




**Constructing Hegemony in Political Discourse: A Critical
Stylistics Analysis**

Asst. Prof. Rasha Tareq Awad Al-Zubaidi (Ph.D.)
English Department / College of Arts/ University of Mustansiriyah
Email : rashatariq@uomustansiriyah.edu.iq



بناء الهيمنة في الخطاب السياسي: دراسة أسلوبية نقدية

ام.د. رشا طارق عواد الزبيدي
قسم اللغة الانكليزية . كلية الاداب . الجامعة المستنصرية



Abstract

The study uses the critical stylistics concept presented by Lesley Jeffries (2010) to analyze how media discourse can construct social portrayals and enforce language hegemony in the media by the depiction of a figure as Donald Trump and Kamala Harris. The study identifies a gap in understanding how media discourse shapes public perception of political figures by reinforcing ideological hierarchies and linguistic hegemony. As part of the discussion, the research uses analytical tools like naming and describing, transitivity analysis, modality, and evaluation to common news coverage and political commentary to show how these news outlets have a subdued influence on the thinking of the general public. The informal style of Trump, which is still populist, is often portrayed as something sincere but erroneous, the media meeting his simplicity with the issue of his right to be president. On the other hand, formal and controlled language used by Harris is proposed as polished, but sometimes overcalculated, which helps to unveil the impact of gendered and racialized norms on political speech. Such opposing images form conflicting notions of credibility, authority, and relatability as they support linguistic hierarchies. The study highlights the role of language, power, and ideology in media language and how the interactions affect the population opinion of political leaders. In addition, the study reflects the current debate on media framing and political communication with the focus on how media discourse perpetuates or constitutes political legitimacy.

Key words : Critical Stylistics , Hegemony , Ideology , Media , Modality.

المستخلص

تستخدم هذه الدراسة إطار (Lesley Jeffries (2010 في الأسلوبية النقدية لفحص دور خطاب وسائل الإعلام في تشكيل تصورات الجمهور وتعزيز الهيمنة اللغوية من خلال تمثيلات دونالد ترامب و كامالا هاريس . باستخدام أدوات تحليلية مثل التسمية والوصف، و تحليل الترانزيتيفية، و الأسلوبية، و الافتراضات، و التقييم، تكشف الدراسة عن التحيزات الأيديولوجية الكامنة في التغطية الإخبارية والتعليقات السياسية. يُصور أسلوب ترامب الشعبي وغير الرسمي في كثير من الأحيان على أنه "أصيل" لكن "متهور"، حيث تقارن وسائل الإعلام بين بساطته والمخاوف المتعلقة بمشروعته الرئاسية. في المقابل، يُصوّر أسلوب هاريس الرسمي والمقنن على أنه "مُهذّب" ولكنه في بعض الأحيان "مفرط في الحسابات"، مما يكشف عن تأثير العنصرية في الاتصال السياسي والتصورات المتناقضة تُسهم في بناء بيئة متنافسة حول المصادقية و السلطة و القابلية للتواصل، مما يعزز الهيكليات اللغوية الهرمية. تبرز الدراسة التفاعل بين اللغة و السلطة و الأيديولوجيا في خطاب وسائل الإعلام، موضحة كيف تؤثر هذه الديناميكيات على مواقف الجمهور تجاه الشخصيات السياسية. بالإضافة إلى ذلك، تساهم الدراسة في المناقشات المستمرة حول إطار وسائل الإعلام و الاتصال السياسي، مسلطة الضوء على الطرق التي يعزز بها خطاب وسائل الإعلام أو يتحدى الهيمنة اللغوية ويشكل المشروعية السياسية.

الكلمات المفتاحية: الأسلوبية النقدية ، الهيمنة ، الأيديولوجيا ، وسائل الإعلام ، الصيغة.

1. Introduction

Linguistic hegemony is the control of a specific language or language variety over another which is frequently supported by political, social and economic institutions (Phillipson, 1992). It is a sort of linguistic imperialism; where one language acquires symbolic and material strength over another, resulting in the marginalization or repression of other less dominant languages (Skutnabb-Kangas, 2000). Such hegemony is not just by the superiority of languages but is perpetuated by the ideological, educational, and institutional systems that advance the privileged position of a specific language (Pennycook, 2017). Schools, the media, and government policies among other institutions actively contribute to the maintenance of the linguistic hegemony by making the use of a particular language more acceptable and the use of an alternative one less acceptable (Tollefson, 2013).

Media discourse is one of the most effective tools of linguistic hegemony. The media as the dominant way of public communication affect the way individuals perceive the language, identity, and power relations (Fairclough, 1995). Media spreads ideologies in news reports, advertisements, films, and digital materials that influence the opinion of people and support commonly acceptable linguistic standards (van Dijk, 2006). As an example, the former colonial language like English or French is still privileged in the postcolonial countries since these languages are viewed in the media as a symbol of modernity, education, and economic development (Kachru, 1990; Pennycook, 1994). The media encourages linguistic inequalities by adopting some languages as very global and others as more local or inferior languages (Bourdieu, 1991). What is more,

media discourse is not just a representative but also constructive in terms of creating ideologies within society with the help of linguistic means including framing, lexical and intertextual allusions (Machin and Mayr, 2012). The social inclusion, exclusion and identity formation are among other ideological consequences of media language than linguistic hegemony (Blommaert, 2005). The public's perception of leaders like Donald Trump and Kamala Harris is subtly shaped by the stylistic choices of news outlets, which can privilege certain representations over others.

Critical discourse analysis (CDA) has significantly been applied in investigating the manner in which the media discourse is influenced by the power relation and vice versa (Wodak and Meyer, 2009). This study sets out to investigate how the discussion of media itself fosters the hegemony of language and how media discourse ideologically works.

The research questions to be answered by the study are the following (1) In what ways does the media discourse support or oppose the linguistic hegemony? (2) What are the linguistic practices used in media texts in the promotion of dominant ideologies? (3) What role do various media outlets play in shaping the language and power perception about people? Through these interrogatives, the research will play a role in the larger body of knowledge that addresses the intersection of language, power, and ideology in the present-day media environments.

2.Linguistic Hegemony: Language as a Tool of Power

The term linguistic hegemony is based on the theory of cultural hegemony created by Antonio Gramsci who claims that the ruling classes can keep their power not only economically and politically, but they can shape the cultural practices, values, and ideologies. Gramsci (1971) hypothesized that such hegemony powers can be able to affect the consciousness of the people, so that their dominance becomes natural and unavoidable. The cultural transmission process has a strategic role to play through language as a facilitator of culture. Linguistic practices are power mechanisms through which social hierarchies and inequalities are replicated by shaping discourses in such a manner that they favor the dominant ideologies and goals.

This paper identifies the idea of linguistic hegemony in different spheres- political, media, economical, and gendered- and shows how language is used to support the position of power of dominant groups of people.

1. Political Hegemony: Speaking as Ideological Control.

Linguistic hegemony is also apparent in the political arena, where political elites use words strategically to influence masses, impact elections and legitimize politics. The languages of politics are not only used in the communication process as Fairclough (2001) puts it, but power is also exercised through language. Through language, the political elites are excited to build ideological scripts that serve their interest status and present the policies in a way that appears universally advantageous. This language trickery is enough to guarantee reproduction of the political power and legitimize the power of the ruling race.

