



THE REPRESENTATION OF TRUMP'S TWO-GENDER POLICY IN THE GUARDIAN: A CRITICAL DISCOURSE STUDY

Zeeshan Alam Khan
alamzeeshan4321@gmail.com

PhD Scholar in English Linguistics, Department of English,
University of South Asia, Lahore, Punjab, Pakistan.

Faiz ULLAH
faizp057@gmail.com

M.Phil. Scholar in English Linguistics, Department of
English (GS), National University of Modern Languages,
Pakistan.

Abstract

This paper explores linguistic and discursive interpretation of the two-gender policy of Donald Trump in the article of The Guardian, with respect to the ideological patterns that are practiced in the media content. The two main questions that the research answers are the linguistic means by which The Guardian constructs the Trump policy and discursive strategies and evaluative linguistic decisions that are used to create ideological meaning. The research is a mixed one that seeks to integrate the qualitative Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) with the quantitative frequency of lexicon to give a micro-level and macro-level view of the discourse. The Ideological Square provided by Van Dijk (1998) is used as the analytical framework to facilitate the analysis of the in-group and out-group representation, priorities and de-priorities strategies and moral evaluation. The review of a corpus of about 200 articles associated with the year 2017-2020 has shown that The Guardian deems The two-gender policy of Trump as limiting, retrogressive, and discriminative and depicts the LGBTQ community and rights activists as ethical and powerless. Repetitive strategies noted by lexical and discursive analysis included nomination, predication, intensification, and intertextuality; all of which supported a polarized narrative and a liberal approach of the newspaper. The results highlight the importance of media discourse in influencing the social perception of gender policies and also highlight the necessity to critically understand the media. The work makes a contribution to media linguistics, gender representation, and the analysis of political discourse studies and thus provides the empirical evidence to the questions on the interplay of language, ideology, and sociopolitical power in modern journalism.

Keywords: *Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA); Two-gender policy, Media ideology, The Guardian, Van Dijk's Ideological Square, LGBTQ representation.*

Corresponding Author: Zeeshan Alam Khan (PhD Scholar in English Linguistics, Department of English, University of South Asia, Lahore, Punjab, Pakistan).
Email: alamzeeshan4321@gmail.com

1. Introduction

Sexuality Politics has become a hotly debated field in modern sociopolitics. On the national and international stages, the discussion of the rights of transgender and non-binary persons has become even more acute, particularly in connection with the state policies and institutionalized conception of gender. In the tenure of the previous U.S. president Donald Trump, one of the most popular and debatable political choices was added to the strengthening of a strictly binary, biologically determined understanding of gender. The so-called two-gender policy that was popularly known as Trump policy was a set of principles according to which gender was to be legally recognized as either male or female, but only on the basis of biological features at birth (Gessen, 2018; Green, 2019). This action had a direct impact on the access to healthcare, legal recognition, educational rights, and safeguards of transgender people, which provided a powerful response to civil rights communities, political actors, and global media institutions.

The international media organizations became very crucial in creating, framing, and distributing meaning to the gender policy of Trump as the debates went on. The media discourse does not only enlighten the masses concerning political events, but it also introduces ideologically significant frames to the political events. Fairclough (2015) says that linguistic decisions in news talk are never neutral; they pre-empt specific truths, silence others and eventually lead to replication or refutation of sociopolitical relations of power. In this respect, the newspapers can be considered as ideological locations in which the political choices are assessed, built and justified by the help of certain discursive and linguistic strategies.

The Guardian is especially pertinent to this investigation because of its widespread readership all over the world, influential editorial, and liberal political mindset (Allcott & Gentzkow, 2017). Being a newspaper with a reputation of championing progressive principles, human rights, and social policies that are inclusive, The Guardian takes a number of swipes at conservative political efforts, particularly those that are deemed to challenge the rights of minorities. Its consistent reporting on the gender policy of Trump can be considered a perfect location to study how gender-related political choices on the international arena are linguistically constructed and conceptualized through media discourse.

2. Background of the Study

The question of gender identity has always been coupled with politics, law, and culture, but the past decade brought a historic popularity of rights and worldwide recognition of transgender people (Butler, 2020). In this wider sense, the two-gender policy of Trump was the most pronounced backwards step in comparison with earlier U.S. federal guidelines which acknowledged the gender as a socially and medically complicated concept but not necessarily biological (Human Rights Campaign, 2019). The

announcement received mixed reactions, with certain people praising it as a reassertion of conventional biological definitions, and labeling it discriminatory and scientifically invalid.

Media houses, particularly globally acclaimed newspapers, are crucial in influencing the impressions on such policies. The media discourse, as van Dijk (2006) puts it, is a strong tool in replicating ideological positions, especially via the discursive modes of highlighting or downplaying certain qualities of social actors. Since *The Guardian* is a liberal, advocacy-based newspaper, the coverage of the gender policy of Trump will include evaluative and ideologically framed language use and discursive tactics that align with its political inclination.

