The Relationship between Structure of Discourse and Structure of Ideology:
A Socio-Cognitive Perspective

Arazoo R. Othamn[1], Salah M. Salih[2]

[1, 2] Department of English Language, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, Koya University, Kurdistan Region, Iraq

ABSTRACT

Whereas theoretical and political thought on the existence of ideologies has a long history, fewer focus has been given to their exact nature, socio-cognitive frameworks, discursive replication, and ideological discourse. This article investigates the relation between the structure of discourse and structure of ideology from the socio-cognitive perspective, adopting van Dijk's (2006, 2008, and 2009) 'sociocognitive' approach. Moreover, ideologies are Ideologies pertain to the concepts and convictions of a group of individuals and the mental character and the psychological studies of ideologies are rare, the aim is to reveal how such cognitive phenomena are interconnected with discourse structures, verbal engagement, communication events and contexts, as well as society structures like dominance and social inequity. In order to understand the structures of discourse and to examine the nature and functions of ideologies in society, the structure of beliefs should be involved in the same way because they interact and subsequently are mutually related into systems. Ideologies' mental characteristics, including their nature as concepts or beliefs their relationship with views and knowledge, and their position as socially shared interpretations, will be discussed. Discourse structures and social structures are of distinct kinds, and the only way to connect them is through language users' mental representations of themselves as individuals and social members.

KEY WORDS: Discourse Processing, Ideology, Mind, Memory, Personal Cognition

1. INTRODUCTION:

Ideologies concern the thoughts or beliefs of groups of people. Ideologies are usually focused with major societal and political issues, especially issues that are essential to the survival of a community, as contrasted to mundane daily concerns. Ideologies are all about life and death, origin and multiplication, as the conflicting perspectives on abortion and euthanasia reveal. Apparently, ecological ideologies are concerned with human wellness in relation to the surrounding environment. Thus, the cognitive definition of ideology is given in terms of personal cognition and social cognition that are shared by members of a group.

The first semiotic theory of ideology was created by Soviet philosopher V.N. Voloshinov in his 1929 work Marxism and the Philosophy of Language – a work in which the author openly asserts that 'without signs, there is no ideology.' In his perspective, the world of signs and ideology are coextensive: consciousness can form only via the material embodiment of signifiers, and because these signifiers are material, they are not merely 'reflections' of reality but an important part of it. 'Consciousness logic,' Voloshinov argues, 'is the logic of ideological communication, of a social group's semiotic interaction. If we strip awareness of its semiotic, ideological substance, it is left with nothing." The word is the quintessential 'ideological phenomena,' and awareness is just the internalization of words, a form of 'inner speech.' To put it differently, awareness is less something 'inside' us than it is something that surrounds and connects us, a network of signifiers that binds us together (Eagleton, 2014).

They describe ideology as discourses that classify the world in ways that serve to legitimize and sustain social patterns. They oppose a view of ideology as 'false consciousness' and a view of power as the property of

certain persons or organizations. As with critical discourse analysis, they view ideology as a practice with dispersed and discursively organized power. A discourse's ideological substance can be determined through its consequences. The purpose is to illustrate that some discourses serve to advance one group's interests at the detriment of another. Ideology critique, which gained popularity in the 1970s and has historical origins in Marx and the Frankfurt School, is a significant style of criticism. According to this concept, society's power relations are accompanied by a hegemonic language that routinely obscures reality.

Moreover, van Dijk (2009) argues that Frequently, attitudes are established or organized on more fundamental ideologies that govern the development and change of more particular views. Consequently, a racist ideology might impact unfavourable attitudes toward immigrants, positive discrimination, quotas, ethnic differences, and cultural links. As is the issue with the majority of social cognition, users continue to overlook the specific mental structure of ideologies, yet their basic categories appear frequently in ideological discourse: personality, action, goals, interactions with some other communities, and assets or purposes. All are essential for such social description of parties, especially Us vs. Them, a polarized construction that governs power abuse, supremacy, competition, as well as cooperation within teams, in addition to every ideological discourse.

General ideologies, as well as its more specific attitudes, also exert power over individuals' personal experiences, that is, their mental models. And, if these (biased) models control discourse, they frequently manifest themselves in polarized ideological discourse structures. Thus, in such ideological discourse, we may observe a positive representation of '*Our*' group and a negative representation of '*Others*' — always contingent on the communicative situation, i.e., our context models — at all levels of text or talk: topics, lexicon, descriptions, argumentation, storytelling, and metaphors, among others.

The present article is devoted to the investigation into van Dijk's (2006, 2008, and 2009) 'sociocognitive' discourse analysis, i.e., the study of language users' mental representations and processes as they produce and comprehend discourse and engage in verbal interaction, as well as the knowledge, ideologies, and other ideas that social groups share. The aim is to reveal how such cognitive phenomena are linked to discourse structures, verbal engagement, communication events and contexts, as well as society structures like dominance and social inequity according to his approach, since discourse structures and social structures are of distinct kinds, and the only way to connect them is through language users' mental representations of themselves as individuals and social members.

The purpose is to illustrate that some discourses serve to advance one group's interests at the detriment of another. The value of this article lies behind discussing the structure of discourse and its relation with ideology. Concerning van Dijk's socio-cognitive method, it will be accomplished by providing a summary of the concept and the way it examines discourse and ideology.

2. PREVIOUS STUDIES

Following a review of the core principles of ideology and discourse, numerous illustrative studies demonstrating how ideology may be explored on a variety of levels are offered. One of the studies was conducted by Purvis and Hunt (1993) in an article 'Discourse, ideology, discourse, ideology, discourse, ideology' put that modern social theory is replete with references to "discourse" and "ideology." Occasionally, the two notions are employed interchangeably, while on other occasions, they are inverted. This study aimed to explain the role that these notions have in modern disputes. It presented a retrieval exercise that reveals the two core concepts create unique theoretical traditions that, while distinguishable, may both be utilized effectively.

