Discourse, Power, and Ideology: Analyzing the 2024 U.S. Presidential Debate through Fairclough's Three-Dimensional Model

1. Muhammad Javed Ashraf, Ph.D. Scholar, Department of Political Science, Government College University Faisalabad, Pakistan. (ranajavedashraf23@gmail.com)
2. Dr. Shahida Naz, Assistant Professor, Department of Applied Linguistics, Government College University Faisalabad, Pakistan. (shahidanaz@gcuf.edu.pk)
3. Dr. Azmat Ullah, Assistant Professor, Department of History, Government College University Faisalabad (GCUF), Pakistan. (azmatullah@gcuf.edu.pk) (Corresponding Author)
4. Muhammad Asim Khan, Ph.D. Scholar, Department of Applied Linguistics, Government College University Faisalabad, Pakistan. (asim142@gmail.com)

Abstract

This research conducted the critical discourse analysis of the 2024 US Presidential debate between Donald Trump and Kamala Harris to analyze how lexical choice mechanics, source domain metaphors, and framing's impact public perceptions of the United States' foreign policy and leadership. This research aimed to compare how each candidate employed language to paint two different pictures of America's role in international affairs, especially in foreign policy and Afghanistan's withdrawal from the United States. The research adopted Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) by Fairclough's Three-Dimensional Model (1989, 1995) and framing theory by Entman (1993). The qualitative research methodology utilized in this study. The primary data included the 90-minute televised debate from the official debate transcript from ABC News source: https://abcnews.go.com/Politics/live-updates/trump-harris-2024-presidential-debate/?id=113525682. This study selected purposive sampling to cover the whole of the debate as a significant political event. The study show that Trump's language such as nationalism and unilateralist speech involving terms such as 'America First', 'weak' and 'nuclear weapon' puts America as a powerful, self-serving actor. Starkly different is Harris's framing of U.S. foreign policy as a more diplomatic, rights-oriented, multilateral project that presents the United States as a positive force for democracy and human rights in the world. The contributions underline how Trump's basic metaphor system – America as a "strongman" – and a "guardian" underpins his nationalist, transactional worldview and approach to foreign policy: Harris, by contrast, illustrates the basic metaphors that define the United States as a "shepherd" of global norms. These contrasting frames not only define their foreign policy narratives but also appeal to different voter bases: Trump appeals to the electorate disenchanted by globalism and calling for America's isolation, while Harris offers the elite's dream of diplomacy and worldwide cooperation in Harris's vision of post-Trump America peace. Drawing from Robert Entman's Framing Theory, the study explained how specific aspects of the candidate's discourse – Trump's aggressive individualism and crisis-oriented language on one hand; Harris's unity and diplomatic language on the other hand – are overemphasized by media outlets contributing to the ideological polarization framing of the

American political system. This research also adds to what is known about how politicians employ language to contribute to the contours of national and international position. It interests us in the social role that media play in influencing voters' perception about leaders and outcomes of elections, and the communiqué about framing in political discourse.

Keywords: critical discourse analysis, media framing, presidential debate, Donald Trump, Kamala Harris, public perception, political credibility, David Muir, Linsey Davis

Introduction

The 2024 U.S. presidential debate of Donald Trump and Kamala Harris played a grandstand for investigating political communication and provided an essential chance to professionally objectify power relations, ideology, and media representation. Electoral controversies are crucial by providing candidates and opportunity to lay out their views, attack their rivals, and shape voters' perceptions; media is a crucial intermediary in constructing these contests (van Dijk, 1995). There remains much to be said for critical discourse analysis (CDA) as a method for studying exactly how power, control, and positions of ideology are discursively created in political discourse. According to van Dijk (1983), language works on social context, especially the context if politics, by depicting the power in the form of discursive constructions which serve as agendas for understanding in the societal context. Media forms an integral part of this processes because it not only informs but also creates respective political realities responding to biases that might exist in a society (Richardson, 2007). The purpose of this research is to determine how the media construed the argument and the ways in which language was employed to reinforce authority, regulate ideas, and mobilize the electorate.

The interconnection between language and power in political discourse can be regarded as being well explored by theoreticians; indeed, it is impossible to deny that language is ideological and is formed under the influence of political factors (Chilton, 2004; Fairclough, 2001). According to Teun A. van Dijk (2006), ideological language serves to explain and promote political actions; this was also seen when political actors appealed to their respective crowds. Media itself therefore operates as an intermediary in this process of serving particular discourses in order to build certain power relations and excluding other from construction (van Dijk 1998). During the presidential debate of 2024, two different political in- clined candidates Trump and Harris provided insight as to how massive the gap in society is between the two extreme views. Therefore, LOs lenses by which they regarded their power and legitimacy were considered by the electorate as politically motivated depending on the source of their performances by the media outlets (Happer & Philo, 2013). Using the CDA framework, this study shows how the various positions of the female contenders were constructed within the mass media and in so doing, points to how Ideologies and power relations are mediated and naturalized by the words we use and hear in the media in the construction of reality.

Significance of the Study

This research is significant on several key counts, especially with regard to the role of the media as the disseminator of political language and power. As more and more countries enter the post-truth era, it is imperative to explain how the media builds political narratives and influences public opinion. Hence, the Trump vs Harris live presidential debate in 2024 presents a good reference point for analyzing how and to what extent media firms, awakened and guided by their biases, may perpetuate or subvert power relations through language. Unlike other works that only present the stories and messages in media texts, this study applies CDA to identify the ideologies that lie beneath the overt narrative in media discourse, thus bringing out how media discourse can either re/produce or contest political actors. Thus, this work not only sheds light on the audience's role that stems from media framing but also considers a general impact on the development of democratic practices and citizens' competence. Awareness of these dynamics is helpful in building media literacy skills and promoting skepticism when consuming political news in this mediated culture.

Problem Statement

The debate held between Donald Trump and Kamala Harris in the 2024 United States presidential election has attracted media's attention, and each media outlet tends to analyze Trump and Harris's speech, which may be influenced by their bias. However, the role that the media plays in the formulation and presentation of political discourse has negative implications of the distortion of the truth in political processes and maintaining power relations. Previous literature focuses on how media reports shape people's perceptions of politicians and politics, but little is known about how different outlets represent such constructions. Thus, this study aims to complement it by applying Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) to the media articles of the 2024 debate in order to investigate how far this coverage replicates or challenges extant political power relations and how language is discursively deployed to positioning the candidates, influencing public opinion, and perhaps distorting democracy. In this prologue, this study aims to investigate the construction of political truths by critically examining the function of media in the contemporary political arenas.

Research Questions

1) What role do lexical choices and metaphors play in constructing power dynamics between Donald Trump and Kamala Harris in the discourse on international policy, as analyzed through Fairclough's CDA?
2) In what ways do Donald Trump and Kamala Harris frame the U.S. withdrawal from Afghanistan, and how do these frames contribute to the construction of national identity and political ideology in the context of the debate on foreign policy?
3) How do the framing strategies used by Donald Trump and Kamala Harris in their televised debate shape public perceptions of leadership in international relations?

Literature review

Presidential debates in the United States are an essential means by which candidates publicize their policies, respond to their rivals and address the public. But the influence of media on todays' society in portraying these debates is rarely considered. This research uses Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) approach to investigate how the selected media in the U. S constructs realities of presidential debates; regarding the discursive means through which presidential candidates were positioned for public consumption.

As earlier studies have shown, media coverage of the presidential debates can focus on various aspects, for example, framing, agenda-setting and effects on voters' behavior (Jamieson & Campbell, 1992; Druckman & Zaller, 2004). Nevertheless, only a handful of works have analyzed media organizations' discursive strategies with the help of CDA.

Critical Discourse Analysis

CDA has been extensively used in understanding the link between language, power and ideologies in political communication, in order to understand how language creates realities of power. CDA has been useful in identifying representations of minority groups in media (van Dijk, 1998) and in studying the construction of national identity (Fairclough, 1995); however, its use in counting content concerning presidential debates is still limited. Politicians engage in political discourse, and from Fairclough (2001) perspective the latter is ideological, thus CDA enables analysis of how politicians and media use language to constitute political realities. Van Dijk (1995) points to political goals of domination and change functions in social practice, an argument that Wodak (2011) takes a step further to show that how candidates and parties frame issues and sample opponents in political discourse is a strategic move used in political campaigns. In addition, there are studies in CDA concerning the presidential speeches, for example, those that focus on the stereotype of warfare in U.S. politics; Solopova and Naumova (2024) discussed how the management of the conflict and the ideological overhaul was semiotized in terms of Syrian and Ukraine wars.

A study by Khan et al. (2019) identified and classified the cohesion of Trump's inaugural speech using Halliday and Hasan's (1976) model of cohesion while also focusing on the manner that different linguistic instances linked the inaugural address together. The analysis recognizes the use of lexical strategy, including repetitiveness, reiteration, and recyclability of the various forms of lexical synonyms, and the grammatical strategy including referencing and conjunctions that were key to connective and persuasive writing. The authors observe that these were the very cohesiveness techniques that they regard as having been useful in reemphasizing the themes of unity and common purpose that characterized the new government and its direction. Organizing schema can therefore inform discursive practice and understanding of how language and politics 'realized' political meanings for the context of political discourse, thereby advancing the emerging and larger body of research in discursive formation. This research contributes to the body of knowledge regarding how political messages are framed and disseminated through integrated language by political leaders and their ability to mobilize the public. Their study focuses on the

language, including negative other-representation and positive self-representation that helps promote ideologies of the conflict and foreign policy. Hence, the carefully explained application of CDA enabled the author to demonstrate that this approach is effective in revealing how language works to employ power and shape political discourses.

Theoretical Framework

CDA is useful for observing language as the social practice by providing insights into the hidden power relations and ideological positioning (Fairclough, 1995). In the context of the media, this paper seeks to identify how one media outlet or a number of them help to shape the political reality and perpetuate dominant discourses by conducting an analysis of the language they use. The theoretical framework for this study draws on two key theories: Fairclough's Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) and Entman's Framing Theory are used as analytic frameworks in this study since they show how language and media representation are used to control meaning. The following scholarly theories will be used in this research to explain the media coverage of the 2024 Head of State debate between Donald Trump and Kamala Harris pertaining to how the power, ideology, and political discourse is reflected in the media.

Norman Fairclough's Three-Dimensional Model

Norman Fairclough's Three-Dimensional Model of Discourse offers the most satisfactory theoretical perspective for the analysis of media coverage. Another well-known writer in CDA is Norman Fairclough, his model can be very effective in analyzing power relations, ideology as well as social relation engagements in discourse. This made the framework helpful for both the linguistic, structural (micro) analysis of media texts and their historical, social (macro) historical context. With this method proposed by Fairclough, you can look at the ways in which the presidential debate was reported in the media as the texts reflect not only Trump and Harris' language and discourses but also how the texts themselves are constructed and how they construct relations of power in the media domain. The three-dimensional structure of certain forms of textual analysis provides an understanding of the practical and discursive field of the debate and its media coverage that the 'Cultural Other' model will allow investigation with depth in terms of Political implications, within the language of the debate.