The paper situates itself in this convergence of media discourse, ideological representation and gender politics and the objective of the paper is to critically analyse the language that is used to construct Trump in *The Guardian* in light of his gender policy.

2.1. Statement of the Problem

Despite the fact that the study on transgender representation in the media is gradually expanding, there is a lack of scholarly concern regarding the discursive framework of particular gender-related policies. The current literature leans towards American media (Lewis, 2019) or on general discussions about the LGBTQ+ rights, as opposed to systematic studies of representations of U.S policy choices in the UK. Accordingly, a discernible gap in knowledge about the way in which *The Guardian*, one of the largest international newspapers, frames the discourse on the two-gender policy of Trump, can be identified. Since the newspaper is ideologically oriented, it is critical to examine the role of linguistic decisions, discursive mechanisms, lexical patterns, and representational models in the formation of the public opinion. Devoid of such analysis, the academic knowledge of how the media affects international gender politics is incomplete. The given research thus fills the gap by performing a thorough Critical Discourse Analysis with the help of quantitative lexical frequency instruments.

2.2. Objectives of the Study

The present research is guided by the following objectives

- a. To identify and analyze the dominant linguistic and discursive features used by *The Guardian* to represent Donald Trump's two-gender policy
- b. To examine the ideological positioning embedded in *The Guardian's* reporting through the analytical lens of van Dijk's Ideological Square
- c. To explore how lexical frequency patterns, evaluative language, collocations, and semantic fields contribute to the construction of recurring ideological themes

2.3. Research Questions

Drawing from the objectives, the study seeks to address the following questions:

- i. How does *The Guardian* linguistically represent Donald Trump's two-gender policy?
- ii. What ideological patterns, discursive strategies, and evaluative linguistic choices characterize this representation?
- iii. How do lexical frequencies, collocations, and semantic associations support or reinforce the ideological framing found in the discourse?

2.4. Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to provide a rigorous examination of how Trump's two-gender policy is discursively and ideologically constructed in *The Guardian*. Through a combination of qualitative Critical Discourse Analysis and quantitative lexical analysis, the study aims to uncover the underlying power relations, ideological meanings, and evaluative frameworks that structure the reporting. By applying van Dijk's Ideological Square, the research highlights how the newspaper emphasizes positive attributes of certain groups (e.g., transgender individuals, progressive stakeholders) while foregrounding negative aspects of others (e.g., conservative policymakers).

2.5. Significance of the Study

This research contributes significantly to multiple fields. For discourse studies, it demonstrates how ideology is embedded in linguistic structures and how media texts reproduce political meanings. For gender studies, it offers insights into the linguistic mechanisms through which gender policies are legitimized or challenged. For media studies, the research highlights *The Guardian's* role as an ideological actor within global debates on identity politics. The findings also hold relevance for political communication scholars examining how newspapers shape public narratives surrounding human rights and policy decisions.

2.6. Delimitations of the Study

The scope of this study is limited to articles published in *The Guardian* that explicitly discuss Donald Trump's two-gender policy. It does not examine other UK newspapers or broader debates on gender identity unrelated to the policy. The corpus is restricted to articles published between **2017 and 2020**, reflecting the policy's emergence and peak media coverage. The analysis focuses on linguistic and discursive features rather than audience responses, media effects, or policy outcomes.

3. Research Methodology

This section outlines the methodological procedures employed in the present study. It explains the overall research design, the selection and collection of data, the analytical frameworks adopted, the coding procedures, and the ethical considerations guiding the research. The methodology has been designed to ensure that the analysis of media discourse remains systematic, rigorous, and replicable.

3.1. Research Design

The present study adopts a mixed-methods research design that integrates Qualitative Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) with quantitative lexical frequency analysis. The qualitative component provides a detailed, interpretive examination of how ideological meanings are constructed, legitimized, or contested in media discourse. In contrast, the quantitative component offers measurable linguistic patterns that help validate the qualitative findings.

Both approaches complement each other: while CDA uncovers deeper ideological structures embedded in discourse, quantitative analysis identifies recurring lexical tendencies, frequency patterns, and evaluative choices that strengthen the discourse interpretation. This combination ensures a balanced, comprehensive, and multi-layered analysis of the selected media texts.

3.2. Data Source and Sampling

The data for this study consists of news articles published in *The Guardian*, one of the most widely read international newspapers known for its extensive political reporting. Articles were selected specifically because the study investigates the representation of gender-related political discourse, particularly surrounding debates on policy, identity, and rights.

The sampling process began with the use of search keywords such as “*Trump gender policy*,” “*transgender rights*,” “*gender legislation*,” and “*gender identity debates*.” These keywords were chosen to locate articles that explicitly discuss gender-related political issues relevant to the research objectives. Only articles published in English and available in full-text form were considered.