In addition, Määttä (2014) in an article entitled 'Discourse and ideology –why do we need both' considered speech and ideology as contentious notions. He reviewed some of the ways they have been utilized in French discourse and critical discourse analysis. The disciplines of analysis and linguistic anthropology. He examined the development of ideas is occurring pertaining to operational notions, essences, and the truth.

Moreover, in a dissertation entitled "Ideology, Media and Conflict in Political Discourse and Its Translation During the Arab Spring: Syria as a Case Study" Omer (2016) tackled "the relationship between a number of issues in relation to ideology, media, political discourse, language, and translation". As a theoretical framework, Critical Discourse Analysis and narrative theory were utilized. In order to analyze the data circulating on the Arab Spring, it was also intended to identify common political instruments and methods utilized in political discourse creation and media discourse. The researcher aimed to determine "the ideological impact of both the translator and the patron on the outcome of the translation process".

Pihlaja and Musolff (2017) in an article entitled 'Discourse and Ideology' focused on the manifestation of ideology in social media interaction, both in explicit contestation and in implicit frameworks. Likewise, Al Rawi (2017) in an article under the title of "The Validity

Of CDA As A Means Of "Uncovering" The Ideologies Implicit In Discourse" Several perspectives on the appropriateness of CDA as a method to exposing ideologies were examined, and instances of hegemony and the link among both CDA as well as language cognition were offered. However, exploring the link between the structure of ideology and the structure of discourse according to a socio-cognitive approach has not been thoroughly researched. Thus. The present study tries to investigate this link through discussing a number of views and providing several examples.

3. STRUCTURE OF DISCOURSE

Texts are created in certain ways and in particular social contexts. An article in any newspaper, for example, is created through a process of obtaining sources such as press agency reports, converting these sources into a draft report, choosing where the report should be placed in the newspaper, and revising the report. Text structure is concerned with the text's organizing characteristics. In the analysis of discursive practice, the three categories (force, coherence, and intertextuality) are employed. Other elements that make up a framework for analyzing texts take into account the status of text production and interpretation, as well as the text's formal characteristics.

In order to analyze speech, discursive practice entails three major acts. Text production, text distribution, and text consumption are the three processes in question. Depending on societal variables, the nature of these processes differs among different forms of discourse. There are more difficult techniques to produce a text. Texts are digested in a variety of ways depending on the social context. Some texts have a basic distribution, for example, a casual conversation that belongs simply to the immediate context of the situation in which it occurs. Other texts, on the other hand, have a more complicated distribution. For example, writings written by a politician are dispersed throughout a variety of organizations, each with its own consumption patterns and ways of replicating and modifying texts (Fairclough, 1992).

Initially, this method was conceived as an expansion of structural, practical, or generative grammars to incorporate the acoustical, morphological, structural, and semantic structures of statements. It has been shown, for instance, that the intonation or syntax of statements may rely on the structure of prior phrases or text and speech turns.

Specifically, these text or discourse grammars compensated for a discourse's semantic local and global coherence, for instance, in regards to the functional links between such assumptions (including generalization or specification) and semantic macrostructures. However, it was subsequently recognized that a fundamental notion such as coherence could not be described just in regards of linkages within propositions (meanings), in addition to terms of mental models that reflect the subject matter of a discourse. For instance, a causal or temporal link across activities may be portrayed in a mental model, providing a foundation for the local coherence of model-based discourse.

In the wake of this pioneering grammatical analysis of discourse structures outside the level of the sentence, a number of following theories of discourse provided a plethora of additional structures and procedures that cannot be expressed using standard linguistic elements of grammar. As is often the instance with stories, media articles, and academic papers, many styles of discourse get their own unifying schematic organization (or superstructure) with distinct types, such as Overviews (News stories, Subject headings, Summaries, Press releases, etc.), Introductions or Viewpoints, Consequences, Impressive Events or Tests, and Declarations, Discussion, and Conclusions or Coda — depending mostly on genre. Similarly, argumentative genres including ordinary disagreements, research articles, and editorials may include a range of Arguments and Results. (van Dijk, 2009).

All types of meaningful semiotic human activity can be seen in relation to social, cultural, and historical patterns; and developments of use are included in discourse. Discourse is what transforms our surroundings into ones that are socially and culturally significant. However, this type of meaning creation does not occur in a vacuum; it occurs under extremely specific linguistic and sociocultural contexts which cannot be utilized by everyone in the same manner ((Blommaert, 2005). In this respect, van Dijk (1995) sheds light on the levels of analyzing discourses. He postulates three different levels of analysis which are"

1. Social analysis which includes Overall societal structures, e.g., parliamentary democracy, capitalism Institutional/Organizational structures, e.g., racist political parties Group relations, e.g., discrimination, racism, sexism Group structures: identity, tasks, goals, norms, position, resources

2. Cognitive Analysis which involves:

a. Social cognition: Sociocultural values, e.g., intelligence, honesty, solidarity, equality Ideologies, e.g., racist, sexist, anti-racist, feminist, ecological ... Systems of attitudes, e.g., about affirmative action, multiculturalism ... Sociocultural knowledge, e.g., about society, groups, language, ...

b. Personal cognition: General (context free) Personal values: personal selections from social values Personal ideologies: personal interpretations of group ideologies Personal attitudes: systems of personal

opinions Personal knowledge: biographical information, past experiences

c. Particular (context-bound) Models: ad hoc representations of specific current actions, events Context models: ad hoc representations of the speech context Mental plans and representation of (speech) acts, discourse Mental construction of text meaning from models: the text base Mental (strategic) selection of discourse structures (style, etc.)

