

A Cognitive Discourse Analysis of the Domain of Supremacy in Selected Speeches by Joe Biden

Marewan D. Taher

Department of English Language, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, Koya University, Kurdistan Region, Iraq

ABSTRACT

This study is an attempt to showcase how the domain of 'SUPREMACY' is conceptualised in some speeches delivered by Joe Biden. This conceptual structure, domain, is necessary to profile relevant scenes of experience during speech based on cognitive attentional strategy. The cognitive mechanisms are not enough to conceive of the ideologies represented in these speeches. Thus, this study adopts the Cognitive Discourse Analysis approach and investigates the cognitive and discursive mechanisms employed by the linguistic and ideological structures in Biden's selected speeches. This study investigates this domain in five speeches made by Biden employing an analytical and qualitative method. The prominent question that this study attempts to answer is: How are the linguistic and ideological structures that represent the domain of 'SUPREMACY' projected in the conceptual structures of Biden and entrenched by the listeners? This study concludes that the domain of 'SUPREMACY' is conceptualised in these speeches through the use of some facets from the most prominent to the least prominent, such as 'SUPERIORITY', 'POWER', 'PROSPERITY', and 'DOMINANCE'. The cognitive identification-attention strategy is maintained in constructing the domain of 'SUPREMACY' in the speaker's mental structure. Although some of the conceptualised facets are covertly represented in the ideological patterns of the selected speeches, the Cognitive Discourse Analysis approach employs cognitive and critical mechanisms to conceive them to profile the domain of 'SUPREMACY'.

KEY WORDS: Cognitive Discourse Analysis, Supremacy Domain, Cognitive Linguistics, Critical Discourse Analysis, Ideology, Facet

1. INTRODUCTION:

Critical Discourse Analysis (henceforth CDA) and Cognitive Linguistics (henceforth CL) are presented in the form of an interdisciplinary approach in this study. The connection between these two disciplines is reflected in the 'cognitive' use in CDA, which has historically absorbed more social science-based approaches, whereas 'social' and 'critical' concepts are maintained in CL as well. However, CL has been so successful in CDA that this combination has become one

of the most fruitful and widespread methodological approaches to the study of ideological inquiry (Hart, 2015).

Attia (2007) believes that CDA and CL seem to have quite distinct foci. Language is viewed as a social practice by CDA practitioners (Fairclough and Wodak 1997; Kress 1989; Wodak 2001). CL is more concerned with language as a mental phenomenon, with an emphasis on the mind and how it affects cognition and language (Koller, 2005). However, CDA is more interested in "individual utterances and sentences ... [as] expressions of ideological discursive practices", but actually they "are expressions of conceptual metaphors" in CL (Stockwell, 2001: 512).

van Dijk's works are regarded as notable exceptions to the prevalent patterns in CDA and its connections to CL. He uses socio-cognitive methods in his CDA works

Koya University Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences (KUJHSS), Volume 7, Issue 1, 2024.

Received 11 Mar 2024; Accepted 5 May 2024,

Regular research paper: Published 25 Jun 2024

Corresponding author's e-mail:

marewan.dhahir@koyauniversity.org

Copyright ©2024. Marewan D. Taher, this is an open access article distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution License.



(Attia, 2007). He is a vocal supporter of the interdisciplinary approach to CDA and emphasises the crucial value of studying cognition in addition to society in the critical analysis of discourse. "His focal triad is construed between discourse, cognition, and society" (Meyer, 2001: 20). His approach is "concerned with mental schemas that represent the social and give rise to stereotypes, that in turn give rise to various ideologies" (Chilton, 2005: 20–21).

This study incorporates both approaches, CDA and CL, in an interdisciplinary approach, which is named Cognitive Discourse Analysis (henceforth CODA). The goal of the CODA approach is to uncover the implicit and explicit ways in which speakers' ideas and thoughts are reflected in language. CODA examines linguistic data, that is, written or spoken language (discourse) created in contexts that are related to certain thoughts. Focusing on concepts and thinking processes when doing discourse analysis is known as CODA, and it is closely associated with conventional discourse analysis techniques. Thinking is the foundation of speaking, to put it simply. Language is dependent on the existence of ideas and cognitive processes. Meaning cannot be formed without cognition, although non-linguistic sounds and noises may. Furthermore, language appears to be the most direct means by which people may convey their thoughts; in virtually all cases, language will be used to respond to the inquiry "What are you thinking?" more often than any other medium (Tenbrink, 2020).

Generally, the domain of supremacy can be divided into economic supremacy, military supremacy, cultural supremacy, political supremacy, and technological supremacy. Employment, investment, health care, and prosperity are all facets of economic supremacy. The facets of sovereignty, integrity, unity, and military power are the facets of the political domain, and so on. Other facets of economic supremacy and political supremacy can be formed from different axes, such as superiority, power, and dominance. This study tackles the domain of supremacy as a domain matrix that generally perceives the facets without subcategorising them into subdomains.

There are many studies on CL, CDA, or DA, and each focus on an aspect of CL in relations to DA studies. However, different studies are mentioned below and each investigates an aspect of cognitive mechanisms and DA. The first work to start with was conducted by Yeari and van den Broek (2011), which was about the cognitive mechanisms employed in reading comprehension by

adopting the Landscape Model. Moreover, discourse understanding and interpretation are involved in analysing the data from a cognitive perspective. Moreover, Hart (2013) carried out a study on press reports of violence incorporating the Cognitive Grammar model of Langacker into CDA. It focused on the conceptual content of the grammatical structures and how event-construals are invoked in these press reports. Furthermore, Al-Hamandi (2018) investigated the concept of intertextuality in some USA presidential elections debates from a cognitive perspective employing the cognitive discourse analysis approach. The study focused on addressing intertextuality and how it affects the addressee in their decision of election.

