



Al Bahith Journal for Social Sciences
Homepage:
<https://journals.uokerbala.edu.iq/index.php/bjh>



A Sociocognitive Analysis of Micro-Level Components in Selected Queen Elizabeth's Speeches

Baneen Adnan Jaafar

Prof. Haider Kadhim Kudair Bairmani (Ph.D.)

University of Kerbala, College of Education for Human Sciences, English Department

Abstract in English

This study is devoted to the investigation of Queen Elizabeth II's speeches on her daughters-in-law from the sociocognitive point of view. Queen Elizabeth usually addresses her family members in her speeches and talks about them on many occasions. She usually employs some linguistic and socio-cognitive strategies when addressing her daughters-in-law. Therefore, the study intends to uncover the linguistic and rhetorical strategies in the selected speeches. The study is qualitative in nature and is based on an eclectic model that is based on m Van Dijk's (2006) Ideology and Discourse Analysis. Three extracts have been selected as samples for the purpose of analysis. After analysing the selected data, some of the findings showed that the Queen used lexicalization and appeared to use the formal style and selective vocabulary in such a way that suits the royal protocol. She also used authority to support her arguments, and with this element the queen relied on her position and status among the public and family members to strengthen the arguments

Paper Info

Received: 2-7-2025

Accepted: 17-7-2025

Published: 20-11-2025

Keywords

*Socio-cognitive,
polarization,
disclaimers,
Ideology, Micro-
level Analysis*

doi: <https://doi.org/10.63797/bjh>.

1. Introduction

Language, as the main tool for human beings to exchange ideas and emotions, carries rich cultural and social information. Sociocognitive linguistics, as an important branch of linguistics, not only focuses on the form and structure of language but also emphasizes the mental and implied aspects of language and the use of language in social and cultural contexts. The Queen's language is particularly special and eye-catching as she conveys her concern for her daughters-in-law. Therefore, this study examines Queen Elizabeth II's speeches, focusing specifically on those addressed to members of the royal family. These speeches are of particular interest due to their significant sociocognitive and symbolic functions. Although substantial sociocognitive research exists, conducted by scholars such as Hiebert (2014), Mislevy (2018),

Assia (2017), and others, the sociocognitive approach has not yet been systematically applied to Queen Elizabeth's speeches despite their evident sociocognitive influence. This study aims to fill this gap by investigating the following research questions: What linguistic devices are used at the micro level in the chosen speeches of the Queen?

1. What linguistic devices are used at the micro level in the chosen speeches of the Queen?
2. What rhetorical devices are used at the micro level in the chosen speeches of the Queen?

1.1. Aims of the Study

The current study intends to achieve the following aims:

1. Analysing the linguistic devices used at the micro-level in the chosen speeches of the Queen.
2. Exploring the rhetorical devices used at the micro-level in the chosen speeches of the Queen.

2. Literature Review

2.1. Sociocognitive Theory (2008)

Van Dijk highlights the connection between the social system and discourse in his sociocognitive theory. The theory digs in the issues of mental representations and mental models of the social situations and institution. According to Van Dijk, each social group has certain common knowledge, norms and values and these have an effect on discourse. Discourse can both create social reality and a result of social reality. The relation between discourse and social structure is mediated through cognition (Van Dijk, 2008).

2.1.1. Ideology and Discourse (1998)

The Sociocognitive Theory discusses the influence of ideologies on speech production and comprehension. Ideologies are shared belief systems which have an effect on the behaviour of individuals, groups, and communities. Ideologies are sometimes hidden in discourse; they shape the perception of what is appropriate or normal in certain context. Ideologies are manipulative, they are used to justify or maintain social inequalities (Van Dijk, 1998).

2.2. The Socio-cognitive Approach View

According to the socio-cognitive approach, learning is the outcome of the interaction between cognitive and social processes. That is to say, knowledge is not acquired in an isolated setting but rather is shaped through interactions with one's social and cultural environment. Knowledge is built through social structures like media, culture, and social classes, which facilitate knowledge sharing across members of society, and through these interactions. People learn "social facts" based on collective understanding that has been formed over time (Van Dijk, 2008). This approach also emphasizes how people actively contribute to the creation of "social realities" through their interactions with shared beliefs within their epistemic communities and their own personal experiences, rather than passively absorbing knowledge.

Therefore, knowledge is more than just accumulated information; it is a socially situated and politically driven process, and the types of knowledge that can be considered acceptable are frequently determined by power dynamics (Van Dijk, 2011). In this process, discourse is crucial because it shapes people's perceptions of and their relationships with the world (Fairclough, 1992).

Individuals inside a culture learn socially constructed realities when they receive what it means to belong to a specific social class in a specific place and time. In this way, the socio-cognitive approach grounds the postmodern epistemological framework in more practical, lived experiences, so complementing it. It is not enough to only comprehend the construction of reality and acknowledge how people function within a social dialectic; action and change-making are equally essential. Therefore, even if people were socially situated and would not actively create "the truth," they would maintain the power to shape the world around them (Fairclough, 1992). Consequently, the socio-cognitive approach emphasizes the necessity for people to interact with the systems in their environment, questioning and possibly transforming them (van Dijk, 2008).

