



A CRITICAL DISCOURSE ANALYSIS OF EUPHEMISTIC LANGUAGE IN DONALD TRUMP'S STATE OF THE UNION ADDRESS 2026

Muhammad Owais Owaiskhattak593@gmail.com	MS Scholar, Department of English, Kohat University of Science and Technology (KUST), Kohat, KPK. Pakistan.
Saiqa Iqbal saiqakhattak007@gmail.com	MS Scholar, Department of English, Kohat University of Science and Technology (KUST), Kohat, KPK. Pakistan.
Shakiaz Ahmed shakiazahmad@gmail.com	MS Scholar, Department of English, Kohat University of Science and Technology (KUST), Kohat, KPK. Pakistan.

Abstract

This study is situated within contemporary political discourse, focusing on the use of language in high-profile speeches, such as Donald Trump's 2026 State of the Union Address. Political speeches serve as powerful tools for shaping public perception, where linguistic choices are often strategically employed to construct meaning, project authority, and influence audiences. Despite extensive research on political discourse, the systematic use of euphemistic language to mask sensitive issues, soften controversial policies, and maintain power relations remains underexplored. This study addresses by examining how euphemisms function in speech and the communicative purposes they serve. Adopting a qualitative and interpretive research design, the study employs Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA), specifically Fairclough's three-dimensional model, in conjunction with Allan and Burridge's theory of euphemisms. The analysis focuses on identifying euphemistic expressions and interpreting their roles within the textual, discursive, and social dimensions of the speech. The findings reveal that euphemisms are systematically used as strategic linguistic devices, primarily realised through lexical and phrasal choices. Several types of euphemisms are identified, including positive, mitigating, indirect (vague), strategic, and ideological forms, with positive euphemisms emerging as the most dominant. These linguistic strategies have been shown to obscure negative realities, frame policies favourably, and reinforce existing power structures. The study concludes that euphemistic language extends beyond stylistic ornamentation and operates as a powerful discursive tool in political communication. Using the CDA framework with euphemism theory, this research offers insight into how language constructs political meaning and sustains power relations, underscoring the importance of critical awareness in interpreting contemporary political discourse.

Keywords: *Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA), Euphemism Theory, Euphemistic Language, Fairclough's 3D Model, Political Discourse, State of the Union Address 2026.*

Corresponding Author: Muhammad Owais (MS Scholar, Department of English, Kohat University of Science and Technology (KUST), Kohat, KPK. Pakistan)
Email:

1. Introduction

Language is one of the fundamental components of an individual's identity (Gulati & Yadav, 2024; Owais et al., 2025). Additionally, language is powerful in political contexts because it enables political leaders to shape public opinion, influence societal attitudes, and craft compelling narratives that support their ideological objectives (Wodak & Meyer, 2020). Therefore, political discourses, such as speeches, are deliberately constructed to strategically convey political events, policies, and national situations; they are not neutral writings. One important way political leaders manage touchy or sensitive topics is by using euphemistic language. The term euphemism refers to the practice of replacing harsh, offensive, or uncomfortable words and expressions with milder or more socially acceptable alternatives (Allan & Burridge, 2020). Furthermore, when defined through the lens of political views, euphemistic language often functions to soften criticism, soften negative information, obscure controversial realities, and present political actions in a more favourable or palatable way (Crespo-Fernández, 2021). The strategic organisation of euphemisms is therefore not merely a linguistic choice but also a cognitive and rhetorical tool with implications for how audiences interpret political messages (Breeze, 2021; Maryam et al., 2026).

In this regard, political discourse has been explored in recent years, examining how language contributes to ideology, power relations, and persuasion (Fairclough, 2021; Hart, 2022). Furthermore, critical discourse analysis (CDA) has become one of the most prominent approaches, examining how language reflects and reproduces social and political structures (van Leeuwen, 2021; Maryam et al., 2026). In particular, the use of euphemistic language in presidential addresses where leaders articulate national priorities, achievements, and challenges has not been sufficiently explored. The State of the Union Address 2026 is one of the most important political speeches in the United States, providing a platform for the president to address both domestic and international audiences on matters of governance, policy direction, and national identity (Simpson, 2024; Owais et al., 2025). In this context, the president of the U.S., Donald Trump's 2026 State of the Union address, presents a significant opportunity to analyse how euphemistic language is used in a major political speech and how it functions discursively to influence audience perception. Therefore, this study aims to conduct a critical discourse analysis of euphemistic language in Donald Trump's 2026 State of the Union Address to identify the euphemisms and how they are used, and to analyse the communicative functions they perform in the political discourse.