The present study is different from the abovementioned works at different points. It adopts CODA in analysing Biden's speech, which is an integration of CL and CDA. Domain theory, which is included in Croft and Cruses's Construal Theory, is employed in analysing and discourse-processing the adopted data in correlation with CDA strategies based on Hart's (2015) model. The present study doesn't only analyse the data based on cognitive linguistic analysis; also, discursive strategies are involved, such as identification strategies.

2. DOMAIN IN COGNITIVE LINGUISTICS

CL is an innovative approach to linguistic thought and practice. Examining the connection between human language, the mind, and socio-physical experience is its main concern. Because CL does not consist of a single, well-defined theory, it is better understood as a 'movement' or 'enterprise.' Rather, it is an approach that has embraced a common set of fundamental commitments and tenets, which have produced a wide variety of complementary, overlapping, and occasionally opposing theories (Evans et al., 2007).

CL comprises an extensive array of theories pertaining to cognition and language. These theoretical frameworks prioritise the cognitive processes of conceptualization and discourse construction. Language conceptualization and meaning interpretation are mostly addressed by the theory of Construal. This theory employs the domain conceptual construct as a construal mechanism for profiling a concept. Croft and Cruse (2004) formulate the theory of Construal and different cognitive construal operations are included, such as (Attention/ Salience,

Judgement/ Comparison, Perspective/ Situatedness, and Constitution/Gestalt). Domain theory is investigated under the Attention/ Saliency category, according to them. Langacker (1987: 487–88) defines the construal relationship as follows: “The relationship between a speaker (or hearer) and a situation that he conceptualizes and portrays, involving focal adjustments and imagery”. According to this definition, the construal relation consists primarily of an individual (speaker or hearer) and a conceived situation. Consequently, it roughly corresponds to Langacker's “viewing arrangement”.

Construal is the capacity to conceptualise and represent an identical circumstance in a variety of ways. In CL, any word is construed in reference to a variety of conceptual factors, including “prominence,” which have been demonstrated to be significant in lexical and semantic description (Langacker, 2019). Construal theory has passed through various modifications and improvements. Talmy proposes a four-way classification under the name of “imaging systems” (Talmy 1977, 1978, 1988): (1) “Structural Schematization”, (2) “Deployment of Perspective”, (3) “Distribution of Attention”, and (4) “Force Dynamics”. On the other hand, under the rubric of focal adjustments, Langacker (1987: 116–37) presents a three-part classification scheme for construal operations (then called as “focal adjustments”): (1) “Selection”, (2) “Perspective”, and (3) “Abstraction”. Langacker (2005) has since revised his classification, which now looks as follows: (1) “Specificity”, (2) “Prominence”, (3) “Perspective”, and (4) “Dynamicity”.

However, this study adopts Croft and Cruse's (2004) version of construal theory, as they incorporate Langacker and Talmy's versions into one comprehensive theory. They classified this theory into four construal operations namely: “Attention-Saliency”, “Judgement-Comparison”, “Perspective-situatedness” and “Constitution-Gestalt”. As this theory is very comprehensive and encompasses various cognitive mechanisms, only Attention-Saliency operation is employed in this study. Attention is a well-recognized fundamental concept in cognitive psychology that revolves around the speaker's consciousness. Attention is a notion that may vary in intensity and is commonly represented by the level of activation of conceptual structures, known as domains, in a neural network model of the mind. These features are believed to increase the saliency of certain occurrences to human attention. This category is made up of different cognitive mechanisms,

but ‘Selection’ is the primary cognitive process in this category. However, these construal operations are helpful to analyse ideological discursive devices employed in specific contexts to offer the representation of reality (Hart, 2014).

It is difficult to overstate the importance of attention for cognitive functions. When people think about something consciously, they are paying attention to it. Therefore, the key to comprehending the cognitive processes involved in a particular activity is knowing where someone's attention is focused at any given moment. People all possess an intuitive understanding of the intimate connections among attention, cognition, and language usage based on these common experiences. When doing CODA, these intuitions might be crucial as they can provide a good foundation for further in-depth analysis. Analyzing might include transforming intuitive observations into something much more structured, something that can support a certain phenomenon the analyst is looking for (Tenbrink, 2020).

Our capacity to focus on experiences that are pertinent to the task at hand while disregarding irrelevant experiences to profile a domain is the focal adjustment of selection. Two semantic processes, however, lend themselves to a construal analysis; they include subtler and/or more systematic shifts in profile. Examples of several facets or domains in a domain matrix are shown below (Croft and Cruse, 2004)

- (1) a. Where is the Sunday Times? (physical object or tome)
- b. Have you read the Sunday Times? (semantic content or text)
- (2) a. Paris is a beautiful city. (location)
- b. Paris closed the Boulevard St. Michel. (government)
- c. Paris elected the Green candidate as mayor. (population)

A newspaper, book, or other embodied text is both a meaningful text and a physical tome at the same time. However, (1a) only selects the physical facet and (1b) just selects the text facet. A word's potential profiled facets might be quite diverse. For instance, (2c) selects the population's voting members, but *All Paris turned out to see the king* select a broader group of people. The government as shown in (2b) refers to city government, but since Paris is the capital of France, it is opposed to any changes to the Common Agricultural Policy, which profiles the national government. In other

words, a domain's structure often consists of many facets. A facet is an area of a domain that corresponds to a certain experience. There is no direct connection between concepts. They are associated with cognitive domains and the specific facet within those domains that their meanings emphasise. Any concept's meaning may be understood by first understanding the domain it invokes and then determining the facet of the domain it represents (Hamawand, 2016).