At this level, the study would look at the specific means that the authors employed to presenting the candidates and the issues they present, that is, Parts-of-Speech, Figures-of-Rhetoric, and Figures-of-Speech. This involves studying such key features as seriousness and cynicism of the rhetoric used, and the choice of metaphors that constitute the image of the candidates and the debate itself (the discourse with Trump as a "populist," and the war-like terminology to denote the debate). The discursive practice level would explore how and in what capacity media institutions frame the discourse, as well as the media bias and how these impact the portrayal of the candidates. It also refers to audience reception and how the different groups are interpolated by the discourse. Last but not least, the social practice level depicts the media coverage production in the light of the country's political and social environment. This encompasses evaluation of how the power

dynamics between candidates, media, and the public are formed and deployed, how ideologies are either advanced or subverted and the role the media play towards favoring social change or momentum of the status quo. The integration of these three levels of analysis would make the study all-embracing by giving a complete picture of how the media coverage of the 2024 presidential debate affects the public and their political beliefs.

Application of Fairclough's Three-Dimensional Model:

Dimension	Analysis Focus	Example from Debate Media Coverage
Textual Analysis	Lexical Choices (e.g., connotations of "populist," "socialist")	Trump's framing as "outsider" vs. Harris as "elite"
	Metaphors (e.g., "battle," "clash")	Debate as a "battle" for America's future
	Pronouns and Deixis (e.g., "us" vs. "them," collective vs. divisive)	"We" the people vs. Trump's "them" narrative
	Framing (focus on policy vs. personality, etc.)	Framing the debate as a contest of "ideologies"
Discursive Practice	Institutional Practices (e.g., media outlet bias, editorial choices)	How Fox News and CNN differ in framing the candidates
	Audience Reception (e.g., interpellation of political ideologies)	How different audiences interpret the debate based on their political leanings
	Intertextuality (e.g., references to past debates, previous administrations)	References to Trump's previous presidency or past debates to build credibility
Social Practice	Power Relations (e.g., control of the narrative by media, candidates' ideological dominance)	Trump's dominance in media or Harris's challenge to the status quo
	Ideology and Hegemony (e.g., neoliberalism, populism)	Trump's framing of economic issues vs. Harris's framing of social issues
	Social Change (e.g., media's role in shaping public opinion and political movements)	Media as a tool for mobilizing conservative vs. progressive voters
	Audience and Social Identity (e.g., constructing identity through political discourse)	How the media constructs the identities of Harris's and Trump's supporters

Entman's Framing Theory

CDA will be supplemented by Robert Entman's Framing Theory (1993) as it explains how media choose and amplify some aspects of the debate while leaving out others in the process, thus influencing public opinion. This concept relates to how media organizations choose to present some aspects of an event or issue while downplaying others, thus determining how the event will be perceived by the viewers (Entman, 1993). In the case of the 2024 debate, this theory will be used to assess how the media paints both Trump and Harris in a certain light by carefully selecting events, words or topics that reflect their biases. Regarding the analyses of the frames, such theoretical framework was chosen because it will allow the identification of the manner in which the analyzed frames operate in order to influencing the opinions of the public, reiterating the ideological polarization and building power relations in the discursive field of the political sphere.

Through the application of Fairclough's CDA and Entman's Framing Theory, this study will analyze the discursive strategies and framing of the 2024 US Presidential Debate by the media. These theories will afford a solid ground from which the researcher can analyze how the media construction and presentation of political events influences political power and public opinion in a divided political climate.

Framing and Agenda-Setting

This paper submits that media framing is instrumental in regulating public perception and politicians' behaviors during such times of heightened political activity such as the debates. Media as official narrators select information in approaches that are advantageous to some contenders or some questions and shape the ways in which voters perceive political stories (Jamieson & Campbell 1992). Druckman and Zaller (2004) postulate that, debates influence voters' behavior in tremendous ways, primarily where the debates are informational and thus entertaining. Framing according to Entman (1993) is the process by which the information that surrounds any given event is amplified or minimized to ensure that only particular aspects of the event guide the audience perception. Media bias in the framing process typically results in the distortion of information to fit the political bias of the given media source hence exacerbating partisan cleavage (Iyengar, 1991; McCombs & Shaw, 1972). This phenomenon applies to the 2024 presidential elections in the United States because the ideological polarization of media coverage will lead to two very different depictions of the same process, for example, the Trump-Harris debates. Comparable trends are identified regarding the international media coverage of Pakistan's general elections in the year 2024 showing that the story is constructed through hegemonic interest and biases as pointed out by Umber et al in the year 2024. The study of a limited number of identified articles demonstrates how media framing re sanctions or modifies the perception of legitimacy and often overlooks them. This raises the question about responsible journalism and the role played by various stories that include different actors when it comes to depoliticization of various major political events.

Media, Ideology and Power Structures

Media is not just an objective recorder of political events, but a player involved in political governance often endorsing existing power relations. According to van Dijk (1998) this means that

media discourses contain ideological attitudes, which either support the current social order or strive to change it. This is clearly illustrated in the manner, political leaders are portrayed in the different media sources based on the polarity of the specific media station. For instance, Fox news, which is considered to be more conservative news organization may portray Trump in more positive light than the CNN, which is more liberal news organization may point out the virtues of Harris (Richardson, 2007). These are not simply the media system's biases, but components of a varying campaign of legitimation and delegitimation central to political contests. As Kellner (2010: 48) has it, the media is instrumental to power relations within any society as it frames how political actors are presented as well as how their policies are received.

Impact of Media on Public Perception and Democracy

Media analysis of political discourses is a central aspect of effectively capturing public opinion, including the impact of the media on the political process and decision-making of voters in a polarized society. According to Happer and Philo (2013) media framing can influence the public discourse since certain occurrences are given certain impressions, hence the impressions given to the political issues and characters. This is most manifested in the extreme polarized environment in which media companies tend to feed their audiences with content that reflects the two extremes of the political spectrum (Sunstein, 2009). To some extent, this information can affect the key candidates for the presidency in the United States in 2024, with the help of media perception of such candidates as Donald Trump or Kamala Harris. Third, and most importantly, the media chooses moments in the debates and then distorts the actual political process and makes it into a spectacle as understood by Debord (1994). Whereas a good proportion of the previous studies concerns media framing during electoral periods or periods of political crises (McCombs & Shaw, 1972; Richardson, 2007), the studies on real-time political discourse still present a research horizon especially in the digital age of the 2024 elections. There is lack of understanding, as well as the research on how two different types of media work together and help frame different political events, which is another important avenue for the future research.

Although Solopova and Naumova (2024) and Umber and Muzamil Sultan (Umber et al., 2024) enlighten the idea of political discourse with the help of CDA, their works remain insufficient in terms of a range of issues as they investigate only the conflict-based rhetoric in the speeches of U.S. presidents (Solopova & Naumova, 2024) or the representation of Pakistan's However, both proposed studies do not solve the problem of the life course of media framing, more specifically concerning the real-time coverage of a political event in which power relations and ideologies are immediately performed in front of the audience, for example, US Presidential debates. This is an important gap in current research because the framing that occurs in media coverage of live debates impacts audiences directly, especially in a polarization environment. This line of research intends to help bridge this knowledge gap through an application of critical discourse analysis in a study of how different political leaning media houses covered the 2024 U.S presidential debate featuring Donald Trump and Kamala Harris. Through analyzing the rhetorical techniques used to construct or contest hegemonic relations, the research will also map the ways

in which these framing processes constitute politics especially within the context of a Clintonian media environment. This research adds to knowledge on how media manipulation of political discourse affects voters and democratization in the modern polarized media context, extending knowledge and understanding of the mediation of political debates in the 21st century (Happer and Philo, 2013).

Methodology

This research will employ a qualitative research approach using Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) and to analyze the media coverage of the 2024 U. S Presidential debate between the then President, Donald Trump and Kamala Harris which occurred on the 10th of September 2024, at the National Constitution Centre in Philadelphia.

Data Collection

Sample

The sample for this study is made up of the 90-minute direct debate between Trump and Kamala Harris on the televised 2024 U.S. Presidential Debate. The primary data will be obtained from the official debate transcript which will be obtained from channel ABC News

Sampling Technique

The sampling technique for this study will use purposive sampling and this type of sampling is well suited when studying certain political events such as Presidential debates. The whole debate will be used as the sample, and the debate in question is the 2024 U.S Presidential Debate between Trump and Kamala Harris.

Data Analysis Technique

Data analysis will employ this study utilizes both CDA, and Framing Theory, which aim at understanding how even the U.S. presidential debate in 2024 between Trump and Kamala Harris creates political realities, power relations, and ideologies within a society. First, CDA is applied through Fairclough's Three-Dimensional Model, which analyzes the debate coverage at three levels, the textual analysis includes the following aspects: lexical choices, metaphors, pronouns, and the framing techniques used to represent the candidates. Discursive practice looks at how these specific biases were generated in media, who made these decisions and how the audience might have responded and Social practice is aimed at exploring how the framing at work reflects the political-social environment. As a theory, this model contributes to explaining how language in the media reproduces or mediates power relations. Furthermore, the Entman's Framing Theory is applied to determine the extent to which some aspects of the debate are given priority over others, how media outlets colour the public's perception of the debate by choosing to prominently focus on particular frames which present the candidates' ideological differences. Drawing from the media framing theory, the analysis will examine how a selective process of presenting information regarding issues such as nationalism, sovereignty, moral leadership and global coproduction

impact construction of national identities and citizens' voting. Ironing out these two theories in the course of this study will help in developing a complex appreciation of the media-politics and media-discourse interfaces in the landscape of the 2024 election.

Limitation of the Study

One limitation of the study is that it only considers the first media coverage of the 2024 U.S Presidential debate between Donald Trump and Kamala Harris which took place on the 10th of September 2024 at the National Constitution Centre in Philadelphia.

Data Analysis

When assessing the primary speech of the 2024 US presidential debate between Donald Trump and Kamala Harris focus should be paid to how both parties presented the Ukraine issue. Debate at a historic venue of the National Constitution Center in Philadelphia offered the audience to compare two visions of leadership and foreign policy. This section of the study analysis focuses on analyzing blame, deflection and framing in relation to Trump and Harris. Hence, Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA), and Framing Theory will be used to study their responses so as to understand how each candidate's language expresses their political standpoint, seeks to win voter support, and seeks to sway public opinion on core international and domestic issues. But that is not all; this analysis shows that their approaches are distinct, as well as the ideological and strategic factors that give form to their campaign messages.

