SEMANTIC PREFERENCE AND SEMANTIC PROSODY OF THE COLLOCATION OF IRAN IN TRUMP'S SOCIAL MEDIA

Ahmad Suhaili,[1]* Frans Sayogie,[2] Ashabul Kahfi Susanto [3]

[1] Sekolah Tinggi Ilmu Tarbiyah Al-Khairiyah, Banten, Indonesia
[2] Universitas Islam Negeri Syarif Hidayatullah, Jakarta, Indonesia
[3] University of Aberdeen, Scotland, United Kingdom

*Corresponding author: frans.sayogie@uinjkt.ac.id

ABSTRACT

The relationship between the United States and Iran has long been marked by tensions, particularly over nuclear issues, economic sanctions, and regional conflicts. Under the Trump administration, these tensions escalated further, especially after the U.S. withdrew from the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action (JCPOA) in 2018. Trump's rhetoric on social media reflected his administration's hardline stance toward Iran, making it a critical subject of linguistic analysis. The study aimed to investigate the semantic preference and semantic prosody of the collocation of Iran in Trump's social media. This research focuses on a corpus-based study of Trump's social media posts, compiled exclusively from those made during his presidency, from January 2017 to January 2021. The corpus dataset of @realdonaldtrump was taken from the trumptweetarchiever.com site, official Facebook and Instagram accounts from January 2017 to January 2021, which were collected in the form of a text compilation with the date containing all tweets and posts related to the country of Iran, then what are the lexicogrammatical elements that accompany it, as well as semantic categories involved in the collocation of these words. Considering the results of the MI (mutual information) score, the single keyword Iran in Trump's social media corpus tends to be associated with collocations related to the issue of economic sanctions, namely the nuclear deal. The results indicated that the keyword Iran carries a predominantly negative semantic preference, although not all keywords associated with Iran hold a positive meaning upon evaluating the concordance. The study concluded that Trump tends to portray the word Iran in a negative light.

Keywords: collocation, corpus-based, Iran, semantic preference, semantic prosody, Trump

INTRODUCTION

The development of social interaction in communicating both verbally and visually has shifted to advances in internet technology based on social media sites. Media as a global information gateway has experienced a very significant shift towards participatory internet media. Unlike traditional media, recent internet advancements, particularly Web 2.0, have allowed (to some extent) a more unrestricted environment for all users to communicate,

participate, and engage in cyberspace via what is known as social media. Web 2.0 refers to a set of technologies that are closely linked with the concept. These include blogs, wikis, podcasts, RSS feeds, and more. These tools enable a more socially connected web where anyone can contribute to and modify information spaces (Thi et al., 2020).

As social media fosters an interactive digital space, it also plays a crucial role in shaping online community engagement. The growing influence of these platforms has given rise to vast digital networks where individuals connect to exchange ideas, share experiences, and collaborate in complex virtual environments. This heightened interactivity has transformed not only social interactions but also business practices and political discourse, fundamentally redefining how people engage in the digital age (Bowman & Willis, 2003). The ability of social media to amplify voices and mobilize communities underscores its role as a pivotal force in contemporary digital engagement (Kozinets V, 2013)

In comparison to mainstream media outlets such as magazines or newspapers, where particular groups pick and display content, social media has succeeded in gaining the attention of millions of users while also affecting individuals and society. With the decreasing popularity of traditional media (newspapers and television broadcasts) and the increased usage of the internet, the social media space is becoming a communication trend (Himelboim et al., 2012). People can join groups that interest them, connect with political candidates, and discuss political issues with other people. The digital revolution has dramatically increased opportunities for citizens to participate in political discussions and civic engagement (Himelboim et al., 2012). Research suggests that despite the seemingly impersonal nature of social media interactions, one's involvement in face-to-face political discussions can be a reliable indicator of their willingness to engage in online political activities. Although traditional media outlets like television and print newspapers remain primary news sources, social networking platforms have emerged as increasingly vital channels for accessing and sharing political information (Enli, 2017).

Social media has provided many opportunities for people to articulate, develop, share, and amplify their views, thoughts, ideologies, and even their daily routine activities, mainly through text or speech; studying discourse analysis on this language interaction seems necessary and most relevant. The more people are familiar with social media, the less vulnerable they are to being misled by irresponsible authorities. As today's society experiences different ways of language interaction, the role and influence of social media are undeniable and need to be analyzed. The study of social media texts has led linguists to believe that these are a kind of social action and lead to the processing of social issues. If the lexicon of social media texts is appropriately chosen, they can have a significant effect on the decisions of followers and lead to the formation of ideological groups. Houston et.al (2015) believe strongly that social media can shape social action and guide society in specific directions.

Some of the social media that have the most active users in the world are Facebook, Instagram, and Twitter. Many people in various countries use

the platform to communicate or get information. On the other hand, what is most remembered for how social media has become a new medium for interaction between leaders and their people in cyberspace is the figure of Trump. It is worth mentioning that Trump has very successful private media. Currently, Trump has 30 million Twitter fans (Department, 2021). He also communicates with followers on social media channels such as Facebook, YouTube, Instagram, and Periscope. Trump accepts interviews ranging from serious news to comedic shows, and he frequently refreshes his Twitter material, ensuring that Trump remains the center of world media interest. As the President of the United States of America, he has been at the top of the scale of international leaders in terms of following   Clarke   and Grieve (2019) examined the diverse linguistic patterns employed in Trump's social media communications. Their analysis provided comprehensive insights into the stylistic variations found in Trump's Twitter posts by examining grammatical patterns across tweets spanning from 2009 to 2018. Their findings revealed four distinct communication styles, each characterized by specific discourse levels: conversational, campaign-oriented, engagement-focused, and advisory. Their investigation traced the evolution of these communication styles over time, with particular attention to the campaign period. The study demonstrated that Trump and his team strategically adapted their tweeting styles based on their communication objectives. Drawing from these observations, the researchers developed several theories regarding the Trump campaign's strategic use of social media during the 2016 presidential election.