Political framing makes the politicians to influence the way the masses perceive issues. Familiar rhetorical techniques are the emotive language, presentation of contentious political policies as such that appeal to national ideals, freedom, security and patriotism. As an example, words such as war on terror, national security are commonly used to legitimize the use of military interventions or surveillance practices, which are usually veiled in their political and economic agendas (Fairclough, 2001).

The use of euphemisms is also empowered by the politicians as a way of dealing with the image in the minds of the people. In the business world, downsizing and restructuring is often used to justify mass layoffs, thereby making the effects of unemployment and reduced economic wellbeing on the society less direct and painful to hear (Gitlin, 1980). Such manipulation of the language creates a warm reception of policies that can result in areas of unfairness being favored to the advantage of the elite but the illusion of equity.

2. Media Hegemony: Language in Shaping Public Opinion

The media acts as one of the strongest institutions in promulgation of this ideologies where language is the focal point in creating the consciousness of the people. Foucault (1980) suggests that knowledge is closely associated with power and the media is a tool of knowledge that is propagated to uphold the hegemonic order. Media use language to set our perceptions towards social issues, commonly shaping events, the policies and social movements, so that they support the interests of the most powerful communities. Media framing is the strategic use of word and visuals to impact the opinion of the masses.

Indicatively, the depiction of a protest by media in the name of a riot and not demonstration may do much to change the perceptions of people regarding the legitimacy of protestor cause (Gitlin, 1980). The use of such terms as terrorist and freedom fighter also underlines the fact that language is used to justify certain people and putting other people as delegitimate figures depending on the ideological orientation, further helping support the authority of those within the media industry.

3. Economic Hegemony: Language and Capitalist Ideology

Linguistic hegemony also applies into the business sector, providing the language of business and capitalism to reproduce and legitimize the capitalist modes of production. Bourdieu (1991) points out that language used in an economic setting is not a simple tool of transactions but it in operation consolidates the ideologies of capitalist domination. Using rhetoric and the euphemisms, economic elites can present exploitative practices as normal, good and desirable to societal advancement. The discourse of capitalism is also often characterised by the prevalence of neutral, or positive-sounding terms which hide the actual effects of the capitalist activities. Indicatively, such an event as layoff is commonly referred to as downsizing as it is perceived as just an essential reaction to market forces and not a deliberate move to earn more profit at the cost of employees. On the same note, concentration of wealth and power in a select few are justified under the guise of efficiency and streamlining and makes economic inequality to display the values as being inevitable by-products of a competitive market system (van Dijk, 1993).

4. Linguistic Imperialism: English as a Global Hegemonic Language

Linguistic imperialism concept is understood as the use of a dominant language especially English on other language speakers, mostly as a result of past and present colonialism and globalization. Since English has become widespread all over the world as Phillipson (1992) argues, it indicates and strengthens the cultural and linguistic domination and subjugation of local cultures and languages by the English speaking countries. The spread of English in the academic setting, business and international relations sets a far-reaching impact to non-English-speaking world. The growing need to know English as lingua franca of the world, disenfranchises other languages, placing English as the language of default expression of knowledge, communication, and inter-global collaboration. Consequently, people and societies with non-English mother tongues tend to be marginalized during the world.

5. Educational Hegemony: Language and Knowledge Production

Language in the learning context represents one of the most prominent ideologies spreading tools and reproduction of the power order in a society. According to Apple (2004), education is not impartial but it is where the prevalent ideologies are enforced to the mainstream via language, curriculum structure, and teaching. The language in the textbooks, lectures and exams is the language of ruling class and influence the creation and dispensation of knowledge. Discourse of education tends to favor Western versions of knowledge at the expense of other

epistemological practices. The example of the educational content of the worldview is often depicted in terms of a Western worldview, making it the standard of worldview. As a result, students who are non-Western can risk having their cultural views and intellectual input being overlooked or set aside.

6. Gendered Linguistic Hegemony: Language and Gender Norms

Gendered linguistic hegemony can be understood as how language reproduces and reinforces power in the society, specifically female and non-binary subordination. Lakoff (2004) addresses the creation and maintenance of gender inequalities through gendered language and defines female experiences and roles as marginalizing when alternatives to male experiences and roles are non-heterotrophic. Gendered language encompasses application of male-related words within working environments like the use of terms as chairman, manpower and mankind to strengthen the views that men are the default leaders, employees and persons of publicity. What is more, the use of gender-neutral terms in numerous languages reinforces gendered assumptions and norms that establish the superiority of male authority, as well as pathways, over and above (Lakoff, 2004). The concept of linguistic hegemony is vital in the comprehension of language as a medium of upholding power relations in different sectors of the society. Language is at the center of reproducing inequality by framing ideologies, shaping public opinion, and justification of economic and political systems. The awareness of the strength of language in supporting these conditions of power reinvention is the key to challenging the hegemon systems and establishing more equal methods of communication and social organization.

3. Overview of Critical Stylistics

Critical Stylistics is a linguistic methodology that originated with Lesley Jeffries (2010), and it represents a combination of the concepts of Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) and conventional stylistics to represent how texts create ideological meanings. This mode will help identify the unspoken and overt means through which language constructs power relations, social ideologies and worldviews in different types of discourse, such as media texts (Jeffries, 2010). Critical Stylistics is worried with ideological and functional form of language unlike traditional stylistics which concerns the aesthetic of the literary and the textual. It offers analytical resources to understand how the selection of language makes or breaks strong ideologies. It is especially applicable to media discourse, which is one of the areas where language is used as a major tool of establishing a mass perception and of perpetuating or challenging hegemonic discourses (Simpson, 1993).

According to Jeffries (2010), there are a number of the Textual Conceptual Functions (TCFs) which allow analyzing the meaning-making in texts:

1. Naming and Describing - The way things and persons are given names to indicate a certain ideological view.
2. Representing Actions/Events/States - The analysis of the verb usage in order to define who is acting, who is responsible and ideological stance.
3. Equating and Contrasting - Finding some parallels that form ideological alliances or contradictions.

4.Assumptions and Presuppositions - The analysis of texts that are implicitly implied.

5.Negation and Absences - The author discusses the impact that what has been omitted or denied has on the reader.

6.Modality and Evaluation - Research to explore the extent of certainty, possibility or subjectivity in a text.

7.Prioritization and Emphasis - Important discourse information is determined as either foregrounded or backgrounded.

These functions assist to unearth the concealed ideological trends in media talk which show how language can be strategically employed to uphold or challenge power regimes (Fowler, 1991).

4.Integration of Critical Stylistics in Analyzing Media Discourse

The use of critical stylistics in the context of media discourse offers a systematic approach to the analysis of the role played by news, political discourse, advertisements, and digital content in the construction of linguistic hegemony. Media institutions tend to use linguistic strategies in order to reinforce dominant ideologies, affecting public opinion in a subtle way by the choice of lexical, syntactical, and rhetorical strategies (Fairclough, 2001).

1.News Media Discourse

Headlines and lexical choices are used to frame events in a way that is consistent with political or ideological positions (Richardson, 2007).Assumptions and presuppositions in

reporting can affect narrative, in the way social issues are perceived by the audience. Representational strategies shape the idea of who is represented as an agent or victim and such as will affect public attitudes towards marginalized groups (van Dijk, 1998).

2. Political Discourse

Naming, describing, and equating strategies are commonly used in political speeches to draw ideological dichotomies (e.g., "freedom fighters" vs. "terrorists"). (Chilton, 2004). Modality and evaluation are employed in the construction of authority, certainty and legitimacy. Omission and presupposition are ways that politicians can evade accountability by strategically omit unfavorable information (Fairclough, 2010).