According to Langacker, "Domains are necessarily cognitive entities: mental experiences, representational spaces, concepts, or conceptual complexes" (Langacker 1987: 147). The foundation of Langacker's theory of domains is the belief that meaning is encyclopaedic and that lexical concepts are inseparable from more comprehensive knowledge structures. These knowledge structures are known as domains by Langacker. Thus, domains are conceptual entities that exhibit different degrees of complexity and organization. A knowledge structure may only be counted as a domain if it offers background knowledge that lexical concepts can be understood and applied to in language. Expressions such as *hot*, *cold*, and *lukewarm*, for example, denote lexical concepts in the domain of TEMPERATURE; people could not use these phrases if they weren't familiar with the temperature system (Evans and Green, 2006). The domain matrix of a given lexical concept is the collection of domains that make up that concept. Clausner and Croft (1999:7) provide the following examples to support this idea: "Our common sense knowledge about birds for example includes their shape, the fact that they are made of physical material, their activities such as flying and eating, the avian lifecycle from egg to death, etc. These aspects of the concept *bird* are specified in a variety of different domains such as SPACE, PHYSICAL OBJECTS, LIFE, TIME, and so on".

In everyday speech, the context in which a lexical word is employed causes "modulation" of the meaning attached to it. This indicates that, in most cases, just part of an entity's profile is active or relevant inside a given utterance. The active zone refers to this part of the profile. This demonstrates how active zone phenomena function in interaction by allowing hearers and speakers to "select" an interpretation permitted by the context and "search through" the inventory of knowledge linked with each word (Evans and Green, 2006).

3. COGNITIVE DISCOURSE ANALYSIS

CODA is not particularly critical in general since it focuses on the language that is used to communicate thoughts. However, it is undeniably true that situational context and culture have a significant influence on how language is understood. As Hart and Lukeš (2009) point out, there are a lot of similarities between critical discourse analysis and cognitive linguistics. For example, the use of metaphors and construals in political or journalistic speech may have specific impacts on readers in addition to partially revealing the writer's perspective on the subject matter (Tenbrink, 2020).

The language that speakers use to convey their thoughts is analysed using CODA. In terms of mental representation, CODA builds on established cognitive methods to address the conceptualization of perceived circumstances and occurrences. Because language and thought are mutually reinforcing, the principles of linguistic structure may be used to uncover principles of cognitive structure. This structural idea—that is, that what we say (and how we say it) is systematically connected to, or dependent on, what (and how) we think—is what inspired CODA. This pertains particularly to what people actually do with language whenever they convey their thoughts, as well as more broadly to what they can accomplish with language and how the linguistic repertory symbolises the thought repertory within a speech community. Put differently, systematic patterns of current thought or ideology are reflected in patterns of language usage (Tenbrink, 2014).

van Dijk (2000, 1-4) discusses the approach of CODA and provides a question to the reader, asking, "There is no such thing as cognitive analysis. Or is there?". He wants to investigate whether cognitive analysis, like other branches of stylistics, rhetoric, narrative or argumentation analysis, syntactic, pragmatic analysis, and conversation analysis, can be incorporated into the study of discourse analysis. As the cognitive psychology of discourse processing (production and comprehension) is involved in the study of discourse analysis, cognitive analysis is part of or relevant to the process of discourse understanding. The rationale for such an endeavour is that written and spoken discourse does not exist in isolation. Discourse analysis highlights the need to study context in order to comprehend various components of discourse. Despite the context, however, there are also certain cognitive characteristics of the individuals, such as their goals, ideologies, knowledge, and views. Without taking these into account, we cannot comprehend why

individuals talk or write at all, much less how they customise what they say or write to the receiver's knowledge or beliefs. Thus, he identifies *cognitive analysis* as "an analysis of those properties of discourse that are accounted for in terms of cognitive concepts, such as various types of mental representation."

Tenbrink (2014) believes that both DA and CL can be studied in relation to the CODA approach. In dealing with DA, CODA uses established discourse analytic methods to address types of research questions that have so far been rarely addressed by discourse analysts. However, in addressing CL, CODA draws on insights from linguistic theory, especially cognitive linguistics, but also functional grammar and other relevant resources, regarding the significance of particular linguistic choices from the overall network of options. Here is a basic heuristic to consider while thinking about the scope of CODA. Using systematic linguistic methods, everything that speakers can meaningfully verbalise may also be usefully analysed. As stated previously, a researcher may be able to discern phenomena through a close examination of linguistic choices that extend beyond what the speakers express explicitly or are conscious of. Hence, systematic linguistic analysis may go beyond conscious awareness, but it is limited by the data supply; it cannot handle cognitive processes that have no representation at all in language.

Since CL and CDA are complimentary approaches, CODA uses both of them in a comprehensive approach of discourse analysis. In other words, CL provides CDA with the conceptual explanation that it lacks—that is, the mental connection between discursive and social behaviours. However, CDA affords CL the chance to expand its analysis beyond conceptual and linguistic structure and include the constraints that these impose on society structure. In CL, references to this triangle relationship have always been made. Nonetheless, the convergence of CL and CDA, which emphasises increased functional variety in text and discourse, is completely consistent with and might be considered a component of the shift towards a more comprehensive Cognitive Sociolinguistics. Since language is a tool of power and can carry ideology covertly, its operationalization in discourse provides a critical analytical window into the ideologies of powerful speakers and the discourse communities they influence (Hart, 2015).

Although there is a wider range of possible applications in general, related research traditions may be divided into two primary categories, which CODA combines and expands upon. The first tradition is about mental representations, which are the conceptualised information represented in language, like scenes that are memorized or perceptually accessible. Usually, this entails description tasks that pertain to a setting under experimental control and need no specific cognitive effort. Here, it is rather typical to address the mental representation of perceived information by closely examining linguistic detail, which yields a wide range of important discoveries. The investigation of complex cognitive processes, as revealed by verbal protocols generated in conjunction with cognitively demanding activities like problem solving or decision making, is the focus of the second field (Tenbrink, 2014).