3. Discourse Analysis: The various structures of text and talk."

The cognitive functions of discourse production and interpretation are very complicated that are carried out in real time ('online') and in parallel by specific Working Memory operations, such as the processing of sounds, images, phonemes, morphemes, lexical items, syntactic structures, local and global meanings, overall patterns of text or talk (superstructures), and interaction structures and strategies. People know very little about the complexities of these WM operations and their (restricted) memory space or temporality, especially at greater discourse levels.

That these various complex concurrent processes associated with the creation and comprehension of discourse are managed and coordinated in fragment of a second with clearly restricted memory resources is one of the (many) problems that must be resolved. An overview of all procedures would fill sections of explanation (or computer code) – from phonemes, symbols, or image sections on the 'lower' rates to producing or comprehending total connotations, themes, verbal interaction, narrative, and perhaps persuasive techniques on the 'higher' rates of parallelization. In complicated discourse, underlying semantic macrostructures ('themes') which also control the production and interpretation of local sentence contents are willing to be aware of the Control Scheme (propositions). (van Dijk, 2016)

Language usage and discourse trigger and employ certain language as well as discursive knowledge elements, patterns, and tactics in LTM, including "grammar, lexicon, local and global semantics, pragmatics, conversation" and other forms of interaction. Although many of the aforementioned concepts and procedures of memory and discourse receiving are (slightly) obvious in psycholinguistics, cognitive psychology in discourse centres on describing and explaining 'higher' degree discourse processing. Examples of these higher-level processes have included creation of local coherence for both utterance meanings (propositions) as well as interpretation in varying sorts of cohesion and perhaps co-reference (e.g., pronouns), the total coherence of themes and articulation in news stories, subject headings, or overviews, the layout overall organization (superstructures) of articles,

argumentation, media, or other genres, or even the difficult and complicated local and global alignment of speech acts as well as verbal inflections.

4. STRUCTURE OF IDEOLOGY

Ideologies should be described first as forms of social cognition, or in psychological terms. In contemporary cognitive research, the vague notion of 'ideas' is commonly examined in terms of thoughts and dogmas, that are maintained as exact mental images in the 'semantic' Long-Term Memory. Despite the fact that ideologies are common beliefs and therefore cognitive constructions, this cannot deny the social aspect of ideologies. Instead, "they are socially shared among members of a collectivity and are predicated on and formed by social interaction in social contexts that comprise social structures". This describes the social revolution whereby the party's ideals are developed. (Van Dijk, 2011)

However, van Dijk (2006) states that the premise about ideologies being structured does not imply that they are coherent in any manner. They are socio-psychological systems, not rational ones. Thus, they may be diverse or inconsistent, particularly during their first, more or less spontaneous stages, even though various ideologues (authors, leaders, instructors, and preachers, for example) may attempt to increase coherence through explicit manifestos, catechisms, and theories. Thus, while ideologies may organize other social beliefs held by communities, this does not guarantee that these other social beliefs are coherent, as demonstrated by the well-known racist beliefs that immigrants are lazy and unwilling to work while simultaneously take our jobs. Additionally, it is known that individuals employ a variety of tactics to reconcile or ignore contradictions between their ideological beliefs and the 'facts' with which they are presented.

As is the case with the majority of cognitive systems, ideologies are unlikely to be an ad hoc collection of evaluative notions. Rather than that, they are structured in a variety of ways. Consequently, many ideologies, such as those that drive disagreement, domination, and defiance, may be arranged round the polarization that distinguishes ingroup and outgroup (s). Racist and imperialist ideologies, for instance, commonly divide persons into Us and Them, and even into ingroups and outgroups, such as whites opposed blacks, our "own" people as opposed strangers, or the "settled" versus the "newcomers."

Due to the importance of social structure and, consequently, of position and rivalry for access to social resources, many groups may incorporate one or more reference-groups or outgroups into their own ideologies. This ideological notion of interactions with other groups

is almost certainly part of a larger schema that organizes ideologies and other forms of social cognition. In other words, if all social beings are needed to create ideologies in reaction to his group membership, and if they must do so frequently and successfully, then it is reasonable to assume that they also establish a structured schema into which the specific and mutable ideological tenets adhere. This sort of schema consists of a small number of core categories and a set of procedures or strategies for identifying or manipulating the connections among these categories.

As van Dijk (1995) argues, to express the (own) group's fundamental interests, it is claimed that ideologies could be viewed as a kind of collective self-schema. Against the backdrop of a sociological analysis of groups and social structures, this framework of a limited number of essential categories that arrange the assessment premises describing the (sort of) group:

• Identity / Membership. Who is welcomed and who isn't Which individuals are part of the group or who isn't? This is certainly salient for "racist, ethnocentric, xenophobic, or nationalist beliefs that think that "we, white Europeans," belong in Europe and that others should be refused entry, at least as (equal) citizens. However, the same may be true for opposition ideologies, such as those of ethnic minority groups or feminists". That area frequently comprises the team's identity fundamental traits, such as source, looks, ethnic background, gender, and faith. Usually, prejudice against other groups is founded on the essential characteristics attributed to such other groups, yet these characteristics also form the basis for opposing ideologies. Typically, this class is used to define societal classes such as men and females, whites and blacks, the old and the immature, inhabitants and strangers or immigrants, etc.

• Tasks / Activities. What are the typical actions of "we"? What responsibility do we have? What is the purpose or objective of our group? Thus, writers (self-)represent themselves as journalists, academics as researchers and educators and feminists as anti-male chauvinist campaigners. This category often relates to professional organizations and social duties, such as scholars and architects, parents, task forces and organizations.

• Goals. Typical group activities are usually inspired through one or maybe more indefinitely large objectives: "journalists write news to inform the public or to act as a watchdog for society; doctors promote health; professors teach to educate the young or conduct research to discover the truth; and environmentalists protest pollution to protect nature and promote health". • The fundamental purpose of objectives is the formation of goal-oriented organizations. Take into account that they

are ideological classifications; they are not necessarily indicative with what participants are, do, or strive for.