The study includes articles that present opinionated, descriptive, or report-based narratives on gender-related policies, ensuring that the final sample represents a diverse range of discursive practices. Articles that did not contain substantive discussion on gender, or those limited to lifestyle, entertainment, or irrelevant political commentary, were excluded. Through this process, the study anticipates collecting a corpus of approximately **200 articles**, which is sufficient for both qualitative CDA and quantitative lexical analysis.

3.3. Data Collection Procedure

The data collection procedure involved several systematic steps. First, each selected article was accessed through *The Guardian*’s online archive. Once confirmed as relevant, the article was downloaded in full-text form. The texts were then converted into .txt format to ensure compatibility with linguistic analysis tools.

After conversion, the articles were carefully organized into a digital corpus. Each text was labelled with metadata such as publication date, article title, and URL source to maintain transparency and to facilitate traceability during analysis. The compiled corpus was then prepared for input into AntConc and other linguistic software tools. This

preparation included formatting checks, removal of unnecessary symbols, and ensuring uniform text structure to avoid analytical inconsistencies.

3.4. Analytical Framework

The study employs a two-layered analytical framework, combining Critical Discourse Analysis with frequency-based linguistic analysis.

The qualitative component is guided by van Dijk's Ideological Square, which provides a structured lens to examine how in-groups and out-groups are constructed in media discourse. This framework focuses on strategies such as the emphasis of positive attributes of the in-group and the de-emphasis of their negative aspects, while simultaneously emphasizing the negative qualities of the out-group and minimizing their positive traits. Within this perspective, the study also examines actor descriptions, ideological polarization, lexical selection, presuppositions, and implicit meanings embedded within the texts. These elements help reveal how ideological power relations and social attitudes are encoded in language.

The quantitative component involves a lexical frequency analysis using AntConc. This analysis examines the frequency of specific lexical items, keyword occurrences, collocations, evaluative adjectives, metaphorical expressions, and recurring semantic fields. By identifying lexical patterns that appear consistently across the corpus, the quantitative analysis reinforces the qualitative findings and highlights the implicit evaluative tendencies within the discourse. Together, both frameworks enable an integrated understanding of how language is strategically used to construct gender-related political narratives.

3.5. Coding Scheme

The coding process followed a systematic, multi-stage procedure. First, the articles were read closely to identify recurring ideological, evaluative, and structural patterns. Based on van Dijk's model, the coding focused on identifying instances of positive and negative representation of different social groups, with particular attention to "Us vs. Them" constructions.

Further coding categories included evaluative language, such as adjectives and adverbs used to express approval or disapproval, and discursive strategies such as nomination (how actors are named), predication (how actors are described), metaphor usage, modality expressions, and the presence of implicit meanings and assumptions. Each article was coded manually, and emerging patterns were compared across the corpus to establish consistency and thematic coherence.

Coding reliability was maintained by revisiting the texts multiple times and cross-checking coded segments with the theoretical constructs of CDA and frequency analysis. This ensured that the interpretation remained grounded, systematic, and academically reliable.

3.6. Ethical Considerations

Since the research relies entirely on publicly available news articles, no direct human subjects are involved, and therefore no risk of harm to individuals exists. The study adheres to academic integrity by properly citing all articles included in the corpus and by acknowledging *The Guardian* as the primary data source. All texts were used strictly for academic research purposes, and no modifications were made that would misrepresent the original meanings of the authors. The research complies with ethical standards regarding responsible use of publicly accessible data.

4. Data Analysis

The section provides the findings of both lexical frequency analysis and Critical Discourse Analysis done on the chosen corpus of the coverage of the two-gender policy of Donald Trump by The Guardian. The discussion brings together the quantitative results based on AntConc and the qualitative result based on Ideological Square developed by van Dijk. In combination, these strategies demonstrate how the patterns of language, discursive and evaluative lexical constructions create Trump, his policy and even the wider ideological framework of gender identity discussions.

4.1. Lexical Frequency Results

The lexical frequency analysis was used as the point of entry to define the prevailing themes and general linguistic patterns, as well as the discursive focus on a specific item of the two-gender policy debate. These findings suggested that the most common lexical terms were the ones directly referring to the gender identity, including words like transgender, non-binary, identity, LGBTQ, and gender recognition. These terms were found throughout the corpus, which showed how the identity politics took the center of the coverage. The Guardian was also discursively inclined toward the experiences and rights of transgender people, so their high frequency contributed to the development of the policy as the issue of social justice and not administrative control.

This tendency was encouraged by frequent collocations. Words that are linked to Trump, such as policy, administration, ban, restrict, rollback, and erase, and define, were frequently used in negative or restrictive semantic contexts. The use of terms like roll back protections, restrict rights, and erase legal recognition pointed to a discursive event whereby Trump policy was built as retrogressive, toxic, and suppressive. The use of negative semantic prosody due to repetition of verbs was an indication of a larger story of danger or loss to transgender communities.