Table 1

Table 1

Aspect Analysis		Text Examples
1. Textual Analysis (Description)		
Lexical Choices	The text reflects different ideological positions through the use of specific adjectives and nouns. Trump uses aggressive language, while Harris emphasizes progress and unity.	Trump uses terms like "disaster," "dangerous," and "destroying," while Harris refers to her "opportunity economy" and the "aspirations of the American people."
Metaphors	Trump uses militaristic metaphors, portraying issues as battles and crises. Harris uses metaphors related to building and rebuilding, signaling progress.	Trump: "destroying our country," "greatest economy," "bounced back"; Harris: "lifting up the middle class," "opportunity economy."
Pronouns and Deixis	Pronouns highlight in-group and out-group dynamics, especially in how the candidates are	Harris: "I'm the only person on this stage who has a plan...";

	framed. Trump often uses "they" (the opposition), while Harris focuses on "we" (unity and collective responsibility).	Trump: "They are taking over towns" (referring to immigrants)
Framing	The debate is framed as a high-stakes contest between two opposing ideologies. Trump's economic policies are framed as dangerous and divisive, while Harris's proposals are framed as solutions for the middle class.	"A historic race," "most consequential event," "cleaning up Trump's mess" (Harris). Trump frames his policies as defending against dangerous forces.
Active vs. Passive Voice	Both candidates use active voice to assert control over their narratives, but Trump's language often casts others (e.g., immigrants) as passive agents of destruction.	Trump: "I created one of the greatest economies." Harris: "What we have done is clean up Donald Trump's mess."
2. Discursive Practice (Interpretation)		
Institutional Practices	The debate is presented by ABC News, which likely has its own editorial stance. The language reflects the need to maintain a neutral tone but still implicitly aligns with certain values.	The tone is professional and neutral, but there is a clear bias in the way the candidates are positioned. Harris is presented as a problem-solver, while Trump is often framed as divisive.
Audience Reception	The audience is implicitly positioned through how the candidates and issues are framed. The media assumes that viewers want clarity and simplicity in policy positions.	Harris's rhetoric about "lifting up the middle class" is targeted at working-class Americans; Trump's rhetoric about "destroying America" resonates with conservative voters.
Intertextuality	The discourse draws on previous events and historical references to build the candidates' identities. Both candidates invoke the past to justify their policies.	Harris's mention of "cleaning up Donald Trump's mess" invokes the 2020 election and the pandemic. Trump references his past administration's economic successes.
Media's Role in Shaping Discourse	ABC News plays a central role in shaping the discourse around the debate. The selection of topics and framing of questions guide the narrative toward specific political ideologies.	The moderators emphasize the economy as the starting issue, which sets the tone for the debate, focusing on the policy differences between Trump's and Harris's approaches.
3. Social Practice (Explanation)		

Power Relations	The power dynamics between the candidates are clearly established. Trump uses aggressive language to assert dominance, while Harris adopts a more diplomatic stance, yet also challenges Trump's record.	Trump: "I created one of the greatest economies," asserting dominance; Harris: "What we have done is clean up Donald Trump's mess."
Ideology and Hegemony	Trump's rhetoric reflects a populist, nationalist ideology, focusing on immigration, crime, and the economy. Harris reflects a progressive, inclusive ideology, emphasizing unity and the middle class.	Trump: "They are taking over towns, destroying our country." Harris: "I have a plan to build an opportunity economy."
Social Structures	The debate reflects and reinforces social divisions, such as those between working-class Americans and billionaires, as well as between conservatives and liberals.	Trump targets working-class Americans with rhetoric about job loss and immigration. Harris appeals to working-class families and small businesses.
Social Change	The discourse demonstrates how ideological positions may affect social change. Trump's policies are framed as a return to a golden era, while Harris's proposals aim to restructure the economy and support families.	Harris's appeal to "lifting up the middle class" contrasts with Trump's focus on tax cuts for corporations, signaling different approaches to economic and social change.

Table 1 scrutinizes discursive moves made by Donald Trump and Kamala Harris in the 2024 presidential debate and establish the way lexical choices, metaphors, and framing relate to constructing power relations, discourses, and ideological structures. Donald Trump sought to present himself as a destroyer of the political system, an outsider who wants to wreak havoc 'Disaster,' 'Destroying our country,' such frames reflect Trumps populist nationalist sentiment While Kamala Harris's framing: 'Lifting up the Middle Class,' 'Opportunity Economy' implies progressive inclusive vision. ABC News reporting depicts Harris as a rational figure striving to find a solution to the problem and Trump as a stimulus that creates conflict. The body is constructed specifically in relation to prior political events as are their identities; the debate represents the social division, Trump for example speaks to the conservative, working-class populace or the potential to reform the economy for the benefit of families according to Harris, illustrating power relations within society and social change.

Table 2

Aspect Analysis	Text Example

1. Textual Analysis (Description)		
Lexical Choices	Both candidates use strong and contrasting lexical choices that highlight their ideological positions. Trump uses words like "destroyed," "ripping us off," and "terrible," while Harris focuses on "opportunity economy," "win the race," and "investing."	Trump: "They've destroyed the economy," "ripping us off"; Harris: "opportunity economy," "focusing on relationships with our allies."
Metaphors	Trump uses metaphors of conflict, using terms like "destroyed," "rip-off," and "wars" to emphasize battle-like dynamics, whereas Harris frames her policies as forward-looking, using metaphors like "win the race" and "investing in technology."	Trump: "They've destroyed the economy," "ripping us off"; Harris: "We win the race on A.I.," "investing in American-based technology."
Pronouns and Deixis	Pronouns like "you" and "they" are used to position the opposition as the out-group. Harris uses "we" and "America" to present unity and the future-oriented role of the nation.	Trump: "They've destroyed the economy," "ripping us off"; Harris: "We need to focus on relationships with our allies."
Framing	The framing of the debate contrasts two visions: Trump's vision of "restoring" and "protecting" America's economic strength versus Harris's vision of "building" and "investing" for a future-focused economy.	Trump: "I went to the Wharton School of Finance," framing his plan as brilliant and historically significant; Harris: "I am offering an opportunity economy."
Active vs. Passive Voice	Both candidates use active voice to assert control over their positions. Trump's language focuses on presenting actions taken by himself as powerful and decisive, while Harris highlights actions that need to be taken for future progress.	Trump: "I was the only president who got China to pay us hundreds of billions"; Harris: "What I am offering is an opportunity economy."
2. Discursive Practice (Interpretation)		
Institutional Practices	The discourse is framed by the media (ABC News) to present both candidates in a competitive, high-stakes context. The moderators aim for neutrality, but the language subtly supports both candidates' ideological positions.	The way the debate is framed—questioning the impacts of tariffs, and probing each candidate's economic proposals—implicitly directs the discussion to highlight differences in policies.

Audience Reception	The audience is positioned to view the debate as an ideological clash. Viewers are expected to align with one of the two contrasting perspectives: Trump's populist/nationalist rhetoric or Harris's progressive/technocratic approach.	Harris: "We need to invest in America's workforce"; Trump: "They've destroyed the economy," emphasizing the discontent of working-class Americans.
Intertextuality	The discourse makes reference to historical events, such as the Trump administration's economic policies and trade wars. Harris critiques Trump's history with China and his handling of COVID, drawing on past media coverage.	Harris: "Trump's presidency resulted in one of the highest trade deficits" and "he thanked President Xi for what he did during COVID."
Media's Role in Shaping Discourse	ABC News plays a critical role in shaping the discourse by raising questions on tariffs, economic impact, and foreign relations, thus positioning the candidates in a way that reflects their political ideologies.	The moderators highlight the differences in the candidates' economic policies, setting the stage for a clear delineation of Trump's protectionism versus Harris's emphasis on collaboration and innovation.
3. Social Practice (Explanation)		
Power Relations	The power dynamics between the candidates are constructed through their discourse. Trump seeks to assert dominance by highlighting his own economic achievements, while Harris counters with critiques of Trump's failures and emphasizes her own competence.	Trump: "I went to the Wharton School of Finance" to assert credibility; Harris: "Trump has no plan for you" to position herself as the solution.
Ideology and Hegemony	Trump's rhetoric is grounded in a populist, nationalist ideology, focused on protecting American interests, particularly with tariffs. Harris adopts a progressive, internationalist perspective, focused on cooperation and technological innovation.	Trump: "I was the only president who got China to pay us hundreds of billions"; Harris: "Focusing on relationships with our allies."
Social Structures	The debate highlights the divide between conservative and progressive ideologies, with a focus on economics, trade, and foreign policy. Trump represents a more isolationist and protectionist agenda, while Harris	Trump's reference to tariffs reflects his nationalist stance, targeting countries like China. Harris focuses on "American-based technology" and "winning the race on A.I."

	advocates for global cooperation and modernization.	
Social Change	The discourse reflects competing visions for social change. Trump's rhetoric suggests a return to traditional American values, while Harris's rhetoric emphasizes progressive change in the economy and technology.	Trump: "I created jobs, made people want to work"; Harris: "We need to focus on investing in technology and workforce to ensure we win the competition."

Table 2 examines the discourse of Donald Trump and Kamala Harris in the debate through the lens of ideological spectrum concerning lexical choices, metaphors, and framing. Trump uses the negative terms like 'destroyed' and 'ripping us off', and war-like stance of 'defender of America's interests' through protectionism, while Harris uses positive adjective 'opportunity economy' and 'investment', and promises the world cooperation and technological advancement, in future tense. The different mechanisms of reference to self and other through the use of pronouns show in-group bias with Harris stressing on 'we' and Trump focuses on opponents 'they.' The overarching theme of the division in the America media is used to sell the New President with Trump representing populist nationalism and Harris representing progressive internationalism. Power relations are discursively built through constructing past success in office through Trump and countering through past failures through Harris as each candidate targets to be seen as the solution to America's problems. It is indicative of the larger societal relations and the various plans and programs for societal transformation The discourse presents Trump as a return to the old, traditional values and Harris as promising new solutions and development of the future.