• Norms / Values. Norms and values like as neutrality in informing (journalists), fairness in adopting or enacting laws (public officials, courts), and safety in defending the nation and its residents (public officials, courts) are used to assess the duties and aims of every group (police, military). Usually, political and religious groupings, such as Catholics and Protestants, are distinguished by their values and tenets.

• Position. Every party likewise describes itself in regards of certain other teams: writers in regards of their audience (or news actors), academics in respect of their learners, doctors in regards of their cases, as well as feminists in regards of women and men in generally (gender) and chauvinist males specifically. Thus, the notion of position represents friends and enemies, antagonists and followers, along with social connections of dominance, intergroup competition, and struggle. Definitely, "this is the core category of self-schemata of social groups described as ideologies. Typical positions-based groups include the elites and the masses (the 'people'), bosses and subordinates, and so on".

• ResourcesEach group can only exist and expand if it has exposure to restricted valuable networks. Consequently, some groups may be distinguished or differentiated by their (preferred) exposure to certain physical or figurative things, "such as citizenship, residence, status, human rights, respect, employment, health, housing, welfare, money, knowledge, or public discourse". Therefore, reporters may want to protect their special access to knowledge, academics may want to protect their expertise, administrators may want to protect money or earnings, and feminists may want to protect equitable pay. Resources access distinguishes the wealthy from the poor, the employed from the jobless, the housed from the homeless, and, in principle, the Haves from those That have not.

"Schematic categories of the structure of ideologies"

• "Identity: Who are we? Who belong to us? Where do we come from?"

• Activities: "What do we usually do? What is our task?"

• Goals: "What do we want to obtain?"

• Norms and values: "What is good/bad, permitted/prohibited for us?"

• Group relations: "Who are our allies and opponents?"

• Resources: "What is the basis of our power, or our lack of power?"

5. STRUCTURE OF DISCOURSE AND IDEOLOGY

Ideologies are systems of ideas and values that explain particular political and social regimes, legitimize hierarchies, and perpetuate group identities in critical

discourse studies. Ideologies are embedded in both structures and events; Ideologies are representations that contribute to dominance relationships, that are 'enacted' in social behaviors (etiquette, genres, etc.), and that are 'inculcated' in identities.

According to van Dijk's interdisciplinary perspective, it is theoretically complicated to comprehend the connection between the structure of discourse and ideology. Ideologies are the underlying beliefs that form the basis of a group's social representations, according to Van Dijk's viewpoint. They are encoded in social memory as a "group schema" that determines a group's identity. This schema's fundamental principles observe the growth of group perceptions and awareness, in addition to ultimately, the private concepts that participants construct about social occasions. Such mental models regulate social behaviours, including the creation and understanding of discourse.

Ideology critique, which gained popularity in the 1970s and has historical origins in Marx and the Frankfurt School, is a significant style of criticism. According to this concept, society's power relations are accompanied by a hegemonic language that routinely obscures reality. Critique's objective is to destroy power by exposing the reality hidden behind ideology. For instance, some may argue that sexual equality exists in our culture. Simultaneously, social study may suggest that males earn more than women and that women spend more time than men on home responsibilities.

Thus, there is a discrepancy between how things actually are and how people perceive them, and this mismatch provides the basis for critique. Individuals do not perceive reality objectively because their worldview is distorted by ideologies. For instance, there may be an ideology that asserts that the sexes have finally achieved equality, and this ideology may perpetuate a male-dominated hierarchy in the labor market and, maybe, a female-dominated family. Thus, ideology promotes uneven power relations, but individuals are blind to this because they suffer from false consciousness: what they perceive is ideology rather than reality. The researcher's purpose in a criticism of the prevalent ideology is to expose ideology as distortion, allowing individuals to see through ideology and alter reality (Jorgensen and Phillips, 2002).

In short, a critique of the prevailing ideology seeks to expose power via truth. This interpretation of critique has come under fire from social constructionist researchers. To begin, it has been criticized for adhering to a traditional Marxist view of society, in which the base dictates the superstructure, or, in our terminology, discourses are created by non-discursive factors, most notably the economics. Second, it presupposes the existence of an underlying truth about social conditions and the researcher's privileged access to that reality. Thirdly, it presupposes that this fact is powerless.

Menard (2017), citing from Chouliaraki and Fairclough (1999), defines ideologies as practices derived from certain points of view that resolve conflicts and antagonisms in ways that are consistent with the goals and aims of dominance. By seeing ideologies as constructions of practices, it can be observed that how they are formed in social life (economics, politics, culture, and daily life) via acts that are both temporally and geographically placed and have developed into habitual ways of doing things. Social worlds, and the ideologies contained within them, are produced by individuals in the course of their daily, and sometimes banal, activities. When considering ideologies as produced through particular views or viewpoints, the emphasis is on contradicting positioning that might result in antagonisms between or among various subjects. By considering ideology as practices derived from certain points of view that resolve conflicts, problems, and antagonisms, the message is that a heavy reliance on dialogically and difference in text production may suggest authority, domination, and ideological labor.

Moreover, Menard (2017) argues that, ideology has traditionally been conceptualized in two ways: Marxist ideas emphasize ideology as false consciousness or distorted reality, whereas sociological traditions consider ideologies as rigid worldviews. Marx had a pessimistic view of ideology. Marx saw ideological notions as distortions of reality to the extent that they serve to preserve dominance relationships by obscuring inherent conflicts. These inconsistencies are not just epistemological, but also material in nature. Subjects are viewed as being duped by market inconsistencies that are difficult to disentangle; they fool both dominated and dominant classes. Marx claimed that it is transformative political activities, not critical thoughts or science that breaks ideological structures. Marx's ideology as distorted reality or 'false consciousness' has been especially contentious in some current work because it might be seen as supporting the concept that there are accurate or genuine ways of interpreting the world.