3. Advertising and Digital Media

Equating and contrasting methods in advertisements form persuasive brand identities that clearly coincide with consumer ideologies (Cook, 2001). Social media discourse perpetuates the hegemonic norms of language use and reinforces dominant ideologies through the use of algorithmic curation (KhosraviNik, 2018). Modality in digital communication affects the way opinions are framed in the form of fact or subjective claims, affecting discourse power structures.

Critical stylistics offers a powerful way of considering the relationship between language and ideology in the media. By analyzing textual conceptual functions systematically, scholars are able to reveal the insidiousness of the structures of linguistic hegemony that form the basis of public perception and social

reality. Integrating this approach with media discourse analysis helps to understand how language functions as an instrument of power, and helps to reinforce or counteract dominant ideologies in contemporary society.

5. Methodology

The methodology used in this study is based on critical stylistics, to detect and analyze the hegemonic ideology in media representation of political figures. Hegemony as conceptualized by Antonio Gramsci (1971) can be referred to as the dominance of one group over others, not through force, but the manipulation of cultural and ideological practices. In terms of political discourse, hegemonic ideologies determine what the public thinks and who has power, often reinforcing the status quo. This is a research of study that involves exploring the media's creation and reflection of these power relations, especially in the discourse of prominent political figures like Donald Trump and Kamala Harris. The critical stylistic method allows for a close study of language to determine how media discourse is used to manipulate power and ideology through language choices. By examining speech, interviews, and media representations, the study will apply linguistic tools from Critical Stylistics to determine how media outlets are representing Trump and Harris in certain ways that reinforce or refute the existing power structures. This methodology aims to explore the construction, maintenance, or contestation of hegemonic ideologies on the political media discourse, focusing on lexical choice, metaphors, agency and assumptions embedded in language. Using these tools, the research will illustrate how these ideologies affect public

perception of political figures and eventually the broader political story.

5.1 Research Design

The research uses qualitative approach of Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) and Critical Stylistics that is focus on exploring hegemonic ideologies in political media. The research focuses on media representations of Donald Trump and Kamala Harris, two individuals with dissimilar political ideologies, in order to analyze the choice of language, which constructs and reinforces power relations in the media. The most important purpose is to expose the way hegemonic narratives are ensured through the use of language, and how these linguistic decisions affect people's perceptions of political power.

5.2 Data Collection

The primary data for this study consist of discourses based on political speeches, press conference, and public interview of Donald Trump and Kamala Harris. The analysis centers on some of the major political moments in their careers, such as their campaign speeches, presidential addresses, and statements to the public. Secondary Data Secondary data, which includes articles, news reports and commentary from both liberal and conservative media, such as CNN, Fox News, The New York Times and The Guardian. These will be used to identify the way each political figure is represented in the media and to make comparisons between media strategies in the construction of hegemonic discourses.

5.3 Model of Analysis

The framework of Critical Stylistics was developed by Ronald Carter, Alan McMahon and Roger Fowler (1996) and it provides a series of tools for an analytical approach to the construction of the ideological position in discourse through language. These tools will be used on the media representations of Trump and Harris, in order to identify the hegemonic ideologies which are embedded in their representation

Tool 1: Lexical Choices (Naming and Describing)

Purpose: Identify the ways that people, actions and events are labelled in the media as these signify underlying ideological stances. Application: Analyze the terms and adjectives that are used to describe Trump and Harris and their respective identities are being created through language. For example, does the media describe Trump as a "patriot" or "populist", but describe Harris as "progressive" or "elitist"?

Tool 2: Transitivity Analysis (Agency and Responsibility)

Purpose: Learn about the verbs of assigning agency in discourse, who has power or is responsible of what. Application: Discuss the presence of action toward political leaders (e.g., Trump having to build the wall) or a larger social construct (e.g., the whole society having to work together to get racial justice).

Tool 3: Modality (Certainty and Possibility)

Purpose: Research purpose modal verbs (can, must, should, etc.) to identify how certain and committed political statements are.

Application: High modality (e.g., Trump, we will win) is sure and authoritative and a low modality (e.g., we should strive to be equitable, Harris) can be an open or collaborative mode.

Tool 4: Sentence Structures and Syntax

Purpose: Determine the complexity of the sentences to get an idea of the discourse structures to identify ideological and power relations. Application: Converse simple, declarative sentences employed by Trump (e.g., Make America Great Again) with the complex sentences employed by Harris (e.g., We need to work together to heal racial divisions in society) which may indicate a more comprehensive, subtle approach.

Tool 5: Metaphor Analysis

Purpose: Explore metaphors as a device for constructing political ideologies and views about reality. Application: Deconstruct and analyze Trump's use of war metaphors (e.g. "We are fighting against terrorism") vs. Harris's use of healing or rebuilding metaphors (e.g. "We must rebuild our democracy for all"), which signal differing ideological stance

Tool 6: Pronoun Usage (Inclusion and Exclusion)

Purpose: Explore the way in which in- group and out-group identities are built with the use of such pronouns like we or they to indicate solidarity or division. Application: Trump's use of "we" in his campaign slogans (e.g. "We will make America great again") vs. his use of "they" (e.g. "They want to destroy our way of life") vs. Harris's inclusive use of "we" (e.g. "We must work together").

Tool 7: Assumptions and Presuppositions

Purpose: Identify the implicit assumptions and presuppositions in the discourse that are hegemonic ideologies .Application: Trump's speech may have presupposed that immigration is a threat to national security, whereas Harris's speech may have presupposed that racial justice is the imperative for societal progress

.5.4 Data Analysis

Below is the analysis of each Trump and Camalla Haris text using the critical stylistics model, followed by an interpretation of how hegemonic ideologies are constructed and reinforced in each case.

Text 1:

"We're going to build the wall, and we're going to stop illegal immigration. The leftists who are trying to stop us want to destroy our country. But we won't let them. We will make America great again. We will never surrender."

1. Lexical Choices (Naming and Describing):

Build the wall: It is a strong call to action, which reflects protection and division. The wall is more than a physical barrier, and it is also a metaphor for securing the nation from threats from the outside. "Leftists": A derogatory term which presents the political opposition as extreme and un-American. And it is used to form an enemy and bolster the us vs. them narrative. Make America great again": A restoration phrase that evokes the

feeling of nostalgia for a better time and a need to recover lost glory.

2. Transitivity (Agency and Responsibility):

Trump as the agent: "We're going to build" and "We will make America great again" make Trump and his supporters the active agents who will restore and defend America. Leftists as passive agents: "The leftists who are trying to stop us" sees the opposition as obstacles preventing Trump's vision, while Trump is the active force that will overcome these threats.

3. Modality (Certainty and Possibility):

High modality: In "We will build and We will never surrender" the certainty and inevitability is formed by the incorporation of will. Trump's language is meant to make his plan out to be indisputable and decisive

4. Sentence Structure and Syntax:

Simple, declarative sentences: The sentences are clear and direct, and meant to assert Trump's authority. For example "We will never surrender" is a statement of defiance and determination.

5. Metaphor Analysis

"Build the wall": This is a metaphor for protection and separation, and portrays immigration as a direct threat to the integrity of the nation. "Make America great again": This is a metaphor of restoration, which implies that America was once great, and needs to be reclaimed.