1.1. Statement of the problem

Language is a powerful tool in political discourse, enabling leaders to frame national issues, persuade audiences, and construct ideological narratives. In today's politics, euphemistic language has become an important linguistic strategy, as it allows political leaders to soften negative realities and ambiguous, sensitive topics, and to present controversial policies in a more favourable light (Allan & Burrige, 2020; Crespo-Fernández, 2021). Despite the widespread recognition of euphemisms in political discourses, there is a relative lack of research that systematically analyses both the use and the communicative functions of euphemistic language in modern presidential speeches. This speech is significant because it addresses critical national and international issues and provides a strategic platform for shaping public opinion and political narratives.

1.2. Research Questions

1. How is euphemistic language used in Donald Trump's State of the Union Address 2026?
2. What communicative functions do these euphemistic expressions perform within the political discourse of the speech?

1.3. Research Objectives

1. To analyse the use of euphemistic language in Donald Trump's State of the Union Address 2026.
2. To identify the communicative functions of euphemistic expressions in the political discourse of the speech.

1.4. Significance of the Study

This study is significant because it examines how euphemistic language is used in Donald Trump's 2026 State of the Union Address and how such expressions function within political discourse. Political speeches play a crucial role in shaping public understanding, and the use of euphemisms can influence how sensitive or controversial issues are presented to the audience. By highlighting these linguistic strategies, the study draws attention to the ways language can be used to frame reality, manage public perception, and maintain authority. Furthermore, the study emphasises the importance of developing critical awareness when interpreting political communication. Understanding euphemistic language enables readers and listeners to engage more thoughtfully with political messages rather than accepting them at face value. In this way, the study underlines the role of language in democratic engagement and informed public discourse.

2. Literature Review

Language plays a central role in constructing social reality, particularly in political contexts, where it serves as a strategic tool for shaping public perception and maintaining power relations. Political discourse is not merely descriptive; rather, it actively constructs ideology and influences how reality is interpreted and understood (Fairclough, 2015;

Wodak & Meyer, 2016). Within this perspective, Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) has emerged as a significant analytical framework for examining how language reproduces dominance, inequality, and ideological control in society. A key linguistic strategy within political discourse is euphemism. Euphemistic language refers to the substitution of direct, harsh, or socially sensitive expressions with more acceptable or indirect alternatives (Allan & Burrige, 2006). While traditionally associated with politeness, euphemisms in political contexts function beyond mere linguistic softening; they operate as powerful rhetorical devices that obscure reality, mitigate criticism, and construct favourable representations of political actors and policies (Crespo-Fernández, 2014). Recent studies have emphasised the ideological and strategic nature of euphemisms. For instance, Sharafutdinov (2024) argues that euphemisms function as cognitive tools that reshape audience interpretation by reframing negative realities. Similarly, Jaganegara (2023) demonstrates that euphemisms serve as a means of disguise in political texts, enabling speakers to avoid confrontation while maintaining persuasive effectiveness. However, these studies primarily focus on general political discourse or media texts rather than high-profile political speeches. Furthermore, scholars such as Narimanova (2025) and Filimonova and Sukhanova (2025) highlight the role of euphemisms as framing devices that allow political actors to control narratives and maintain ideological coherence. While these studies provide valuable insights into the persuasive functions of euphemistic language, they often lack a comprehensive analytical framework that integrates both linguistic identification and discursive interpretation. In addition, research within CDA (Chilton, 2004; Hart, 2014) has demonstrated that political discourse inherently involves strategic language use aimed at constructing positive self-representation while minimising negative aspects. However, these studies tend to address broader discursive strategies and do not focus specifically on euphemistic language as a central analytical category.