According to Dirven et al. (2007, 1236), Cognitive Linguistics "offers analytic tools for the critical assessment of ideologies." A fundamental principle of CL is that conceptual structures and processes, which are based on broader cognitive capacities, are reflected in language. It follows that language in interaction allows for access to ideologies because it is a specific type of conceptual system. For ideological research, linguistic analysis, and CL analysis in particular, is a crucial instrument. Since CL may reveal how ideas and concepts are structured to form ideologies, it is particularly helpful for CDA. In short, CL may be used as an analytical lens to bring hidden ideologies that are articulated and enacted via discourse to the spotlight of critical awareness.

The larger collaboration between CL and CDA seeks to explain discourse ideology in terms of form-meaning combinations along each of these axes. Thus, this synergy offers an explanatory framework in which the ideological elements of language are connected to broad conceptual principles. In fact, the ability to account for a broad range of ideological cases in discourse—many of which may seem diverse—against a shared theoretical framework is a unique strength of the CL Approach to CDA (Dirven et al. 2007). Attempting to situate various analytical strands inside a single cohesive framework, Hart (2011, 2013) offers a taxonomy based on Croft and Cruse's (2004) characterization of construal operations. In this case, construal operations are categorised as Gestalt, Comparison, Attention, and Perspective instantiations of four common cognitive systems. In a similar vein, four "discursive strategies"—structural configuration,

framing, identification, and positioning—can be used to evaluate the ideological roles of these construal operations (Hart, 2015).

4. METHODOLOGY

CODA, as an interdisciplinary approach, is adopted in this study to analyse the selected speeches made by Joe Biden. This approach makes a sort of synergy between CL and CDA to investigate the conceptual structure and ideological structure represented by the cognitive domain of 'SUPREMACY' employed by Biden in these statements. The adopted model of analysis in this study is eclectic, as it incorporates three different works. The first adopted work is Croft and Cruse's (2004) Cognitive Construal Theory. This theory incorporates different construal mechanisms under four cognitive categories in conceptualising meaning, but this study employs only one category, namely attention or salience. In this

cognitive category, different cognitive mechanisms are maintained, namely selection, scope of attention, and scalar adjustment. These three cognitive mechanisms are adopted in analysing the selected speeches to uncover the domain of 'SUPREMACY' in Biden's speech.

Hart (2015) is another adopted work in the analysis of Biden's speeches in this study. In this work, the intersection between CL and CDA is studied to uncover Biden's ideology represented in the conceptual structure in the form of the cognitive domain of 'SUPREMACY'. This work offers a taxonomy of construal operations and discursive strategies. It incorporates four cognitive construal operations with the other four discursive strategies. This study adopts only the third discursive strategy, namely identification, which is composed of three cognitive mechanisms, namely profiling, scanning, and scalar adjustment in the cognitive attention category. This synergy is presented below.

Table1
Hart's (2015) Construal Operations and Discursive Strategies

System Strategy	Gestalt	Comparison	Attention	Perspective
Structural Configuration	Schematization			
Framing		Categorization Metaphor		
Identification			Profiling Scanning Scalar Adjustment	
Positioning				Deixis Modality

Tenbrink (2020) is the third adopted work in the analysis of Biden's speeches in this study. In this approach, Tenbrink establishes the mechanisms that integrate cognitive linguistic processes and discourse analysis into a unified interdisciplinary approach known as CODA. The mental representations of the linguistic and ideological features embedded in Biden's speeches are analysed, adopting this approach to unveil the concepts that represent the domain of 'SUPREMACY'.

The selected speeches or data in this study are five, and they were all delivered by Joe Biden as part of his campaign during the presidential primary election of America 2024, from January 30, 2024, until February 13,

2024. An analytical and qualitative method of analysis is adopted in analysing these statements using the CODA approach to identify the domain of 'SUPREMACY'.

This study hypothesizes that the domain of 'SUPREMACY' is conceptualised in these speeches to reveal objective and subjective views of the orator, i.e., representing America and Biden himself. It also hypothesises that different facets of 'SUPREMACY' are employed through the use of linguistic and ideological structures. Moreover, it hypothesises that CDA is not enough to uncover the ideological structure maintaining the domain of 'SUPREMACY', but instead CL is necessary in conceptualising the embedded conceptual structure in

constructing this domain in the mental structure of the audience. Based on the aforementioned hypotheses, this study attempts to answer the following questions: How are the linguistic and ideological structures that represent the domain of 'SUPREMACY' embedded in the conceptual structures of Biden and of the hearers? What are the cognitive mechanisms involved in profiling the domain of 'SUPREMACY' in these speeches? What are the main facets of the domain matrix 'SUPREMACY' in construing these speeches by the hearers?

5. DATA ANALYSIS

5.1 Speech One/ January 30, 2024

"Donald Trump stripped good-paying jobs and shipped them overseas for cheaper labor rather than pay workers a fair wage. Not anymore. On my watch, we're investing in America and American-made products." (Biden, 2024a).

In this statement, Biden makes a comparison of the states of investment in America in his time and Trump's time. Based on Biden's presidency agenda, his ideology toward investment in America is covertly stated from the semantic and grammatical aspects of the above linguistic construction. According to the CODA approach, the identification (attention) strategy is maintained to invoke a salient cognitive facet in the domain of SUPREMACY. Although the domain of 'SUPREMACY' has multiple facets, the statement **"On my watch, we're investing in America and American-made products"** activates the facets of 'SUPERIORITY' and 'PROSPERITY' in the domain of 'SUPREMACY' in the mental structure of the conceptualiser. The perceiver profiles these two facets in the conceptual structure due to the use of the aforementioned linguistic constructions. It is an essential cognitive feature that, in construing any scene, one facet of one domain strands out relative to the other facets.