2.3. The Triangle of Discourse, Cognition, and Society

The sociocognitive approach to discourse offers a critical framework for investigating how society, language, and cognition interact to create social structures and meanings. In order to comprehend how meanings are created and how they aid in the maintenance of social structures like dominance and inequality, van Dijk highlights that sociocognitive discourse analysis combines language, cognition, and social contexts. He theorizes that this method depends on mental representations that people and communities create, which are linked to intricate cognitive processes including societal common knowledge, ideologies, and values (Van Dijk, 2008).

"Since underlying cognitive structures in many ways are expressed in, or control, discourse structures" (Wodak & Meyer, 2015, p. 70). Thus, discourse analysis is used as objective and reliable instrument in the social sciences and cognitive and social psychology (Wodak & Meyer, 2015). This perspective is in line with Teun A. van Dijk's sociocognitive theory of discourse, which highlights that people's cognitive processes for processing and interpreting social realities also have an impact on discourse. Van Dijk (2016) indicates that cognitive processes, including mental models and schemas, shape and reshape the production and interpretation of discourse and the ways in which language reproduces power, ideologies, and social inequality. Thus, a framework for understanding how language reflects and maintains social systems is provided by the incorporation of cognitive perspectives into discourse analysis.

The sociocognitive theory recognizes "constructions" as mental representations that are stored in the brain and effect on how we interact with the outside world, contrary with other social constructionist approaches like discursive psychology. In order to understand how individuals and communities form their perceptions of social reality, which in turn impact on power relationships and ideological convictions, these representations are important. Thus, the area of sociocognitive discourse studies (henceforth, SCDS) offers a method for analysing language and social structures by investigating these mental representations and the cognitive mechanisms behind discourse production (van Dijk, 2017).

This approach emphasizes how crucial mental representations are in forming discourse by showing that several aspects of it can only be completely described in terms of different cognitive conceptions, especially those pertaining to participants' knowledge, information, and beliefs. For example, important components in creating meaning in conversation include syntactic word order, phonological stress, topic and focus, proposition structures, local coherence links between propositions, pronouns, and co-reference. Furthermore, people organize their interpretations and comprehensions of discourse using metaphors, frames, implications, presuppositions, and arguments (Van Dijk, 2017).

A sociocognitive discourse study does this by examining explicit psychological theories of mental representations, such as particular mental models of language users or journalists, and how these models function as a mediator between societal structures, shared social cognition (knowledge, attitudes, and ideologies), and real text and speech. In contrast to other CDS research, this examines and explains discourse in relation to its political and social settings, by adding a cognitive bridge between discourse and society, SCDS goes one step further. It contends that social and political structures may only affect text and speech through language users' thoughts and that there is no direct connection between different structures, such as discourse and society. This is made feasible by the fact that social members mentally represent both discourse and social structures, enabling them to make cognitive connections between them before expressing them by speech and in text (van Dijk, 2016).

According to van Dijk (2016), CDS examines the social and political aspects of speech and writing with an emphasis on how media organizations might influence public opinion, especially with regard to immigration. CDS studies the ways in which media and political elites shape discourse, which may serve to further xenophobia and racism. Scholars in this field emphasize the discursive reproduction of power abuse and opposition to it, placing a high priority on social equity and justice. CDS takes a multidisciplinary, problem-oriented approach and calls for an ethical framework for evaluating discourse. It frequently criticizes speech that infringes on human rights, including racist or sexist rhetoric.

In critical discourse studies (henceforth CDS), van Dijk's sociocognitive approach is based on the interaction of discourse, cognition, and society. The sociocognitive approach highlights the mediating function of cognition in a unique way, even if other CDS paradigms examine the reciprocal relationship between speech and society. Despite their underlying differences, discourse and social structures are linked by language users' cognitive processes, which allow them to function as both individuals and social group members (Van Dijk, 2008a). In order to understand social interactions and derive meaning from conversation, language users rely on mental models. In the words of van Dijk (2014), "the ways language users as human beings represent their natural, social, and communicative environments in terms of multimodal mental models" (p. 49). These mental models, which are influenced by beliefs, attitudes, and knowledge, serve as a link between individual thought processes and social standards. A public speech about economic injustice, for example, may have an impact on society's views if its themes are consistent with the listeners' pre-existing mental model of justice and equity.

Similarly, van Dijk (2016) states that SCDS suggests discourse and society are not directly connected; instead, cognitive processes serve as an intermediary. "It claims that there is no direct link between such different structures as those of discourse and society and that social or political structures can only affect text and talk through the minds of language users"

(p. 4). Future discourses may be influenced by these interpretations, establishing a dynamic feedback loop between social structures and mental processes. Chilton (2004) argues that the sociocognitive approach not only reflects societal structures but also actively influences their transformation. He emphasizes that media representations of social groups can perpetuate power imbalances and contribute to discrimination. In this context, language serves as a mechanism of power, reinforcing dominant ideologies while sidelining others. However, changes in public opinion have the power to subvert prevailing narratives and give rise to fresh discourse styles that alter our perception of the world. Thus, the opinions of these scholars as a whole highlight how important discourse is in forming society norms and ideology through the complex interplay between social structure and individual cognition.

Cognitive mediation is crucial to psychology, but many interactionist discourse approaches continue to be "anti-cognitivist," like behaviorism, concentrating only on what is "observable" or socially "accessible." This ignores the fact that grammatical, semantic, pragmatic, and interactional structures are cognitive "representations" or "inferences" drawn from actions and conversations rather than being observable (Van Dijk, 2009).

