Ideological Framing of Gender in The Guardian: A Critical Discourse Analysis of Trump's Two-Gender Policy

Lakht-e-Batool

lakhtebatool05@gmail.com

M. Phil Scholar, Department of English Linguistics and Literature, Riphah International University, Islamabad, Pakistan

Dr. Awais Bin Wasi

awais.wasi@riphah.edu.pk

Assistant Professor, Department, English Linguistics and Literature, Riphah International University, Islamabad, Pakistan

Corresponding Author: * Lakht-e-Batool lakhtebatool05@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

The paper is an investigation of the linguistic and discursive construction of the two-gender policy of Donald Trump in The Guardian with an emphasis on the ideological patterns within the domain of media representation. The study investigates the use of language options and discursive practices that are used to frame the policy and how these strategies influence the perception of gender, identity, and power by people. In particular, it answers two key questions: (1) what linguistic resources do The Guardian apply to create the two-gender policy of Trump, and (2) what discursive strategies and evaluative linguistic choices are involved in the production of ideological meaning. By utilizing a mixed-methodology, the research consists of the combination of a qualitative Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) and quantitative corpus-based frequency analysis to give both micro- and macro-level understanding of media discourse. About 200 articles published in 2017-2020 by the Guardian were collected, processed, and analyzed with the help of AntConc. The Ideological Square developed by van Dijk (1998) is applicable to the qualitative analysis, allowing conducting systematic research on the in-group and out-group constructions, the polarization strategies, and the moral judgments. The lexical frequencies, keywords, collocations, evaluative adjectives, and repetitiveness of semantic patterns are analyzed quantitatively. Results indicate that The Guardian has continuously framed Trump two-gender policy as oppressive, backward, and discriminatory, as well as representing LGBTQ communities and rights activists as ethical, marginalized, and vulnerable. The nomination, predication, intensification, intertextuality, and metaphorical framing are recurrent discursive strategies that make the ideological position polarized and liberal. This research shows that media discourse contributes greatly to the social interpretation of gender policies and there is need to be critical of journalistic discourse. This study will contribute to media linguistics, gender representations studies and political discourse analysis by offering empirical evidence in the interplay of language, ideology and sociopolitical power.

Keywords: CDA; Media Discourse; Gender Policy; Ideology; the Guardian

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.

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.

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.

Objectives of the Study

The present research is guided by the following objectives:

1. To identify and analyze the dominant linguistic and discursive features used by *The Guardian* to represent Donald Trump's two-gender policy

2. To examine the ideological positioning embedded in *The Guardian's* reporting through the analytical lens of van Dijk's Ideological Square

3. To explore how lexical frequency patterns, evaluative language, collocations, and semantic fields contribute to the construction of recurring ideological themes

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?

Purpose of the Study

This research will be aimed at offering a rigorous analysis of the discursive and ideological crafting of the two-gender policy of Trump in The Guardian. The study will examine the power relations, ideological connotation and evaluative constructs behind the reporting through both qualitative Critical Discourse Analysis and quantitative lexical analysis. Through the application of the Ideological Square by van Dijk, the study reveals the focus of the newspaper on the positive qualities of specific parties (e.g., transgender people, progressive stakeholders), and predicts the negative traits of other parties (e.g., conservative policymakers).

Significance of the Study

The study has a lot of contribution to several areas of study. In the case of discourse studies, it shows how ideology is incorporated in the language structures and the reproduction of political messages in the media texts. In the case of the gender studies, it provides information on the linguistic processes by which gender policies are justified or subverted. In the case of media studies, the study identifies the role of The Guardian as an ideological participant in the international discussions of identity politics. The results are

also relevant to the political communication researchers who study the process of how the newspapers are able to influence the narratives of the citizens of human rights and policy making.

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.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The current section offers the theoretical and empirical basis of the work by reviewing the theoretical traditions of thought and concepts and analysis tools associated with comprehending how the media houses linguistically and ideologically create political choices pertaining to gender identity. The five areas that are interrelated and form the outline of the discussion are the Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA), the Ideological Square developed by van Dijk, media coverage of gender policies, the media coverage of Donald Trump, and the importance of the lexical frequency analysis in the study of discourse.

Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA)

Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) is an interdisciplinary method of research that is interested in the correlation between language, power and ideology. CDA, as it is based on the contributions of other scholars like Fairclough (1995), Wodak (2011), and van Dijk (2008), does not understand discourse as a linguistic product only, but as a social practice that is deeply rooted in bigger frameworks of domination and inequality. It highlights that discourse is part of constructing, legitimizing and reproducing social ideologies, particularly in situations where there is a political or socio-cultural struggle.

One of the fundamental ideas of CDA is that there is no neutral linguistic choice. These are purposefully chosen in order to highlight some meanings and hide others to define how the events, policies, and social actors will be perceived by the population (Fairclough, 2015). Discourse creates ideological narratives, which disrupt the world perceptions of readers, through selection of lexical choice, patterns of transitivity, modality, presupposition, framing and metaphor. CDA is thus an effective method of detecting down toned meanings and ideological prejudices in writing.

Media discourse is one of the most notable locations of CDA studies since the newspapers are institutions of symbolic power (Fowler, 1991). Van Dijk (1995) observes that media houses also play an important role in giving voice to some forms of ideology, sidelining others and fashioning political events in ways that align with particular political orientations. The analysis of the coverage of The Guardian in relation to Trump two-gender policy by CDA, can be conducted to perform a systematic investigation into the effects of the linguistic characteristics of the formation of ideological meaning in terms of the discourse of the masses.

Van Dijk's Ideological Square

Teun A. van Dijk's Ideological Square (1998) is a central analytical framework for understanding how discourse organizes social representations of in-groups and out-groups. According to van Dijk, ideological discourse often operates according to four basic principles:

1. Emphasize the positive attributes of the in-group

2. Emphasize the negative attributes of the out-group

3. De-emphasize the negative attributes of the in-group

4. De-emphasize the positive attributes of the out-group

These ideals create a pattern of inclusion and exclusion that are systematic and discourse validates particular positions and undermines others. The choice of lexical words, metaphors, attributions, quotations and narrative forms make a foundational contribution towards creating this ideological polarization.

The Ideological Square is popular among the political discourse studies. It has been shown to be the foundation of media portrayals of migrants (Taylor, 2019), political leaders (Cap, 2017), religious minorities (Richardson, 2004), and controversial policies. It is especially well adapted to polarization and is thus very useful in the analysis of news reports about the two-gender policy of Trump, which in its turn, created polarized political discourses. Using this framework, the current research paper determines the way Trump, his administration, transgender communities, and overall ideological groups are constructed in The Guardian by means of evaluative language and discursive strategies.

Media Representation of Gender Policies

The ways in which gender identity and gender-related policies are portrayed in the media has become a major field of modern studies. Many researchers highlight that media discourse does not objectively report on gender matters but interprets them in terms of ideology that is indicative of the general values of culture (Billard, 2019). To illustrate, it has been demonstrated that conservative sources are more likely to frame transgender rights as a threat to the traditional norm, and liberal sources are more likely to frame it as the issue of justice and inclusion (Lewis, 2020).

Ideological framing is most prone to gender policies such as legal recognition, health care, education, and military privileges. According to Knight (2021), newspapers are often dependent on evaluative adjectives, problem-solution frames, and moral positioning to build debates about gender identity. On the same note, Zott and Nielson (2020) show that the policies related to transgender representatives are usually presented as protection or contracting, depending on the political viewpoint of the news outlet.

The Guardian has always been described as a liberal source that promotes progressive gender policies (Allcott & Gentzkow, 2017). Consequently, its expression of the two-gender policy of Trump will be likely to portray the ideological adherence to human rights and gender inclusivity. It is then essential to look at the issues of linguistic framing, lexical assessment, emphasis in the narrative, and discursive methodological strategies in the construction of the debate.

Representation of Donald Trump in Media

The presidency of Donald Trump (2017-2021) produced an amount of academic literature on media representation, partly because of his aggressive political action and divisive policies. It has been found that the negative evaluative language, irony, and metaphor are the tools used in highlighting controversy, unpredictability, or authoritarian tendencies in portraying Trump by media in the West (Ott and Dickinson, 2019). Linguistic markers like marked lexical choice, loaded description, and strategic foregrounding, even in so-called neutral reporting, bring about polarized representations.