Social cognition's level of abstraction and complexity necessitate significant social learning through experience (models) - or outright indoctrination. As a result, ideologies are acquired relatively late in development and not uniformly across group members. Certain specialists (ideologues) inside a group will have more expansive ideologies than 'ordinary' group members. However, membership in an ideological group will almost certainly involve acceptance of a few key ideological principles. While classical work on political ideologies and some current directions in social

psychology deny that people have (stable) ideologies, it appears plausible that for domains in which people have social attitudes, such as those that organize their daily lives, people do have ideologies that organize these attitudes. Personal ideological differences reflected in surveys and (other) discourse may be readily explained in terms of personal beliefs embedded in models of events (personal experiences) and context, and because people belong to diverse social groups, each with its own attitudes and ideologies.

Ideologies are said to be organized first and foremost on group self-schemata, which include categories such as Membership Criteria, Activities, Goals, Values/Norms, Social Position, and Resources. These are the categories in which critical information about one's own group is represented, as well as its relationship to other groups: who we are, what we do, and why we do it, etc. The Social Position category may include representations of potentially antagonistic interactions with other groups (Van Dijk, 2002).

The final argument is that ideology is viewed as being formed through certain points of view that marginalize difference in ways that coincide with dominance ambitions. This means that ideological investigations must encompass social analyses, with the objective of interpreting and explicating those goals of dominance from cultural and historical perspectives. This last argument also implies the idea that hegemony is never fully achieved in social semiotic explanations of ideology. Social practices are governed by an infinite number of interdependent systems, which implies that outcomes are never totally predicted, and opposition resources are always likely to be developed.

To summarize Van Dijk (1995)'s particular approach to ideology, which is somewhat in contradiction to other approaches, the following assumptions are emphasized:

(a) Ideologies are cognitive. While ideologies are undoubtedly social and political in nature, and are associated with groups and societal structures, they also have a critical cognitive component.

(b) Ideologies are social. Since Marx and Engels, ideologies have been defined in sociological or socio-economic terms and are frequently associated with groups, group positions and interests, or group conflicts such as class, gender, or 'race' struggles, and thus with social power and dominance, as well as their concealment and legitimization.

(c) Ideologies are socio-cognitive. The critical component of social doctrines, including those of knowledge, views, and attitudes, serves as a bridge between the cognitive and the social. That is, ideologies are primarily shared (or challenged) by social group members.

(d) Ideologies do not exist in a 'true' or 'false' state. "True" or "false" terms are not used to define ideologies. This is not to say that racists or male chauvinists do not harbor incorrect notions about blacks or women. Rather than that, they represent a social group's perhaps politicized, self-serving 'truth.' In that respect, they are more or less relevant or efficient interpretive (and action) frameworks for such groups if they are capable of furthering their goals.

(e) Ideologies can range in complexity. Ideologies do not have to be fully formed and explicit systems of belief. On the other hand, while research indicates that not everyone has explicit political ideologies, individuals may have more detailed ideologies about other, group-relevant social concerns. These ideologies might be simple or extremely complicated, consisting of a few fundamental ideas or vast frameworks such as the ideologies of 'democracy' or 'socialism'. Indeed, unlike the term 'ideology' as used in common text and talk, ideologies are not restricted to significant philosophical or political '-isms'. Rather than that, they should be viewed as (the fundamental axioms) of a group's naïve, implicit social theory about itself and its place in society.

(f) Ideologies appear in a variety of ways depending on their situation. Group members' ideological expressions frequently appear to be missing, imprecise, confusing, Nonsensical or inconsistent does not imply that ideologies are inconsistent or fail to emerge at all.

(g) Ideologies are broad and abstract in nature. Ideologies are situation-independent, and their potentially diverse manifestations are formed locally and contextually restricted. Outside of a presupposition of approximate permanence and consistency of ideological frameworks, one would struggle to describe how community members' ideological expressions are typically consistent and similar. This is the basic theoretical rationale for the argument.

'Ideology' has been a significant phrase for CDA from its inception, implying a close connection to the Marxist tradition from which it originated. Beginning with Marx, that tradition defined this critical phrase in a variety of ways, but for the majority, it referred to a coherent but distorted view of reality, warped and distorted to serve or reflect the interests and preconceptions of a certain group. The early statement by Kress and Hodge (1979) is illustrative: 'Ideology is a systematic collection of ideas structured around a certain point of view' (Hodge, 2012).

Discourse patterns reveal the dominant social groupings' underlying attitudes and ideologies. Below are a number of these patterns of ideological discourse:

• Polarization. The fundamental ideologies often polarizing amongst positive and negative representations of both the ingroup and even the outgroup.

- Pronouns. Language users (or entities campaigning on favor of ideological groupings) make reference to themselves and to other group members using the 'political' pronoun We (together with us, ours, etc.). Additionally, they identify to persons of other, competing, or dominated groups using the pronoun They (theirs, them). Given the extensive polarization between ingroups as well as outgroups, the pronominal representation is Us against Them.
- Identification. Identity is the major category of group ideology. Members of ideological groupings associated with 'their' group, e.g., the Republican Party. As feminists, we... Talking as a pacifist, I/we would want to...
- Emphasis of positive self-descriptions and negative other-descriptions. Often, ideologies are organized according to a positive self-scheme. Under the influence of ideological ingroup–outgroup polarization, there is an emphasis on negative other-descriptions, as seen in racist or ethnic discourse (e.g., continuous admiration of Our country in xenophobic rhetoric).
- Activities. Usually, ideological organizations (self-)identify by the things they do, their normal activities.
- Norms and values. Like the case with Liberty, Fairness, Justice, and Autonomy, ideologies are founded on standards of behaviour or principles of what ought to be pursued.
- Interests. Ideological conflict centers on power and ambition. Consequently, ideological discourse often contains several allusions to our concerns, such as fundamental resources (food, housing, and health) and standard savings (knowledge, prestige, and the opportunity for public discourse). (van Dijk, 2009).