The purpose of SCA has two main objectives: first, to identify and map the network of knowledge, beliefs, prejudices, and attitudes that individuals consciously or unconsciously activate when constructing and interpreting discourse; and second, to analyze how these cognitive mechanisms shape discourse structures and influence their interpretation in specific communicative contexts. "SCA would be interested in why leaders of right-wing political parties address their supporters in the way in which they do and how people make sense of such discourse" (Gyollai, 2022, p. 540). SCA is an interdisciplinary framework that uses techniques from cognitive psychology and sociology to examine the function of knowledge in discourse rather than being a method (Gyollai, 2022).

In keeping with van Dijk (2008), "social cognition" refers to the mental representations and cognitive processes that group members use to interpret and understand the world, which, in turn, influences both texts and social structures. He contends that social cognition functions as a bridge connecting the macro-level social structures and the micro-level textual structures. Therefore, examining the relationship between textual structures and cognitive factors influencing both individuals and groups is necessary to comprehend how texts might have influence on society. The model suggested by the sociocognitive approach is diagrammatically represented in Figure 2.1, where the bidirectional arrows show the dialectical relationship between textual structure and social structure mediated by social cognition, and the shaded area denotes the microlevel focus of text analysis (Hart, 2010).

Social memory is associated with social cognition, as defined by Van Dijk (2002). According to van Dijk, memory is an abstract mental structure that may be separated into short-term and long-term memory, and it is the basis for cognitive processes and representations. Information stored in long-term memory compares to information processed in short-term memory. Short-term memory processes information and compares it with long-term memory stores. Semantic memory and episodic memory are additional divisions of long-term memory. While episodic memory stores information based on individual experiences, semantic memory stores more generic, abstract, and socially shared information, such as our knowledge of the language or the outside world (Van Dijk, 2002).

Van Dijk (2002) refers to semantic memory as social memory. This is because of the difference between the socially shared character of semantic memory and the idiosyncratic

nature of episodic memory. Socially shared mental representations and structures are known as social cognitions. Even though they are embodied in the cognitive systems of individuals, social cognitions are social since they are shared and presupposed by group members (Van Dijk, 1993). The sociocognitive model provides a connection between individualism and social constructivism in the context of how texts are interpreted. Social cognitions are typically framed in abstract categories such as ideologies, discourses, attitudes, opinions, prejudices, and member resources. These cognitive frameworks, shaped by social environments, are mainly developed, applied, and transformed through engagement with texts (Van Dijk 1990).

Sperber (2000) argues that this process is made possible through the human ability to engage in meta-representation, which refers to the representation of another representation. Texts function as public forms of meta-representation, as they transmit mental representations and, by extension, reflect certain features of those mental states. Therefore, understanding a text requires forming cognitive meta-representations based on its linguistic structures. The cognitive, social, and discourse components are therefore the three divisions of van Dijk's sociocognitive theory. These components are discussed in detail in the following sections.

2.3.1 Discourse: Components and Structures

The previous explanations show that all connections between discourse and society pass through social cognition. Social dominance structures can only be reproduced through specific behaviours of dominant group members, which are controlled by social cognition. Therefore, elite discourses, such as news reports on ethnic matters, influence societal ethnic dominance structures through the shared views of dominant group members about ethnic minorities and their relations. Social cognition acts as a key link in the interaction between discourse and society. Moreover, the formation and change of social cognition depend on discourse itself (Van Dijk, 1992). The cognitive and social aspects of the theory require collaboration with psychologists and sociologists, but the discourse component primarily falls under the responsibility of critical discourse analysts. These analysts often need to engage with other fields, similar to how linguists collaborate in psycholinguistic and sociolinguistic studies. Critical discourse analysts do not need to develop entirely new theories about how discourse functions, as they often share many ideas with other discourse scholars. However, they tend to move beyond purely structural theories by explaining how discourse is used in society to either (re)produce or challenge the abuse of power (Van Dijk, 2009). Moreover, discourse constitutes a pivotal site for ideological contestation and potential transformation, operating as an intermediary that links individual meaning-making processes with broader institutional structures and practices (Fairclough, 2003).

Gee (2014) elaborates that, on a deeper level, it is about how social goods such as money, status, power, and acceptance are shared in society. He states, "Since, when we use language, social goods and their distribution are always at stake, language is always political in a deep sense" (p. 8). In addition, Gee (2004) explains that discourse serves as a fundamental tool for constructing social identity and acts as a mediator of societal power. Through language, individuals negotiate their roles and positions within society, playing a key part in establishing or challenging group identities, power dynamics, and social norms. As a social practice, discourse not only reflects but also creates power and dominance dynamics within society.

Critical discourse analysts focus on the discourse component of social phenomena, which involves both linguistic structures and ideological frameworks. While they collaborate with psychologists and sociologists to understand cognitive and social dimensions, their main

task is to explore how discourse can reproduce or challenge power structures in society. Unlike other analysts, they generally move beyond structural theories to examine discourse's role in societal practices. Discourse is a multifaceted phenomenon, encompassing linguistic, social, mental, and cultural dimensions, including verbal interactions, social practices, and media forms. These components include both the structural and ideological elements of discourse (Van Dijk, 2009).