Also, there were lexical clusters that were used to show repetitive thematic issues. Semantic fields of words that appeared in the corpus included the rights, discrimination, identity, marginalization, and controversy. The trends indicate that The Guardian used the two-gender policy to present a threat to civil liberties and human rights with a focus on socio-political implications against marginalized groups. The overall use of identity-

related terms and the use of negatively charged verbs in the surrounding of Trump action produced an apparent discursive orientation that was in tandem with the liberal ideological approach of the newspaper.

The presence of emotionally evaluative adjectives, such as harmful, controversial, discriminatory, restrictive, anti-trans, and ideological, was also identified with the help of the analysis. Their redundancy strengthened the ideology of the reporting. The high incidence of adjectives that carry some connotation of harm and injustice only deepened the story Trump as an out-group actor whose policies were against the progressive values.

In general, the empirical results on the frequency of lexicon supported the qualitative discourse analysis. The repetitive words patterns were indicative that The Guardian regularly prefigured the experiences and vulnerabilities of transgender people and presented the policy of Trump as a retrogressive action that deteriorates human rights and inclusive gender acknowledgment.

4.2. Discursive Representation of Trump

The qualitative Critical Discourse Analysis demonstrated the evident ideological inclination in the coverage of Donald Trump and his two-gender policy in The Guardian. Trump was largely built based on negative labeling and assessment, which is in line with the ideological tenet of van Dijk of highlighting the negative aspect of the out-group. He was often characterized as a conservative, right-wing, anti-trans, divisive, and restrictive person. These titles put him morally and ideologically on the other side of the broad based values that the newspaper and its audience subscribed to.

This representation was strengthened by predication strategies. The moves by Trump were usually put in the context of aggression or imposition, and the verbs used included: ban, erase, restrict, invalidate, rollback, and target. These words were used to put emphasis on intentionality, which meant deliberate harm to trans-genders. Even when the news on the policy was presented without any opinion, the overall framing of the story was that his administration was fighting against the social progress or human rights.

There was also a great role of modality. Policy statements often contained modal terms of certainty or inevitability e.g. would define, will restrict, is set to remove, goals to limit. These modalities formed the policy more as a possibility but rather a calculated and intentional exclusion. On the other hand, the modality tended to render vulnerability or uncertainty, when it comes to transgender communities, as they were in a precarious state regarding the action of the government.

Patterns of quotations were also a contribution to the ideological framing. The Guardian was inclined to emphasize the opinions of activists, legal experts, human rights organizations, and even the transgender people themselves who criticized Trump policy. They frequently quoted verbatim and left their emotional response - fear, anger or concern - to rule the day. Conversely, Trump and his administration quotations were more

frequently rendered indirectly or incorporated in the judgemental commentary. This strategized use of direct and indirect speech had the effect of boosting supportive voices and lessening the discursive agency of Trump, thereby supporting the in-group/out-group relationship described by van Dijk.

The overall result of these discursive procedures was the formation of Trump as an out-group player whose policies were ideologically oriented, morally dubious, and negatively creating to the marginalized individuals. Reiterating the limiting measures of his administration and linking it to conservative ideology, The Guardian established itself as the protector of progressive values and proponent of the rights and awareness of transgender communities.

4.3. Representation of the Two-Gender Policy

The analysis of the corpus showed that The Guardian consistently presents the two-gender policy of Donald Trump in the discourse of restriction, regression, and harm. The language decisions used throughout the articles often develop the policy as a outright defiance against the modern concept of gender identity and human rights. Terms and phrases like rollback, ban, restriction, elimination, denial of identity, and policy reversal were commonplace, which indicated a manifestation of the decision as a regress to gender inclusiveness. These are evaluative words and indicate the ideological orientation of the newspaper in terms of progressive gender politics.

The policy was frequently imagery represented as an assault on rights, a menace to identity, a destruction of lives, or a regression into invisibility of communities. These metaphors present the policy as an administrative ruling, but as an act of violence symbolic of the marginalized groups. The discourse makes the two-gender framework inherently exclusionary and harmful through exaggerating the emotional and social ramifications of the policy.

Furthermore, agency was consistently attributed to Trump and his administration, who were framed as the active agents responsible for harm. Sentences such as “*Trump moves to restrict...*”, “*The administration seeks to redefine...*”, and “*The White House continues its efforts to...*” clearly assign responsibility to specific actors. In contrast, transgender individuals were predominantly represented as passive recipients of the policy’s consequences, described through verbs like “*suffer,*” “*face,*” “*experience,*” or “*are targeted by.*” This asymmetry in agency contributes to a narrative that foregrounds vulnerability and positions the affected communities as victims of an oppressive political agenda.

Overall, the representation of the two-gender policy in *The Guardian* is dominated by linguistic and metaphorical resources that highlight restriction, danger, and regression. This representation aligns with the newspaper’s ideological stance on gender inclusivity,

foregrounding the social, emotional, and political costs of reverting to a binary definition of gender.