Hegemonic Ideology: This text builds a nationalist and anti-immigrant ideology with Trump as the savior of the nation who will restore its former greatness. The opposition (the leftists) is presented as a destructive force, and a polarized view of the world is presented, one in which the followers of Trump are the defenders of America. The metaphor of the wall is central to this, representing both a physical and an ideological divide between Trump's supporters and the menace of the radical left. Effect: This text appeals to emotions of national pride, fear of outsiders, and victimhood which is used to call Trump's base into action by making them victims of the political elites. The certainty in Trump's rhetoric reinforces his hegemonic power and dominance, the inevitability of his agenda.

Text 2:

"For too long, politicians have taken advantage of the American people. It's time to put America first again. We'll bring jobs back, we'll restore our strength, and we'll protect our borders. The elites have been running this country into the ground, but that ends now."

1. Lexical Choices (Naming and Describing):

Put America first": A nationalist call, placing the interests of America above all others: it is a signal for a turn to self-interest and protectionism." Elites": The word "elites" is used to denounce the political establishment as corrupt and out of touch with the needs of the people. Running this country into the ground": The use of running into the ground is a metaphor for mismanagement and decay, putting the elites in charge for the decline of the nation.

2. Transitivity (Agency & Responsibility):

Trump as the agent: In "It's time to put America first again", Trump is the agent of the change and makes himself the one who will put America back in her rightful place. Elites as passive agents: The "elites" are characterized as the passive agents who have done harm to the country. Trump puts himself in the role of the active agent who will undo their damage.

3. Modality (Certainty & Possibility):

Moderate modality: Use of "need" in "We need to put America first" implies a sense of urgency, but this is not as absolute as high modality. The text contains a great hint of change with an element of possibility but without the guarantee of certainty we find in other texts.

4. Sentence Structure and Syntax:

Complex sentence structure: The use of compound sentences ("We'll bring jobs back, we'll restore our strength") gives a sense of the multi-dimensional nature of the goals of Trump's agenda, with each goal supporting another. The coordination of ideas is, in part, Trump's comprehensive way of restoring national power.

5. Metaphor Analysis:

"Put America first": This is a metaphor of prioritization implying that America's needs have been neglected and need to be reordered.

"Running this country into the ground": This is a metaphor of decay and destruction depicting the elites as being responsible for America's issues.

6.Hegemonic Ideology: This text is a populist, anti-elite story, Trump is the voice of the common people against the corrupt elites. The use of the phrase "put America first" claims national sovereignty and self-interest, making Trump the savior of American jobs, culture and values. The elites are portrayed as the enemy, responsible for mismanagement of the country's resources.

Effect: By establishing Trump as the outsider battling against the elite establishment, the rhetoric appeals to those who feel disenfranchised by the political system. It reinforces Trump's image as a saviour to reclaim power for the people and take back America from the elite. The moderate modality brings urgency but leaves room for struggle which continues, which brings in those who are frustrated by the status quo.

Text 3:

"I am the only one who can fix this. The system is broken, and the political elites have ruined it. We will drain the swamp, restore power to the people, and make America strong again."

1.Lexical Choices (Names and Descriptions):

"I am the only one who can fix this": This highlights Trump's exclusive power and leadership, and his role as the sole solution to America's problems. This makes him different from other political figures. "Drain the swamp": This is a metaphor used to signify purification and reform, and it places the political system in a position of being corrupt and in need of cleansing. "Political

elites": In this term the elite class is the oppositional force that is responsible for the decline of America.

2. Transitivity (Agency & Responsibility):

Trump as the central agent: "I am the only one who can fix this" sets Trump as the only agent that can fix the country's problems.

Elites as passive agents: The "elites" are presented as the passive force that is responsible for ruining the country and Trump as the active force that will make it great again.

Modality (Certainty & Possibility): High modality: "I am the only one who can fix this" is a statement of absolute certainty, with Trump as the one leader with the ability to bring change.

3. Sentence Structure and Syntax: Simple and declarative sentences: "We will drain the swamp" and "We will make America strong again":

These are assertive and straightforward sentences. The structure of the sentences speaks of clarity and definitiveness, which reinforces Trump's image of authority.

4. Metaphor Analysis: "Drain the swamp":

This is a metaphor of cleansing. The swamp symbolizes corruption and Trump is the leader who will cleanse the political system. "Make America strong again": This is a further continuation of the metaphor of restoration as it implies that America's strength has been taken away from her and needs to be restored.

5. Hegemonic Ideology:

This text creates an image of a strongman for Trump, as he is expected to be the sole person who will reform the country. By scapegoating the political elites as the root of America's decline, Trump is the savior who will give the people back their power and reclaim America's strength. The image of swamp is important here, it reinforces the image of a dirty system in need of purification.

Effect The language creates Trump as the sole figure who can transform the system to reassert his hegemonic control on his

followers. It positions the elites as the enemy and turns the divide between Trump's supporters, the victims of elite corruption, and the political establishment, the corrupt and out of touch.

Text 4:

"I have done more for the American people than anyone else in such a short period. But the fake news continues to lie about our successes. I will keep fighting for you, the forgotten Americans."

1. Lexical Choices (Naming and Describing): "Fake news": A term Trump uses to delegitimize any negative coverage and makes the media deceptive and untrustworthy. This phrase presents a break between Trump's truth and the lies given by the media. "Forgotten Americans": This term appeals to the feeling of neglect that is felt by a part of the population. Trump is positioning himself as the champion of people who feel ignored by the establishment.

2. Transitivity (Agency & Responsibility): Trump as the agent: "I will keep fighting for you" Trump comes out as the active agent working for the forgotten Americans. The media as passive agents: The media is presented as the evil force that spreads lies and detracts from Trump's accomplishments.

3. Modality (Certainty and Possibility): Moderate modality: "I will keep fighting for you" gives a sense of dedication but without the absolute certainty of some of his other texts. It implies that Trump will proceed in his efforts but is by no means a guaranteed outcome. The Sentence Structure and Syntax: Simple, declarative sentences: This very simple language reflects Trump's desire to seem direct and unqualified in his commitment to his supporters.

4. Metaphor Analysis: "Fake news": This metaphor makes the media the enemy, which takes away their credibility and the media's story is the truth. "Forgotten Americans": This is a metaphorical framing of such a large portion of the population as having been forgotten by the political system, and this creates a narrative of victimhood, and Trump as their savior.

5. Hegemonic Ideology: This text has the job of positioning Trump as the savior of the forgotten Americans. By positioning the media as deceitful and positioning himself as the target of their lies, Trump is consolidating his hegemonic control over public perception by positioning himself as the protector of truth and the spokesman for the disenfranchised. Effect: The fake news narrative reinforces Trump's control over the narrative in the sense that he becomes the only truth-teller. This language is played to populist sentiments, generating loyalty from people who feel left behind by the system. It also delegitimizes any opposed voices, which reinforces a polarized and manipulated worldview.

Text 5

"We've rebuilt our military, we've brought back jobs, and we've made America respected again on the world stage. The Democrats want to tear down what we've built. They want to open our borders and give everything away. But we will never allow that. We will keep America strong, and we will continue to put America first."