Semantic prosody and semantic preference are crucial concepts in corpus linguistics that help reveal hidden meanings and attitudes in language use. Semantic prosody refers to the consistent aura of meaning that a word carries due to its frequent associations with particular collocates (Louw & Milojkovic, 2016). while semantic preference describes the tendency of words to co-occur with other words from certain semantic fields (Stubbs, 2001b)

Previous research on the representation of Iran in media discourse has provided valuable insights into how the country is portrayed in online news. A significant study by Esmaili and Khaghaninejad (2018) conducted a corpus-based analysis of the word *Iran* using the News on the Web (NOW) corpus. Through an examination of collocational patterns and their categorization, their findings revealed that "Iran" was predominantly associated with themes of conflict, violence, and regional threats in the Middle East. Their corpus linguistic approach demonstrated how language patterns in news media contribute to constructing specific representations of Iran in international discourse, making their study particularly relevant to understanding how Iran is framed in various forms of media communication.

Another study that implemented corpus-based linguistic analysis is (Hardiman & Mada, 2023); the study examined a lemma of "sustainable" using semantic prosody and semantic preference framework in the largest corpora of News on the Web (NOW). The study found that the word *sustainable is* associated with a positive meaning, such as environmental issues and financial, but another negative meaning is closely related to development issues.

Although several studies have analyzed Trump's social media language style and corpus usage in discourse analysis, there is still a significant research gap. Clarke and Grieve (2019) focused on general linguistic variation in Trump's tweets, while Hardiman and Mada (2023) analyzed the word "sustainable" in a news corpus. However, no study has specifically investigated the semantic and prosodic meanings of the collocation of the word "Iran" in the context of Trump's social media. This study aims to fill this gap by using a corpus-assisted critical discourse analysis approach to uncover the semantic and prosodic preferences of the collocation "Iran" in Trump's social media posts. This study also aims to provide new insights into Trump's language use regarding Iran. Additionally, it will enhance our understanding of how political leaders utilize social media to frame international issues and potentially influence public opinion, and to elevate the representation of a country that has been marginalized by Trump, with the intent of addressing discourses constructed around the fear of *Iran* and exploring its potential impact on various audiences.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Collocation, Semantic Prosody, and Semantic Preference

The term collocation was first introduced by Firth (1964), who became known as the father of collocation (McEnery & Hardie, 2011). According to Firth (1964), collocations are considered actual words that often occur together and belong to one part of the meaning. Firth (1964) explained that the meaning of collocation is at the syntagmatic level; for example, the meaning of the word night is the ability to be used together with the word dark and vice versa; the word dark, of course, collocations with the word night (McEnery & Hardie, 2011). The meaning seen from collocation becomes a syntagmatic phenomenon. This means that collocations must be analyzed at the next level.

The term node is used for words that represent the research focus or keywords in a survey. Therefore, the choice of nodes and collocations depends on the research subject. The relationship between nodes and collocations is flexible and interchangeable. To illustrate, when a researcher designates word A as their primary focus of investigation, A serves as the node while its associated term, word B, functions as a collocation. This relationship can be reversed - when word B becomes the primary subject of study, it assumes the role of the node while word A shifts to becoming a collocation. In this analysis framework, the term "span" describes the number of vocabulary items that appear on either side of the designated node (Stubbs, 2001a). In this study, the semantic set resulting from determining the semantic priority of node terms identifies the contexts or main subjects with which node terms tend to be associated with *Iran* in Trump's social media compilation text.

Collocation has information that can be collected and used to determine semantic preferences. Partington (1998) explained that semantic preferences are closely related to collocation. You can think of it as a "collocation feature." Semantic preference occurs when a lexical item is frequently collocated with multiple items within a particular semantic set. It

relates the focus analysis, node words, to different members of a specific semantic set. Partington argued that semantic preferences strongly stem from node collocation (Partington, 1998). In examining semantic preferences, Stubbs (2001) extends this understanding by emphasizing that these relationships transcend simple word-to-word connections. Instead, they encompass broader associations between lemmas or word forms and groups of semantically connected terms. This can be understood as a linguistic phenomenon where collocating words share common semantic traits. To demonstrate this concept, Stubbs (2001) analyzed the word "large" within his extensive 200-million-word corpus. His findings revealed that 25% of the 56,145 instances of this word showed associations with terms from related semantic categories, particularly those expressing quantity, size, scale, portions, amounts, and measurements.

The concept of semantic preferences describes the connections between words and word groups that share semantic features and thus possess related meanings (Al-Hamzi et al., 2020). An analysis of the British National Corpus demonstrates this phenomenon through the word "raise," which frequently occurs alongside terms related to economic and employment contexts, such as income, prices, wages, earnings, and unemployment (Baker et al., 2006). This pattern was further illustrated in Stewart's (2010) research examining the verb "break out" within the same corpus. The study identified 1,126 instances where this verb collocated with terms like war, conflict, infection, and crisis, demonstrating a clear semantic preference for contexts involving conflict, disease, or problematic situations.