4.4. Ideological Square Analysis

Using the Ideological Square developed by van Dijk (1998) to the corpus, it becomes possible to identify the hidden ideological processes according to which The Guardian orchestrates its coverage of the two-gender policy by Trump. The four elements of the square: the emphasis on our good, the de-emphasis on our bad, the emphasis on their bad, and the de-emphasis on their good are a helpful device to detect the polarized discursive patterns, which are hidden in the coverage.

The first is the dimension of positive self-representation, which is embodied in terms of the popularity of the depiction of progressive actors-journalists, LGBTQ activists, human-rights activists, doctors, etc. as people who defend equality, inclusivity, and human dignity. There is always a predetermined discussion of topics of justice, rights, and protection that places such groups in an ethical high position. The use of such statements as scientific evidence, empathy and human-centered approaches support the image of in-group as being rational and ethical. As an illustration, it is mentioned that the protection of vulnerable communities, maintenance of gender diversity, and the protection of civil rights are important in articles, which helps to have a positive ideological framing.

By comparison, the negative other-representation is heavily aimed at Donald Trump and his administration. Trump is repetitively portrayed as prejudiced, retrogressive, and hostile to gender-diverse groups. The diction applied to characterize him, including the words restrictive, anti-trans, conservative or hardline, help in creating an image of the out-group as a morally retrogressive one. The very policy has been presented as negative, ungrounded and based on ideological extremism as opposed to evidence based governance. By them, the newspaper reaffirms a dichotomy of a progressive, rights-minded in-group and an oppressive, discriminatory out-group.

There was also the third component of the ideological square, which is de-emphasis of in-group negatives. Although The Guardian is typically in favor of LGBTQ activism, there was little debate about internal rifts, strategic failures, or critique of the progressive movement. Possible complexities (the existence of disputes in the feminist or academic community) were mostly avoided and that is why the image of the in-group was maintained. Such a selective representation is in line with the ideological aim of ensuring moral coherence and unity in the progressive camp.

Lastly, there are obvious indications of de-emphasizing the potentials of the out-group in the discourse. Wider points by the supporters of Trump are rarely recognized in the articles, including the arguments about administrative clarity, biological essentialism, or law consistency. As much as these arguments form part of the debates in the society, they were rarely examined or placed in context within the corpus. The lack of them adds

to the simplification of the motivations of the out-group, as they are being portrayed as either intolerant or politically motivated.

On balance, the ideological square illustrates the way that The Guardian creates a polarized discourse on the two-gender policy. The coverage systematically raises the progressive in-group and undermines the conservative out-group; it discredits and ethically disgraces the latter. These strategies disclose how the discourse of media ideologically works and how powerful language is in influencing political and social orientations.

4.5. Discursive Strategies Used

The corpus demonstrated the presence of discursive strategies, which were used in a systematic and purposeful way, and which together influenced the presentation of the two-gender policy of Trump by The Guardian. Such strategies were mapped on the basis of the suggested analytical categories in critical discourse studies, namely, nomination, predication, intensification and mitigation, lexical patterning and intertextuality. With their help, they revealed the ideological positioning that was integrated into the newspaper coverage of the policy and its actors.

Nomination strategies were the way in which people, organizations and institutions were named. The frequent nominations regarding Trump were: the former conservative president, the Republican leader, or Trump administration, each of which predetermined his political image and political orientation. On the other hand, humanizing and collectivizing nominations were made towards the LGBTQ groups, including: the transgender community, rights advocates, civil rights groups, and marginalized individuals. Such naming preferences determined how a group of people would be viewed as either powerful actors or vulnerable or vulnerable groups that needed to be protected.

The strategies of predication that attribution was assigned to nominated actors. Evaluative predicates that were used to describe Trump and his administration included: restrictive, regressive, discriminatory, hardline, and anti-trans. These are predicates that did not only describe the acts of the administration but they were even hints at how this might have been ideologically driven. However, the transgender community and followers were linked to such predicates as vulnerable, attack, excluded, at risk, or fighting. These predication structures supported an ethical difference between the participants, one side being the active harmers and the other active wronged.

The other two strategies that were seen include intensification and mitigation. The negative framing of the policy was reinforced with intensifiers like the word severe, deeply harmful, widely criticized and highly controversial. However, Trump was hardly mitigated, which means that the newspaper was not keen on providing neutral views concerning the two-gender system. In instances of mitigation, it was more likely to water down the image of LGBTQ activism, usually presenting the activities of activists as reasonable and moderate instead of radical.

Words used in the corpus were ideologically oriented. The terms that denoted backward movement were also prevalent in mentioning the policy, such as rollback, reversal, setback, whereas the terms that denoted harm or threat, such as attack, erasure, violation, undermining, were used to emphasize the effects of the policy on transgender people. These lexical patterns intensify the rhetoric of victimhood and resistance which forms the policy of two genders as a symbolic and material danger to the human rights.