1. Naming and Describing (Lexical Choices). Rebuilt our military: This is a phrase that focuses on the power and recovery, which puts the military as one of the main icons of national security and

supremacy. The word "rebuilt" implies that the military had been in some form of decline and needed to be raised back to its former power. "Brought back jobs": The language "brought back" evokes a metaphor of restoring, that jobs were lost or taken away and Trump's leadership has resulted in the jobs being brought back. "Made America respected again": This phrase plays on the metaphor of restoration, implying that America's global position and influence was once strong but did fall, and Trump has restored it. "Democrats": "Democrats" is used as a way to demonize the opposite party and see them as the enemy that wants to destroy America's advancement. The language creates a sense of division between Trump's supporters and the Democrats as the latter are portrayed as threats to American values. "Tear down": This verb implies that the Democrats want to destroy that which has been built, making their agenda seem to be one of destruction rather than construction or restoration.

2. Transitivity (Agency and Responsibility) Trump as the agent: In "We've rebuilt our military" and "We've brought back jobs", Trump places himself and his administration as the agents who have worked hard to restore the nation's military and economic might. This brings out his role as the leader who took some drastic steps to ameliorate the situation of the country. Democrats as passive agents: In "The Democrats want to tear down" the Democrats are characterised as the passive actors who want to undo Trump's achievements. By using the verb "tear down", the text puts the opposition in an active role, going about destroying what has been accomplished. Trump's followers as the recipients: By emphasizing "We will keep America strong", Trump makes his followers the recipients of the strong America he is making

and also implies that Democrats will not make America strong. Objects:

3. Certainty and Possibility. High modality: The use of "we will never allow that" and "we will keep America strong" indicate certainty and inevitability. These phrases cast absolute confidence in Trump's leadership and his capacity to safeguard America's future.

Moderate modality: The possibility is introduced through the use of want to in The Democrats want to tear down but the assertion of the intentions of opposition remains. It suggests the actions of the Democrats are a real threat but not with the same degree of certainty as Trump's own agenda.

4. Sentence Construction and Grammar. Declarative, assertive sentences: The text is mostly made up of simple and declarative sentences that put accent on certainty and strength. The structure is clear and direct, there is no room for ambiguity, which reinforces Trump's message of decisiveness.

Repeating of we: The repetition of we in the text puts stress on the action and the union between Trump and his supporters as their ideas are one and they are the only rightful representatives of the American values.

5. Metaphor Analysis "Rebuilt our military": This is a metaphor of restoration that the military was in a state of disrepair and needed fixing. This makes Trump out to be a restorer of national power and prestige. "Tear down": This is a metaphor of destruction, and implies that the Democrats want to be able to tear down America's successes. "Made America respected again": This is

another metaphor of restoration, invoked in a way that America used to respect on the world stage, but had lost that respect, and Trump has reclaimed it.

6. Hegemonic Ideology: Nationalism and Patriotism: The text is nationalist in ideology, which portrays Trump as the leader who's making America great again. The use of the phrase, "made America respected again," focuses on national pride and American exceptionalism. Trump's leadership is presented as the reason for this regained respect, insinuating that his actions have undone the downward spiral of America's global position. Anti-Democratic Sentiment: The Democrats are portrayed as America's enemies to its success. They are being framed as forces of destruction want to reverse the gains made under Trump. This polarization between Trump's people (the defenders of America) and the Democrats (the destroyers) is an important feature of Trump's hegemonic rhetoric and it reinforces the us vs. them dynamics.

Populist and Anti-Elite Rhetoric: The text also carries on the anti-elite rhetoric, with the Democrats being out of touch with the needs of the American people. Trump himself plays the role of the champion of the common people against the elite and their destructive policies.

Effect of Hegemony: Empowerment of Trump's Base: By creating and perpetuating language about Trump as the savior of America, this rhetoric fortifies the loyalty of Trump's supporters. The language of restoration appeals to those who feel that America has been weakened or undermined by previous administrations. It encourages them to view Trump as the sole

leader who is able to bring the country back to its former glory. Creation of Division The text polarizes the audience by drawing a dichotomy between Trump's supporters (the protectors of American greatness) and the Democrats (the destructive forces). This division strengthens Trump's hegemonic narrative where his followers are united against a common enemy creating a unified front of nationalism and pride. Legitimizing Trump's Leadership: The rhetoric builds up Trump's leadership, to the point that Trump's leadership is not just necessary, but inevitable. His use of certainty (through phrases like "we will never allow that") gives off a huge feeling of authority, making him the only one capable of leading America back to greatness. This centralization of power strengthens his hegemonic control of his political base.

Below are five examples of texts representing the rhetoric of Kamala Harris, followed by an analysis using the Critical Stylistics model, and, placed between, an interpretation of the hegemonic ideologies in each text. The aim is to analyze the way Harris constructs power relations, brings about support and challenges hegemonic systems through her discourse.

Text 1:

"We must come together as a nation to address the systemic injustice that affects communities of color. Racial inequality is a stain on the soul of our nation, and it is time to take action. We cannot wait any longer for change. We need to pass policies that protect all Americans, no matter their race, background, or income."

Source: Kamala Harris' speech on racial justice during the 2020 presidential campaign.

1. Lexical Choices (Naming and Describing):

Systemic injustice: This phrase emphasizes the fact that the problem is deeply rooted within the social fabric of the system and is not a matter of individual behavior but is more of a structural issue that must be changed at the systemic level. **Racial inequality:** This term puts racism in a central theme concerning the overall well-being of the country. Harris employs this to put her message into context as not just a message of personal injustice but the national one. **Stain on the soul of our nation:** This metaphor makes racism a sort of moral rot, the thing that destroys the integrity of the nation and its main principles of justice and equality.

2. Transitivity (Agency and Responsibility):

Harris as the agent: Harris puts the nation (and herself as the leader) in the role of an agent in the process of making changes in *We must come together* and *We need to pass policies*. **Systemic injustice as the passive target:** Harris subordinates systemic injustice and racial inequality as the issue to be tackled and applies the blame to the systems that were inherited and keep the inequality happening, but not on individuals.

3. Modality (Certainty and Possibility):

High modality: The usage of *must* and *need* is indicating a sense of urgency and necessity. Harris is trying to show that the change she is promoting is not only important, but necessary to the future of the country.

4. Sentence Structure and Syntax:

Imperative and complex sentences: The imperative constructions like *We must come together* create the impression of action and urgency whereas the complexity of the sentence structure, specifically the phrase *racial inequality is a stain on the soul of our nation*, underlines the seriousness and moral respect of the matter.

5. Metaphor Analysis:

Stain on the soul of our nation: This phrase is used to describe racial inequality as an ethical blemish, which belittles the country, which implies that it needs to be cleansed as it is an obscenity that will leave the country undefeated and fair once more. *Hegemonic Ideology*: Harris develops a progressive, anti-racist ideology, which demands a systemic change to solve the racial injustice problem. The use of the concept of systemic injustice is meant to confront the hegemonic racial systems that have historically oppressed the oppressed groups of people, especially communities of color. *Posing the issue of racial inequality as a moral stain*, Harris demands the country to come to terms with the injustices of the past and the present, which is consistent with her discourse of justice and equality. *Impact on the Audience*: The purpose of this rhetoric is those that believe in social justice, racial equality and systemic reform. Harris describes the case of racial justice as a moral imperative, not only a policy issue, but also an attempt to reach the conscience of the nation, with the help of the moral metaphor of a stain.

Text 2:

"I will work tirelessly to ensure that healthcare is a right, not a privilege. No one should have to choose between paying for medication and putting food on the table. We will create a healthcare system that works for everyone, regardless of income or status."

Source: Kamala Harris' speech on healthcare reform during her 2020 presidential campaign.