In addition to collocation, McEnery (2012) revealed that by using the concordance approach, a pretty important concept emerged, namely semantic prosody. The concept of semantic prosody was first introduced by Louw (1993), and others later developed and varied it. Stubbs (2001) calls this concept discourse prosody, which is a concept rooted in *neo-Firthian* concordance-based collocation analysis. In traditional semantics, this concept is related to connotation. Stubbs (2001) states that words or phrases can be said to have negative, positive, or neutral connotations if they appear together with units that have negative, positive or neither (neutral) meanings. For example, the word "happen" has more negative connotations than positive ones because subjects with negative connotations often appear compared to subjects with positive connotations.

In the linguistic corpus paradigm, semantic prosody is different from the traditional concept of connotation, which relies more on choice to determine the connotation of a word. Semantic prosody can only be modified by using concordance analysis (Louw, 1993). However, Odlin and Sinclair (1994) argue that semantic prosody does not only evaluate words with positive, negative, or neutral meanings but can go deeper than that. To distinguish semantic prosody and semantic preferences, Odlin and Sinclair (1994) provide an example by analyzing phrases with the naked eye.

METHOD

The research employs a corpus-based linguistic analysis approach, utilizing descriptive statistics such as frequency numbers and MI (Mutual Information) scores for qualitative interpretation of the investigated collocates. The data for this study was sourced from The Trump Twitter Archive ([www .thetrumparchive.com](http://www.thetrumparchive.com)) as well as official personal accounts on Facebook and Instagram, which provides a comprehensive collection of tweets posted on Donald Trump's Twitter account when Trump served as president for the first time in 2017-2021. This archive serves as a reliable repository of social media data, enabling systematic analysis of linguistic patterns and variations.

The corpus consists of 358 distinct tweets, alongside a broader collection from Trump's official Facebook and Instagram accounts, amounting to a total of 10,342 tokens. This dataset spans multiple social media platforms, offering a more comprehensive and nuanced view of Donald Trump's digital rhetoric across different online spaces, enabling the study of cross-platform linguistic behaviors.

The research procedure encompasses data extraction from The Trump Twitter Archive, as well as scraping data from the official Facebook and Instagram accounts, followed by preprocessing of content to ensure data consistency. This process continues with the identification and categorization of linguistic patterns, analysis of collocational relationships and semantic preferences, and statistical computation of frequency distributions and MI scores. The analysis follows corpus linguistics methodology, which examines language based on real-life usage patterns, as described by McEnery and Wilson (2001). While modern corpus linguistics benefits from computational tools that emerged with personal computers in the 1990s, the analysis maintains a balance between automated and manual approaches. As Tognini-Bonelli (2001) emphasizes, while sophisticated corpus linguistic tools facilitate rapid data processing, they complement rather than replace human analysis.

The study integrates both quantitative measures of word frequencies and collocational patterns with qualitative interpretations of semantic preferences and contextual meanings. The writers perform manual verification of automated findings to ensure accuracy in understanding contextual nuances and semantic relationships (Tognini-Bonelli, 2001).

In addition to these methods, the study also incorporates the use of AntConc, a software tool designed for corpus analysis. AntConc facilitates the identification of collocational patterns, word frequency distributions, and keyness analysis, enabling a more granular examination of the linguistic features within the dataset. Using AntConc, the study performs a detailed analysis of word frequency, collocational relationships, and semantic preferences within the context of Donald Trump's social media posts across Twitter, Facebook, and Instagram. This tool helps in the extraction of significant patterns and supports the calculation of MI scores, which are instrumental in measuring the strength of word associations within the corpus. Mutual Information (MI) also measures how much information one random variable shares with another. While computational tools facilitated rapid data processing, manual verification ensured a more accurate

interpretation of semantic preferences and semantic prosody, highlighting the broader rhetorical framing of *Iran* in Trump's social media narratives. By integrating both statistical corpus methods and qualitative linguistic analysis, this methodology provides a systematic and data-driven approach to understanding how *Iran* was represented in Trump's digital rhetoric.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS

Collocations of *Iran* in Trump's Social Media

In Trump's social media text, the keyword *Iran* appears, as mentioned in the discussion above, 307 times (complete data is in the attachment). Of the 307 times the word is used and the collocations around the keyword *Iran*, the authors found that there are at least 25 collocates that accompany the appearance of the word *Iran* in Trump's corpus. The 25 collocates will be described below:

Table 1. Table of Significant Collocation Keywords of *Iran* in Trump's Social Media Corpus

Keyword	Collocate Significance	MI Score	Freq
Iran	Deal	4.6	46
	Nuclear	4.1	20
	Sanctions	4.1	13
	United	3.2	12
	President	3.1	12
	Billion	4.4	12
	Country	4.3	10
	Terror	4.2	9
	Syria	4.1	9
	Obama	3.1	8
	Against	3.7	7
	ISIS	3.9	7
	Good	3.7	7
	Terrible	3.9	6
	Korea	4.6	6
	Iraq	3.1	6
	Cash	4.6	6
	Great	2.9	6
	Responsible	3.9	5
	Trade	4.8	5
	Thank	3.7	5
	Killed	3.9	5
	China	5.1	5
	Behavior	4.8	5
	Allowed	4.8	5