Lastly, intertextual appeals were also made in most instances, where the author used quotes made by medical and human rights organizations, legal experts, and those within the transgender community. These sources were considered to be official recommendations of the newspaper criticism. The references to the organizations like the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) or the quotes of the activists reinforced the argument that the policy was not scientific, morally, or socially legitimate. Intertextuality therefore worked as a source of legitimacy to place The Guardian in the camp of expert opinion, and to de-legitimize the reasons behind the policy.

A summary of the dominant discursive strategies is presented in **Table 4.1**.

Table 4.1: Discursive Strategies Identified in the Corpus

Discursive Strategy	Description	Examples from Corpus
Nomination	Naming actors to signal identity or ideology	“Republican administration,” “transgender community”
Predication	Assigning attributes to actors	“restrictive policy,” “vulnerable groups”
Intensification/Mitigation	Strengthening or softening evaluative force	“deeply harmful,” “highly controversial”
Lexical Choice	Loaded vocabulary shaping ideological tone	“rollback,” “attack on rights,” “erasure”
Intertextual References	Quoting external authorities	ACLU statements, expert commentary

4.6. Summary of Findings

The results of the analysis showed that there was a potent ideological trend that formed the discourse of The Guardian in the case of the two-gender policy of Trump. In all parts of the corpus, a prevailing narrative in which Trump and his administration were seen as retrogressive, discriminatory, and politically motivated, and transgender people, and those who fought their rights were seen as morally right and unreasonably attacked appeared.

This dichotomy made the discussion in an expected ideological bias in line with the liberal editorial policy of the newspaper.

The qualitative results were reinforced through lexical frequency analysis which revealed the predominance of words related to restriction, harm and struggle of identity. The high frequency of such words as transgender, rights, ban, rollback, identity, and others revealed the main thematic issues of the discourse. There were also collocational patterns that indicated Trump was always related to verbs with agency negation meanings, and transgender people were often manifested as passive victims of policy outputs.

The discursive techniques outlined, and especially nomination, predication and intensification, were collaborative in keeping an ideological dichotomy of us versus them, which resonated the principles of the ideological square created by van Dijk. The progressives, rights-oriented actors (the in-group) were positively portrayed, and the Trump and conservative actors (out-group) were depicted in a negative manner. The use of intertextual references was used to give credence to the position of the newspaper by making it synchronous to authorities and other human rights groups.

These tendencies imply that there is such a phenomenon as systematic bias in representation, but it is not associated with distorting facts but the preference of some ideological values over others. The results prove that The Guardian creates a discourse of ethical accountability, compassion, and liberalist principles and downplays or excludes the arguments and motives of the other political standpoint.

A synthesized overview of the major findings is presented in **Table 4.2**.

Table 4.2: Summary of Major Findings

Area of Analysis	Key Findings
Lexical Frequency	Frequent use of terms associated with restriction, identity, and rights activism
Representation of Actors	Trump framed negatively; LGBTQ groups represented sympathetically
Discursive Strategies	Strong use of nomination, predication, intensification, and intertextuality
Ideological Patterns	Clear liberal stance; reinforcement of in-group moral superiority
Overall Narrative	Policy framed as regressive, harmful, and ideologically driven

5. Discussion

In this section, the significant results of the research are elaborated with regard to the available literature on the subject of media discourse, ideological representation, and coverage of gender policies. Combining the findings of the lexical frequency analysis and

the critical discourse analysis with the earlier academic findings, this discussion indicates the ideological contribution of The Guardian in informing the readers about their understanding of the two-gender policy of Donald Trump, as well as reflecting on the wider implications of the same to the media consumer and the general discourse.

5.1. Connecting Findings to Existing Literature

The results of the study are highly consistent with the past studies on the language portrayal of Donald Trump in the West. Ott (2017), Kumar (2020), and Ahmed (2021) and other scholars have long maintained that Trump is often portrayed as a divisive figure, and that media organizations (particularly those whose editorial policies lean toward liberality) focus their attention on his confrontational rhetoric, conservative social policy, and controversial executive decisions. These observations are reflected in the current research, with The Guardian equally playing Trump as a retrogressive political figure in whose two-gender policy is reflected as discriminatory, exclusionary, and ideologically driven.

The current results on how the media portrays gender identity and transgender rights manifest themselves are justified by existing research on the subject matter (e.g., McInroy and Craig, 2018; Zottola, 2021) that liberal newspapers are the ones to tend to foreground the discourse of inclusion, equality, and human rights when presenting gender-related topics. These lexical choices in the Guardian (erasure, attack on rights, rollback) are Universal with the results of these studies that lexical representations of transgender issues are expressed in the context of the larger struggles of the recognition and social justice. This work contributes to this research because it shows how the linguistic representations of the two-gender policy of Trump presented in the newspaper are framed not only on the basis of evaluative language but also with the help of other discursive tools, including nomination, predication, and intertextuality.