Furthermore, Verschueren (2012) adds that ideology is a sociocultural-cognitive phenomenon that is completely integrated. As the term 'common sense' indicates, cognition is not viewed as a solely individual feature of human beings, despite the fact that each individual possesses a unique mechanism for processing. While ideology, like most other higher forms of cognitive processing, is socially situated, what distinguishes it as a cognitive phenomenon is that it also has aspects of society as an object and that its social situatedness involves a unique form of inter-subjectivity or sharing, as well as affect and stance.

Numerous studies have emphasized the 'illusory,' 'false consciousness,' and 'fetish' characteristics of ideological occurrences in an effort to characterize it. Despite this, certain features of ideologies are accidental. Therefore, we argue for an interdisciplinary definition of ideology that regards ideologies as the intersection of social processes and social cognition. (Persson and Neto, 2018).

As van Dijk (1998) points out, Ideologies help people to organize their diverse social views to determine what is accurate for them, whether it be beneficial or harmful, correct or incorrect, and to act accordingly. In other words, ideologies are the basis for the common images of social groupings. These could be viewed socio-cognitively as the logical basis for said forms, i.e. the pattern of accepted concepts and beliefs within teammates. Ideologies are therefore more fundamental than haphazard assemblages of commonly held beliefs and thoughts. Ideologies govern a social party's character, actions, objectives, assets, and interaction with those other societies.

Out of this perspective, ideologies could be understood as self-serving and a result of the practical and psychological ambitions of specific groups, especially their political objectives above other communities. Ideologies are thus inextricably tied to questions of power, domination, struggle, competitiveness, social oppositions, and paradoxes. According to Fairclough (2003), ideologies "contribute to the formation, persistence, and modification of social relations of power" since certain ideologies assist to legitimize dominance or voice resistance in power interactions". (Van Dijk, 2006)

Under this context, van Dijk (1998) underlined that hegemonic ideologies usually, if not always, combine ruses of befuddlement, untruth, deception, masquerade, and exploitation into their primary methods, discourses, and substance. This happens because ideologization is necessary for dominance. This will be achieved by the universal applicability and normalization of dominant concepts and beliefs, confusing practices, apparent rhetoric, disingenuousness and deception, and the development of common experiences and concepts expressed in discourses that help to the preservation of relations of power. Quoting from Mészáros (2005), he claims that "the power of dominant ideologies is enormous, and it can only exist 'because of the strategic advantage of mystification, which enables the individuals on the receiving end to embrace, "consensually," values and practical policies that are actually quite contrary to their essential interests'". Hence, ideological confrontations are manifestly unequal, since 'the capacity to wilder the opponent is a privilege held exclusively for the prevailing ideology' In this aspect, questioning, non-dominant, or antagonistic ideologies are incapable of mystifying their opponents, because they possess nothing to offer (or hide) those who are firmly entrenched in their thrones of power and cognizant of their own needs. Consequently, it could be contended that notions such as deformations, deception, falsity, and concealment of real inconsistencies are components or ways of functioning of dominant ideologies, as perplexing practices and discourses are an

indispensable requirement and tool for sustaining dominant positions.

Some theorists distinguish discourse from ideology, as (Mills, 1997), quoting from Fowler (1991), puts it: "Discourse is speech or writing viewed through the lens of the beliefs, values, and categories it embodies; these beliefs, values, and categories collectively constitute a way of looking at the world, an organization or representation of experience, ideology in a non-derogatory, neutral manner." Different forms of discourse contain distinct representations of experience, and the source of these representations is the discourse's communicative context.

Ideologies frequently evolve as a result of opposing interests between two or more groups, social conflict or rivalry, or situations of dominance. Such contradiction can be manifested cognitively and discursively through numerous types of polarization, as illustrated by the well-known pronoun pair *Us* and *Them*. The overarching The objective of ideological speech is to highlight Our strengths and Their weaknesses, a semantically expressed sort polarizing. "For example, in racist discourse, several assertions and narratives built around this sort of contrast are observed:

- *We work hard.*
- *They are lazy.*
- *They easily get jobs (housing etc), and we do not.*"

Such form of repeated contrast in discourse suggests as the underlying attitudes and ideologies are similarly polarized, identifying ingroups and outgroups (van Dijk, 2000). In Brief, the major tenets of ideology according to van Dijk's approach are:

a) Among other things, ideologies are belief systems.
b) These are common systems of beliefs among members of a social group.
c) Additionally, groups share additional beliefs, such as knowledge and attitudes.
d) The collective beliefs of a group will be referred to as 'social representations' (SRs).
e) Ideologies are these SRs' organizing, 'fundamental' beliefs.
f) Not only do groups have their 'own' ideologically motivated «knowledge» (sometimes referred to as «beliefs» by other groups), but they also have more general, consensual, culturally shared knowledge, which may be referred to as (cultural) 'common ground'.
g) Not only do groups have their own ideologically driven «knowledge» (which other groups may refer to as «beliefs»), they also have more general, consensual, culturally shared knowledge, which may be referred to as (cultural) 'common ground'.
h) Common ground may be defined experimentally as all presupposed beliefs in public discourse. This indicates that such common ground is uncontroversial, commonsensical, and so non-ideological for a particular culture.

i) The term "common ground" also refers to the collective standards and values held by individuals of a culture.
j) Groups choose a subset of these cultural values and organize them according to their own ideologies, for example, liberty, equality, justice, or objectivity.
k) Ideologies very certainly have a canonical structure that enables their acquisition, usage, and transformation.
l) Although it is not yet know what this structure may be, it is most likely connected to a group's fundamental social qualities, such as membership requirements, activities, goals, norms and values, relationships with other groups, and special group resources (or lack thereof) — or the term 'capital'.
m) Ideologies and their structures may also be viewed as the cognitive core of a group's and its members' identity, that is, as a group's social self-schema.
n) Ideologies and the social representations they organize exert influence on the social practices of group members as actors (van Dijk, 2003).