As shown in Table 1, the collocate "deal" actually has the highest score in the MI soccer range. Collocate deal (agreement) in the keyword *Iran* appears 46 times. Throughout 2016, the Trump extension until 2021, the spread of social media texts consistently associated the *Iran* deal as terrible. The "deal" was considered the continuation of the life of the Iranian nation due to America's massive investment in the deal. Moreover, this terrible settlement is compared to disturbing Israel's existence in the Middle East:

Figure 1 The Collocate of "deal" in *Iran* keyword

Table 2. Concordance Line of *Iran Deal* (Source: Trump Social Media Official Account)

Example 1	*"Not anymore. The beginning of the end was the* **horrible Iran deal,** *and now this (U.N.)! Stay strong, Israel January 20th is fast approaching!"*
Example 2	*"Iran was on its last legs and ready to collapse until the U.S. came along and gave it a lifeline in the form of* **the Iran Deal: $150 billion."**
Example 3	*"Bob Corker, who helped President Obama give us* **the bad Iran Deal** *& couldn't get elected dog catcher in Tennessee, is now fighting Tax Cuts."*
Example 4	*"Senator Cryin Chuck Schumer fought hard against* **the Bad Iran Deal,** *even going at it with President Obama & then Voted AGAINST it! Now he says I should not have terminated the deal - but he doesn't really believe that! Same with Comey. Thought he was terrible until I fired him!"*
Example 5	*"Hey, Comrade Sanders,* **the Iran Deal** *gave the green light to Iran for* **a nuclear bomb** *in a few years - and BILLIONS to fund terror. Your weakness makes America and the world LESS SAFE!"*

Looking at the concordance line above, the collocate "agreement" that accompanies the keyword *Iran* in the outline becomes an object process of a material transitive verb. Using the simple past tense shows a permanent situation, stating facts and truth. Line 3 draws the "Iran deal," highlighting President Obama's role in it.

In the concordance line above, if we group the collocate "deal" that accompanies the word *Iran*, it falls into the category of economic semantics. In the context of its use (as shown in examples 1-5), the keyword *Iran* with the collocate "deal" appears in discussions about economic sanctions. *Iran*, represented in the deal, is associated with a situation that will be destroyed economically if the "deal" is not granted. For Trump himself, the *Iran* deal is as if the previous US government (Obama) gave 150 billion dollars in money, which the US itself did not benefit from at all, or he called it a unilateral transaction. Even the Iranian deal is not as important as the money spent compared to the US healthcare budget, tax cuts, and job creation.

The findings of the social media texts in Trump's significant colloquialisms were proven to accompany the talks regarding *Iran*. Collocate examines 62 frequencies within the text and also connects *Iran* with the conflicts happening in the region.

As it is well known, it was in this mass of the Trump administration that the agreement to withdraw from the JCPOA was made. America itself initiated this agreement. With the agreement, *Iran* complies with all measures in developing nuclear weapons. On May 8, 2018, Donald Trump issued National Security Presidential Memorandum 11, which formally withdrew the United States from the agreement. Not only that, the United States also reinstated the sanctions that had been applied to *Iran* (Katzman, 2022).

Iran will not be separated from the nuclear issue in regional countries. In the keyword, *Iran*, significant collocate *Nuclear* was found. The mass of Trump administration also withdrew from the agreement unilaterally, as is found in the lines of the concordance below:

Table 3. Concordance line of *weapon* (Source: Trump Social Media Official Account)

Example 6	*"The very defective JCPOA expires shortly anyway and gives Iran a clear and quick path to nuclear breakout. Iran must abandon its nuclear ambitions and end its support for terrorism. The time has come for the United Kingdom, Germany, France, Russia, and China to recognize this reality."*
Example 7	*"Proportionate to shooting down an unmanned drone. I am in no hurry our Military is rebuilt, new, and ready to go by far the best in the world. Sanctions are biting &; more were added last night. Iran can NEVER have Nuclear Weapons, not against the USA and not against the WORLD!"*

Example 8	*"Iran cannot have Nuclear Weapons! Under the terrible Obama plan, they would have been on their way to Nuclear in a short number of years, and existing verification is not acceptable. We are putting major additional Sanctions on Iran on Monday. I look forward to the day that."*
Example 9	*"The Iran Deal gave the green light to Iran for a nuclear bomb in a few years - and BILLIONS to fund terror. Your weakness makes America and the world LESS SAFE!"*
Example 10	*"So I look forward to discussing whatever I have to discuss with anybody that wants to speak. In the meantime, who knows what's going to happen? I can only tell you we cannot ever let Iran have a nuclear weapon. And it won't happen."*
Example 11	*"A dangerous journey. We don't even need to be there in that the U.S. has just become (by far) the largest producer of Energy anywhere in the world! The US request for Iran is very simple - No Nuclear Weapons and No Further Sponsoring of Terror!"*
Example 12	*"IRAN WILL NEVER HAVE A NUCLEAR WEAPON!"*

The conversation about the collocate "nuclear" positions is a dangerous weapon. In fact, the JCPOA agreement only relaxed dangerous nuclear weapons projects, as stated in *Iran*'s line 6 concordance statement, a clear and quick path to nuclear breakout (nuclear explosion). From lines 6-12, the collocate "nuclear" is talking about weapons or bombs. Correspondingly, all the lines of the concordance talk about a nuclear deal that will make the country insecure, as in line 9, *"The Iran deal gives Iran the green light for a nuclear bomb in a few years - and BILLION to finance terror."*

The process of the action verb colors the Iranian collocate in the keyword "nuclear" as the subject or actor of the action and also as the object in the verb process. In the process of Iranian collocate, verbs have negative semantic preferences by involving and placing the keyword "nuclear" with Iranian collocate with the frame "Iran can't have nuclear weapons, *Iran* can ever have nuclear." In fact, the lexical choice, verb tenses, and active (agent) role that *Iran* occupies have contributed to the formation of other detrimental imagery used by Trump's social media corpus.