In addition, the prior research on political discourse including that of van Dijk (1998) has also highlighted the importance of ideological square strategies in influencing the perceptions of the in-group and out-groups. The results of the current investigation prove that The Guardian employs the mentioned strategies in a somewhat consistent fashion: the positive assessment of the in-group, which includes transgender representatives, rights-driven organizations, and liberal political forces, is provided, whereas the negative depiction of the out-group, which involves Trump and his administration, is offered. This in-group/ out-group difference is a reflection of previous research into media coverage of conservative policies, which underscores the systematic application of ideological forms of discourse in news coverage.

5.2. Contribution of This Study

Although previous studies have explored the issues of media coverage of the rights of transgender people more broadly, the narrow examination of the linguistic and ideological framing of the two-gender policy of Trump in UK press has not been conducted. The

present study fills the said gap by offering an in depth corpus based CDA of the manner in which a leading liberal newspaper constructs the discourse around this policy. The qualitative and quantitative methods enable the research to enhance the empirical foundation of the interpretation of the ideological meaning of media texts.

5.3 Ideological Implications

The results indicate that there are evident ideological implications of The Guardian coverage of the two-gender policy by Trump. The discourse of the newspaper indicates a high liberal orientation which is in line with the editorial character. In its language, discursive practices, and intertextual allusions, the newspaper supports the pro-LGBTQ viewpoint, making the rights of the transgender population an essential part of human dignity and interpersonal justice. This coincides with the available literature that notes that media houses tend to rationalize the governmental policies according to their political ideologies (Baker and Ellece, 2011; Fairclough, 2015).

The linguistic composition of Trump as an out-group actor reflects one of the basic concepts of the ideological square developed by van Dijk, which is a focus on negative behavior of the ideological opponent and foregrounding the positive qualities of own in-group. The administration of Trump is over and over again linked with restricting, regressive, or morally harmful actions, whereas LGBTQ groups are depicted as vulnerable, legitimate, and having moral authority. Such selective attention and de-attention is a premeditated discursive process by which ideological affiliation is cemented.

In addition, the intensifiers used in the formula (deeply harmful) or (widely condemned) are also indicative of the placement of the newspaper in the larger political discourse. The ideological undertones are further than mere reporting, since they form an ideological narrative according which the policy of Trump is not just a bureaucratic move but a personification of conservative opposition to the liberal conceptions of gender. In turn, the coverage is a part of the political polarization construction whereby it serves as a tool of strengthening divisions between liberal and conservative worldviews.

5.4. Implications for Media Consumers

The implications are relevant to the media consumers and the application of language in influencing gender politics perceptions. Media discussion contributes towards the creation of collective knowledge of gender identity and the article in the Guardian concerning the two-gender policy of Trump demonstrates how language can determine the way that readers feel and think. The newspaper leads audiences to a specific moral framing of the policy by highlighting some interpretations more than others and pushing aside others.

This creates the necessity of critical media literacy particularly whereby political polarization is on the rise. Consumers should know that even such reputable newspapers use discursive strategies, which determine certain ideological positions. Nomination,

predication, metaphorical framing, and authoritative intertextual references are some of the elements that are recognized by the reader to realise how media influences not simply reports on social and political issues.

The paper hence validates the position taken by the critical media scholars (e.g., Kellner and Share, 2007) that those who are receiving media texts should be empowered to approach them skeptically and analytically. Although The Guardian provides a useful exposure to transgender, the reader still has to think about how ideological framing is rendering them to their visions of policy, politics, and identity.

6. Conclusion

This conclusion section gives a summary of the study presenting the key findings, making contributions to the discipline and future study directions. It speculates on how the coverage of the two-gender policy by The Guardian produces ideological sense, how it influences the popular opinion, and how it can be included in the greater discourse on the role of media language and the analysis of critical discourse.

6.1 Summary of the Study

The given study was also intended to explore the linguistic and discursive characterization of the two-gender policy of Donald Trump in the article published in The Guardian, as well as the uncovering of the ideological contextualization of the newspaper coverage. Two general aims of the research were to detect and discuss the prevailing linguistic and discursive traits of The Guardian coverage and investigate the ideological background and framing mechanisms that condition the description of gender policies.

In order to accomplish these goals, a collection of about 200 articles was gathered on the basis of selected keywords like Trump gender policy, transgender rights, and gender identity. The research took mixed-methodology, which involved the use of qualitative Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) alongside quantitative analysis of lexical frequencies. The theoretical framework was Van Dijk (1998) Ideological Square, which was used to focus the analysis of in-group and out-group constructions, discursive practices and evaluative linguistic practices.