Researchers like Ross and Rivers (2018) have shown that Trump is often portrayed as an unstable character, especially among liberal press. In the meantime, the conservative media are inclined to represent him as a defender of national identity or traditional values (Mercieca, 2020). This polarization represents more widespread ideological divisions in the media arena.

Trump is commonly portrayed as imposing restrictive or exclusionary policies in the case of gender-related policies. Discrimination, regression, and moral conflict are some of the themes highlighted through newspaper reports (Johnson, 2021). Thus, the discussion of the presentation of two-gender policy by The Guardian should focus on linguistic framing and ideological positioning because these aspects are the core of media coverage on his administration.

Lexical Frequency in Discourse Studies

The Lexical frequency analysis despite being quantitative in nature has proved to be a useful complement to qualitative CDA. Baker (2006) and Gabrielatos (2018) suggest that verbal frequency, collocations and lexical clusters allow a researcher to observe the prevalent themes, motifs of discourse and ideological predisposition of a corpus. Such quantitative results enhance the interpreting ability of qualitative discourse analysis through offering empirical proof of frequent language propensies.

The frequency analysis allows pointing out what lexical items are emphasized, the frequency of the use of the evaluative adjectives, the repetition of metaphors, and the prevalence of semantic fields in the discourse. These trends mirror the misgivings of discourse and ideological representationsFor instance, repeated use of words such as "ban," "restrict," "deny," or "challenge" may indicate negative framing of a policy, while words like "rights," "identity," or "protection" may signal a rights-based orientation.

Within this study, lexical frequency analysis assists in identifying key lexical patterns in The Guardian's coverage of Trump's two-gender policy, thereby supporting the CDA interpretation of ideological framing, actor representation, and narrative emphasis.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This subtopic details methods of procedure that will be used in the current research. It describes the general research design, data selection and collection, analytical frameworks to be used, and the coding process as well as the ethical concern that informed the research. The methodology has been made in such way that the analysis of media discourse is both systematic, rigorous and replicable.

Research Design

The current research takes a mixed-methods research design combining Qualitative Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) and quantitative lexical frequency analysis. The qualitative aspect entails a descriptive, interpretive analysis of the processes through which ideological meanings are created, justified or opposed in media texts. On the contrary, the quantitative part provides verifiable linguistic patterns that will be used to affirm the qualitative results.

The two methods present each other, as, on the one hand, CDA reveals more advanced ideological constructs of discourse, on the other hand, quantitative analysis reveals recurring lexical dispositions, frequency correlations, and evaluative decisions that give the discourse a stronger impression. Such a combination guarantees a multi-layered, balanced, and extensive analysis of the chosen texts in the media.

Data Source and Sampling

Data used in this study will be news articles in The Guardian article, one of the most read international newspapers with widespread political coverage. The selection of articles was done with a specific purpose, namely, the study examines the presentation of the gender-related political discourse, especially in regards to the discussions of the policy, identity, and rights.

The search keywords that were used in the sampling process included: Trump gender policy, transgender rights, gender legislation, and gender identity debates. The problem of these keywords was to find the articles that would specifically recommend political issues concerning gender in reference to the research interests. Only those articles that were published in English and had full-text were taken into account.

The articles to be incorporated in the study will be either opinionated, descriptive, or report-based accounts about the gender-related policies, which will guarantee the sample, end up with a wide variety of discursive practices. Articles which failed to include substantive commentary on gender, or whose only focus was on lifestyle, entertainment, and irrelevant political commentary were filtered out. In the process, the study is expected to gather a set of data in the form of a corpus of about 200 articles; this is adequate to both carry out a qualitative CDA and quantitative lexical analysis.

Data Collection Procedure

Data gathering process had a number of steps that were systematic. To begin with, all the chosen articles were accessed via the online archive on The Guardian. After the relevancy was established, the article was downloaded as a full-text version. The texts were then made in.txt format so as to be compatible with linguistic analysis tools.