Despite these contributions, several gaps remain evident. First, much of the existing research examines euphemisms in media discourse rather than in high-level political speeches delivered by national leaders. Second, previous studies often analyse either the forms of euphemisms or their communicative functions in isolation, without integrating both dimensions within a unified analytical framework. Third, Fairclough's three-dimensional model has been applied only to a limited extent to the examination of euphemistic language in recent U.S. presidential discourse. Therefore, this study addresses these gaps by conducting a Critical Discourse Analysis of euphemistic language in Donald Trump's 2026 State of the Union Address. By integrating Fairclough's three-dimensional model with Allan and Burrige's theory of euphemism, the study offers a comprehensive analysis of both the linguistic realisation and the discursive functions of euphemistic expressions in contemporary political discourse.

3. Methodology

3.1. Research Design

This study adopts a qualitative research design to explore and interpret the use of euphemistic language and its communicative functions in a specific political speech. Likewise, qualitative research is appropriate because it allows one to examine the linguistic features, meanings, and underlying ideologies embedded in discourse in depth.

3.2. Research Method

The study employs Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) and, within this framework, specifically adopts Fairclough's 3D Model as its primary analytical framework. In addition, the study applies the euphemism theory proposed by Allan and Burrige (2006) to identify and categorise euphemistic expressions in the speech.

3.3. Sample (Data Selection)

The sample for this study consists of a single political speech, namely Donald Trump's 2026 State of the Union Address. Additionally, this speech was chosen for its political significance, broad audience reach, and role in shaping national and international discourse. As a high-profile presidential address, it provides a rich site for examining how language is strategically used to construct political narratives and influence public perception.

4. Data Analysis Procedure

The data is analysed using a qualitative critical discourse analysis framework (Fairclough's 3D model), supported by euphemism theory as outlined by Allan and Burrige (2006). The analysis was conducted systematically through the following steps:

- The researcher first carefully read and re-read the official transcript of Donald Trump's State of the Union Address 2026 several times to gain a comprehensive understanding of the overall discourse, political themes, and linguistic patterns used throughout the speech.
- During repeated readings, the researcher identified words, phrases, and expressions that appeared to function euphemistically, particularly those used to soften negative realities, obscure controversial issues, mitigate criticism, or construct positive political representations.
- The identified euphemistic expressions were then highlighted, extracted, and categorized according to Allan and Burrige's (2006).

After categorization, the selected excerpts were analyzed through Fairclough's three-dimensional framework:

- Textual analysis,
- Discursive practice,
- Social practice.

At the textual level, the researcher examined lexical choices, repetition, metaphorical expressions, semantic prosody, evaluative language, and rhetorical structures. At the discursive practice level, the analysis focused on how euphemistic expressions shaped audience interpretation, framed political realities, and constructed persuasive meanings within the speech. At the level of social practice, the study interpreted how euphemistic language reflected broader ideological structures, power relations, nationalism, political authority, and hegemonic discourse within contemporary political communication. Finally, the findings were critically interpreted to explain how euphemistic language functioned strategically to construct political narratives and influence public perceptions.

5. Findings

5.1. State of the Union address (2026)

5.1.1. Excerpt 1

“Our nation is back: bigger, better, richer, and stronger than ever before.”

At the textual level, the words viz., “bigger, better, richer, and stronger” employ highly evaluative lexis that constructs a strong semantic prosody of progress and success. This represents a positive euphemism, which, according to Keith Allan and Kate Burridge, functions as a form of semantic elevation, reframing potentially negative or neutral realities in a more favorable light. Discursively, this lexical framing guides the audience toward a preferred interpretation of national recovery by foregrounding improvement while suppressing reference to prior failures. At the level of social practice, this contributes to the construction of a national revival narrative that ideologically legitimises political authority and naturalises leadership success, thereby reinforcing power relations. In Fairclough’s terms, such discourse naturalises subjective political claims as objective reality, thereby reinforcing power relations.

5.1.2. Excerpt 2

“This July 4th, we will mark two and a half centuries of liberty and triumph, progress and freedom in the most incredible and exceptional nation ever to exist on the face of the earth.”

At the textual level, words such as “liberty,” “triumph,” “progress,” and “freedom” function as ideologically loaded lexical choices, constructing a selective and idealized representation of history. From the perspective of Keith Allan and Kate Burridge, this reflects a positive, ideological euphemism, in which socially acceptable and glorified expressions replace complex and potentially problematic historical realities. At the discursive level, this framing encourages audiences to interpret history through a celebratory lens while omitting conflict and inequality. Ideologically, it reinforces national exceptionalism, demonstrating how euphemistic language sustains dominant narratives

and hegemonic ideologies. In Fairclough's terms, such discourse naturalises subjective political claims as objective reality, thereby reinforcing power relations.