Placing "nuclear" as an object in the verb process serves as an object or beneficiary in that process. Receiving the benefits of these verbs is discussed negatively by linking the beneficiary benefits (the *Iran* deal) and nuclear as an attempt to commit terrorist crimes.

In line 6 of the concordance, it is stated, "*Iran* must abandon its nuclear ambitions and end its support for terrorism." Iran's role as a subject of process verbs is associated with nuclear weapons and the use of sponsorship of terrorism (acceptance of the benefits of the subject's actions). Even in line 9 of the concordance, "Iran agreement gives the green light to *Iran* for a nuclear bomb in years - and BILLION to finance terror," the subject of the Iranian verb

is directly proportional to the benefit of the recipient, i.e., the object of the process verb (billions of money, nuclear bomb, and fund terrorism).

The Iranian collocate conversation with the keyword "nuclear" has a negative semantic preference. This can be seen by placing *Iran*'s involvement as a process that causes nuclear weapons and even dangerous nuclear bombs. Even the collocate weapon or even the singular noun weapon indicating the possession of multiple weapons is discussed around the keyword "nuclear" as much as 10 repetitions as in the concordance line below:

Example 13	*"National Security Adviser suggested today that sanctions & protests have Iran "choked off" will force them to negotiate. Actually, I couldn't care less if they negotiate. It will be totally up to them, but no nuclear weapons and "don't kill your protesters."*
Example 14	*"President Obama made a desperate and terrible deal with Iran - Gave them 150 Billion Dollars plus I.8 Billion Dollars in CASH! Iran was in big trouble and he bailed them out. Gave them a free path to Nuclear Weapons and SOON. Instead of saying thank you, Iran yelled"*
Example 15	*"For far too long- all the way back to 1979, to be exact-nations have tolerated Iran's destructive and destabilizing behaviour in the Middle East and beyond. Those days are over. Iran has been the leading sponsor of terrorism, and their pursuit of nuclear weapons threatens the civilized world. We will never let that happen."*
Example 16	*"I think that Iran is a country of tremendous potential; we're not looking for leadership change when that is looking for that kind of change this country has been through that many times before that doesn't work we're looking for no nuclear weapons, and we can have it done in a very early belief that the rain can be a great nation I'd like to see that happen, but they can't have nuclear weapons."*

The "nuclear" keyword conversation is closely related to the possession of a weapon. But in fact, it is proven that *Iran* is subject to the rules for developing nuclear energy as alternative energy as in the 2015 JCPOA agreement but unilaterally prohibited by Trump. However, Trump persistently argues that nuclear development is for the sake of weapons and ballistic missiles.

Another significant collocate is the attributive predicate of the word "terror." This collocate is found in Trump's social media corpus 9 times. The *Iran* keyword conversation with the collocate "terror" has a very negative representation. *Iran* is discussed negatively by depicting a country full of terror. As in the concordance line below:

Table 4. Concordance line of *terror* (Source: Trump Social Media Official Account)

Example 17	*"The noble people of Iran who love America deserve a government that's more interested in helping them achieve their dreams than killing them for demanding respect. Instead of leading Iran toward ruin, its leaders should abandon **terror** and Make Iran Great Again!"*
Example 18	*"The wonderful Iranian people are suffering and for no reason at all. Their leadership spends all of its money on **Terror** and little on anything else. The US has not forgotten Iran's use of IEDs & EFPs (bombs), which killed 2000 Americans and wounded many more."*
Example 19	*"Request for Iran is very simple - No Nuclear Weapons and No Further Sponsoring of **Terror**!"*
Example 20	*"40 years of corruption. 40 years of repression. 40 years of **terror**. The regime in Iran has produced only #40YearsofFailure. The long-suffering Iranian people deserve a much brighter future."*
Example 21	*"I don't know Putin has no deals in Russia, and the haters are going crazy - yet Obama can make a deal with Iran #1 in **terror** no problem!"*
Example 22	*"President Obama refuses to answer questions about Iran **terror** funding. I won't dodge questions as your President."*
Example 23	*"Iran went on a **terror** spree, funded by the money from the deal, and created hell in Yemen, Syria, Lebanon, Afghanistan, and Iraq."*
Example 24	*"Hey, Comrade Sanders, the Iran Deal gave the green light to Iran for a nuclear bomb in a few years - and BILLIONS to fund **terror**. Your weakness makes America and the world LESS SAFE!"*
Example 25	*"The Iran Deal is defective at its core. If we do nothing, we know what will happen. In just a short time, the world's leading state sponsor of **terror** will be on the cusp of acquiring the world's most dangerous weapons."*

The emergence of collocate *terror* that accompanies the keyword *Iran* describes the attributive predicate attached to the character of the noun *Iran*, which is considered a country full of terror. In lines 19 and 20 of the collocate "terror," it is discussed that *Iran* is described as a country producing nuclear

weapons to sponsor terror, and it is said that for almost 40 years, this country has been a terrorist nest country. Weapons of mass destruction, nuclear, the act of deal that is full of problems, cause chaos in the Middle East.