The 'SUPERIORITY' facet is profiled in the domain of 'SUPREMACY' due to the use of the linguistic structure **"on my watch"**. This statement shifts the attention of the perceiver to an active zone in the conceptual structure, i.e., in the cognitive domain, as his time is more superior than that of Trump. This profiled facet is surrounded by a dominion (scope of attention) in the domain of 'SUPREMACY'. Here, Biden invites the hearer to attend the success in investment that he's achieved so far in his era. Thus, the profiled facet, SUPERIORITY, is conceived with a fine-grained view by the hearers.

Moreover, the 'PROSPERITY' facet is profiled in the domain of 'SUPREMACY' as these linguistic items, **"we're investing in America and American-made products"**, are employed. Based on the 'Identification' feature in CODA, the perceiver selects a relevant facet of 'PROSPERITY' due to the use of these linguistic constructions. The perceiver selects the relevant facet that attends their attention to an aspect of experience and ignores irrelevant experiences. Here, Biden attempts to focus the listener's attention on conceptualising the concept that America is more prosperous in his time than that of Trump, i.e., the economy of America in his time is more transcendent than that of Trump's time. This process assigns part of the domain of 'SUPREMACY', i.e., the active zone, which is profiled by the facet of 'PROSPERITY'. This facet is abided by a scope of attention, dominion, to activate the profiled concepts that are immediately presupposed by the aforementioned linguistic items. So, the profiled facet, PROSPERITY, is conceived with a fine-grained view by the hearers as the era of Biden, and his achievements in investment are almost known by the perceivers.

5.2 Speech Two/ February 4, 2024

"There are extreme and dangerous voices at work in the country—led by Donald Trump—who are determined to divide our nation and take us backward. We cannot let that happen. We've come a long way these past four years—with America now having the strongest economy in the world and among the lowest inflation of any major economy." (Biden, 2024b).

This speech was delivered after Biden won the South Carolina Democratic Party's primary election and said that **"Trump is determined to divide our nation and take us backward."** Based on attention-cognitive strategy, in conceptualising the scenes in any statement, certain aspects are profiled and receive more attention while the perceiver neglects the others. The main cognitive mechanism in the attentional strategy is selection. The perceiver selects a concept, a domain, that is relevant to the experience at hand. The 'SUPREMACY' cognitive domain is maintained in this statement as well. The domain of 'SUPREMACY' is multifaced, but in this statement, only two sub-domains of 'SUPERIORITY' and 'POWER' are profiled in the conceptual structure of the perceivers.

Based on the linguistic structure of the speech, the ideology and attitude of Biden are conceptualised in the

mental structure. By using the pronoun 'We', Biden polarises the audience into two groups: ingroups and outgroups. He draws the attention of his fellow ingroup members. The statement **"We cannot let that happen"** profiles the domain of 'POWER' in the active zone of the domain matrix of 'SUPREMACY', as it implies that Biden has enough power to stop Trump from dividing America. Furthermore, since the modal verb 'can' is a dynamic modal verb within the domain of ENABLEMENT, 'we' is the agonist, and the main verb 'let' is a causative verb, that refers to the division, Trump is the antagonist, Biden and his audiences and fans having power and standing against Trump's plans. Thus, the range of possible profiled facet is wide, but the perceiver selects 'POWER' as it is salient in the active zone of the 'SUPREMACY' domain. After the domain of 'POWER' is selected, its scope of attention is delimited in the dominion of 'SUPREMACY' to designate the profiled concept. Therefore, this profiled concept is construed with coarse-grained view employing scalar adjustment strategy.

Moreover, the statement **"We've come a long way these past four years – with America now having the strongest economy in the world"** profiles the concept of 'SUPERIORITY' in the domain of 'SUPREMACY'. Biden tries to approach the long-term conceptual structure in the minds of the perceivers through the linguistic construction of his statement to be construed in the form of cognitive domains. According to CODA, the perceiver construes this statement and singles out a concept of 'SUPERIORITY' in the active zone of the domain matrix 'SUPREMACY' based on some relevant culture-specific experiences that are represented in the long-term mental structure. Some linguistic items in this statement, such as **'past four years'** and **'America'**, are construed as reference points that are in the focus of attention of the hearer, and they enhance the scope of attention of the profiled domain of 'SUPERIORITY'. Thus, the scenes in this statement are conceptualised with a fine-grained view in the dominion of 'SUPREMACY'.

5.3 Speech Three/ February 7, 2024

"We will continue our fight to protect women's health care from MAGA Republican attacks." (Biden, 2024c).

In order to make abortion a key issue on the campaign trail, Biden made this statement as part of his election campaign. Based on CODA, the identification strategy, known as the cognitive attentional mechanism, is concerned with salient social experiences represented in

the conceptual structure to invoke the relative domain. The linguistic construction of this statement reveals Biden's ideology, as it's reflected in his speech in making two groups: an ingroup that refers to his fellows and an outgroup that is represented by Trump and his party, the Republic. The linguistic item **"MAGA"** is represented to retrieve the mental concept in the long-term structure regarding the era of Trump's presidency, whereas the pronouns 'we' and 'our' are represented to retrieve the mental concept in the short-term mental structure, for it is maintained for local conceptualisation during discourse.

This speech profiles a concept within the mental structure aimed at attending to the perceiver's attention. It focuses the perceiver's attention towards the concept of 'POWER' within the domain of 'SUPREMACY'. As the domain of 'SUPREMACY' is multifaceted, the perceiver profiles the facet of 'POWER' in the active zone in the mental structure, i.e., Biden attempts to be perceived as a powerful figure to protect women from Trump and his followers. In construing this statement, the facet of 'POWER' involves a subtler and more systematic shift in the 'SUPREMACY' domain matrix. The cognitive mechanism, known as dominion or scope of attention, is involved in conceptualising this statement and profiling a salient facet, 'POWER', in the domain of 'SUPREMACY'. The linguistic items *"continue our fight to protect women's health care"* represents a referent point in the conceptual structure to delimit the range of 'FIGHT'. Moreover, the scenes that represent the profiled facet of 'POWER' is conceived with the fine-grained view as the perceiver has clear mental access in the short and long-term mental structures.