Swales (1990) argues that "discourse communities" have a major impact on discourse structure because they shape texts to fit with the common objectives and expectations of particular groups. The subsequent theories incorporated different organizational frameworks, such as summaries, orientations, and resolves that were specific to particular genres, whereas early methods mostly concentrated on grammatical structures. According to Bhatia (2004), genre-specific discourse structures are created to arrange information and achieve communicative objectives that represent the author's intention. Effective interaction is enhanced by these discourse structures, which make activities like evaluation, justification, and persuasion easier. Building on these concepts, Van Dijk (2009) emphasizes that for the purpose of creating coherence through mental structures; discourse structure consists of phonological, syntactic, and semantic components. Cultural products like television series and argumentative genres like editorials allow discourse to serve a variety of communicative purposes. In the end, discourse shapes identity and power dynamics in society by combining cognitive and structural components.

CDA research examines how discourse systems (re)produce power dynamics and social inequity. The ideology of dominant groups is shown through patterns like polarization and pronoun usage, which highlight how language either reinforces or weakens authority (Wodak, 2021). According to Van Dijk (2005), several significant ideological discourse systems sustain power (re)production and social inequality. Among the constructions in concern are:

- **Polarization:** Highlights the significant difference between a negatively represented out-group and a positively portrayed in-group. This Variation is frequently used to strengthen group loyalty and defend different opinions or actions toward others.
- **Pronouns:** "We," "us," and "our" are used to support unity and solidarity within the in-group, whereas "they" and "them" are used to demonstrate resistance and distance toward out-groups. These dichotomous distinctions are often used to describe ideological discourse.
- **Identification:** Represents how members support their organization by using phrases like "As a feminist, I/we...", which strengthens the group's identity and shared ideals.
- **Emphasis on positive self-descriptions and negative other-descriptions:** Maintaining moral superiority, emphasize the good aspects of the in-group and minimize its flaws while negatively portraying the out-group.
- **Activities:** Groups are frequently recognized by their typical roles or behaviours, which highlight their acts as essential to their ideology.
- **Norms and values:** Uses common ideals like equality, justice, and freedom to defend actions of the in-group and criticize the out-group.

- **Interests:** Reflects the competitiveness inherent in ideological struggles, emphasizing material or symbolic benefits like power, position, and access to public discourse.

2.3.2 Cognitive Components

The sociocognitive approach highlights how important memory, mental representations, and cognitive processes are to the creation and understanding of speech. In order to comprehend the link between discourse and social structures, van Dijk (1995) emphasizes the necessity of connecting text and talk structures with mental frameworks from a sociocognitive perspective. In social, economic, and political settings, the conceptual impacts of the use of language are influenced by shared mental representations among group members, which also drive social actions.

Since cognitive linguistics fills the gap between language and conceptual structures and their social implications, its inclusion in CDA is appropriate. According to Muntigl (2010, p.175), "More recently, CDA has been criticized on the grounds that it lacks a cognitive dimension in which human social action and/or social discourse may be better explained." This view, as put forward by Chilton (2005), maintains that the types of critical analyses typically conducted by CDA practitioners are insufficient, as they fail to address the operations of the human mind and the nature of the mental representations and processes involved. Chilton asserts that, in the absence of a cognitive linguistic perspective on discursive action, the analyst is inevitably limited to offering a descriptive account of discourse, falling short of adequately explaining how people think and understand or how ideologies, social identities, and racist attitudes emerge and spread.

More critically, Chilton argues that CDA, in its current form, may ultimately be unable to achieve one of its core objectives: to combat inequality and oppression (Chilton, 2005, as cited in Muntigl, 2010). Although cognitive linguistics aids CDA in explaining how language influences conceptualization, CDA expands on cognitive linguistics by tackling social norms that limit behaviour and discourse. It is crucial for discourse, cognition, and ideology to interact because language transmits meanings that may impact social beliefs, attitudes, and ideologies. For example, euphemisms and metaphors can impact how people see social issues such as racism (Van Dijk, 2008).

Scollon and Scollon (2001) assert that people's cultural origins and mental processes have a significant impact on their communication behaviours. The way that academic writers from different linguistic communities organize their writing and use rhetorical devices that attract readers may differ, highlighting the influence of sociocultural norms on discourse. Van Dijk (2006) supports this position by stating that context models are crucial for bridging the gap between cognition and societal integration since they represent participants' subjective assessments of communication situations. Since language choices and communication techniques are influenced by people's knowledge, beliefs, and intentions, these models have an impact.

- **Discourse Processing:** Cognitive processes, involving thinking, perceiving, and interpreting, are contained in discourse processing and have been observed in neuropsychology. While short-term memory, often referred to as working memory, controls present cognitive processes like attention and action, long-term memory stores permanent information and beliefs. Neurological conditions like Alzheimer's disease can interfere with the way these systems work together to control discourse-related

activities (van Dijk, 2016; Van Dijk, 2009). Kintsch (1998) goes on to spotlight the not noteworthy of mental models in addition to prior knowledge for discourse comprehension, as well as the ways in which cognitive structures impact comprehension.