The articles were converted and then they were arranged into a digital corpus with much care. Metadata including the date of publication, article title, and URL origin was applied to each text to ensure transparency and to allow the traceability of the text when conducting analysis. The resulting corpus was made ready to feed into other linguistic software tools like the AntConc. This was done by formatting verification, unnecessary symbols were removed, and the text structure was also made as uniform as possible to prevent analytical discrepancies.

Analytical Framework

The analysis utilizes a two-layered analytical perspective, that is, the Critical Discourse Analysis and frequency-based linguistic analysis.

Qualitative element will be informed by the Ideological Square proposed by van Dijk that gives a systematic approach to the discussion of in-groups and out-groups construction in media discourse. The strategies, which are the emphasis of the positive traits of the in-group and the de-emphasis of the negative ones, and at the same time, the focus on negative traits of the out-group and the minimization of positive ones are placed in this framework. The paper also looks at actor descriptions, ideological polarization, lexical selection, presuppositions as well as implicit meanings that are implicitly enshrined in the texts in this view. These aspects serve to express the fact that ideological power relations and social attitudes are encoded in language.

The quantitative element is a frequency analysis of the lexicon with the use of AntConc. This review looks at rates of particular lexical terms, keyword rates, collocations, evaluative adjectives, metaphorical phrases,

and repetitive semantic groups. The quantitative analysis, determining the lexical patterns that run through all of the corpus, supports the qualitative results and points out the implicit evaluating tendencies of the discourse. Collectively, the two structures allow a holistic perception of the manner in which language is employed strategically to create political discourses about gender.

Coding Scheme

Coding was done in a systematic and multi-stage process. The articles were first read with a close reading to identify the same ideological, evaluative and structural patterns. According to the model created by van Dijk, the coding was aimed at determining the instances of positive and negative presentation of various social groups, and special emphasis was put on the Us vs. Them constructions.

Additional coding categories were evaluative language (adjectives, adverbs applied to show approval or disapproval), discursive strategies (nomination (how actors are called), predication (how actors are explained), Metaphor use, modality expressions and the existence of implicit meanings and assumptions. Articles were coded manually and recurring patterns were compared within the corpus of articles to make a consistency and thematic coherence.

The reliability of coding was ensured through the repetition of the texts and the comparison of the coded portions with the theoretical constructs of CDA and frequency analysis. This made the interpretation sound and grounded, systematic, and scholarly.

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.

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.

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.

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.

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 commonplaced, 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.

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.

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 predicational 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 1**.

Table 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

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 2**.

Table 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

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.

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.

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.

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.

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.

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.

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.

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.

Recommendations for Future Research

Although this study offers valuable information about the linguistic and ideological formation process of the two-gender policy by Trump, there are still a number of ways to improve the research stream. To examine the effects of ideological orientation on framing the same policy, first, comparative research could be conducted on the conservative newspapers, including The Daily Telegraph or The Sun, to see how these two sources address the same policy. Such studies may enlighten the divergent stories and show how much of a polarization of media takes place in gender policy coverage.

Second, it would be possible to consider social media discourse in future research, i.e., Twitter, Facebook, or comment sections on the internet, to get a participatory and interactive component of gender policy discourse. The analyses of social media can help to understand the role of language, memes, hashtags, and user-generated content in the production and distribution of ideological discourses and the formation of popular opinion.

Third, the study of audience reception will offer important information about the manner in which media consumers perceive and react to ideological framing. The surveys/focus groups/experimental designs would determine whether the readers internalize, resist, or critically analyze the moral and political stances that are put across in the media.

Lastly, increasing the time frame of the study to policy discussions prior to, during, and following the Trump administration would perhaps shed some light on how media representation and focus on ideology changes longitudinally, which would further add to the discourse analysis in political and gender studies.

This part summarizes that the reporting of the two-gender policy by Trump by The Guardian is an example of the media discourse being a reflection and a producer of an ideology. Moral polarization of the newspaper, by selective use of lexical and discursive strategies, is built in a way that the newspaper anticipates progressive values and presents the opposition as retrogressive. The research supports the significance of critical media literacy and proves that the systematic study of language may highlight the mechanisms of ideology that form the vision of disputable social problems in the masses.

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'sa 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.