5.4 Speech Four/ February 9, 2024

"Every time I attend – I've had the honor of being vice president of the United States with Barack. And one of the reasons he asked me to do that job was because of my background in foreign policy, and I had traveled the world doing a lot of things, doing issues that were pertinent at the time." (Biden, 2024d).

Biden delivered this speech as part of his campaign reception in New York. He implicitly wants to convey that he has been assigned to be the vice president due to his broad knowledge background in foreign policy, and he indirectly reminds the audience of his past success and the work he accomplished in that position at the time. According to CODA, Biden attempts to employ the

attentional cognitive mechanism in the audience's long-term mental structure, i.e., memory. In other words, he tries to focus the attention of the audience on certain issues from his earlier work with Barak as vice president. This statement assigns different cognitive models in the mental structure of the audience, but the 'SUPERIORITY' facet in the domain of 'SUPREMACY' is salient in the mental structure.

The identification (attention) strategy shows how ideological structures are represented in the mental structure. As language is represented in the conceptual structure, ideology is fundamentally conceptual in nature. The linguistic construction in the above statement, **"my background in foreign policy, and I had traveled the world doing a lot of things, doing issues that were pertinent at the time"** focuses the perceiver's attention, so the perceiver selects a facet that is pertinent to the construed scenes. This linguistic construction can be conceptualised employing many facets, but in the active zone of the domain of 'SUPREMACY' only the facet of 'SUPERIORITY' is profiled. Here, Biden invites the attention of his audience to conceptualise his image as a concept of being 'SUPERIOR' or the best one at the time of being vice president of Obama, as he had knowledge of foreign policy. Thus, the facet of 'SUPERIORITY' is activated in the domain of 'SUPREMACY'.

After the facet of 'SUPERIORITY' is selected, the range or scope that represents its boundaries in the conceptual structure should be identified. Through the background knowledge of the conceptualizers, Biden tries to make his past deeds and functions to be the point of attention bringing them on stage. Thus, the scenes that represent the linguistic constructions such as *"vice president of the United States with Barack"* and *"my background in foreign policy"* are construed using the notion of accessibility of reference. This notion affords conceptual access to some earlier concepts in the mind of the audience. Thus, these scenes are construed as fine-grained. However, the scenes represented by the linguistic construction *"and I had traveled the world doing a lot of things, doing issues that were pertinent at the time"* are construed with a coarse-grained view as the conceptual boundaries that identify the scope of these scenes are unidentified.

5.5 Speech Five/ February 13, 2024

"This bipartisan bill sends a clear message to Ukrainians and to our partners and to our allies around

the world: America can be trusted, America can be relied upon, and America stands up for freedom. We stand strong for our allies. We never bow down to anyone, and certainly not to Vladimir Putin. So, let's get on with this." (Biden, 2024e).

Biden delivered this speech as part of his statement about the Senate's passage of the Bipartisan Supplemental Agreement. The implanted ideological structure can be clearly deduced from the speech of Biden. His speech reflects his ideology regarding Ukraine as an ingroup and Russia as an outgroup. Dominance as a discursive ideological device can be explicitly perceived in the linguistic construction of the above statement. As this statement presents America as an ideal country, it triggers multiple cognitive domain structures in the perceiver's mind, but only the domain of 'SUPREMACY' is highlighted. Although the domain of 'SUPREMACY' is multifaceted, the facets of 'SUPERIORITY', 'POWER', and 'DOMINANCE' are salient in the active zone of the domain matrix. The selection of these facets depends on linguistic and non-linguistic knowledge of the linguistic items in the context in which they appear.

According to the CODA, the cognitive attention mechanism, known as the identification process, accounts for the salient conceptual contents represented by linguistic items, i.e., in construing any scene, one item strands out in relation to other linguistic items. The linguistic constructions such as *"America can be trusted, America can be relied upon, and America stands up for freedom"* activate the facet of 'SUPERIORITY' in the domain matrix 'SUPREMACY', so they capture the audience's attention. In other words, the audience selects the concept of 'SUPERIORITY', as it is salient in the active zone of the domain matrix due to the use of the aforementioned linguistic items. Here, Biden's speech profiles the concept of 'America' as superior to other countries since it can be trusted, relied upon, and stands up for freedom. The profiled concept or facet goes through the cognitive mechanism of delimiting its scope in relation to the other facets in the domain matrix. The linguistic item 'America' functions as a reference point for accessibility. This linguistic item delimits the surrounding scope of the profiled facet, so the scenes represented by these linguistic items are construed with a fine-grained view.

Another facet of 'Supremacy' can be deduced from this statement. The facet of 'DOMINANCE' can be subsumed due to the use of the linguistic construction *"We stand*

strong for our allies." Here, Biden triggers the ideological structure in the audience's conceptual structure through the use of the pronouns 'we' and 'our', which lead to the polarisation of ingroups and outgroups. These linguistic items exhibit underlying ideologies in the conceptual structure in the form of 'DOMINANCE' to represent Biden and America as dominant entities. Therefore, this linguistic construction leads the audience to select the facet of 'DOMINANCE' in the domain matrix of 'SUPREMACY'. In construing this linguistic construction, the concept of dominance is profiled in the conceptual structure of the audience, so it shifts their attention to activate the facet of 'DOMINANCE' in this domain matrix. This facet is conceptualised with a wide scope of attention, as this linguistic construction provides broad interpretation in the encyclopaedic knowledge of the audience. Thus, the scenes represented by this facet are conceived with a coarse-grained view of the audience.