This attributive process (terror) is represented by an adjective that considers certain qualities or attributes of the Iranian state, which is represented by a frame + adjective, and even the relational process represents an act of classification and judgment so that it is interpreted as a distinctive sign of the ideology of power expressing the activities and goals of social groups towards people.

The collocate "terror" speaks as a condition that occurs in that country by positioning *Iran* as a subject in a verb or an object in a verb process. As in line 23 of concordance, *Iran* acts as an agent/perpetrator of Acts that wreak havoc on particular objects. "*Iran* commits terror, is funded by the money from the deal, and is creating hell in Yemen, Syria, Lebanon, Afghanistan, and Iraq." That *Iran* is carrying out terror, creating chaos in the countries of Yemen, Syria, etc.

In the discussion of Trump's social media corpus, he talks a lot about *Billion* collocations in the keyword *Iran*. The collocate tends to be described in a negative light. Even cash assistance from the US is utilizing nuclear weapons projects. Conversations in colloquialisms accompanying the keyword *Iran* were found in 12 repetitions. The concordance lines in this collocate are shown below:

Table 5. Concordance line of *Billion* (Source: Trump Social Media Official Account)

Example 26	*"The Democrats and President Obama gave **Iran** 150 **Billion** Dollars and got nothing, but they can't give 5 **Billion** Dollars for National Security and a Wall?"*
Example 27	*"Iran was on its last legs and ready to collapse until the U.S. came along and gave it a lifeline in the form of the **Iran** Deal: $150 **billion."***
Example 28	*"President Obama made a desperate and terrible deal with Iran - Gave them 150 **Billion** Dollars plus I.8 **Billion** Dollars in CASH! **Iran** was in big trouble, and he bailed them out. Gave them a free path to Nuclear Weapons and SOON. Instead of saying thank you, Iran yelled"*
Example 29	***"Iran** was violating the 150 **Billion** Dollar (plus 1.8 Billion Dollar in CASH) Nuclear Deal with the United States and others who paid NOTHING long before I became President - and they have now breached their stockpile limit. Not good!"*
Example 30	*"Former Obama officials & their media protectors can howl all they want. It's a FACT that as part of #IranDeal, they delivered $1.7 **billion** in cash to #**Iran,** And they did this even though Iran owes $55*

	billion in court-ordered payments to American victims of Iranian terrorism."
Example 31	*"John Kerry got caught essentially admitting that funds given ridiculously to Iran were used to fund attacks on the USA. Only a complete fool would have given that 150 **Billion** Dollars Plus to **Iran**. They then went on a Middle East Rage! @foxandfriends @PeteHegseth"*
Example 32	***"Iran** toys with US days before we pay them ridiculously **billions** of dollars. Don't release money. We want our hostages back NOW!"*
Example 32	*"Hey, Comrade Sanders, the Iran Deal gave the green light to **Iran** for a nuclear bomb in a few years - and **BILLIONS** to fund terror. Your weakness makes America and the world LESS SAFE!"*
Example 33	***"Iran** has long been secretly "enriching" in total violation of the terrible 150 **Billion** Dollar deal made by John Kerry and the Obama Administration. Remember that deal was to expire in a short number of years. Sanctions will soon be increased substantially!"*

In line 26 keywords *Iran* is spoken of as being a ruined country until aid money and deals from the US come and save their country. Even in the line of the 27 concordances, assistance was given in cash, and nuclear weapons were obtained free of charge. Trump always brings up the assistance provided as a criticism of the Obama administration.

Iran tied in with cash aid and even specified how much aid was due to the US. In lines 28 to 33, it is discussed that the aid was violated by diverting it for terror plans, nuclear bombs, and angering Middle Eastern countries. Claims of financial support that the billions of dollars in support given to *Iran* by the US as confirmed are facts. Furthermore, the previous government, specifically Obama, allocated billions of dollars.

In line 33 of the concordance, Trump uses the present perfect progressive tense: "Iran has long been quietly "enriching" the total breaches of the egregious $150 Billion deal." This sentence in the English definition (Pyle, 2013) is a sentence that is used to express actions that have occurred in the past and are still happening in the present. The horrific enrichment project is said to have occurred and is still ongoing.

Furthermore, another significant collocate that goes with the *Iran* keyword is the noun "*country*," specifically the state. The dialogue of nation collocate that accompanies the term *Iran* is repeated ten times. The following are the concordance lines in this collocate:

Table 6. Concordance line of *Country* (Source: Trump Social Media Official Account)

Example 34	*"They must now break away from the remnants of the Iran deal -– or JCPOA –- and we must all work together toward making a deal with Iran that makes the world a safer and more peaceful place. We must also make a deal that allows Iran to thrive and prosper and take advantage of its enormous untapped potential. Iran can be a great **country**."*
Example 35	*"Those who fear that President Donald Trump is on the verge of dragging our **country** into war with Iran are forgetting, or deliberately twisting, what everyone knows about his reluctance to put our troops in harm's way needlessly and endlessly."*
Example 36	*"Schumer and the Democrats are big fans of being weak and passive with Iran. They have no clue as to the danger they would be inflicting on our Country. Iran is in financial chaos now because of the sanctions and the Iran Deal termination. Dems put us in a bad place - but now good!"*
Example 37	*"I think that Iran is a **country** of tremendous potential; we're not looking for leadership change when that is looking for that kind of change this country has been through that many times before that doesn't work we're looking for no nuclear weapons, and we can have it done in a very early belief that the rain can be a great nation I'd like to see that happen, but they can't have nuclear weapons."*
Example 38	*"I have just instructed the Secretary of the Treasury to substantially increase Sanctions on the **country** of Iran!"*

In the lines of concordance 34 and 37, the collocate "state" accompanying the keyword *Iran* is discussed positively. *Iran* is described as a country whole of potential. The use of the mental process "think" in line 37 is a conversation that drives an opinion. According to Wodak and Meyer (2016), the mental process of a verb like the word "think" in line 37 allows "speakers to express their involvement in the discourse, and their position of the view in the reporting, description, narrative or quotation of events or utterances that the relevant opinion is that the colloquialism of "country" with the keyword

Iran which will become a great country again by discussing Trump's agreement, in this case, is subject to and obedient to his decisions.