5.1.3. Excerpt 3

“And we’ve seen nothing yet.”

At the textual level, the phrase “nothing yet” operates as an indirect (vague) euphemism, which aligns with Keith Allan and Kate Burridge's notion that euphemisms often function through indirection and avoidance to manage sensitive or uncertain information. Linguistically, it reflects strategic vagueness and indeterminacy. Discursively, this ambiguity allows the audience to project positive expectations without requiring concrete evidence. At the ideological level, such vagueness functions as a persuasive strategy that maintains political flexibility while reinforcing optimism and sustaining authority.

5.1.4. Excerpt 4

“We’re going to do better and better and better.”

At the textual level, the repetition of “better” functions as a strengthening strategy, reinforcing a semantic field of improvement. This represents a positive euphemism, in which, as Keith Allan and Kate Burridge note, language is used to enhance and elevate perception rather than to provide precise information. Discursively, the repetition embeds the idea of continuous progress, strengthening persuasion. At the social level, this contributes to the ideological construction of effective leadership while obscuring measurable realities, thereby reinforcing belief in ongoing success.

5.1.5. Excerpt 5

“This is the golden age of America.”

The metaphor “golden age” functions as a highly evaluative euphemism, reflecting the concept of metaphorical euphemism described by Keith Allan and Kate Burridge, in which figurative language is used to soften or idealise reality. At the textual level, it simplifies complex socio-political conditions into a single positive image. Discursively, it encourages an uncritical interpretation of the present as historically exceptional. Ideologically, this metaphor legitimises political leadership by constructing a hegemonic narrative of prosperity while masking structural challenges.

5.1.6. Excerpt 6

“When I spoke in this chamber 12 months ago, I had just inherited a nation in crisis, with a stagnant economy, inflation at record levels, a wide-open border, horrendous recruitment for military and police, rampant crime at home, and wars and chaos all over the world.”

The verb “inherited” functions as a mitigating euphemism, which aligns with Keith Allan and Kate Burridge's view that euphemisms are used to soften responsibility and reduce direct attribution of blame. At the textual level, the term suppresses agency by

avoiding explicit identification of those responsible for the “crisis.” The accompanying lexical items, such as “stagnant economy,” “wide-open border,” and “rampant crime”, construct a strongly negative semantic field; however, the use of “inherited” reframes these conditions as pre-existing rather than caused. Discursively, this guides the audience to attribute failure to previous administrations without overt accusation. At the level of social practice, this contributes to a broader ideological strategy of self-legitimation, in which the current leadership is positioned as corrective and competent. At the same time, past governance is implicitly delegitimised, thereby reinforcing power relations.

5.1.7. Excerpt 7

“But tonight, after just one year, I can say with dignity and pride that we have achieved a transformation like no one has ever seen before and a turnaround for the ages.”

The terms “transformation” and “turnaround” function as strategic euphemisms, reflecting what Keith Allan and Kate Burridge describe as reframing mechanisms, in which language reshapes perception rather than directly representing measurable reality. At the textual level, these abstract nouns lack specificity, allowing semantic flexibility and avoiding concrete evaluation. Discursively, this framing constructs a narrative of dramatic success and encourages the audience to interpret political developments as exceptional achievements. The phrase “for the ages” further intensifies this effect through hyperbolic evaluation. Ideologically, this discourse contributes to the construction of a hegemonic success narrative, legitimising leadership and masking potential complexities or shortcomings, thereby reinforcing authority.

5.1.8. Excerpt 8

“It is, indeed, a turnaround for the ages.”

The repetition of “turnaround” functions as discursive reinforcement, strengthening the previously established euphemistic framing. According to Keith Allan and Kate Burridge, repetition can stabilise euphemistic meaning and normalise a particular interpretation. At the textual level, the adverb “indeed” adds emphasis, reinforcing certainty. Discursively, this repetition reduces interpretive ambiguity and consolidates a singular narrative of success. At the ideological level, such reinforcement contributes to the normalisation of political achievement, limiting alternative or critical interpretations and sustaining dominant discourse.

5.1.9. Excerpt 9

“And we will never go back to where we were just a very short time ago.”