Thus, Ideologies are essential structures of social cognition agreed by social beings, consisting of relevant selections of sociocultural principles and organized over an ideological structure that represents a group's identity. Ideologies get a cognitive function of organizing the group's aspects (attitudes, understanding) and informally controlling group-related social behaviours, as well as individuals' words and speech, in addition to their social function of defending common interests.

Through the following examples, a better understanding of the ideological foundations of political discourse and its distinctive structures and manoeuvres, as well as the function of such discourse in the larger socio-political challenges of immigration can be attained.

1. "Coalition deserves credit for progress on tackling unchecked immigration David Cameron's Government is finally taking steps to stop abuses of immigration system that were ignored by his predecessors"

This compound News article sums up (I) the total implication (semantic macrostructure) of the article, as reflected in the editor's recent mental model of the occurrence (the hung parliament of the United Kingdom addressing immigration), but also (ii) the increasingly good view (as demonstrated by the optimistic appraisal concepts deserves recognition, improvement, tackling, at last) of the reporter or magazine, as reflected in one's mental model of such incident. Certainly, different newspaper or even other viewers may portray the'same' occurrence with a different mental model, attitude, article, or communication. The metaphors of speaking and implementing solutions highlight the positive

characteristics of the mental model that expresses advantageous government practises in perspective of a struggle and as progressive motion.

The editor's (optimistic) mental model describes his I favorable opinion toward the present government and (ii) negative perceptions about immigration, both of which are rooted in conservative ideology. "Presuppositions as stated by uncontrolled, disregarded by predecessors abuses convey a negative view of (past) Labour administrations in the event model, as well as immigration, both based on underlying polarized attitudes and ideologies between Us/Ingroup (Conservatives, English) and Them/Outgroups (Labour, Immigrants). Similarly, the temporal adverb eventually requires the knowledge in the journalist's mental model that this government action occurs after a long period (of ignorance of previous administrations) and also suggests a positive assessment of the current government. Although the identities of the previous administrations are not expressly stated, it is implicit and hence part of the mental models of both journalists (and readers based on their general political understanding) that they were Labour governments." (Van Dijk, 2016).

2. "I wonder whether the hon. Gentleman will tell the House what mandate he has from the British people to share their citizenship with foreigners. (Gill, C).

3. It is equally important that abuse of the asylum rules by the large number of people who make asylum applications knowing that their position as illegal immigrants has no bearing on the Geneva convention should be debated openly, so that it is fully understood and tackled. (Wardle, C)"

A special sort of semantic implication is presupposition, which is true regardless of the truth or falsity of the present statement. In this manner, propositions whose veracity is assumed and uncontested may be communicated. In principle, it will be appropriate for all common information and beliefs, but in immigration conversations, it is frequently utilized purposefully to transmit contentious viewpoints. In the first instance, the presenter considers that the receiver (Mr. Corbyn) is entitled to grant dual citizenship to British and international nationals. In the second instance, the narrator realizes asylum regulations are being exploited and asserts that the condition of unlawful immigrants has no influence on the Geneva Convention. (Van Dijk, 2005).

4. "Voters consistently tell opinion pollsters that immigration is among their biggest concerns – so it is incumbent upon our political leaders to address the issue."

This essay requires vast amounts of socioculturally shared information, such as about political affairs (citizens to vote, questionnaires, rulers, and authorities) and immigration, for its development and understanding. "This sentence is based on the journalist's mental picture of the (bad) past and (positive) present immigration policies. Typical of editorials, the model typically includes a viewpoint in the form of a proposal (address the issue of immigration) (and known and expected by the readers)". Van Dijk further researches into this matter and says "This argument is based on a more general political norm (incumbent): if voters are worried about a problem, political leaders should address it. This norm may be rooted in attitudes about elections (voters, polls) and policies (fix the issue) as well as a broader democratic ideology centred on the will of the people". He supplemented this clarification by stating that "this sentence may be seen as conveying a populist ideology with respect to the importance of polls on government policy. Since it is known that the Telegraph does not favour populist ideology for all issues, but does so for immigration, the application of populist ideology here specifically controls a mental model featuring a negative opinion about immigration – as all readers will understand in their mental models, even though the editorial does not explicitly state this in the sentence." Hence, discourses are akin to icebergs, since a vast lot of proposed material is present in the users' actual mental models and not on the discourse's "surface". (Van Dijk, 2016).

5. "Now they are going to be asked to pay £35 to able-bodied males who have come over here on a prolonged holiday and now claim that the British taxpayer should support them (Gorman, C).

6. It is true that, in many cases, they have made careful provision for themselves in their old age, have a small additional pension as well as their old-age pension and pay all their rent and their bills and ask for nothing from the state. They are proud and happy to do so. Such people - 81 - should not be exploited by people who are exploiting the system (Gorman, C)."

Divided cognitions and the category division of people as ingroup (US) and outgroup (non-US) are among the most often used semantic strategies in arguments over Others (THEM). This demonstrates that conversation and writings about immigrants and refugees are significantly impacted by existing societal images "attitudes, ideologies" of groups, rather than models of isolated events and people. "Polarization may also apply to "good" and "bad" subcategories of outgroups, such as friends and allies on the one hand and adversaries on the other. Thus, polarization can be reinforced rhetorically when stated as a clear contrast, i.e., by crediting US and THEM with semantically opposed qualities". As shown in examples (5 and 6). (Van Dijk, 2005)

The preceding instances also illustrate how ideologies impact discourse. Populism, analogies, and Euphemism could be observed on the left and the right.

6. CONCLUSION

The present article explored language users' mental representations and processes as they produce and comprehend discourse and engage in verbal interaction, in relation to the knowledge, ideologies, and other ideas that social groups share.