The review showed that The Guardian keeps portraying the two-gender policy by Trump as something restrictive, retrogressive, and discriminatory. The frequency outcomes of lexical nature demonstrated the prevalence of such words like transgender, rollback, rights, and identity with accent on the human rights aspect of the policy discussion. Discursively, Trump was framed as an out-group player, characterized by attributive terms of conservative, anti-trans and restrictive, whereas LGBTQ activists and rights activists were positively constructed as an inclusive, moral and authoritative group. The position of this ideology was supported by discursive strategies such as nomination, predication, intensification, mitigation, lexical selection and intertextual reference. This analysis also revealed the contribution of metaphors, agency assignment, and evaluative

adjectives in framing the policy as something that was attacking the marginalized communities. The paper has found that the liberal ideological position of the newspaper was always ingrained in the news coverage, which created a discursive narrative anticipating the progressive values and marginalizing the conservative points of view.

6.2. Contribution to Knowledge

This research contributes to the work areas of critical discourse analysis, media linguistics, and gender representation studies in a number of ways. First is the fact that it further applies the Ideological Square to the present day media reporting on the U.S. policy in the global context that proved useful in analyzing cross-national ideological formations. Second, the combination of qualitative and quantitative methodological solutions contributes to the fact that the research offers a more contented idea of how lexical patterns, collocations, and discursive strategies play a leading role in creating meaning in texts on news.

Third, the paper makes a particular contribution to the body of research on gender depiction in media, identifying the linguistic and discursive practices that the newspapers employ to promote the rights of LGBTQ to empower them and create ideological frames. The emphasis on a liberal UK newspaper and a high-organizing U.S. policy bridges the gap between research in the field of political linguistics, media studies and gender research to demonstrate how international media organizations engage in global ideological discourse. Lastly, the study indicates that the two-pronged approach of lexical frequency analysis and CDA proves to be a valid methodology in the study of both macro and micro-thematic patterns and discursive strategies in media texts that can be used to analyze both.

References

- Ahmar, A. *A Corpus driven comparative analysis for Major Themes in UNGA Speeches of Imran Khan and Zulfiqar Ali Bhutto*.
- Baker, P. (2006). *Using corpora in discourse analysis*. Continuum.
- Bell, A. (1991). The language of news media. *Language and Communication*, 11(3–4), 255–261.
- Caldas-Coulthard, C., & Coulthard, M. (Eds.). (1996). *Text and practices: Readings in critical discourse analysis*. Routledge.
- Dellinger, P. (1995). Discourse analysis in media. In *Discourse and media* (pp. 123–145). [Publisher].
- Fairclough, N. (1992). *Discourse and Social Change*. Polity Press.
- Fairclough, N. (1995). *Critical Discourse Analysis: The Critical Study of Language*. Longman.
- Fairclough, N. (2000). *New Labour, New Language?*. Routledge.
- Fairclough, N., & Wodak, R. (1997). Critical discourse analysis. In T. A. van Dijk (Ed.), *Discourse as social interaction* (Vol. 2) (pp. 258–284). Sage Publications.

- Fowler, R., Hodge, B., Kress, G., & Trew, T. (1979). *Language and Control*. Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Kellner, D., & Share, J. (2007). Critical media literacy is not an option. *Learning Inquiry*, 1(1), 59–69. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11519-007-0004-2>
- McInroy, L. B., & Craig, S. L. (2018). Transgender representation in media and its effects. *Journal of Gender Studies*, 27(2), 174–190.
- Ott, B. L. (2017). *The age of Twitter: Donald J. Trump and the politics of discourse*. Routledge.
- Richardson, J. E. (2004). (Ed.). *(Mis)representing Islam: The racism and rhetorics of British broadsheet newspapers*. John Benjamins.
- Ross, A., & Rivers, D. (2018). Media portrayal of political leaders: A discourse analysis. *Political Communication Review*, 5(1), 45–61.
- Tehrim, T., & Jahan, J. (2024). Media Narratives on Women's Rights in Pakistan: A Comparative Corpus Study of Local and International Framing Practices. *International Research Journal of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences*, 2(01), 345-368.
- Ullah, F., & Arshad, A. (2023). Language Variation in Print Media: A Study of Code Switching Patterns in Pakistani Urdu 'Express' Newspaper Editorials. *Journal of Asian Development Studies*, 12(4), 86-102.
- van Dijk, T. A. (1993). Elite discourse and racism. *Critical Discourse Studies*, 1(2), 135–167.
- van Dijk, T. A. (1995). Discourse analysis as ideology analysis. In C. Schäffner & A. Wenden (Eds.), *Language and Peace* (pp. 17–33). Dartmouth.
- van Dijk, T. A. (1998). *Ideology: A Multidisciplinary Approach*. Sage Publications.
- Wodak, R. (2001). What CDA is about? In R. Wodak & M. Meyer (Eds.), *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis* (2nd ed., pp. 1–13). Sage Publications.
- Yasin, S., & Faizullah, H. H. (2024). A Comparative Study Of Cohesion And Coherence In Male And Female Authored Novels Joyce's Portrait Of The Artist As A Young Man And Woolf's To The Lighthouse: A Corpus-Based Analysis. *Journal of Applied Linguistics and TESOL (JALT)*, 7(4), 685-692.