The phrase “where we were” represents an indirect (vague) euphemism, which aligns with Keith Allan and Kate Burridge’s notion that euphemisms often function through indirection and referential ambiguity. At the textual level, the absence of explicit description allows the speaker to evoke a negative past without defining it. Discursively,

this vagueness invites the audience to construct their own interpretation of past failure, increasing persuasive effectiveness. At the social level, this creates a binary opposition between a negatively implied past and a positively constructed present, reinforcing a narrative of progress while avoiding accountability and critical scrutiny.

5.1.10. Excerpt 10

“We’re not going back.”

This statement represents an extreme form of euphemistic abstraction, in which complex socio-political realities are reduced to a simple, emotionally charged binary. According to Keith Allan and Kate Burridge, such abstraction is a common euphemistic strategy for avoiding direct engagement with sensitive or controversial issues. At the textual level, the brevity and lack of detail enhance memorability and rhetorical force. Discursively, it produces a strong, unified message that is easily accepted by audiences. Ideologically, this simplification reinforces a forward-looking narrative while discouraging critical reflection on past or present realities, thereby sustaining political authority.

5.1.11. Excerpt 11

“...the most incredible and exceptional nation ever to exist on the face of the earth.”

The adjectives “incredible” and “exceptional” function as ideological euphemisms, reflecting positive semantic elevation as described by Keith Allan and Kate Burridge. At the textual level, these evaluative terms construct a strong semantic prosody of superiority. Discursively, they guide the audience toward an uncritical acceptance of national dominance and greatness. At the ideological level, this reinforces nationalist ideology, positioning the nation as inherently superior while marginalising alternative perspectives. In CDA terms, such discourse contributes to the reproduction of hegemonic power structures by naturalising dominance as an unquestioned reality.

6. Discussions

The findings reveal that euphemistic language functions as a strategic discursive device in Donald Trump’s 2026 State of the Union Address. Euphemisms are used to construct positive political narratives, reduce criticism, and reinforce ideological authority. Using Fairclough’s three-dimensional model and Allan and Burridge’s theory of euphemism, the study shows that euphemistic expressions operate not only at the linguistic level but also within wider social and ideological contexts. The findings support Norman Fairclough’s view that political discourse is closely linked to ideology and power. Expressions mentioned, for instance, “golden age,” “turnaround for the ages,” and “bigger, better, richer, and stronger”, create an idealized national image while limiting alternative interpretations. Similarly, Ruth Wodak and Michael Meyer argue that political language often presents subjective claims as objective truths. The study also supports the argument

of Keith Allan and Kate Burridge that euphemisms function as tools of concealment and mitigation. For example, the word “inherited” shifts responsibility for national problems to previous administrations, while vague expressions such as “we’re not going back” avoid direct political detail. These findings are consistent with the work of Emilio Crespo-Fernandez, who highlights the persuasive role of euphemisms in political discourse. Overall, the study demonstrates that euphemistic language in political speeches is not merely stylistic but ideological and persuasive. It shapes audience perception, strengthens political legitimacy, and reinforces existing power structures.

7. Conclusion

This study demonstrated that euphemistic language is a central and systematic feature of contemporary political discourse, particularly in high-profile presidential speeches. Analysis of Donald Trump’s 2026 State of the Union Address reveals that euphemisms are not merely stylistic devices but strategic linguistic tools operating across multiple levels of discourse. By integrating Fairclough’s three-dimensional model with Allan and Burridge’s euphemism theory, the study shows how euphemistic expressions are linguistically realised through lexical and phrasal choices, discursively interpreted to shape audience perception, and socially embedded within broader ideological and power structures. The dominance of positive and strategic euphemisms highlights a consistent effort to construct favourable political narratives, legitimise leadership, and obscure potentially negative realities. It also underscores the importance of critical language awareness in interpreting political communication, as seemingly neutral or positive expressions may carry significant ideological implications. Overall, the findings reinforce the view that language plays a crucial role in shaping political reality, influencing public perception, and sustaining power relations in contemporary society.

8. Recommendations

Based on the findings, several recommendations are proposed.