1.Naming and describing: Lexical Choices:Healthcare is a right, not a privilege: The term right creates healthcare as an automatic right of all citizens in opposition to the concept of healthcare as a privilege, one that only a select few can afford due to their economic situation.Choose between paying medicine and getting food on the table: this is the phrase that reveals the problem of the economic struggle a great number of Americans have to fight, and inequality of access to the first needs is perceived.

2.Transitivity (Agency and Responsibility):

Harris as the agent: Harris, in I will work tirelessly to ensure, places herself as the active agent who will promote and bring a change to the healthcare system. She assumes the persona of the reformist who is keen on correcting the injustices in the existing system.

Target: The target is the healthcare system as an issue that should be reformed to make health care accessible to everyone in the country.

The element of certainty and possibility can be referred to as modality human Modality

3. Certainty and Possibility):

High modality: The line that is used is I will work tirelessly and this implies high confidence and commitment. Harris portrays herself as an individual who will make the change happen, and the healthcare reform issue is a matter of urgency and nothing to be compromised.

4. Construction and Syntax of Sentences:

Short, clear sentence constructions: The statement No one should have to choose is a simple sentence with clear sentence construction that conveyed the urgency of the matter as well as its fairness. The message is accessible and urgent due to the simplicity of the syntax.

5. Metaphor Analysis:

Right, not a privilege: This is a catchphrase that puts healthcare as a human right and not a commodity that can be bought and sold. The difference between right and privilege displays the ethical duty of ensuring healthcare accessibility to everyone.

6. Hegemonic Ideology: Harris in his discussion of the healthcare talks about universal healthcare as a right and an ideology that questions the hegemonical capitalist ideas that view healthcare as a privilege. Throughout the inequality between the rich and the low-income earners, Harris is protesting in favour of a more egalitarian healthcare system. This is contrary to the prevailing

ideologies which support the systems of market where access to healthcare is based on the financial capacity.

Impact on the Audience: This writing seems to attract the audience who believes in the equality of rights and the welfare of the entire society, which makes Harris a progressive leader who works to reform. It promotes unity among individuals who feel that health care is a right of everyone regardless of their socio-economic backgrounds and defeats the prevailing authority systems that make profit at the expense of human beings.

Text 3:

"We are a nation of immigrants, and we must recognize that our strength lies in our diversity. Every person deserves to be treated with dignity and respect, regardless of where they come from. Together, we will build a future where everyone can thrive, no matter their background."

Source: Kamala Harris' speech on immigration reform during the 2020 presidential campaign.

1.Naming and Describing: Lexical Choices.Nation of immigrants: This phrase has given the U.S a sense of what it is supposed to be, an inclusive nation, which focuses on the fact that it is a melting pot that has received various cultures and backgrounds that made it successful. Dignity and respect- These terms are used to highlight human rights, the equal nature of all human beings, and place Harris in the role of defending the right of immigrants and social justice.

2. Transitivity (Agency and responsibility):

Harris as the agent: We will build a future makes Harris and her supporters the active participants in creating a future of justice and inclusivity to all people, especially immigrants. The immigrant as a passive actor: Immigrants are depicted as the beneficiaries of the policy that Harris advocates, who deserve dignity and respect despite the obstacles in the system.

3. The certainty and possibility (Modality):

High modality: "We should see and Everybody should have imperatives to see and do. Harris describes the urgent need to treat everyone with respect as a moral imperative, which is an obligatory need in society.

4. Sentence Structure: This sentence abides by the normative sentence structure. Sentence Structure: The sentence follows the normative sentence structure. Easy and declarative sentences: The simplicity of the speech made up of direct constructions such as, we are a nation of immigrants; every person has a right to be treated with dignity; can enable the message conveyed by Harris to be clear, understandable, and effective. It makes her argument more morally clear.

5. Metaphor Analysis: Nation of immigrants: it is a metaphor of unity which describes that the U.S is a diverse and inclusive nation where immigrants are part of its success. It emphasizes diversity as strength disproving the xenophobic rhetoric of immigrants being a threat.

6. Hegemonic Ideology: The language used by Harris creates a progressive and inclusive ideology that can be used to oppose xenophobic and nationalist ideologies in which immigrants are marginalized. Placing the U.S. as a land of immigrants and urging the respect and dignity, Harris confronts hegemonic discourses, which consider immigration to be the problem, not a strength.

Impact on the Audience: This appeal is effective to people in support of the rights and diversity of immigrants, and it positions Harris as a social justice advocate and an inclusive leader. It is a call to action to fight against institutional discrimination, as well as to unite nationally and ethnically.

Text 4:

"We are all in this together. The future of this country depends on our ability to address the climate crisis. We cannot afford to wait. We will take bold action to protect our environment, create green jobs, and ensure a sustainable future for generations to come."

Source: Kamala Harris' speech on climate change and environmental reform during her 2020 presidential campaign.

1. Lexical Choices (Naming & Describing): "Climate crisis: This term has been used to make climate change seem like a critical and a looming threat that cannot be acted upon later. It does not use the more neutral phrase of climate change, which has in the past been used to undermine the seriousness of the problem. Green jobs: The name is the association of environmental reform with economic opportunity, which places the factor of green energy as a source of employment and economic development.

Sustainable future: It is a term that suggests the necessity of a solution to the problem that is long-lasting and does not harm the environment of the future generations.

2. Transitivity (Agency and Responsibility): Harris and the nation as the actors: We are all in this together makes Harris and the American people collectivists who must act to resolve the climate crisis. The shared responsibility and solidarity is highlighted by the use of we. The climate crisis as the inactive object: The climate crisis is the main issue to be tackled and so Harris introduces herself and the nation to be the agents of tackling and diminishing the threat.

3. Modality (Certainty & Possibility): High modality: "We cannot afford to wait" and we will take bold action which shows that it is a firm and imperative action. Harris puts forward the climate crisis as a problem that should be tackled with urgent and radical response.

4. Construction of Sentence and Syntax: Simple, declarative sentences: The phrase, we are all in this together, is straight forward and simple, which supports the notion of togetherness and responsibility. It gives a urgency and action togetherness.

5. Metaphor Analysis: Climate crisis: This phrase is used to describe climate change as an emergency, which needs a rapid and decisive response to prevent an irredeemable harm. Sustainable future: This is a metaphor which imagines the future where there is a balance between the environment and economy that will sustain resources to the future generations.

6.Hegemonic Ideology: Harris discusses the climate crisis as not only an environmental problem but also an economic and social one and clarifies the necessity of taking decisive steps to save the planet and establish green jobs. This discussion disputes the hegemonic.

Text 5

It is time for us to address the growing income inequality in this country. The wealthy have seen their wealth skyrocket, while working families continue to struggle. We need to raise the minimum wage, ensure equal pay for equal work, and provide affordable healthcare for all. A strong economy works for everyone, not just the wealthy few."

Source: Kamala Harris' speech on economic justice and income inequality during the 2020 presidential campaign.

1.Lexical Choices (Naming and Describing): Income inequality: The term income inequality makes economic inequality a systemic problem and not an outcome of personal behavior. The term puts emphasis on a structural issue which needs intervention by policy. Wealthy: Making a direct mention of the rich allows Harris to pin down the elite group as the primary beneficiaries of the present system, and it is implicitly an attack on the concentration of wealth and its effects on the economic fairness. Working family: This is a phrase that focuses on economic hardship that the middle and lower classes are subjected to making them the victims of economic policies benefiting the rich. Strong economy works for everyone: This is the phrase that puts the emphasis in the nature of a strong economy being inclusive,

that is, there should be a fair economy that benefits all the population rather than just a few people who belong to the elite group.