Table 3

Aspect Analysis		Text Example
1. Textual Analysis (Description)		
Lexical Choices	Trump uses aggressive and accusatory language, labeling Harris as a "Marxist" and focusing on terms like "criminals," "radical," and "destroyed," reflecting a strong ideological stance. Harris counters with terms like "lies," "immoral," and "freedom," emphasizing rights and fairness.	Trump: "She's a Marxist," "criminals," "destroyed our country"; Harris: "Lies," "immoral," "should not be telling a woman what to do with her body."
Metaphors	Trump uses metaphors of destruction and conflict, portraying policies as harmful to the country, while Harris uses moral and	Trump: "It will be the end of our country," "destroyed our country"; Harris: "This is

	legal metaphors, framing the issue as a matter of rights and justice.	immoral," "a survivor of a crime… does not have the right."
Pronouns and Deixis	Trump uses "she" and "they" to distance himself from Harris and her policies, while Harris uses "we" and "one" to emphasize collective responsibility and universal rights.	Trump: "She has no policy," "They have destroyed our country"; Harris: "I have talked with women around our country," "One does not have to abandon their faith."
Framing	Trump frames the debate as a fight to protect the country from radical left-wing policies, using fear-based rhetoric about "criminals" and "Marxism." Harris frames the issue as a fight for women's rights and moral responsibility, emphasizing the need to protect individual freedoms.	Trump: "She's a Marxist," "They've destroyed our country"; Harris: "This is immoral," "The freedom to make decisions about one's own body."
Active vs. Passive Voice	Both candidates use active voice to assert control over their positions. Trump's language focuses on actions that have been taken by himself and his allies, while Harris emphasizes the victims of policies and positions her opposition as the actor in the imposition of harmful policies.	Trump: "I was going to send her a MAGA hat," "I did a great service"; Harris: "I will proudly sign it into law," "I have talked with women around our country."
2. Discursive Practice (Interpretation)		
Institutional Practices	The debate is structured around controversial social issues, where the media's role is to facilitate a direct exchange between candidates, pushing them to justify their positions on abortion and women's rights. The language used reflects each candidate's ideological stances.	The moderators guide the discourse towards abortion and immigration policies, pushing Trump and Harris to clarify their positions, often focusing on contrasts.
Audience Reception	The discourse positions the audience to align with either a conservative or progressive perspective on abortion. Trump's rhetoric resonates with pro-life voters, while Harris appeals to those who value women's reproductive rights.	Trump: "I was proud to kill Roe v. Wade," appealing to pro-life voters; Harris: "I will sign the protections of Roe v. Wade," appealing to pro-choice supporters.
Intertextuality	The debate references the history of Roe v. Wade and the Supreme Court decisions. Both candidates invoke past policies and decisions to argue for their current positions. Trump	Trump: "Through the genius and heart of six Supreme Court justices"; Harris: "Donald Trump

	reflects on the legacy of the 2022 Supreme Court decision, while Harris critiques Trump's role in reshaping abortion laws.	hand-selected three members of the United States Supreme Court."
Media's Role in Shaping Discourse	ABC News facilitates the debate by asking critical questions on abortion, but their role also implicitly aligns with framing the candidates' positions on social issues, shaping the discourse through the questions they ask and the time allocated for responses.	The moderators highlight Trump's reversal on abortion policies and Harris's criticism of his record, providing a space for both candidates to frame their positions clearly.
3. Social Practice (Explanation)		
Power Relations	The power relations in the debate are established through the use of authority and credibility. Trump attempts to dominate the conversation by claiming moral superiority, while Harris challenges Trump's authority by exposing inconsistencies and appealing to moral principles of justice.	Trump: "She's a Marxist," "She has no policy"; Harris: "This is immoral," "Trump abortion bans… make no exception even for rape and incest."
Ideology and Hegemony	Trump's rhetoric reflects a conservative, pro-life ideology, emphasizing the need to protect the country from what he frames as a radical leftist agenda. Harris advocates for a progressive, pro-choice stance, focusing on bodily autonomy and the importance of protecting women's rights.	Trump: "I believe strongly in exceptions for rape, incest, and life of the mother"; Harris: "The freedom to make decisions about one's own body should not be made by the government."
Social Structures	The discourse reflects broader ideological divides in American society. Trump's rhetoric is aimed at a conservative audience concerned with pro-life issues, while Harris appeals to progressive values and the protection of women's rights.	Trump: "A survivor of a crime... should not have the right to make a decision about what happens to her body"; Harris: "A survivor of incest being forced to carry a pregnancy to term? They don't want that."
Social Change	The discourse highlights a significant divide in American society regarding reproductive rights, with Trump framing his stance as a return to tradition and Harris framing her position as one that seeks to protect and expand rights for women.	Trump: "It's a great service I did, bringing Roe v. Wade back to the states"; Harris: "When Congress passes a bill to put back in place the protections of Roe v. Wade, I will proudly sign it into law."

Table 3 includes a discourse analysis of the Donald Trump and Kamala Harris debate on abortion and women's rights: lexical choices, metaphors, and framing as the construction of power and political beliefs. A subset of these are said by Trump, which carries threatening tones and values the literal meaning over the word implying Trump as a populist warrior against threat such as 'Marxist,' 'criminals,' and 'destroyed.' Harris on the other hand uses positive terms such as 'lies,' 'immoral,' and 'freedom,' which regards individual's rights and achievements. While Trump employed destructive metaphors like "the end of our country", which positions policies as a negative thing, Harris employs moral metaphors labeling her position as a fight for justice and rights. Pronouns and deixis enrich this in-group vs out-group differentiation, Trump uses the distance 'she' and 'they' about Harris, whereas, Harris uses inclusive 'we' and 'one.' The choice is presented as the battle; Trump is a leader who guards the country from the far-left inspired danger, whereas Harris sees herself as a champion of women's choice and legal inequality. The two candidates take affirmative stances for themselves and while Trump is more interested in what he has done already, Harris is more interested in what she wants to accomplish in the future. The institutional constraints of ABC News, therefore, frame the debate focusing on the social issues for example, abortion rights, and decides how a given candidate's stand fits into a liberal-conservative American mentality. The discourse also shows a match of the ideological and social relations in the American society; Trump addresses the conservative voters of the USA, with the support of which he participated in the promotion of the anti-abortion law, while Harris calls upon the progressive voters of the USA, standing for the protection of the right to an abortion, thereby framing the debate in terms of the choice for America between the return to traditional values and a continuation of space exploration.

Table 4

Aspect Analysis		Text Example
1. Textual Analysis (Description)		
Lexical Choices	Trump uses hyperbolic and accusatory language ("lie," "catastrophe," "destroying the country"), while Harris employs more fact-based language ("insulting," "unconscionable," "unfit").	Trump: "It's a lie," "She's destroying this country"; Harris: "It's insulting," "unconscionable," "unfit."
Metaphors	Trump uses fear-based metaphors, such as "failing nation" and "Venezuela on steroids," to depict a dire future under Harris. Harris uses moral metaphors like "immoral" and "unfit."	Trump: "We're a failing nation," "We'll end up in Venezuela on steroids"; Harris: "The choice is clear," "dangerous and unfit."
Pronouns and Deixis	Trump uses personal pronouns to attack Harris, stating "she" in a derogatory	Trump: "She's destroying this country"; Harris: "The people of

	manner, while Harris uses "we" and "America" to frame her argument as one of collective interest.	America," "You deserve a president who puts you first."
Framing	Trump frames the issue of immigration and abortion as part of a larger attack on American values, invoking fear of radical change. Harris frames the discussion as one about compassion, fairness, and responsibility.	Trump: "We're a failing nation," "We'll end up being Venezuela on steroids"; Harris: "The people of America have voted for freedom," "A president who puts you first."
Active vs. Passive Voice	Trump predominantly uses active voice to assert his control, making strong claims like "I did something that nobody thought was possible," while Harris uses both active and passive to describe policies and their effects.	Trump: "I did something that nobody thought was possible"; Harris: "This comes at a time when the people of our country need a leader who engages in solutions."
2. Discursive Practice (Interpretation)		
Institutional Practices	The debate is structured around the discourse of problem-solving and leadership, where the candidates are positioned as opposites—Trump's rhetoric seeks to inspire fear and call to action, while Harris emphasizes practical solutions and compassion.	Trump: "We're a failing nation"; Harris: "I believe you deserve a president who actually puts you first."
Audience Reception	The discourse appeals to both conservative and progressive audiences by contrasting Trump's fear-based rhetoric with Harris's emphasis on fairness and responsibility.	Trump: "We're a failing nation," "Venezuela on steroids"; Harris: "The choice is clear," "The people of America have voted for freedom."
Intertextuality	The debate references past political debates (e.g., student loan forgiveness, immigration reform), with Trump invoking previous political failures and Harris referencing her legislative efforts.	Trump: "Just like they couldn't get student loans"; Harris: "Donald Trump got on the phone, called up some folks in Congress, and said kill the bill."
Media's Role in Shaping Discourse	The media is positioned as an intermediary between the candidates and the public, bringing in factual responses (e.g., the Springfield city manager's clarification) that challenge Trump's rhetoric.	Muir: "The people of Springfield... say there's no evidence of that"; Trump: "We'll find out."

3. Social Practice (Explanation)		
Power Relations	Power is exercised through both Trump's domination of the discourse and Harris's challenge to his credibility. Trump attempts to dictate the narrative by casting Harris's responses as lies, while Harris counters by questioning Trump's fitness for office.	Trump: "She's destroying this country," "It's a lie"; Harris: "You want to talk about extreme... his former chief of staff has said he has contempt for the Constitution."
Ideology and Hegemony	Trump's rhetoric reflects an authoritarian, nationalist ideology that focuses on maintaining control through fear of external threats and cultural degradation. Harris advocates for a progressive, solution-oriented ideology that emphasizes human rights, fairness, and institutional integrity.	Trump: "We're a failing nation," "We'll end up in Venezuela"; Harris: "The choice is clear," "A president who puts you first."
Social Structures	The discourse reinforces the ideological divide between conservative and progressive America, with Trump portraying himself as the protector of traditional values and Harris as the defender of equality and justice.	Trump: "I did something nobody thought was possible," "People want to take their country back"; Harris: "I have the endorsement of 200 Republicans," "We need a leader who engages in solutions."
Social Change	The discourse signals a clear ideological division on the future of America, with Trump portraying the nation as on the brink of collapse and Harris calling for unity, fairness, and human dignity in addressing issues like abortion and immigration.	Trump: "We're a failing nation, we'll end up in Venezuela on steroids"; Harris: "I will sign the protections of Roe v. Wade into law," "We need a leader who puts you first."