- Future research should analyse euphemistic language across multiple political speeches and time periods to provide a broader and more comparative understanding of its use.
- Cross-cultural studies are also recommended to examine how euphemistic strategies vary across different political and socio-cultural contexts.
- Additionally, integrating corpus-based methods with Critical Discourse Analysis could enhance the empirical depth of future studies. Researchers are further encouraged to apply alternative CDA frameworks, such as Teun A. van Dijk’s socio-cognitive model, to explore the relationship among language, cognition, and ideology.

- Finally, promoting critical language awareness in education and media practice is essential to enable audiences to interpret political discourse more critically and effectively.

References

- Allahverdiyeva, V. A. F. A. (2023). Innovative, productive method of teaching foreign languages to international students. *Multidisciplinary Science Journal. Malque Publishing*, 5, 2023029-2023029.
- Allan, K., & Burrige, K. (2006). *Forbidden words: Taboo and the censoring of language*. Cambridge University Press.
- Allan, K., & Burrige, K. (2020). *Forbidden words: Taboo and the censoring of language* (2nd Ed.). Cambridge University Press.
- Breeze, R. (2021). Euphemism and political discourse: A critical perspective. *Journal of Language and Politics*, 20(4), 489–505.
- Chilton, P. (2004). *Analysing political discourse: Theory and practice*. Routledge.
- Crespo-Fernández, E. (2014). Euphemisms and political discourse in the British regional press. *Brno Studies in English*, 40(1), 5–26. <https://doi.org/10.5817/BSE2014-1-1>
- Crespo-Fernández, E. (2021). Euphemism and political discourse: A pragmatic approach to language manipulation. *Journal of Language and Politics*, 20(3), 412–430.
- Fairclough, N. (2015). *Language and power* (3rd Ed.). Routledge.
- Fairclough, N. (2021). *Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language* (2nd Ed.). Routledge.
- Gulati, P., & Yadav, G. (2024). *Language: The First Identity* [Preprint]. Researchgate. <https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.13264.93440>
- Hart, C. (2014). *Discourse, grammar and ideology: Functional and cognitive perspectives*. Bloomsbury.
- Hart, C. (2022). *Critical discourse analysis and cognitive science: New perspectives on political discourse*. Cambridge University Press
- Narimanova, L. (2025). A comparative analysis of euphemisms in U.S. and Russian political discourse. *Comparative Political Linguistics Review*, 7(2), 134–150.
- Jaganegara, H., & Wijana, I. D. P. (2023). Euphemism serves as a disguise tool in political texts: A case study of Tempo online political articles. *SULUK: Journal Bahasa, Sastra, dan Budaya*, 5(1), 1-19. <https://doi.org/10.15642/suluk.2023.5.1.1-19>
- Maryam, F., Shahzad, M., & Owais, M. (2026). LANGUAGE, METAPHOR, AND THE CONSTRUCTION OF ECOLOGICAL AND FEMINIST IDENTITY IN THE ISLAND OF THE MISSING TREE. *Journal of Applied Linguistics and TESOL (JALT)*, 9(1), 1698-1710. <https://doi.org/10.63878/jalt2060>

- Narimanova, L. (2025). The role of euphemisms in political discourse: A comparative study of U.S and Russian Politics. *International Scientific Research Journal*, 6(2), 32-35
- Owais, M., Nasim Gul, & Imran, S. (2025). Exploring English Language as a Social Currency in Recent Intermediate English Textbooks of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa: A Critical Discourse Analysis. *Journal of Arts and Linguistics Studies*, 3(4), 7069–7094. <https://doi.org/10.71281/jals.v3i4.587>
- Sharafutdinov, R. (2024). Euphemisms in political discourse: A cognitive and rhetorical perspective. *Journal of Political Linguistics*, 15(2), 85–102.
- Simpson, P. (2024). Political speech and national identity in the twenty-first century. Oxford University Press.
- Sukhanova, A. A., & Filimonova, N. V. (2025). The phenomenon of Euphemism in US political discourse. *Russian Linguistic Bulletin*, (6 (66)). <https://doi.org/10.60797/RULB.2025.66.19>
- Van Leeuwen, T. (2021). Discourse and practice: New tools for critical discourse analysis. Oxford University Press.
- Wodak, R., & Meyer, M. (2016). *Methods of critical discourse studies* (3rd Ed.). Sage.
- Wodak, R., & Meyer, M. (2020). *Methods of critical discourse studies* (4th Ed.). Sage.