2. Transitivity (Agency and Responsibility): Harris as the agent: Harris presents herself and supporters of the minimum wage movement as the agents of change in the economic policy in the two speeches, *It is time for us to address* and *We need to raise the minimum wage*. She urges the country to act to correct the income inequality. The rich as the puppets: In the statement, *The wealthy have seen their wealth skyrocket* the rich are placed as the passive beneficiaries of an economic system that rewards them disproportionately as other people continue to suffer. This inactivity is opposite to active participation of Harris in achieving change.

3. Modality (Certainty and Possibility): High modality: It is indicated by using the words *We need to raise the minimum wage* and *We must ensure equal pay* that there is a feeling of necessity and urgency. These are being fronted in form of imperatives which mean that these measures cannot be compromised and they need to be put in place at once to make the society a more just place to live in. Moderate modality: A strong economy works for everyone, on the other hand, is written in a moderate modality, alluding to it being an ideal state, but not necessarily a given in the absence of reform. It demands the change of economic policies to reach the common good economy.

4. Sentence Construction and Syntax: The declarative and imperative sentences: Harris employs the declarative sentences such as: *It is time for us to address*, as a way of stating that the

issue is urgent and afterwards uses imperatives to raise the minimum wage. These combinations bring about the feeling of actionable urgency and moral responsibility. Parallel structure: The sentence, We need to raise the minimum wage, ensure equal pay, and affordable healthcare to all is constructed with the parallel structure and underlines the significance of each of the policies as equally crucial to the process of reducing economic inequality.

5. Metaphor Analysis: Strong economy works for everyone: It is a metaphor which describes a strong economy as an inclusive and fair economy in which everyone will gain and not a few chosen persons. It implies that an economic system is to be founded on the principles of equity and inclusiveness. The rich have become richer than ever before: this is a metaphor of the exponential growth that points to the unprecedented acculturation of riches among the elite that creates an unbalanced economy to the disadvantage of the rest of the population.

6. Hegemonic Ideology: Economic Justice/ Egalitarianism: Harris views income inequality as a structural problem that has to be reformed. Harris criticizes the prevailing economic system that maintains the differences between the rich elite and the working classes since it focuses on the unequal distribution of wealth within society. She is a supporter of an equitable economy, which benefits all, not only the rich minority. Challenging Neo-liberal Capitalism: The text puts the rich in a position of enjoying the privileges of an economic system that disunequally rewards them, which is in contrast to the efforts of the working families. Harris supports the change in the current capitalist economic system, which focuses on profits to a system

that promotes economic justice and fairness to all Americans by demanding higher wages, equal remunerations, and access to affordable healthcare. Social Justice and Inclusive Policy: The rhetoric of Harris attacks the systems of economic control that are hegemonic, and promotes inclusive policies, in which the well being of all citizens, especially marginalized ones are the central focus. She employs the concept of a robust economy as one of her means of mobilizing support to policies serving the interest of the many and not the few. Effect on the Audience: This rhetoric appeal actually is a direct electrification of the supporters of that feeling being disenfranchised by the existing economic systems, including working-class Americans and low-income people who are victims of economic inequality. Throughout her speech, Harris addresses the desires of the people who would its economic justice and fairness by the application of a general language such as everyone and working families. Her speech is extremely imperative and has high modality, which lays stress on urgency and necessity and makes these reforms non-negotiable and required in a fair society. This makes her audience feel that they should act against economic injustice. By positioning the rich as the ones who are the main beneficiaries of the status quo, Harris develops the contrast between the elite and ordinary people, making the former the champion of economic justice and the bringer of balance.

6. Discussion

An examination of the hegemonic ideologies of Donald Trump and Kamala Harris reveals that two different rhetorical approaches that seek to establish power and influence the political discussion are evident. Both politicians deal with burning social topics, Trump seems to be concerned with nationalism, immigration, and economic inequality, and Harris is concerned with social justice, economic equality, and healthcare reform. Nevertheless, their way of power, agency, and social order are different with regard to political ideologies.

Hegemonic Ideology: Trump's Hegemonic Ideology: Nationalism and Populism: Trump has made his rhetoric about a nationalist and populist ideology making it a constant reminder that America has lost its greatness and that it needs to be brought back. His "Make America Great Again" and his emphasis on building the wall put the sovereignty and protection of America in the first place. **The Anti-Elite Sentiment:** The language used by Trump always puts the elite group in a negative perspective as greedy and not understanding the needs of the working-class Americans. When he mentions such words as the elites and focuses on the word swamp, he is making a clear line between the populace (his own and other supporters) and the political establishment, making himself the outcast, where the power will be given back to the people. **Restoration of Order:** The ideology of Trump is founded on the idea of restoring the military might in the country, restoring the economic dominance and restoring immigration policies. His speech is very dependent on the imagery of the power and decisive leadership, which portrays him as the one person that could restore America.

Harris' Hegemonic Ideology:

Social Justice and Inclusivity: Harris uses the vocabulary that revolves around social justice, where a change is necessary to correct the income inequality, racial injustice and systemic change. She identifies herself as the representative of the oppressed and demands a policy that enables equal opportunities and chances to all.

Economic Justice and Equity: Harris questions the hegemonic capitalism systems that are benefitting the elite. She is opposed to the system that has placed wealth and resources in the hands of the few because her agenda is income inequality and healthcare as a right. She supports the idea of a more equitable wealth allocation and right to the basic human rights, including healthcare and education. **Giving Back the Development:** The restoration narrative by Harris is based on justice and equality. Her demand to increase the minimum wage, equal pay and reform healthcare is the cry of her wish to rectify the unequal power relations which are relatively higher in the marginalized communities.

Lexical Choices: Trump is very strong and assertive in his choice of lexical choices to regain control of national identity and policy. Such words as build, win, strong and make America great again sound confident and decisive.

Metaphor Usage: The use of metaphors as in the case of the building the wall and the draining the swamp are both metaphors that are clear and polarised in terms of protection (against immigration) as well as cleaning (of corruption). These

metaphors rank the idea of getting America right and making it great again as moral, ethical necessities.

Modality: Trump has high modality in his utterings. Such words as will, must and never give the impression of certainty and inevitability to what he wants to see the country become. Such an authoritative voice enhances his hegemonic authority, and his policy agenda is stipulated as unchallengeable and indispensable.

Lexical Choices: Harris is more descriptive, addressing the audience with such words as we, together, everyone to underline the idea of solidarity and collective action. This supports the notion that her political agenda is one of serving the entire population but not just a few individuals.

Metaphor Usage: Harris refers to metaphors of justice like stain on the soul describing racial inequality and places this issue in the framework of moral and spiritual failures which must be cleansed. Her metaphors are about healing and restoration and not about division and confrontation.

Modality: Harris has also employed high modality with her statements, in such cases as must and need as indicators of urgency and moral obligation. Her words are, however, put to a voice of a collective action where she encourages the country to join her in righting the wrongs of the system, and not to present herself as the one who has come to the rescue.

