foreign combatants will be tried in military commissions. (P. 39)

Trump tries to get audiences' sympathy by using the metaphor term in 'build bridges and erase division', which is related to the way he attract Muslim community countries to cooperate him. On the other hand, he supports his idea using illustration related to the goal of his commission, in which this strategy is supported using lexicalization in 'high-value target' that used to attract audiences' sympathy, by creating a positive presentation toward his idea.

Unlike Hillary Clinton, who has risked so many lives with her careless handling of sensitive information, my Administration will not telegraph exact military plans to the enemy. I have often said that General MacArthur and General Patton would be in a state of shock if they were alive today to see the way President Obama and Hillary Clinton try to recklessly announce their every move before it happens, like they did in Iraq, so that the enemy can prepare and adapt. (P. 26)

While my opponent accepted millions of dollars in Foundation donations from countries where being gay is an offense punishable by prison or death, my Administration will speak out against the oppression of women, gays and people of different faith. Our Administration will be a friend to all moderate Muslim reformers in the Middle East, and will amplify their voices. This includes speaking out against the horrible practice of honor killings, where women are murdered by their relatives for dressing, marrying or acting in a way that violates fundamentalist teachings. (P. 28)

Trump emphasizes the differences between him and his rival, which includes their different perspective of view. Trump tries to deliver his ideology to win the US 2016 election, by creating the positive representation of him, using comparison to prevail over Hillary Clinton. His idea is supported using the application of lexicalization to describe his rival, such as in 'risked so many lives', 'careless handling of sensitive information', and 'recklessly announce' phrases. Therefore, by using jargon of 'Making America Safe', Trump is not only delivering his plan for American's safety, but he also criticizes the current policy and his rival programs, in order to prevail over them and get audiences' sympathy to win the US 2016 election.

Assimilation is not an act of hostility, but an expression of compassion. Our system of government, and our American culture, is the best in the world and will produce the best outcomes for all who adopt it. This approach will not only make us safer, but bring us closer together as a country. Renewing this spirit of Americanism will help heal the divisions in our country. It will do so by emphasizing what we have in common, not what pulls us apart. (P. 43)

This is my pledge to the American people: as your President I will be your greatest champion. I will fight to ensure that every American is treated equally, protected equally, and honored equally. We will reject bigotry and oppression in all its forms, and seek a new future built on our common culture and values as one American people. (P. 44)

Both of those quotations show the way Trump creating the positive representation of him, in which he tries to get closer to his audiences, by asking them to cooperate in making America safe. At the first quotation, Trump uses national self-glorification to build his audiences' nationality, by emphasizing that American culture is the best in the world. Moreover, he uses metaphor in 'heal the division' to create an idea that the previous division is a failure, and the new division of Trump can fix the failure. At the second quotation, Trump uses authority, by mentioning him as the audiences' president. This authority is supported using positive self-representation, by the use of lexicalization of 'greatest champion', 'treated equally', 'protected equally', and 'honored equally' to audiences' sympathy. Moreover, at the last part of his addressee, he uses populism by mentioning American people, which is not only related to his audiences, but also all of American people. Using this strategy, Trump tries to get all of American people's sympathy, including his audiences', in order to win the US 2016 election.

4. CONCLUSION

A close examination of the transcript through van Dijk's (2004) comprehensive framework revealed that Donald Trump implements the ideological manipulation on his addressee to win the US election. Specifically, there are three main ideologies which are found on Donald Trump's addressee, those are the ideology to destroy terrorism act, the

ideology to prevail over his rival, and the ideology to win the US election. To justify his statement, Trump utilized the subtle ideological discourse structure which could be classified into two major strategies of positive self-presentation and negative other-presentation. Number game, lexicalization, metaphor, and illustration are frequently used as effective devices in persuasion and justification. Van Dijk's (2004) framework, as a cognitive approach, with 27 ideological discourse structures, proved to be an appropriate design, in which a political figure tries to control and penetrate into the mind of their audience to reach their goal.

REFERENCES

- Hornby, A.S. 2004. *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary*. London: Oxford University Press.
- <http://dictionary.reference.com>. Accessed on 13 November 2016.
- <http://thehill.com/blogs/pundits-blog/presidential-campaign/291498-full-transcript-donald-trump-addressee-radical>. Accessed on 10 November 2016.
- <http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary>. Accessed on 13 November 2016.
- <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=zy7eX2W76Tw>. Accessed on 10 November 2016.
- Rahimi, A. & Sahragard, R. 2006. The Linguistics Journal. *Critical Discourse Analysis: Euphemization and Derogation on the Emails Written on the Death of the Pope*. Vol. 1(2): 29-87. Accessed on 13 November from <http://www.researchgate.net/Publications/266080999>.
- Rahimi, A. & Sahragard, R. 2007. *Critical Discourse Analysis*. Tehran: Jungle Publications.
- Teittinen, M. 2000. *Power and Persuasion in the Finnish Presidential Rhetoric in the Early 1990's*. Accessed on 13 November 2016 from <http://www.natcom.org/conferences/findland/mariteittinen>.
- Van Dijk, T.A. 1998. *Ideology: A Multidisciplinary Approach*. London: Sage Publications.
- Van Dijk, T.A. 2004. *Politics Ideology and Discourse*. Accessed on 14 November 2016 from <http://www.discourse-in-society.org/teun.html>.
- Van Dijk, T.A. 2008. *Discourse and Power*. United Kingdom: Palgrave.
- Widdowson, H. 2000. Applied Linguistics. *On the Limitations of Linguistics Applied*. 21 (1): 3-25. Accessed on 14 November 2016 from <http://m.applij.oxfordjournals.org/content/21/1/3.abstract>.
- Wodak, R. & Meyer, M. 2009. *Methods for Critical Discourse Analysis*. London: Sage Publications.

IJOTL-TL, Vol. 4, No. 1, January 2019

p-ISSN: 2502-2326; e-ISSN: 2502-8278

<https://solocls.org>; Email: ijotl@gmail.com

Center of Language and Cultural Studies, Surakarta, Indonesia

Sujito, Indriana & Muttaqin, Mahir, Wildan. 2019. Critical Discourse Analysis
on Donald Trump's Strategy against His Addressee to Win the US Election.

IJOTL-TL (2019), 4(1): 27-38. DOI:10.30957/ijotl-tl.v4i1.554.