In Table 4, it is shown that Trump and Harris employed oppositional discourse strategies in the debate; the power relations, politics, and cultures at play. Trump mediates his message in an emotional form where he uses words such as 'lie' 'catastrophe' and 'Venezuela on steroids' which create a feeling of there being a coming disaster. His use of 'failing nation', 'we'll end ending up in Venezuela', gives his discourse a tone of rallying Americans to defend their American dream which is in tandem with conservative moral fabric. While Harris resorts to more muted, data-oriented rationale, labeling them as the billionaire 'insulting' the 'unfit' one, and poses herself as a kind, problem-solving, egalitarian figures promising to protect human rights and distribute justice. Both candidates strategically employ pronouns and deixis to construct in-group/out-group dynamics: Trump targets Harris using foul language such as 'she' while Harris, assuages the masses and focuses on 'we' and 'America'. There is Trump's apprehensive view of America as a

country being overrun by radical elements, and there is Harris's view of justice and responsibility. Whereas active voice authors command agency and objectivity through assertions of what the subject did or made, passive voice authors support solutions and costs in specific and diffuse communities by means of optional constructions, Trump speaks actively—directly—with first person verbs and adverbial intensifiers ("I did something nobody thought was possible"). On discursive practices, it is revealed how the object of fear is confirmed to the Conservative audience by Trump and how the concept of fairness in liberal progressive America is evoked by Harris. They refer to actual political endeavors, for example, reform of students' loans, using past activities and, inaction as a vindication of the current stances. This brings out the social responsibility of the media as moderators counter Trump's dangerous populist blather with factual reasons behind Harris's position. The primary struggle for power depends on Trump seeking to overpower with threats and personal insults for Harris to finally pivot and focus on accusing Trump of electoral fraud, presenting herself as a guardian of the Constitution. In terms of language, Trump is an authoritarian nationalist, while Harris has progressive human rights agenda, so the candidates represent social and cultural opposites in America. Last, the debate dwells on the deep-Rooted division over the so-called social justice with Trump painting the picture of a failed America, and Harris, painting a picture of a new America with equal opportunity, and justice for all.

Table 5

Aspect Analysis	Text Example
1. Textual Analysis (Description)	
Lexical Choices	Trump uses aggressive, fear-driven language to emphasize threats, such as "destroying the fabric of our country," "allowed criminals," and "greatest mistakes in history," positioning himself as a protector. Harris employs measured, rational language with terms like "respect for the rule of law," "chart a course for the future," creating an intellectual appeal rooted in moral values.	Trump: "Destroying the fabric of our country," "They allowed criminals," "One of the greatest mistakes in history." Harris: "Respect for the rule of law," "Stand for the country," "Chart a course for the future."
Metaphors	Trump uses fear-laden metaphors to depict America as crumbling or under siege, e.g., "destroying the fabric of our country," "crime is through the roof," and "migrant crime," painting a dystopian picture of a nation under attack. Harris uses metaphors of renewal, optimism, and healing, such as "turn the page,"	Trump: "Crime is through the roof," "Destroying the fabric of our country," "Migrant crime"; Harris: "Let's turn the page," "Chart a course for the future," "End the chaos."

	"chart a course for the future," and "end the chaos," focusing on progress and unity.	
Pronouns and Deixis	Trump emphasizes his individual achievements with personal pronouns ("I got to know the parents," "I fired them") to highlight his role. Harris uses collective pronouns ("we," "our," "the American people") to foster unity and collective action, focusing on shared responsibility and progress.	Trump: "I got to know the parents," "I fired them"; Harris: "We are going to work," "The values I bring to the importance of home ownership."
Framing	Trump frames issues as crises, such as immigration and crime, to evoke fear and present himself as the only solution. He emphasizes national decline, whereas Harris frames the debate as one of stability, law, and unity, offering herself as a unifier and reformer.	Trump: "Crime here is up and through the roof," "One of the greatest mistakes in history." Harris: "Let's turn the page," "Let's not go back."
Active vs. Passive Voice	Trump predominantly uses the active voice to emphasize his actions and control, positioning himself as the key player shaping events (e.g., "I fired them"). Harris mixes active and passive voice, using passive to refer to collective actions or societal impacts (e.g., "The American people are exhausted").	Trump: "I fired them," "I got more votes"; Harris: "The American people are exhausted," "I will not ban."
2. Discursive Practice (Interpretation)		
Institutional Practices	The debate contrasts authoritarian tendencies, embodied by Trump's focus on law and order through fear, with Harris's emphasis on democratic integrity, law enforcement reform, and economic recovery. Trump advocates for a more centralized, nationalistic approach, while Harris promotes a more inclusive, reformist agenda.	Trump: "I would have been five times higher," "I will take extreme measures"; Harris: "I stand for equality," "We need to reform law enforcement."
Audience Reception	Trump appeals to voters fearing societal changes like immigration and crime, emphasizing urgency and control. Harris appeals to moderates and progressives, seeking stability and a solution to systemic problems through rational, unifying rhetoric.	Trump: "One of the greatest mistakes in history," "They allowed criminals"; Harris: "I stand for the future of the American people," "We need a leader who respects the rule of law."

Intertextuality	Trump references his past political actions and critiques of the Biden administration, while also invoking broader cultural narratives about crime and immigration. Harris uses personal anecdotes and past political stances to reinforce her credibility and values.	Trump: "I fired them," "The Biden administration failed"; Harris: "My experience with the American people," "We've seen this before."
Media's Role in Shaping Discourse	The media's role is significant in fact-checking claims and reinforcing political narratives. Trump frequently dismisses media reports as biased, accusing them of distorting the truth, while Harris uses media coverage to validate her stance on issues like law enforcement.	Muir: "The American people say the crime rate is not what you're saying"; Trump: "The media is fraudulent."
3. Social Practice (Explanation)		
Power Relations	Trump attempts to dominate the debate by positioning himself as a decisive leader with the power to enact drastic changes, while Harris challenges his authority and questions his credibility. Harris portrays herself as a defender of democratic principles in contrast to Trump's authoritarian tendencies.	Trump: "I would have been five times higher," "I fired them"; Harris: "He is dangerous to democracy," "We need a president who respects the rule of law."
Ideology and Hegemony	Trump's rhetoric reflects authoritarian ideologies focused on law, order, and nationalism, positioning himself as a protector of traditional values. Harris advocates for a progressive vision of democracy, fairness, and constitutional integrity, opposing Trump's authoritarianism.	Trump: "We will be in chaos without law and order," "I am the protector of America"; Harris: "I stand for justice," "We need to restore the rule of law."
Social Structures	The debate highlights the divide between conservative values (law, order, nationalism) represented by Trump and progressive reforms (equality, inclusivity, social justice) represented by Harris. The issue of immigration and crime underscores these structural divides.	Trump: "They let criminals in," "I did what no one else could do"; Harris: "We need to change the way we approach policing," "We need equal rights for all."
Social Change	Trump resists social change, perceiving it as a threat to security and national values. His focus on strict immigration and crime control	Trump: "We need strict border control," "The country is falling apart without me"; Harris: "We

signals a desire to maintain the status quo. Harris advocates for social change, emphasizing inclusivity, justice, and reform as paths toward progress.	need to tackle systemic inequality," "We must reform law enforcement."

Table 5 focuses on how Donald Trump and Kamala Harris were assertive and different in their debate during the presidential campaigns on the basis of analyzes, political stance, and statements to the public. Trump's choice of words depicts an attitude of danger and uses blurry images to paint crime and immigration as the evils that may dent the state. Here, he often employs first personal indexical pronouns, as, for instance, "I fired them," meaning to say that he alone has resolved these crises. Opportunely however, Harris portrays herself as the antithesis of all these, as the force of reason, unity and positive change, thus using words such as 'a vision for the future', 'restoration of respect for the rule law'. Her use of the word, we, is different from Trump whose language is often self-referential. While both candidates use activity voice, Trump focuses on personal power, 'I did it', while the vice-president candidate uses both active and passive voice to call for individualism as well as social responsibility 'The American people are tired'. The language also shows that Trump has conservative attitudes to social transformation while Harris uses progressive slogans which appeal to moderates and progressives. Inter-textuality demonstrates how Trump repeats past behaviors and how Harris relied on her political experience. Media also has huge influence here, while Trump disregards it, Harris subverts it for her confrontation with him. Evidence of power play is observed, where Trump acts like a thug, and Harris like the angel of the democracy. Trump promotes dictatorial power while Harris stands for justice and the principle of Constitution. The debate also highlights the differing visions for America's future: Trump and Harris stand apart in their opposition to social progress, immigration, and criminal justice, the latter promoting reform for people of color, and promising systemic change.

Table 6

Aspect Analysis	Text Example
1. Textual Analysis (Description)	
Lexical Choices Trump's language is aggressive and confrontational, particularly when defending his stance on the 2020 election and the Israel-Palestine conflict. Harris uses diplomatic, measured, and fact-based language, especially in defense of Ukraine and addressing national security concerns.	Trump: "No judge looked at it," "Our elections are bad," "We have a nation in decline." Harris: "Israel has a right to defend itself," "We must have a two-state solution," "We will continue to work around the clock."

Metaphors	Trump uses metaphors of national decline and destruction (e.g., "Our nation is dying," "It's blowing up") to frame issues as emergencies, positioning himself as the solution. Harris uses metaphors of unity, peace, and security, emphasizing negotiation and diplomacy (e.g., "This war must end," "We must chart a course").	Trump: "We have a nation in decline," "Our nation is dying"; Harris: "We must chart a course for a two-state solution," "This war must end."
Pronouns and Deixis	Trump frequently uses "I" and "we" to assert his authority and actions, such as "I said that," "I know Putin very well." Harris uses "we" to create a collective stance, emphasizing national unity and responsibility, e.g., "We have to have a president who respects our military."	Trump: "I know Putin very well," "I'll get it settled fast"; Harris: "We must work around the clock," "We must chart a course."
Framing	Trump frames issues like election fraud and international conflicts as crises that only he can solve, emphasizing urgency and personal responsibility. Harris frames issues as challenges requiring careful, coordinated responses rooted in law and diplomacy.	Trump: "Our elections are bad," "A nation in decline"; Harris: "We must work around the clock," "We must have a two-state solution."
Active vs. Passive Voice	Trump predominantly uses active voice, emphasizing his own actions and decisions (e.g., "I will get it settled," "I got 75 million votes"). Harris also uses the active voice to assert her position but incorporates passive constructions to highlight broader actions and collective responsibility (e.g., "It is well known").	Trump: "I know Putin very well," "I'll get that settled and fast"; Harris: "It is well known that Donald Trump is weak and wrong on national security," "It is well known that he admires dictators."
2. Discursive Practice (Interpretation)		
Institutional Practices	Trump's rhetoric aligns with nationalist, populist practices, often asserting his superiority and denouncing the establishment. Harris's rhetoric upholds institutional norms, such as respect for democratic processes, international law, and diplomacy.	Trump: "We have to have borders," "I got more votes," "We need walls"; Harris: "Israel has a right to defend itself," "We need a two-state solution."
Audience Reception	Trump appeals to an audience that is skeptical of the political establishment, especially those who support his claims of election fraud and prefer a more	Trump: "Our nation is dying," "I was told if I got 63 [million votes], I can't be beaten"; Harris: "I believe in the importance of