- **Knowledge:** Knowledge is defined as beliefs that meet epistemic norms of society and form the foundation for comprehension, interaction, and cognition. Van Dijk (2009, 2002) distinguishes between universally recognized generic knowledge, which is undeniable and shared across society, and group-specific information, which may be dismissed by outsiders as "beliefs" or "opinions." Discourse is a means of acquiring and preserving knowledge, shaping personal mental models, and transmitting societal norms and values. In this vein, Foucault (1980) emphasizes how knowledge systems are inherently linked with power structures, with those in charge of knowledge possessing the capacity to influence public opinion, control societal concepts, and maintain dominant ideologies. Likewise, Hart (2010) contends that the construction and transmission of meaning in discourse are fundamentally influenced by the interplay among language, cognition, and social power. He illustrates how discourse modifies perception and validates specific social realities using a cognitive linguistic approach to critical discourse analysis. From this perspective, knowledge is a socially situated construct that serves to uphold or subvert power dynamics in society rather than being a neutral reflection of reality.
- **The Role of Ideologies on Attitudes:** Evaluative and group-based, socially shared concepts include attitudes and beliefs. Social knowledge, on the other hand, is not generally acknowledged and is distinct from these universal ideas (van Dijk, 2002). Underlying ideologies shape attitudes, which are schematically built ideas that include opinions about one's origins, identity, and relationships with other groups. Ideologies such as racism, for instance, use a divisive "Us vs. Them" framework to organize shared views and influence attitudes on immigration, education, and culture. This polarization controls power relations and the portrayal of in-groups and out-groups in language through themes, arguments, and metaphors (Van Dijk, 2009).

Van Dijk also talks about how ideas create mental models that influence speech and personal experiences, forming the foundation of attitudes. Polarized interpersonal relationships that are reflected in text structures, vocabulary, and narratives are examples of biases in ideological discourse (van Dijk, 2016). Since social actors are members of movements or ideological groups, they share similar views on significant societal issues like immigration and terrorism. These common opinions are influenced by ideologies such as neoliberalism, militarism, and feminist movements that organize social cognition around identity, goals, and resources. There is polarization between in-groups and out-groups in discourse practices, mental models, and social attitudes (Van Dijk, 2009, 2016).

2.3.3 Social Components

In the opinion of Van Leeuwen (2008), discourse is a social engagement that is intricately entwined with society's institutions and power relations, rather than only being a cognitive process. He investigates the ways in which hegemonic organizations manipulate public discourse to maintain social hierarchies. Social cognition plays a major role in this process of regulation since shared information and ideologies shape how discourse gets

generated and perceived. Discourse analysis, in the author's view, needs to consider these cognitive and sociological factors in order to properly comprehend how language either supports or challenges inequality and power.

As well, CDA examines social cognition, which includes the common attitudes, knowledge, and beliefs of people in groups of people. A sociological view connects macro-level institutions like governments, political movements, and media enterprises to micro-level interactions like personal interactions and media consumption. Everyday social interactions, many of which involve language, help shape and promote these macrostructures at the micro level (Van Dijk, 2009). The link between discourse and social frameworks is the main topic of Discourse and Society, which also discusses how discourse can be examined from many angles. There are four primary components to the discussion:

1. Social Situations: a communicative event, which is by its very nature social and involves participants in a variety of roles and behaviors, is where discourse takes place. By establishing the context of the conversation, these social circumstances aid in the construction of discourse. In order to comprehend conversation completely, one must take into account the social and cognitive frameworks that influence it as well as how these frameworks are reflected in mental models, or context models.
2. Action: by analyzing acts of discourse, CDA comprehends how they fit into broader social and political frameworks. Discourse is examined not just at the textual level but also in terms of the social acts it elicits, such advocacy or persuasion. Discourse actions are viewed as expressions of social and political movements, in which language is used to influence societal attitudes and behaviors.
3. Actors: different actors participate in discourse, each of whom has a distinct function in the exchange of ideas. These actors might be local or global, individuals or groups, and they can be identified by their institutional, professional, or social identities.
4. Societal Structures: discourse enacts and strengthens social systems in addition to reflecting them. Discourse is used to convey social behaviors like law and education, which are frequently connected to dominance and power dynamics. CDA focuses on the ways in which discourse interacts with cognitive representations and societal structures, emphasizing how speech maintains ideologies, power relations, and social inequities (such as racism and sexism). These social systems can be exposed and maintained through discourse (Van Dijk, 2021).

The terms "power" and "domination" do not refer to qualities of interpersonal connections but rather to the control connections that exist between social groupings or organizations. Power functions on a social and cognitive level, affecting the mental models, knowledge, attitudes, and ideologies of dominated groups in addition to controlling their discourses and actions. Discourse has significance for controlling other groups' thoughts in order to maintain power (Van Dijk, 2009). A group's ability to influence another's behaviour or thoughts by gaining access to valuable resources like wealth, education, or status is known as social power. This power, which can be persuasive or coercive, can indirectly govern people by influencing their way of thinking. CDA examines how dominance or abuse of power helps the powerful group while harming the weaker ones. In democratic settings, power can be frequently justifiable, but when it is misused, it can cause inequality (Van Dijk, 2009).