Using the word "think" allows Trump to position himself in relation to *Iran*'s performance. It may also reveal the type of knowledge and/or judgment the tweet shares or intends to share with others about *Iran*. Meanwhile, "fear" and "forget" in concordance line 35 are emotive processes used to express strong emotions and sentiments towards *Iran* in the colloquialisms of a country/country.

Another collocate that surrounds *Iran* is the figure of *Obama*. Uniquely, Trump has always blamed the Obama administration for dealing with *Iran*. He always stated that Obama was wrong in providing cooperation and providing opportunities for terrorism to occur in the region; providing opportunities to enrich weapons was one of Trump's criticisms of the administration.

Table 7. Concordance line of *Obama* (Source: Trump Social Media Official Account)

Example 39	*"Iran is failing at every level despite the terrible deal made with them by the **Obama** Administration. The great Iranian people have been repressed for many years. They are hungry for food and for freedom. Along with human rights, the wealth of Iran is being looted. TIME FOR CHANGE!"*
Example 40	*"The people of Iran are finally acting against the brutal and corrupt Iranian regime. All of the money that President ß so foolishly gave them went into terrorism and into their pockets. The people have little food, big inflation, and no human rights. The US is watching! #IranProtests #IranianProtests #Iran #USA"*

In line with this concordance, the deal that *Obama* made is described as a terrible deal. As a result of the deal, Trump mentioned the great people of *Iran* who were very depressed. In fact, in the 39 lines of the concordance, he stated that the consequences of Obama's investment actually provided opportunities for terrorism. The chaos is described as very threatening, and inflation and human rights occur.

After evaluating the significant collocate by using an assisted computer (MI Score) and then checking the concordance line qualitatively, the next step is showing the semantic preference by evaluating those previous steps above.

Table 8. Semantic Preference for *Iran*

Keyword	Semantic Category	Connotation	Meaning
Iran	1. Economy 2. Alliances and allies	Positive, Negative Negative	- - Getting billions of dollars in funding from America

	3. The Nuclear Treaty	Negative	-	- The sanctions, the flawed nuclear deal, are terrible
	4. War	Negative		- Iran is a state sponsor of terrorism and plays a role in supporting the Assad regime (Syria) with Russia
	5. ISIS	Positive	-	
	6. Characteristics	Negative		
	7. Release of Sandra	Positive		
	8. Terror	Negative		- Together with China spreading fake news related to covid-19
	9. trump	Positive	-	
			-	- Russia and Iran killing the people of Idlib, attacks with chemical weapons
			-	- Nuclear Uranium Enrichment as a dangerous weapon
			-	- Unstable country
			-	- Attacking US military bases, Allied Houthis Yemen, Middle East under threat
			-	- Innocent people's bomber
			-	- ISIS rebels who destabilize Syria actually benefit IRAN
			-	- Assassins, Bombers, Terrorists
			-	- Promises a deal that will be better after the release of Sandra, who is from the US
			-	- Causes of conflict in the Middle East wars such as in Yemen, Syria, Lebanon
			-	- Weapons of mass destruction from nuclear development
			-	- Trump's deal pressures Iran to better
				- In the masses of the Trump administration, Iran has managed to comply with its policies
	10.		-	

From the semantic preferences above, it can be seen that discussions about the keyword *Iran* with the accompanying collocate tend to be or even dominated by negative conversations towards *Iran*. The discussion of the keyword *Iran* appears positive when discussing the budget that has been given to *Iran* in President Obama's mass. The positive discussion was also the result of Obama's weak attitude in enforcing the nuclear deal. The keyword *Iran* was also discussed positively when what America and Trump wanted was to release government hostages and promise an even better deal. On the other hand, *Iran* is also discussed positively with choristers such as the country and

Trump. However, the colloquialism is in a position of submission to American policy. On average, of the findings of 10 dominant collocates, only 2 of them have positive semantic preferences.

The findings of this study indicate that Iran was consistently represented negatively in Trump's tweets. This aligns with the work of Esmaili and Khaghaninejad (2018), which explored media discourse. However, unlike previous studies that primarily examined mainstream news coverage, this research demonstrates how Trump actively shaped political narratives through his choice of words and patterns in his social media discourse. Using a Corpus-Assisted Critical Discourse Analysis approach, the study found that the word "Iran" in Trump's tweets is frequently linked to terms associated with threats, conflict, and global instability. This association may reinforce negative perceptions of Iran among his audience. These findings highlight that social media is not just a communication tool; it is also a powerful political instrument used to construct and maintain specific discourses. This study provides new insights into political communication strategies, particularly in framing international issues related to U.S.-Iran relations during Trump's administration. Future research could examine similar discursive strategies employed by other political leaders and investigate how audiences engage with and respond to these constructed narratives in social media interactions.