	authoritarian approach to governance. Harris appeals to those valuing democratic principles, stability, and diplomacy.	sovereignty," "The American people deserve better."
Intertextuality	Trump's rhetoric refers to past political battles (2020 election, Ukraine war, relations with Putin), often invoking global figures like Putin and Viktor Orban to support his stance. Harris contrasts Trump's views with those of global leaders and institutions, emphasizing his isolationist approach.	Trump: "Viktor Orban said it...," "They were afraid of him [Putin]"; Harris: "I met with Zelenskyy," "We brought 50 countries together to support Ukraine."
Media's Role in Shaping Discourse	The media serves as both a reflection and a battleground in this debate. Trump critiques the media's role in suppressing his views (e.g., judges dismissing his election claims), while Harris uses the media to bolster her credibility and expose Trump's lack of facts.	Trump: "No judge looked at it," "The media didn't report it," "Fake numbers"; Harris: "It is well known that Donald Trump is weak on national security," "It is well known he admires dictators."
3. Social Practice (Explanation)		
Power Relations	Trump positions himself as the ultimate authority, often asserting that others are either weak or incompetent. Harris challenges this by emphasizing the need for competence, diplomacy, and respect for facts in leadership.	Trump: "The most respected man is Donald Trump," "They don't respect Biden"; Harris: "The American people deserve better," "We cannot afford a president who attempts to upend the will of the voters."
Ideology and Hegemony	Trump's ideology is nationalist, authoritarian, and anti-establishment. He emphasizes law and order, borders, and a return to "strength." Harris advocates for a more progressive and democratic worldview, focusing on justice, equality, and international cooperation.	Trump: "We need walls," "The election was fraudulent," "I got 75 million votes"; Harris: "We need a two-state solution," "Israel has a right to defend itself."
Social Structures	The debate highlights the ideological divide between Trump's support for nationalism and authoritarianism, and Harris's commitment to democracy, law, and diplomacy. The framing of Ukraine and Israel provides insight into the	Trump: "Putin is afraid of me," "We need walls"; Harris: "It is well known that Donald Trump is wrong on national security," "We

	divergent views on foreign policy and national security.	must work for a two-state solution."
Social Change	Trump advocates for maintaining the status quo, particularly in terms of immigration control, borders, and national security, while Harris calls for reform in handling foreign relations, international law, and diplomacy.	Trump: "Our elections are bad," "We need borders"; Harris: "We must chart a course for a two-state solution," "The war must end."

Table 6 explains the differences between Donald Trump and Kamala Harris regarding governance, foreign, and security policies. Introducing himself as the president with all the solutions, Trump constantly focuses on using harsh tones that depict an election fraud, an upcoming war, an America in despair. There are lots of personal pronouns like 'I' many a times used to underline the subject's initiative and decision making power. In contrast, Harris's speech diplomatic, conciliatory, and to emphasizes such values as togetherness and multilateralism Harris often uses inclusive we. She speaks about cooperation, legal instruments, and diplomacy; all international problems are painted as the call for cooperation. Trump boasts of nationalist authoritarianism, and Harris embraces democratic and multilateralism. These two pitches are still discernible in the way they have pitched themselves to their audiences, with Trump appealing to the populaces who have no confidence in the political elites and would like absolute power centralized while Harris sells democracy and stability. This function is incredibly important, and Trump complains that the media does not share his vision, while Harris uses it to reveal his shortcomings. On the political level, Trump as a nationalist and isolationist on the one hand, and Harris as an internationalist and progressive on the other. In reference to social change, Trump opposes change as he emphasizes on safety within the US, and avert immigration to the country, while Harris advocates for change in foreign policy, diplomacy and international relations.

Table 7

Aspect Analysis		Text Example
1. Textual Analysis (Description)		
Lexical Choices	Trump uses aggressive and accusatory language, including terms like "weak," "stupid," "horrible," and "worst," to discredit Harris and promote his own narrative. Harris uses diplomatic and measured language, emphasizing respect, unity, and progress with phrases like "upholding international rules," "the American people deserve better," and "new generation of leadership."	Trump: "The war should have never started," "She's worse than Biden," "Horrible negotiator"; Harris: "We stand for democracy," "We must uphold international rules," "A new generation of leadership."

Metaphors	Trump uses metaphors of weakness and power, often framing his opponents as incompetent or dangerous, such as "weak and stupid," "the worst president," and "the worst vice president." Harris uses metaphors of leadership and unity, including "a new generation of leadership," "strength," and "we can do more."	Trump: "She's worse than Biden," "That's the kind of talent we have with her," "A horrible negotiator"; Harris: "A new generation of leadership," "We must stand up for our principles," "Strength in leadership."
Pronouns and Deixis	Trump uses the personal pronoun "I" to assert his authority and achievements, often focusing on his personal influence over world leaders and events. Harris uses collective pronouns like "we" and "our" to foster unity and collective responsibility, framing the debate in terms of shared American values.	Trump: "I got involved with the Taliban," "I said, 'Don't do it anymore'"; Harris: "We must have a president who understands the significance of America's role," "We believe in what is possible."
Framing	Trump frames the issues of Ukraine, Afghanistan, and race in terms of weakness and failure, positioning himself as the antidote to these issues. Harris frames the debate as one of responsibility, leadership, and respect for democratic norms, particularly regarding international relations and race.	Trump: "Putin would be sitting in Moscow and wouldn't have lost 300,000 men"; Harris: "We stand for democracy, for the strength of our alliances."
Active vs. Passive Voice	Trump predominantly uses active voice, emphasizing his actions and decisions, such as "I got involved" and "I told Abdul." Harris, while using active voice, also employs passive constructions to shift focus on actions and broader implications, such as "The war must end" and "We must stand up for our principles."	Trump: "I told Abdul, don't do it anymore," "I got involved"; Harris: "We must stand up for our principles," "The war must end."
2. Discursive Practice (Interpretation)		
Institutional Practices	Trump's rhetoric revolves around his leadership and control over international affairs, emphasizing his relationships with world leaders like Putin and his role in peace negotiations. Harris focuses on institutional respect, diplomacy, and the	Trump: "He [Putin] would have been sitting in Moscow much happier than he is right now," "I got involved with the Taliban"; Harris: "We must uphold international rules," "We must stand up for our principles."

	importance of upholding democratic values in foreign relations.	
Audience Reception	Trump appeals to an audience that values strong leadership, toughness, and assertiveness in foreign policy, while Harris appeals to those who value diplomacy, international cooperation, and respect for democratic processes.	Trump: "I said, 'Don't do it anymore,'" "The war should have never started"; Harris: "We must stand up for our principles," "We have to have a president who understands the significance of America's role."
Intertextuality	Trump references his past actions (e.g., peace negotiations with the Taliban) and critiques of Harris and Biden's handling of international relations. Harris references democratic norms, American diplomacy, and the importance of multilateral cooperation in dealing with global crises like Ukraine and Afghanistan.	Trump: "I got involved with the Taliban," "Secretary General Stoltenberg said Trump did the most amazing thing"; Harris: "We must uphold international rules," "I met with President Zelenskyy."
Media's Role in Shaping Discourse	The media plays a role in clarifying and fact-checking statements, as seen when Muir points out discrepancies between Trump's claims and the public record (e.g., about Harris's role in negotiations). Harris uses the media to reinforce her credibility and challenge Trump's factual inaccuracies.	Muir: "David, one thing," "We witnessed a poignant moment today on Capitol Hill honoring the soldiers"; Harris: "It has been about standing as America always should, as a leader."
3. Social Practice (Explanation)		
Power Relations	Trump positions himself as the ultimate authority and solution to national and global issues, particularly in his claims about the Taliban and Ukraine. Harris counters by emphasizing the need for leadership grounded in diplomacy, respect, and adherence to democratic principles.	Trump: "I got involved with the Taliban," "Putin would be sitting in Moscow"; Harris: "We must have a president who understands the significance of America's role," "We must uphold international rules."
Ideology and Hegemony	Trump's rhetoric is nationalistic, authoritarian, and rooted in skepticism of international alliances, emphasizing America's unilateral actions in global affairs. Harris advocates for democratic values, international cooperation, and upholding legal norms in foreign policy.	Trump: "They sent her to negotiate peace"; Harris: "We must stand up for our principles," "We believe in democracy."

Social Structures	The debate underscores the divide between Trump's conservative, nationalist worldview, which values direct action and unilateral control, and Harris's more progressive, multilateral approach to global governance, diplomacy, and international law.	Trump: "I got involved with the Taliban," "We wouldn't have left $85 billion in equipment behind"; Harris: "We must stand up for our principles," "We stand for democracy."
Social Change	Trump resists social change, framing his actions as necessary for national security and asserting that the world's problems can be solved through American strength. Harris promotes social change in terms of diplomatic engagement, multilateral cooperation, and adherence to democratic principles.	Trump: "I got involved with the Taliban," "This is the worst withdrawal"; Harris: "We must uphold international rules," "We must stand up for democracy."

Table 7 highlights a 'night and day' difference between Trump and Harris' discursive positioning when it comes to leadership, international relations, and protection, which tells us something about how they each position themselves in the hegemonic contest. Trump speaks and writes abusively and in an accusative manner and employs symbols of deficiency to marginalize his opponents and positions himself as the savior of such crises as Ukraine and Afghanistan. He focuses on individual action and individual decision-making and presents himself like an autocratic leader. Instead, Harris espouses and uses a far more moderate language as befits national interests, emphasizing on unity, democracy and multilateralism. She employs collective referents bearing collective accountability and diplomacy with regard to the international law. Trump's speeches comfort people who appreciate authoritarianism and individual decisions; Harris is loved by those who care about globalization and democracy. The debate reflects an ideological divide: Trump aligns himself with the extreme nationalist, dictatorial paradigm in international relations, while Harris has international, and legal, and diplomatic perspective. The same can be said about media: Harris denied Trump's statements and, in turn, ensured folks about the importance of democracy and collaboration worldwide. Speaking of the social aspect and progressive transformations Trump rejects them as endangering the USA and pushing for the opposite of diplomacy, while Harris focuses on the constructive changes stressing the importance of returning to democracy.

Discussion

Through a focus on lexical choices and metaphors, this paper identifies that power dynamics and more specifically, debate between Donald Trump and Kamala Harris in 2024. According to the principles of the CDA, the above mentioned and other elements of the text are not just means of communication: they are ways in which power, ideology, and relations between

people and groups of people are constructed, negotiated and reproduced. An examination of the lexical repertoire demonstrates how both Donald Trump and Kamala Harris are linguistically painting their personae as well as perpetuating their political agendas, especially, the external politics. The president repeatedly uses negative and critical words in speech about Harris and is particularly focused on her work in foreign affairs. Laying into Biden for being a ' horrible negotiator' and such terms of reference as 'weak-minded' and 'stupid' –all contribute to Trump's campaign of disparagement aimed at discrediting Biden and portraying her in the worst possible light as an unsuitable person to deal with international relations. Such lexical choices do not serve as plain insult of Harris but also is aimed at weakening her authority as a President who cannot lead the country through complicated foreign issues. On the other hand, Harris's lexical choices are oriented towards making her look like a powerful, moral wielding authority. Terms such as leadership, responsibility, international rules are vested to portray her approach as democratic and respect to international rules. Where Trump played into ignorant nationalism, Harris claims America as a fellow of diplomacy and multilateralism upholding global standards. The other linguistic choices clearly present the candidates envision contrastingly of Americas leadership in the world.