Group power is based on both symbolic (knowledge, position) and material (property, capital) resources. Ethnicity, skin tone, and nationality are examples of symbolic elements that can be used to exert power in ethnic encounters. Societal (including macro-level and micro-level structures), cognitive (individual or societal mental models), and discourse (controlling interaction and communication) are the three main components of CDA. Dominance leads to inequality in society since it is the misuse of social power (Van Dijk, 2009). Racism is a type of dominance in which a particular group, typically white people, uses strategies like manipulation and persuasion to control access to resources. Dominant groups shape political, media, and educational narratives for the reason that they have preferential access to public discourses. They have influence over the time, location, and subject matter of discourse, while less powerful organizations have limited access. Unequal access to communication legitimizes dominance and shapes public opinion (Van Dijk, 1992).

Van Dijk (2013) described these ideas in order to clarify the institutional and systemic character of power, its function in maintaining domination, and its impact on social cognition. These presuppositions provide a framework for comprehending the relationships between power and the way they affect unjust social practices:

1. Power is an aspect of connections among groups, not of individuals.
2. Social power is the ability of one group to influence the behaviour or attitudes of another.
3. Power is often restricted to particular areas of society, such as the media or politics.
4. Dominance includes the misuse of authority, which results in injustice.
5. Power is a component of having privileged access to social resources and communication.
6. Dominance and power are institutionalized for consistent reproduction and control.
7. Dominance is frequently disputed, with dominated groups demonstrating counter-power.

Van Dijk (2002) goes on to say that abuse of power influences behaviour as well as cognitive processes, influencing public discourse to shape ideologies, attitudes, and knowledge. Power is often persuasive rather than coercive in democratic settings, influencing social cognitions and mental models through discourse strategies. Preferred models and ideologies may be formed via this manipulation. CDA explores for techniques and cognitive structures that underlie these activities.

A group's social reproduction is shaped by the social cognitions of its members, which are shaped by the ideologies that are acquired through socialization and information processing. The group's identity, conventions, values, and resources are all reflected in its ideology. Ideologies are made up of these attributes and are often self-serving. White racists, for example, see society as a struggle between whites and non-whites, and they believe that anybody who challenges their identity, values, and resources is a threat. This is presented using a "Us vs. Them" perspective, in which "They" are associated with negative characteristics and "We" with good ones (Van Dijk, 2005).

2.4 Micro (local) vs. Macro (global)

Both micro and macro settings influence communication by relating social structures to individual behaviours. The interaction between the micro and macro levels of society is known as context. Whereas macro-level contexts cover broader societal structures like historical, cultural, and institutional frameworks, micro-level interactions concentrate on the immediate, local contexts of communication. Because individual behaviours both reflect and have an impact on broader societal processes, these levels are interrelated. Through roles and affiliations, communication bridges the micro and macro by combining situational and societal variables with personal and communal knowledge (Van Dijk, 2009).

Users engage in cognitive processes that enable them to shift between different contextual levels, selecting relevant abstractions based on the communicative goals at hand. Although these macro-level contexts often remain implicit, they serve as a foundational framework that shapes both the interpretation and production of discourse. In more formal or explanatory interactions, higher-order contextual dimensions such as cultural frameworks and social identities become more salient due to the influence of underlying social and cognitive structures (Van Dijk, 2008). As seen in news reporting, where more general subjects come before specifics, macrostructures like overarching themes arrange material in a hierarchical manner and influence how credible a story is perceived to be (Fairclough, 1995).

In the opinion of Van Dijk (2008, 2009), context models function at many levels of abstraction, ranging from localized discourse to social structures. A racist comment in parliament, for example, might serve as a localized interaction that reflects broad issues within society, like inequality in races. Communication helps create and reproduce social realities, such as institutional norms and power dynamics, by fusing macro-level meanings with micro-level details. In discourse, the micro and macro levels frequently overlap. For instance, language use is a component of social order at the micro level. Inequality, power, and domination are issues at the macro level. One sociological framework that fills the conceptual gap between these levels is CDA (Fairclough, 1995).

According to **Van Dijk (2008)**, the following are important processes that connect these levels:

1. **Members and groups:** Individuals engage in conversation as part of groups that take collective action through their members.
2. **Actions and processes:** Individuals' social actions influence broader society processes like news production or legislation.
3. **Context and social structure:** Press conferences and other discursive events are institutional practices that are ingrained in social institutions.
4. **Personal and social cognition:** Social actors have shared knowledge and personal memories that affect discourse.

Macro-level information typically serves as the implicit backdrop, supporting discourse generation and understanding but less commonly taking the focal point. Micro-level interactions and macro-level frameworks operate together to create meaning and influence social processes because of this dynamic interplay (Fairclough, 1995; van Dijk, 2009).

2.5 Ideology

The concept of ideology is fundamental to social theory, CDA, and sociocognitive studies because it clarifies how social behaviours and human mental processes are influenced by power dynamics, values, and beliefs. Early definitions of ideology, like the one given by Antoine Destutt de Tracy, who named it the "science of ideas," concentrated on the nature of ideas (Eagleton, 1991). However, modern interpretations place a strong emphasis on its function in power dynamics and social control (Gramsci, 1971; Althusser, 1971). Ideology is frequently understood as a set of values and beliefs that social groups hold in common, influencing how people view the world, understand interpersonal relationships, and defend hierarchies of power (Van Dijk, 1998).

Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels provided one of the most significant interpretations of ideology, contending that ideology promotes a false consciousness among subordinate groups in order to further the interests of the ruling class (Marx & Engels, 1986). Ideology is positioned as being inextricably linked to signs and the material manifestation of signifiers is how consciousness emerges. As "inner speech," language binds people to a social network of meaning, shaping awareness (Voloshinov, 1929). Ideology, according to CDA, is discourse that upholds and maintains social inequalities, frequently favouring one group at the expense of others. In order to reveal hidden realities, such as inequality between genders that endures in spite of assertions of equality, it challenges hegemonic language for hiding power dynamics (Eagleton, 2014).

Reality and people's perceptions, which are influenced by ideologies, are not the same. These ideas alter reality; for example, the notion of gender equality might mask the enduring power disparities in the workplace and in families. People who experience this disparity develop "false consciousness," in which they are unable to identify the ideological basis of their experiences. It is the responsibility of the researcher to criticize ideologies in order to reveal this distortion and promote a change in reality (Jorgensen and Phillips, 2002). Sociological and Marxist ideologies present different views on how collective beliefs shape individuals' understanding of social phenomena. Sociological ideologies are considered a rigid worldview that shapes how people perceive society. On the other hand, Marxist theory describes ideology as "false consciousness," which hides social contradictions and strengthens class domination. Marx believed that ideological structures could only be challenged through political action, not intellectual criticism. This examination of ideologies underscores their role in maintaining the interests of dominant groups (Van Dijk, 1998). The study of CDA focuses on ideologies as systems that underpin social practices and events and serve to legitimize power dynamics and hierarchies. Ideologies are viewed as methods that come from particular points of view and resolve disputes in ways that advance dominant objectives. Ideologies are embodied in behaviours, genres, and identities and these practices are influenced by regular social interactions. In addition, different points of view give rise to ideologies, which can result in conflicts and even domination. Through the analysis of ideologies as practices and representations, CDA aims to reveal and challenge the distorted perspectives that uphold dominance (Menard, 2018; Chouliaraki & Fairclough, 1999).

Ideology is a sociocultural and cognitive phenomenon that permeates human cognition and social relationships. Verschueren (2012) asserts that ideologies reflect a particular kind of inter-subjectivity since they are socially located and shared rather than purely individual products. They can be utilized as frameworks that arrange attitudes, values, and social beliefs, affecting group identity and behavior. Persson and Moretto (2018) support a multidisciplinary approach to ideology, emphasizing its function in forming social norms and power dynamics

by seeing it as the interface between social systems and cognition. According to Van Dijk (1998, 2000, 2006a, 2006b), ideologies structure beliefs, norms, and goals and act as the fundamental structures for social group identity. They frequently use polarization strategies, dividing "us" from "them" in order to defend domination and hierarchies of power. In order to preserve their power, dominant ideologies usually use aspects of manipulation, distortion, and mystification. However, Van Dijk (2001) also points out that these ideologies are not always negative because they can motivate resistance to oppression and promote social change on a collective level. Ideologies influence words and actions by mediating between micro-level interpersonal interactions and macro-level societal structures through their cognitive and social functions.

Van Dijk (1998) asserts that institutional discourse can foster collaboration, diplomatic engagement, and a shared set of human values by constructing a favorable ideology toward the "other." This is accomplished by promoting a positive view of out-groups by emphasizing their admirable qualities, such as bravery, charity, or pure morality. For example, when a speaker highlights the fortitude and solidarity of a people in another country during a crisis, they not only improve relations across groups but also portray their own organization as impartial, compassionate, and aware of the wider world. This strategy known as "positive other-presentation," serves as a discursive instrument that validates partnerships and promotes reciprocal understanding across social and cultural divides. Furthermore, by substituting narratives based on respect, collaboration, and solidarity, it works to fight exclusionary ideologies that are based on self-glorification and negative others- presentation.

2.6. Micro-level Analysis

In the micro-level analysis, discourse is analysed at the level of fine details and local structures that reflect underlying ideologies. This phase focuses on the detailed elements that constitute discourse, such as words, phrases, and sentences, and how they are used to express ideas and beliefs. Below is an explanation of the elements mentioned in Micro-level Analysis (Van Dijk, 2000). For micro-level analysis, Van Dijk (2006) provides the following distinct discursive devices (Van Dijk, 2006, p. 735-736), which are:

- 1. Authority:** A strategy used to evoke the authority's claim or view of a particular event or issue as a way to emphasize and strengthen the argument. The authority could be any person from potentates to high profile politicians.
- 2. Disclaimer:** A strategy a way by which the speaker emphasizes positively an idea and then denies it through the use of the lexical item as "but" in the second clause, at the same time it is used to indicate the positive self-representation and the negative other representation.
- 3. Metaphor:** A rhetorical strategy that is used to describe something by comparing it with abstract unfamiliar meanings.
- 4. Polarisation:** A syntactic strategy a way by which the speaker emphasizes the good qualities of the categorized individuals belonging to "Us" and emphasizes the bad qualities of the categorized individuals belonging to "Them".
- 5. Victimization:** A strategy used as a way by which the speaker represents negative descriptions and corny stories of the out-group.

6. Empathy: Empathy refers to the ability to express understanding and compassion for the struggles or suffering of others. In political or ideological discourse, empathy can be used strategically, particularly in disclaimers, to influence the speaker's image with the audience. The expression of empathy may sometimes be superficial, serving to create a positive impression without genuinely addressing the concerns of the out-group.