In this statement, one other facet can be extracted from the linguistic construction: *"We never bow down to anyone, and certainly not to Vladimir Putin. So, let's get on with this"*, which is the facet of 'POWER' in the domain matrix of 'SUPREMACY'. This linguistic construction implies that America is powerful in relation to other countries and will never yield to them, especially to Russia, and it also implies that He as Biden and his presidency are strong and powerful and do not yield to Putin and his government or bow down to anyone. The semantic structure of this statement overtly represents the image of power in Biden's conceptual structure or ideology. Thus, Biden attempts to focus the attention of the audience targeting the ideological patterns in the conceptual structures of the audience. Based on the encyclopaedic knowledge of the audience, this linguistic construction shifts the attention of the audience, so the facet of 'POWER' is profiled in the domain matrix of 'SUPREMACY'. The scope of attention attributed to this statement is not clear since its boundaries are not clearly identified. However, the use of the proper noun 'Putin' delimits the scope of attention as it functions as a focal point in the conceptual structure of the audience. Thus, part of the scenes that represent this linguistic construction is conceptualised with a fine-grained view by the hearers.

6. Results and Discussion

The findings of the selected data analysed in the previous section are presented and discussed based on

the research questions and hypotheses formulated in this study, as follows:

1. The domain of 'SUPREMACY' is multifaceted, so it is investigated as a domain matrix in this study. Thus, four different types of facets are profiled in conceptualising this domain matrix in reference to the selected speeches.

2. The concept of 'SUPERIORITY' is the most salient facet in the domain of 'SUPREMACY', as it occurs in four different speeches of this study. It is followed by the facet of 'POWER', as it occurs in three different speeches as well. However, the facets of 'PROSPERITY' and 'DOMINANCE' are less prominent or profiled in conceptualising the domain of 'SUPREMACY' in these speeches, as each occurs only in one speech.

3. Different linguistic and ideological structures represent the conceptualisation of the facet of 'SUPERIORITY' in these speeches. In the first speech, it represents the state of investment in America as superior during Biden's presidency period to that of Trump's era. In the second speech, however, this facet embodies the economy of America as superior to other countries in the world. The third form of this facet is profiled in the fourth speech to represent Biden's success in foreign policy as a vice president of Obama at that time, whereas the last form of this facet is profiled in the fifth speech to conceptualise America as a superior country to its partners and allies since it can be trusted, relied upon, and stands up for the freedom of other nations and countries.

4. The second prominent facet in the domain of 'SUPREMACY', after 'SUPERIORITY', is 'POWER'. In the second speech, Biden attempts to construct this facet in the audience's mental structure to construe HIMSELF as an image or concept of power that can stop Trump from dividing America and backward it. Again, in the third speech, Biden tries to draw the audience's attention to the facet of 'POWER' that represents HIM as a powerful concept that can fight and protect women's health care from Trump's attacks. Moreover, the last form of this facet is represented in the last speech to conceptualise America and Biden HIMSELF as powerful entities to be conceived in the audience's cognitive models as a concept of 'POWER' that never yields or bows down to Putin.

5. In the selected data, 'PROSPERITY' is another facet of the domain matrix 'SUPREMACY' that represents part of the first speech. Here, Biden conceptualises the states of investment in America and American products as prosperous in his presidency.

6. The last facet in this study is 'DOMINANCE', which is represented by part of the last speech. Biden attempts to profile this facet in the audience's mental structure to conceptualise HIMSELF and America as dominant or strong entities for their allies.

CONCLUSIONS

Based on the results obtained from the data analysis in light of the research questions and hypotheses, the following conclusions have been drawn:

- The domain of 'SUPREMACY' is conceptualised in the selected speeches of Biden through the use of some facets from the most prominent to the least prominent, such as 'SUPERIORITY', 'POWER', 'PROSPERITY', and 'DOMINANCE'.
- CDA is not enough to investigate the mental representation of the domain of 'SUPREMACY' in the selected speeches, as ideological structure is conceptual in nature, so CL should be involved to uncover the mental processes that are maintained in employing the ideological patterns by Joe Biden.
- The cognitive identification-attention strategy is maintained in constructing the domain of 'SUPREMACY' in the mental structure of the speaker employing the embedded ideological structures that are represented by the linguistic structures of the selected speeches.
- Although some of the conceptualised facets are covertly represented in the ideological patterns of the selected speeches, the CODA approach employs cognitive and critical mechanisms to conceive them under the domain matrix of 'SUPREMACY'.