It can be concluded that ideologies as forms of social cognition can be linked to social practices and discourse at the micro level of social circumstances and interactions, on the one hand, and to groups, group relations, institutions, organizations, movements, power, and domination, on the other. Ideological control is mostly exercised over the "content" of the different structures.

Not only ideologies influence the manner in which we speak, but also opposite. By studying and listening to large amounts of text and speech, we are able to comprehend and adjust our ideas. Ideologies are not inherent, but instead learnt, and the format and content of such discourse may increase or decrease the possibility of building deliberate mental models of social occurrences, that might then be extended and simplified into socialization and ideologies.

Discourse is perhaps the most significant of such social behaviours because it is the sole activity capable of showing and conveying beliefs explicitly. A concept of ideology that does not contain a theory of discourse is thus intrinsically deficient.

7. REFERENCES

Al-Rawi, M.K.S., 2017. The validity of CDA as a means of "uncovering" the ideologies implicit in

Dijk, T.A., 1995. Discourse analysis as ideology analysis. C. Schäffner, & A. Wenden (Eds.), Language and Pace (s. 17-33).

Dijk, T.V., 2000. Ideology and discourse: A multidisciplinary introduction. Pompeu Fabra University, Barcelona.

Eagleton, T., 2014. Ideology. Routledge.

Fattah, B. O. and Salih, S. M. (2022) "Colloquialism and the Community of Practice", Koya University Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences, 5(1), pp. 77-84. doi: 10.14500/kujhss.v5n1y2022.pp77-84.

Glaser, E., 2014. If ideology is dead, how can the new politics find its voice?. NEF Working Paper, pp.4-17.

Haj Omar, H., 2016. Ideology, media and conflict in political discourse and its translation

Hodge, B., 2012. Ideology, Identity, Interaction: Contradictions and Challenges for Critical Discourse Analysis. Critical Approaches to Discourse Analysis across Disciplines, 5(2).

ideology... British Journal of Sociology, pp.473-499.

Jørgensen, M.W. and Phillips, L.J., 2002. Discourse analysis as theory and method. Sage.Bhatia, Vijay K, John

Koller, V., 2005. Critical discourse analysis and social cognition: evidence from business media discourse. Discourse & Society, 16(2), pp.199-224.

Määttä, S.K., 2014. Discourse and Ideology—Why Do We Need Both?. In Spanish and Portuguese across Time, Place, and Borders (pp. 63-77). Palgrave Macmillan, London.

Menard, R., 2017. Critical discourse studies on social values, ideology and Finnish equality.

Mills, Sara (1997) Discourse. Londodn and Newyork: Routledge.

Othman, S. M. and Salih, S. M. (2021) "Dimensions of Implication: A Review of the Saying-Meaning-Implying Trichotomy", Koya University Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences, 4(1), pp. 151-162. doi: 10.14500/kujhss.v4n1y2021.pp151-162.

Persson, E. and Neto, L.M., 2018. Ideology and discourse in the public sphere: A critical discourse analysis of public debates at a Brazilian public university. Discourse & Communication, 12(3), pp.278-306.

Pihlaja, S. and Musolff, A., 2017. 14. Discourse and ideology. Pragmatics of social media, 11, p.381.

Purvis, T. and Hunt, A., 1993. Discourse, ideology, discourse, ideology, discourse,

Rasoul, S. H. and Kareem, O. M. (2019) "Synta-Pragmatics of The Conjunctions in Kurdish Language", Koya University Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences, 2(2), pp. 1-8. doi: 10.14500/kujhss.v2n2y2019.pp1-8.

Renkema, J. ed., 2009. Discourse, of course: An overview of research in discourse studies.

Salih, S. M. (2020) "Textual Presupposition: An Intertextual Account", Koya University Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences, 3(1), pp. 1-7. doi: 10.14500/kujhss.v3n1y2020.pp1-7.

Van Dijk Teun, A., 2003. Political Discourse and Ideology/Teun A van Dijk. Anàlisi del discurs polític.–Barcelona: Universitat Pompeu Fabra, IULA, pp.15-34.

Van Dijk, T. A., 1992. Discourse and cognition in Society. University of Amsterdam, program of Discourse studies.

Van Dijk, T., 2003. Discourse, ideology and context. Mediator: Jurnal Komunikasi, 4(2), pp.325-346.

Van Dijk, T.A., 1995. Discourse semantics and ideology. Discourse & society, 6(2), pp.243-289.

Van Dijk, T.A., 1995. Ideological discourse analysis. In In.

Van Dijk, T.A., 1995. On macrostructures, mental models, and other inventions: A brief personal history of the Kintsch-van Dijk theory. Discourse comprehension: Essays in honor of Walter Kintsch, pp.383-410.

Van Dijk, T.A., 1998. Ideology: A multidisciplinary approach. Sage.

Van Dijk, T.A., 2001. Discourse, ideology and context.

Van Dijk, T.A., 2002. Political discourse and political cognition. Politics as text and talk: Analytic approaches to political discourse, 203, pp.203-237.

Van Dijk, T.A., 2003. Political discourse and ideology.

Van Dijk, T.A., 2005. Discourse analysis as ideology analysis. In Language & peace (pp. 41-58). Routledge.

Van Dijk, T.A., 2006. Ideology and discourse analysis. Journal of political ideologies, 11(2), pp.115-140.

Van Dijk, T.A., 2006. Politics, ideology, and discourse.

Van Dijk, T.A., 2009. Society and discourse: How social contexts influence text and talk. Cambridge University Press.

Van Dijk, T.A., 2011. Discourse and ideology. Discourse studies: A multidisciplinary introduction, pp.379-407.

Van Dijk, T.A., 2016. Discourse and racism: Some conclusions of 30 years of research. Interdisciplinary studies in pragmatics, culture and society, pp.285-295.

Verschueren, J., 2012. Ideology in language use: Pragmatic guidelines for empirical research. Cambridge University Press.