CONCLUSIONS

Considering the results of the MI score, the single keyword *Iran* in Trump's social media corpus tends to be associated with collocations related to the issue of economic sanctions, namely the nuclear *deal*. There are also apparent associations of the noun with terms related to the discussion of *nuclear weapons*, such as the *multi-million dollar* gain in American aid to *Iran*. The noun is also closely related to the terms associated with issues of negative characterization of *Iran*, such as *terror*, *hostages*, and *bad regimes*. In addition, we can see that nouns are often combined with terms related to *aid*, such as *financial* (Obama deal) collocation, *profitability*, and *sponsorship of terrorism*.

A further look at the concordance lines in Trump's corpus reveals a strong tendency for nodes to have negative prosody. The association of nouns with nine out of ten collocations signifies absolute or very negative prosody, such as *the alliance of non-western countries (Russia, Syria)*. That is, nouns tend to occur together with collocations that have a negative meaning.

Therefore, it can be said that Trump tends to portray the word *Iran* in a negative light. However, based on the analysis, it is also possible for the noun to have a positive prosody if it is associated with President *Trump* and *country* collocation. Thus, it can be concluded that even though a word generally has a negative dominant meaning, it does not necessarily mean that the prosody will also turn negative. The study demonstrates how political figures can shape public perception and international relations through linguistic framing in social media discourse, particularly through negative collocations and prosody.

In addition, it should be noted that the results of this study are limited to the number of collocations and concordance lines of the nodal words

included in this study. So that other research might be able to look even bigger regarding *Iran* on a large scale, such as examining digital public perceptions of *Iran*.

REFERENCES

Al-Hamzi, A. M. S., Gougui, A., Amalia, Y. S., & Suhardijanto, T. (2020). Corpus Linguistics and Corpus-Based Research and Its Implication in Applied Linguistics: A Systematic Review. *PAROLE: Journal of Linguistics and Education*, *10*(2), 176–181. https://doi.org/10.14710/PAROLE.V10I2.176-181

Bowman, B. S., & Willis, C. (2003). We Media: How audiences are shaping the future of news and information. *Media*. https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444809336551

Clarke, I., & Grieve, J. (2019). Stylistic variation on the Donald Trump Twitter account: A linguistic analysis of tweets posted between 2009 and 2018. *PLoS ONE*. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0222062

Departmen, S. R. (2021). *Global social networks ranked by number of users 2021*. Statista. https://www.statista.com/statistics/272014/global-

Enli, G. (2017). Twitter as arena for the authentic outsider: exploring the social media campaigns of Trump and Clinton in the 2016 US presidential election. *European Journal of Communication*. https://doi.org/10.1177/0267323116682802

Esmaili, F., & Khaghaninejad, M. S. (2018). Iran"s Representation in news Discourse: A Corpus-driven Analysis of NOW Database. *International Journal of English Language & Translation Studies*, *6*(3), 113–120. www.eltsjournal.org

Firth, J. R. (1964). *Papers in linguistics*. Oxford University Press.

Hardiman, D. P., & Mada, U. G. (2023). *Semantic Preference and Semantic Prosody of the Collocations of Sustainable in NOW Corpus*. *29*(March), 184–199. https://doi.org/http://doi.org/10.17576/3L-2023-2901-13

Himelboim, I., Lariscy, R. W., Tinkham, S. F., & Sweetser, K. D. (2012). Social Media and Online Political Communication: The Role of Interpersonal Informational Trust and Openness. *Journal of Broadcasting and Electronic Media*. https://doi.org/10.1080/08838151.2011.648682

Katzman, K. (2022). *Specialist in Middle Eastern Affairs*.

Kozinets V, R. (2013). Netnography: Redefined. In *Netnography: Redefined*.

Louw, B., & Milojkovic, M. (2016). *Corpus stylistics as contextual prosodic theory and subtext*. John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Louw, W. E. (1993). Irony in the Text or Insincerity in the Writer? — The Diagnostic Potential of Semantic Prosodies. *Text and Technology*, 157. https://doi.org/10.1075/Z.64.11LOU

McEnery, T. (2012). Corpus Linguistics. In *The Oxford Handbook of Computational Linguistics*. https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199276349.013.0024

McEnery, T., & Hardie, A. (2011). Corpus linguistics: Method, theory and practice. In *Corpus Linguistics: Method, Theory and Practice*. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511981395

Odlin, T., & Sinclair, J. (1994). Corpus, Concordance, Collocation. *The Modern Language Journal*, *78*(3), 407. https://doi.org/10.2307/330144

Partington, Alan. (1998). Patterns and meanings: using corpora for English language research and teaching. In *John Benjamins*. John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1017/S136067430323121X

Stubbs, M. (2001a). Texts, corpora, and problems of interpretation: A response to Widdowson. In *Applied Linguistics*. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/22.2.149

Stubbs, M. (2001b). *Words and phrases: Corpus studies of lexical semantics*. Blackwell Publishers.

Thi, N., Thao, T., & Shurong, T. (2020). Is It Possible for "Electronic Word-of-Mouth" and "User-Generated Content" to be Used Interchangeably? *Journal of Marketing and Consumer Research*, *65*(0), 41–48. https://doi.org/10.7176/JMCR/65-04

Tognini-Bonelli, E. (2001). *Corpus Linguistics at Work*. *6*. https://doi.org/10.1075/SCL.6

Wodak, R., & Meyer, M. (2016). Critical discourse studies: History, agenda, theory, and methodology. In *Methods of Critical Discourse studies*. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0376-7361(09)70018-4