REFERENCES

- Al-Hamandi, S.H. (2018). Cognitive Discourse Analysis: A New Approach of Analyzing Intertextuality in Spoken Presidential Debates. *Journal of Al-Farahidi's Arts*, 10(32-1), pp.01-27.
- Attia, M. (2007). A Critical Cognitive Study: The Egyptian Written Media. In: C. Hart and D. Lukeš, eds., *Cognitive Linguistics in Critical Discourse Analysis: Application and Theory*. Newcastle: CAMBRIDGE SCHOLARS PUBLISHING, pp.81-106.
- Biden, J. (2024a), "Donald Trump stripped good-paying jobs and shipped them overseas for cheaper labor rather than pay workers a fair wage. not anymore. on My Watch, we're investing in America and American-made products.", Twitter, Twitter, 30 January, available at: <https://twitter.com/JoeBiden/status/1752371344824512821>
- Biden, J. (2024b), "There are extreme and dangerous voices at work in the country—led by Donald Trump—who are determined to divide our nation and take us backward. We cannot let that happen. We've come a long way these past four years—with America now having the strongest economy in the world and among the lowest inflation of any major economy.", Twitter, Twitter, 4 February, available at: <https://twitter.com/JoeBiden/status/1753940095353135236>
- Biden, J. (2024c), "We will continue our fight to protect women's health care from Maga Republican attacks.", Twitter, Twitter, 7 February, available at: <https://twitter.com/JoeBiden/status/1755000439316046152>
- Biden, J. (2024d), "Remarks by president Biden at a campaign reception", The White House, The United States Government, 9 February, available at: <https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefing-room/speeches-remarks/2024/02/09/remarks-by-president-biden-at-a-campaign-reception-new-york-ny-7/>
- Biden, J. (2024e), "Remarks by President Biden on Senate Passage of the Bipartisan Supplemental Agreement", The White House, The United States Government, 13 February, available at: <https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefing-room/speeches-remarks/2024/02/13/remarks-by-president-biden-on-senate-passage-of-the-bipartisan-supplemental-agreement/>
- Chilton, P. (2005). Missing Links in Mainstream CDA: Modules, Blends and the Critical Instinct. In *A New Agenda in (Critical) Discourse Analysis: Theory, Methodology and Interdisciplinarity*, ed, Ruth Wodak and Paul Chilton, 19-51. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Clausner, T.C. and Croft, W. (1999). Domains and Image Schemas. *Cognitive Linguistics*, 10(1), pp.1-31. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1515/cogl.1999.001>
- Croft, W. and Cruse, D., 2004. *Cognitive Linguistics*. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press.

- Dirven, R., F. Polzenhagen and H.-G. Wolf (2007). Cognitive Linguistics, Ideology and Critical Discourse Analysis. In D. Geeraerts and H. Cuyckens (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Cognitive Linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. pp. 1222-40.
- Evans, V., and Green, M. (2006). *Cognitive Linguistics: An Introduction*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Evans, V., Bergen, B.K. and Zinken, J. (2007). *The Cognitive Linguistics Reader*. London; Oakville: Equinox.
- Hamawand, Z. (2016). *Semantics: A Cognitive Account of Linguistic Meaning*. Sheffield: Equinox.
- Hart, C. (2011). Moving beyond Metaphor in the Cognitive Linguistic Approach to CDA Construal Operations in Immigration Discourse. In: C. Hart, ed., *Critical Discourse Studies in Context and Cognition*. John Benjamins Publishing Company, pp.171-192.
- Hart, C. (2013). Constructing Contexts through Grammar: Cognitive Models and Conceptualisation in British Newspaper Reports of Political Protests. In J. Flowerdew (ed.), *Discourse and Contexts*. London: Continuum. pp. 159-184.
- Hart, C. (2013). Event-construal in Press Reports of Violence in Two Recent Political Protests: A Cognitive Linguistic Approach to CDA. *Journal of Language and Politics*, 12(3), pp.400-423. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1075/jlp.12.3.05har>
- Hart, C. (2014). Construal Operations in Online Press Reports of Political Protests. In: C. Hart and P. Cap, eds., *Contemporary Critical Discourse Studies*. London: Bloomsbury Academic, pp.167-188.
- Hart, C. (2015). Cognitive Linguistics and Critical Discourse Analysis. In: E. Dabrowska and D. Divjak, eds., *Handbook of Cognitive Linguistics*. Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter Mouton, pp.322-346.
- Hart, C. and Lukeš, D. (eds.) (2009). *Cognitive Linguistics in Critical Discourse Analysis: Application and Theory*. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Koller, V. (2005). Critical Discourse Analysis and social cognition: Evidence from Business Media Discourse. *Discourse & Society* 16(2): 199- 224.
- Langacker, R. (1987). *Foundations of Cognitive Grammar: Theoretical prerequisites*. California: Stanford University Press.
- Langacker, R. (2005). Construction grammars: Cognitive, radical and less so. In Francisco J. Ruiz de Mendoza Ibañez, and M. Sandra Peña Cervel, eds., *Cognitive Linguistics: Internal Dynamics and Interdisciplinary Interaction*, pp: 101-59. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Langacker, R. (2019). Construal. In: E. Dąbrowska and D. Divjak, ed., *Cognitive Linguistics- Foundations of Language*. Berlin, Boston: Walter de Gruyter, pp.140-166.
- Meyer, M. (2001). Between Theory, Method and Politics: Positioning of the Approaches to CDA. In *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*, ed, Ruth Wodak and Michael Meyer, 14-31. London: Sage Publications.
- Stockwell, P. (2001). Towards a critical Cognitive Linguistics? In *Poetics, linguistics and history: Discourses of war and conflict*, ed, Poetics and Linguistics Association Conference Papers, 510-28. South Africa: Potchefstroom University.
- Talmy, L. (1977). Rubber-sheet Cognition in Language. In *Papers from the... Regional Meeting*. Chicago Ling. Soc. Chicago, Ill (Vol. 13, pp. 612-628).
- Talmy, L. (1978). The Relation of Grammar to Cognition- a Synopsis. *American Journal of Computational Linguistics*, pp.16-26.
- Talmy, L. (1988). The Relation of Grammar to Cognition. *Topics in Cognitive Linguistics*, ed. Brygida Rudzka-Ostyn, 165-205. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Tenbrink, T. (2014). Cognitive Discourse Analysis: Accessing Cognitive Representations and Processes through Language Data. *Language and Cognition*, 7(1), pp.98-137.
- Tenbrink, T. (2020). *Cognitive Discourse Analysis: An Introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- van Dijk, T. A. (2000). Cognitive discourse analysis: An introduction. University of Amsterdam www.discursos.org/unpublished%20articles/cogn-dis-anal.htm
- Yeari, M. and van den Broek, P. (2011). A Cognitive Account of Discourse Understanding and Discourse Interpretation: The Landscape Model of Reading.

Discourse Studies, 13(5), pp.635–643. doi:
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1461445611412748>.