Thus metaphors continue to help advance and solidify Trump's power and control over Harris and create a much stronger rhetoric on both local and global issues along with their visions on Foreign Policy. This is something that Trump uses often – metaphors of power and authority and often with a hint of threats – 'nuclear weapons' and 'successful negotiation of agreements of NATO'. Such metaphors build up the image of the strongman, who has no time for diplomacy and prefers to apply unmasking and pressure to other leaders. Trump has focused on the nuclear risks and turns the public into the endangered ones, who have no other choice but to trust the President to set the world straight. On the other hand, Harris employs more metaphors that are based on values of morality of the foreign policy, where the U.S. is described as a 'shepherd' of 'International rules and norms. Using the symbolism of leadership her metaphors are paladin like leaning towards cohesiveness, teamwork and rights of human as opposed to dominance. I think her metaphor of 'standing up for principles' on the other hand shifts the discourse from Trump's economic calculation which that kind of diplomacy represents. The former are evident through their differing political paradigm; Trump's preference for power and dominance in international relations is seen in his metaphors as compared to Harris' importance of diplomacy and moral standard in world affairs; the latter are found in how these metaphors act as propaganda for the Presidents' potential in foreign relations.

That is why the overt lexical differences and metaphors chosen by Trump and Harris represent entirely different visions and attitudes towards America's might and role on the global stage. The aggressive language choice that Trump uses is the result of the discursive strategies focused on strength and control, as well as on the nationalist-populist agenda. In diplomacy, he uses words such as "deals" and "paying up" in diplomacy and this paints international relations stratagem in a negative light where anything successful is gotten at the detriment of the other. On

the other hand, Harris's democratic language of international cooperation, the desire to bring the American foreign policy in compliance with the norms of international democracy makes her look like a leader for global values and human rights. In her speech, Harris overviews multilateralism and diplomacy as two ways to create stability and bring peace. This ideological divide is not only reflected in their choice of metaphors but also in the way they frame their roles on the global stage: Trump as transactional president ready and willing to break every rule if it would benefit the United States and Harris as the moral president guided by the principles of international law, democracy. In the context of CDA by Fairclough these strategies are not sense of individual leaning but the part of the ideological battle for definitions of America, American leadership and mission in the world. The relationships of power in these lexical choices and metaphors suggest two styles of the authority of the American president in foreign policy: Trumpism as strength and going it alone versus Harris's diplomacy and collaboration.

Trump develops the US withdrawal out of Afghanistan as victory which reveals nationalism, America first policy, and rejection of endless wars of entanglement. His oratory focuses on self-interest, and the withdrawal was then about getting out of unworthy foreign entanglements. By defining the withdrawal as a 'triumph' and as action needed America defends itself Trump builds up the American identity as one of a strong, independent and practical nation, and refuse the America as world's policeman role. This rhetoric makes Trump the savior of American lives and money, claiming that America should not wage wars that do not benefit her. Looking at metaphors of power and determination Trump calls for a limitation of American's engagement in foreign wars and concentrates on internal issues in accordance with his republican, nationalist vision of foreign policy which is embraced by disillusioned voters.

Harris on the other hand portrays the U.S withdrawal from Afghanistan as forced and inevitable, and yet he individualizes the withdrawal as a form of noble and dutiful act. Using this type of Great Power lure, while refusing the shackle of foreign engagement, Harris recognizes the human price of the withdrawal; nevertheless, he also underlines that America can and has to continue to lead the world and turn it into a place that is more welcoming of individuals and their rights, more committed to democracy, and more stable. That said, critiquing the haphazard manner of undertaking this withdrawal, Harris presents the decision as a rational one, in which the United States simply has to act in a careful and deliberate manner on the global stage as it does wherever else so as not to cause unnecessary suffering and suffering while it can and must look out for its interests. Her framing is on the need for the US to maintain cooperation with the rest of the world to help defeat all the rising extremism actors. In this manner, the author discourages the U.S. foreign policy defining its role in the world as the one that avoids challenges but leads others to the better future instead of the darkness of war.

These two images present two completely different visions of what the United States is and ought to be, and whose side is which. Trump's narrative builds on the vision of America as a superior country and their selfish interest should be put ahead of global commitments, which narrate his nationalist, and protectionist mentality. This readily finds support with the electorate

because many have felt that the U.S has over committed itself in the international arena and deserves a president who will address its needs. Harris in contrast portrays America in a favorable light as stewards of human rights, as a world power, a policeman, a participant in diplomacy and an ally. In effect, her words are resonant with people who still see America as a protector of the world's interests promoting cooperation under the banner of Democracy. These frames are not only reflections of their positions on Afghanistan but also embody broader political ideologies: The domestic policies of Trump's nationalist presidency campaign against the foreign policy experiences and globalism orientation of Kamala Harris. By means of these two competing frames, the decision of the withdrawal of the United States from Afghanistan is taken as being a representation of the big ideological clash that defines the existence of the two candidates, inasmuch as it defines the shape of America to come.

Analyzing the outcome in the Donald Trump and Kamala Harris debate on the 2024 televised debate we see that both applicants utilize framing strategies in order to influence the notion of leadership concerning international relations. Through their respective rhetorical tactics and discursive choices, they construct two fundamentally different views of leadership: One candidate based on nationalism and power, naked self-interest, and assertive America First unilateralism (Trump), the other on global interdependence, ethical values, and globalism (Harris). Although Americans envision different futures for the world, for Europe and the world to envision a future with the US and in which the US will play a major role, these employ framing strategies and foreign policy ideas are not only about how they envision the future for the world but how they want the world to view them. The words they choose, the metaphors they employ, the stories they tell are as much about their policies as they are about winning over different parts of voters, and thus the way by which the public is informed about leadership in the sphere of international relations.

A key issue to focus on is that the manner of leadership Donald Trump has defined involves the unalloyed sovereignty of the nation, acting independently without reference to any external power or global governing structure, in this case 'America First'. Trump has embodied an autocratic populist and an America First nationalist and isolationist who seeks to dismantle globalization, internationalism, and globalism. His framing depicts the step as positive by calling retrenchment as something that has to be done in order to safeguard American assets and lives from squander in extra international battles. While turning to a discourse of strength and decisions Trump labels his opponents as 'soft', and himself as the only one who can make decisions for the US benefit. This vision resonates with the disillusioned voters that have become tired of long overseas engagements and global entanglements and should not be wearying the nation with such paraphernalia. Trump has brought a different perspective – leadership is aggressive and safeguarding, the United States as a self-serving, independent nation rather than a world's police force.

Kamala Harris, on the other hand, paints a perspective of leadership in international relations as being a delicate dance between the self-and the other. What her language shows is that

United States promotes the idea of the country as an actor who advocates moral values of human rights, democracy, and world order by integration. Evaluating the problems and the human losses of the Afghanistan withdrawal, Harris treats this process as a heavy but correct action, which was poorly realized contrasting this approach with Trump's protectionism. Alliance, and multilateral system is the key approach that Harris also advocates for the U.S., implying that the U.S. needs to engage the world to sustain peace and manage global questions such as terrorism, and gross violation of human rights. This framing presents leadership as holistic, diplomatic and global orientated, putting Harris into the frame of a leader who is ready to stand behind global order, instead of isolationist. It appeals to the very Cuban mentality of the voter, who would like to see more diplomacy, and not this angry nation most of the Americans are portrayed as by Obama and other presidents.

Trump and Harris apply leadership frames to create the image of two American Countries with different outlooks and goals based on wider philosophies. Trump's version of nationalism is sovereignty, self-interest, and disregard of the international rules which places the United States as a country that needs to serve its needs rather than the world. It also wanted to appeal to a group that has grown tired of the price of globalization and wars, paint a picture of a America that is self-contained and hegemonic. On the other hand, Harris sets up an image of the U.S as a globalist power for democratic, human rights, stability, and diplomatic multilateralism. Her vision is leadership with much focus on the U.S., as the world's moral compass, that needs to partner with other countries to solve world problems. Pearl's view is somewhat similar to Harris's vision appealing to those who champion the American leadership through cooperation, wherein the U.S. is an instrument to protect and sustain the world. Both these categorizations stem from more fundamental worldview differences where Trump's narrative implies retreat from global leadership towards America's national self-interests and Harris' is advancing global connectedness and America's moral responsibility of the world.

The media framing of the 2024 debate between Donald Trump and Kamala Harris is a perfect example that shows the world how distortion and omission lead to ideological polarization. According to Robert Entman framing theory, this paper comes up with findings showing how Trump's use of aggressive, assertive and individualistic language is perceived by conservative media as a sign of powerful leadership while Harris's diplomatic, reformative language is seen as unifying and progressive, demonstrating the power relations typical of American political culture.

The aggregated language of the media focuses on certain themes by lexical means, metaphors and pronouns; Trump often uses personal 'I' and 'crisis' vocabulary, whereas Kamala Harris uses such terms as 'we', 'to heal', 'diplomacy'. These framing strategies were dictated by the candidate's political views, while Trump was portrayed as standing for national borders, Harris, promoting unity and equality. Selective media framing determines people's reception of Trump as a security figure and Harris as the advocate of progressive changes. Media influence about global relations and change in society also enhances the definition of the candidates' political stands where Trump's security, and nationalism concepts stand out differently from Harris's

concepts of change, and the international community. This binary framing supported by the media enhances the Trumpism nationalism/ Harris Black-woman progressive agenda paradigm and their symbiotic role in managing public thought through the censorship of a political narrative thus actualizing political realities within a polarized society.

The suspect framing strategies of both Donald Trump and Kamala Harris provide the two opposed visions of leadership in international relations. Framing created by Trump draws leadership as exerting the USA power, coupled with nationalism, self-interest, and the ability to operate without partners. They argumentation offers a picture of leadership that wants to diminish the global interactions and look within. On the contrary, Harris discusses leadership with reference to the global processes, common good, and international partnership, defining the US as the country with the mission of the human rights' advocate and the democracy sponsor. These contrasting frames not only influence public perceptions of leadership but also shape broader national identities, positioning the U.S. in fundamentally different roles on the world stage: one as an unselfishly motivated monarch power and the other as a fair and pacificist negotiator. According to these frames, both candidates desire to bias the voters of America on the mode of interaction the United States should undertake in relation to other nations in the world and the leadership type that the country should emulate in the twenty first century.