The Ideology of Power and Control of Trump:

Concentration of power: The language used by Trump is to concentrate power in his hands, he frequently employs first

person singular pronouns such as I and we to emphasise the idea that it is he that is the driving force behind the recovery of the nation. His preoccupation with military might, frontier defence and economic nationalism makes him the defender of American interests whereas others (such as the radical left and the elites) are the destroyers of the American prosperity. Us vs. Them: The rhetoric proposed by Trump is based on binary opposition between his followers (the real patriots of America) and the adversary (the elites and immigrants and the radical left). This division is used to rally up his base on the concept of a national struggle against those who would destroy the country.

Ideology Harris: Power and Inclusivity:

Redistribution of Power: Harris proposes the redistribution of power especially in economic justice and racial equality concerns. She proposes policies that question the status quo (especially the one that accumulates wealth and privilege) and insists on the fact that all the citizens of the nation enjoy equal access to resources and opportunities.

Solidarity and Collective Responsibility: Harris stresses inclusivity and collective responsibility as she is not a savior, but a leader who will unite people to solve the problems in society. According to her rhetoric, the only way to truly change anything is by joining together as a group, and that each person will contribute to making the world a better and more equal place.

Ideology of Trump: The rhetoric of Trump is more powerful and polarizing. His high modality utterances and powerful metaphors make it seem like there was some degree of certainty and urgency on his vision, which makes him the savior to America. His

preoccupation with keeping the country safe against an imagined danger (immigration, the radical left, etc.) supports the idea of a hierarchical power structure in which his leadership is the only way to solve the problems of America.

Harris: Ideology: Harris is a more inclusive and reform-oriented rhetoric, though no less strong and decisive. Although she appeals to high modality in order to convey the urgency, she focuses on collective action, solidarity, and social justice, which offers a vision that shatters the current power dynamics, especially economic disparity and racial animosity. The rhetoric of Harris is of making a more just society, not of retrieving or recovering a perceived lost greatness.

More hegemonic strategies concerning centralized power and division are employed by Trump by making use of aggressive language and metaphors of protection to foster a feeling of urgency and certainty regarding his agenda. He is more of a consolidation of power rhetoric and making himself look like the sole solution to the problems affecting America.

Harris, by contrast, takes an inclusive language, reformist metaphors to question the hegemonic systems of the world, which continue to prevent equality and justice. Although her speech is also urgent, it is based on the collective and redistribution, on social justice and not on national supremacy.

With regard to hegemonic control, the rhetoric used by Trump is more hegemonic and authoritarian, whereas the rhetoric used by Harris only challenges the status quo and promotes social change and equality.

7. Conclusion

The study has examined the aspect of linguistic hegemony which is a Critical Stylistic Analysis of media discourse with special emphasis of how language is used to influence the social views, enforce ideological superiority, and even maintain power relations within the society. Through the lexical decisions we have made, agency, modality, metaphors and sentence construction of media texts we have revealed how discourse is employed to construct and keep up hegemonic ideologies especially in the political arena. The discussion has pointed out that media talk is not only an expression of the reality, but rather it is a form of creating reality that favors certain opinions to the disadvantage of others and the representation of issues in a manner that favors the powerful. Specifically, the paper has demonstrated how politicians such as Donald Trump and Kamala Harris use words to either demonstrate their dominance or progressive transformation in influencing people to comprehend issues like immigration, economic inequality, and racial justice. Both leaders can create powerful narratives that appeal to their audience by the use of strong metaphors (e.g., Trump, build the wall, and Harris, stain on the soul), attracting their emotions, fears, and desires. The metaphors are not merely rhetorical strategies but also ideological persuasion mechanisms, where political issues are put in perspective so as to create a specific interpretation of the in-group and the out-group. Their mode of speech, whether high modality (certainty) or moderate modality (possibility) is also a decisive factor in strengthening the powers, creating what seems to be inevitable or urgent in the formation of political action. In addition, the analysis has also highlighted the significance of agency within the discourse of the media. The role

of the agent, the role of the passive target is a very important component of the construction of power. Politicians in their speeches, project themselves as the ultimate agents of change or restoration, and their opposition is usually labelled as either passive or opposing or even a threat to national values and security. The paper finds that linguistic hegemony is a necessary concept in explaining the processes of power within a media discourse. It uncovers the fact that language is not only a means of communication, but it is a weapon of power that determines our perception of the world and our role in it. Through critical evaluation of the stylistic use in political rhetoric, we are able to identify the obscure nature of the processes of social control, and we are able to better grasp how it is the media who influence the allure of the populace, policy-making and the continuation of the status quo. It is important to perceive the potential of language in such a manner in order to encourage a more critical approach to media and enable audiences to question the hegemonic ideologies that shape their perception and behavior.

References

- Apple, M. W. (2004). *Ideology and curriculum* (3rd ed.). Routledge.
- Blommaert, J. (2005). *Discourse: A critical introduction*. Cambridge University Press.
- Bourdieu, P. (1991). *Language and symbolic power* (G. Raymond & M. Adamson, Trans.). Harvard University Press.
- Bourdieu, P. (1991). *Language and symbolic power* (G. Raymond & M. Adamson, Trans.). Harvard University Press.
- Chilton, P. (2004). *Analysing political discourse: Theory and practice*. Routledge.
- Cook, G. (2001). *The discourse of advertising*. Routledge.
- Fairclough, N. (1995). *Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language*. Longman.
- Fairclough, N. (2001). *Language and power* (2nd ed.). Pearson Education.
- Fairclough, N. (2010). *Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language*. Routledge.
- Foucault, M. (1980). *The history of sexuality: Volume 1: An introduction* (R. Hurley, Trans.). Pantheon Books.
- Fowler, R. (1991). *Language in the news: Discourse and ideology in the press*. Routledge.
- Gitlin, T. (1980). *The Sixties: Years of hope, days of rage*. Bantam Books.
- Jeffries, L. (2010). *Critical stylistics: The power of English*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Kachru, B. B. (1990). The alchemy of English: The spread, functions, and models of non-native Englishes. *University of Illinois Press*.
- KhosraviNik, M. (2018). Social media and the discourse of mass deception: Computational propaganda and ideological narratives. *Journal of Language and Politics*, 17(2), 211-230.
- Lakoff, R. (2004). *Language and woman's place: Text and commentaries*. Oxford University Press.
- Machin, D., & Mayr, A. (2012). *How to do critical discourse analysis: A multimodal introduction*. SAGE.

- Pennycook, A. (1994). *The cultural politics of English as an international language*. Longman.
- Pennycook, A. (2017). *The cultural politics of English as an international language* (2nd ed.). Routledge.
- Phillipson, R. (1992). *Linguistic imperialism*. Oxford University Press.
- Richardson, J. E. (2007). *Analysing newspapers: An approach from critical discourse analysis*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Simpson, P. (1993). *Language, ideology, and point of view*. Routledge.
- Skutnabb-Kangas, T. (2000). *Linguistic genocide in education—or worldwide diversity and human rights?* Routledge.
- Tollefson, J. W. (2013). *Language policies in education: Critical issues*. Routledge.
- van Dijk, T. A. (1993). *Elite discourse and the legitimization of power in the news*. *Discourse & Society*, 4(4), 459-472. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0957926593004004003>
- van Dijk, T. A. (1998). *Ideology: A multidisciplinary approach*. SAGE.
- van Dijk, T. A. (2006). Discourse and manipulation. *Discourse & Society*, 17(3), 359–383. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0957926506060250>
- Wodak, R., & Meyer, M. (2009). *Methods of critical discourse analysis* (2nd ed.). SAGE.