Findings of the Study

Through a critical discursive analysis of the 2024 presidential debate, this paper demonstrates that both Trump and Harris consciously use language and framing to code and narrate two different storylines of American foreign policy and leadership, especially, the Afghanistan withdrawal. Trump's framing is based on nationalism and sovereign referring to his campaign slogan of "America First". This is not a defeat he tells his audience, the US needs to reduce its international involvement in conflicts that do not benefit the country in the short term. He uses terms like the world's policeman and endless wars as he continues to explain that America should only engage internationally to protect its soil and assets. Trump is a populist President whose speeches are appealing to voters frustrated with long-term conflicts and globalism and who has embraced the image of a clean-break, tough-minded, nationalist commander in chief who puts the United States first. Speaking differently, Harris presents this withdrawal as a necessity that must be accomplished soberly to avoid creating more suffering around the world and threatening human rights and world peace. She believes that such withdrawal should remain an active process involving the United States indicating her strong belief that the United States should remain an active constructive participant in world politics, thus the United States should provide the international community with the positive example of being the upholder of democracy and support for peace in the world.

The analysis raises awareness of how discursive practices have perpetuate an exclusionary model of the nation, as well as an antagonistic political division. Trump uses the nationalist discourse based on sovereignty, individualism and non-interaction with foreign nations, which is

going to interesting the voters against globalization and military interventions. His framing paints the American leadership as unilateralist, arrogant as well as hegemonic and uninterested in international treaties. Harris has a globalist image claiming the United States is a country that acts in its self-interest while also promoting justice and order on the world stage. Alliance, human rights and cooperation form the central ideas of her speech while supporting the image of the United States as a democratic nation that needs to play the leading role in the word. These contrasting frames not only hesitated in the perceptions of American leaders but also exposed two perspectives on the populist nationalism and Progressive internationalism between Trump and Harris, which made big impacts on the world's breadth of American leadership.

Finally, this research establishes the usefulness of framing theory in defining electoral choices by looking at how voters perceive candidates and their policies, hence the importance of media in maintaining ideological cleavages and playing an arbiter to voters' choices (Entman, 1993; Fairclough, 1989, 1995).

The present study supports previous academic work on media framing, discursive analysis, and ideological mediation of the political communication, especially during presidential debates. For instance, Jamieson and Campbell (1992) and Druckman and Zaller (2004) noted that mediated passages during debate affect the public and voters in as much as media frames it intentionally or not. This paper has postulated that any discourse around the Afghanistan withdrawal should pinpoint how these two personalities have used language and framing as strategies that create the world of the political theatre to nail the competition ideologies and identities. Populist views rejecting entangled engagements in conflict are stimulated by Trump's nationalist rhetoric of "America First" and the withdrawal as the finality of "forever wars." This can be linked to the concept van Dijk (1998) and Wodak (2011) of national sovereignty and under this meaning, political discourse is a way of maintaining power structures and hegemonic ideology. By contrast, Harris's rhetoric, involving the appeals to the international responsibility and human rights, corresponds to the globalist discourse of America's responsibility to lead, indexes her commitment to multilateralism, an attractive framing for American liberals. This division is in line with the existing ideological splits observed in media analysis (Iyengar, 1991; McCombs & Shaw, 1972), in which Framing also affects the audience's understanding of politics.

In addition, the use of Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) by Fairclough and Framing Theory by Entman (1993), makes a significant contribution in understanding how the media frames political realities in language. Of all the models proposed by Norman Fairclough, the model that incorporates textual analysis, discursive practice, and social practice tremendously helps to grasp how the language used by Trump and Harris in the debate is a manifestation of the more extensive ideological power relations. According to Fairclough (2001) and van Dijk (1995) CDA offers a unique way of examining how language and power and ideology work in political language. These people found that this study provides scripts for the assertion that media framing defines political power based on the framing of the candidates and their policies. During the real 2024 US election, different patterns of framing practices are identified in an increasingly polarized

media system – with either Trump's populist discourse or Harris's focus on moral authority – and illustrate how media bias and partisan affiliation shape opinion and voting decisions among the electorate. Presumably, this theoretically-situated approach advances current knowledge on the 'real-time' effects of live media coverage of debates on public opinion, on the overarching role of media as potentially supportive or oppositional to existing political ideologies in the process (Happer & Philo, 2013; Solopova & Naumova, 2024).

Conclusion

This paper has examined the Discourse and Framing adopted by Donald Trump and Kamala Harris in the 2024 U.S. presidential debate describing two different outlooks on America's foreign policy and leadership. Altogether, using the method of CDA and Entman's Framing Theory, the research conducted showed how language ideologies and power relations work together to erect political subjectivities and shape outlooks. From the analysis of the debate it is evident that the two candidates used not only different lexical variations but also used different metaphors to propound their different political philosophies. Trump's narratives, built around nationalism, sovereignty, and unilateralism constructed the U.S. as a realist power, keen on developing strength, security and efficiency. On the other hand, Harris's discourse was oriented to diplomacy, cooperation and supporting of democratic values making the USA as a global moral power. The imagery and language chosen by both candidates, from Trump's "strongman" to Harris's "shepherd of the international community" were those of the two respective ideological paradigms.

The research evidence confirms how leadership is socially constructed through the media; framing strategies being effective strategies on the use of media to mobilize specific voters. Trump promising 'America First' and protectionism found favor among those who oppose globalization and do not want the United States to take part in international military entanglements or humanitarian actions, whereas Harris was perceived by the audience as a man who wants to bring diplomacy back to the White House and help the United States become a leader to promote multiculturalism and human rights around the world. Lastly, this research shows how an analysis of discourse is informative in the political campaign because it shows how candidates use articulations as a way of defining their policies but also in enunciating nations and international roles. From the findings pertaining to the framing strategies utilized by both candidates, the study enhances the literature on ideological polarization in the present-day political communication and the role of media literacy in understanding the interaction between language and power models and choices. It will be helpful for subsequent studies to analyze effects of the framing strategies applied on TV debates with reference to the outcomes of voting intentions among voters of different age, education level, and their political preferences. Furthermore, research could explore to which extent social media platforms assist or hinder these discursive frames within and across domains, especially concerning polarization and policy-making.

References

1. Davis, L. (2024, September 10). ABC News presidential debate. ABC News.
2. Debord, G. (1994). The society of the spectacle. Zone Books.
3. Druckman, J. N. (2001). On the limits of framing effects: Who can frame? The Journal of Politics, 63(4), 1041–1066.
4. Druckman, J. N., & Zaller, J. R. (2004). Electoral campaigns and voter choice: The case of the 2000 presidential election. Annual Review of Political Science, 7, 331-352.
5. Dunmire, P. L. (2012). Political discourse analysis: Exploring the language of politics and the politics of language. Language and Linguistics compass, 6(11), 735-751.
6. Entman, R. M. (1993). Framing: Toward clarification of a fractured paradigm. Journal of Communication, 43(4), 51-58.
7. Fairclough, N. (1995). Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language. Longman.
8. Fairclough, N. (2001). Language and power (2nd ed.). Pearson Education.
9. Fairclough, N. (2015). Language and power (3rd ed.). Routledge.
10. Gamson, W. A., & Modigliani, A. (1989). Media discourse and public opinion on nuclear power: A constructionist approach. American Journal of Sociology, 95(1), 1–37.
11. Happer, C., & Philo, G. (2013). The role of the media in the construction of public belief and social change. Journal of Social and Political Psychology, 1(1), 321–336.
12. Hayes, D. and Guardino, M. (2010). The visibility of the candidate: The effects of news coverage on public perceptions of candidates. Political Communication, 27(3), 1-24.
13. https://abcnews.go.com/Politics/live-updates/trump-harris-2024-presidential-debate/?id=113525682
14. Iqbal, A. (2015). Discourse Analysis of Prominent Politicians' Public Speeches. Linguistics and Literature Review, 1(1), 1-18.
15. Iyengar, S. (1991). Is anyone responsible? How television frames political issues. University of Chicago Press.
16. Jamieson, P. E., & Campbell, K. E. (1992). The presidential debates: A strategic analysis. Oxford University Press.
17. Khan, M. A., Mahjabeen, A., Khan, H., & Arshaad, T. (2019). COHESION IN POLITICAL DISCOURSE: A CASE STUDY OF PRESIDENT TRUMP'S INAUGURAL SPEECH. *PalArch's Journal of Archaeology of Egypt/Egyptology*, 16(3), 68-86.
18. Kellner, D. (2010). Media spectacle and media events: Some critical reflections. In A. M. Nunes (Ed.), Media events: The experience of now in an online world (pp. 13–27). Brill.
19. Kozlovskaya, N. V., Rastyagaev, A. V., & Slozhenikina, J. V. (2020). The creative potential of contemporary Russian political discourse: From new words to new paradigms.TLC Journal, 4(4).
20. Lakoff, G. (2004). Don't think of an elephant! Know your values and frame the debate. Chelsea Green.

21. Lichter, S. R., Rothman, S., & Lichter, L. S. (1986). The media elite: America's new powerbrokers. New York: William Morrow.

22. McCombs, M. E., & Shaw, D. L. (1972). The agenda-setting function of mass media. Public Opinion Quarterly, 36(2), 176–187. https://doi.org/10.1086/267990

23. Muir, D. (2024, September 10). ABC News presidential debate. ABC News.

24. Richardson, J. E. (2007). Analyzing newspapers: An approach from critical discourse analysis. Palgrave Macmillan.

25. Slembrouck, S. (2001). Explanation, interpretation and critique in the analysis of discourse. Critique of Anthropology, 21(1), 33-57.

26. Solopova, O. A., & Naumova, K. (2024). Just War: Critical Discourse Analysis of US Presidential Speeches. International Journal of Arabic-English Studies.

27. Sunstein, C. R. (2009). Going to extremes: How like minds unite and divide. Oxford University Press.

28. Umber, S., Sarwar, M. H., Khan, M. A., Zaidi, S., & Latif, M. A. (2024). Unboxing the Ballot Box: A Critical Discourse Analysis of International Media Perspectives on Pakistan's 2024 General Elections. Kurdish Studies, 12(2), 6079-6096.

29. van Dijk, T. A. (1995). Discourse analysis as ideology analysis. In C. Schäffner & A. Wenden (Eds.), Language and peace (pp. 17-33). Dartmouth Publishing.

30. Van Dijk, T. A. (1998). Ideology and discourse. Sage Publications.

31. van Dijk, T. A. (1998). News as discourse. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

32. Van. Dijk, T. A. (1983). Discourse analysis: Its development and application to the structure of news. Journal of communication, 33(2), 20-43.

33. Wodak, R. (2011). The discourse of politics in action: Politics as usual. Palgrave Macmillan.