7. Lexicalization: Lexicalization is the process of selecting and using specific words or expressions in discourse to convey particular concepts and beliefs. The vocabulary used can change depending on the speaker's position, role, goals, and ideological perspective. Depending on the situation, expressions can be either positive or negative.

2.7. Queen Elizabeth II's Royal Family

Princess Diana, Camilla, Kate Middleton, and Meghan Markle, are Queen Elizabeth II's four most important daughters-in-law, and this part highlights their activities for charity and services to the royal family. Princess Diana was one of the most famous members of the British royal family. She was the ex-wife of Prince Charles. Her life was widely covered by the media, which portrayed her as a model of giving and kindness. Diana remained famous all around the world in spite of her personal problems, including her divorce from Prince Charles. She significantly advanced humanitarian causes, particularly in the fields of landmine removal and AIDS awareness (Morton, 2017). She had a large following and became a significant figure in public activity despite her tragic death in 1997.

Kate Middleton, the Duchess of Cambridge, is one of the most significant members of the British royal family today. Following her 2011 marriage to Prince William, she has been the subject of media attention ever since. Kate is well-known for her wide humanitarian work, especially in the areas of child welfare and mental health (Moody, 2013). Her job as a princess is crucial in parenting her children, Prince George, Princess Charlotte, and Prince Louis, and she exemplifies elegance and composure while being independent.

Prince Harry's wife, Meghan Markle, was born in the US and used to be an actress. Meghan's 2018 marriage to Prince Harry was a worldwide sensation, and her non-royal origins and social views garnered a lot of attention. She started advocating for gender equality and human rights after getting married. After she and her husband chose to leave royal duties in 2020, her relationship with the royal family worsened despite her advocacy for social justice causes. They wanted to live a more independent life, which is why they made this choice (Scobie & Durand, 2020).

Prince Charles's second wife is Camilla, Duchess of Cornwall. She had difficulties and public attention throughout her life prior to her marriage to Prince Charles, especially because of her previous involvement with him during his marriage to Diana. Following their 2005 marriage, Camilla rose to prominence within the royal family and took part in a wide range of royal and charitable activities such as campaigns to promote environmental awareness and mental health (Bower, 2006). Although she has been criticized, she has become a revered member of the royal family.

Besides Queen Elizabeth's more well known daughters-in-law, Sophie, Countess of Wessex, and Sarah Ferguson, Duchess of York, were also significant members of the royal family. Sophie, who married Prince Edward, kept a more quiet public image and worked on her humanitarian activities, whereas Sarah Ferguson, who was married to Prince Andrew, was

well-known for her outspoken style and media presence (Dixon, 2022; Kulik & The Editors of Encyclopaedia Britannica, 2025).

3. Methodology

This study is a qualitative in nature. It aims to explore the linguistic and discursive strategies in the selected speeches. Queen Elizabeth usually employs some linguistic and socio-cognitive strategies when addressing her daughters-in-law. Therefore, the study intends to uncover the types of contexts and their influence on constructing the meaning and communicative intention of the Queen's speeches. As defined by Creswell (2009), qualitative research involves exploring and understanding the importance that individuals or societies focus on a social or human issue. Developing questions and processes, gathering data in the participants' environment, inductively analysing the data, moving from details to broad themes, and coming up with interpretations of the data's relevance are all steps in the research process.

For this study, the researcher used a qualitative analytic approach for several reasons. First, qualitative methodology let us examine how sociocognitive factors impact Queen Elizabeth II's comments regarding her daughters-in-law. Second, the research focuses on verbal communication in the form of speeches, rather than numerical data, making the qualitative approach ideal for analysing the language and discourse used by Queen Elizabeth II. Finally, qualitative methods allow for dynamic exploration, enabling the researcher to examine the nuances of her speeches, follow up on particular phrases or themes, and uncover the sociocognitive dynamics at play. Although the study is qualitative in nature, the researcher also employs frequencies and percentages to objectively support the results and answer key research questions, offering a comprehensive perspective on the language and its implications. The study is qualitative in nature and is based on an eclectic model that is based on Van Dijk's (2006) Ideology and Discourse Analysis.

4. Data Analysis

Extract (1)

"It has therefore been agreed that there will be a period of transition in which the Sussexes will spend time in Canada and the UK. These are complex matters for my family to resolve, and there is some more work to be done, but I have asked for final decisions to be reached in the coming days."

1. Meaning

1.1 Disclaimers

The quote from Queen Elizabeth's speech reflects a clear use of disclaimers in discourse. The Queen begins by announcing an agreed-upon transition period in a neutral way: *"It has therefore been agreed that there will be a period of transition,"* which reflects an attempt to present a solution. However, this is quickly followed by acknowledgment of the challenges that need to be addressed, such as: *"These are complex matters for my family to resolve" and "there is some more work to be done."* This shift from a positive statement to recognizing difficulties is the essence of a disclaimer. It presents the situation as resolved while also signaling that more work remains. By doing this, the speech maintains a balanced image and

prepares the audience for potential challenges, thus minimizing the chances of criticism or negative reactions.

1.2 Polarisation

The extract shows implicit polarization between “my family” as the responsible group managing and resolving difficult issues, and “the Sussexes” as a separate group choosing to live a different lifestyle. Although the terms “us” and “them” are not explicitly used, the clear distinction between “my family” and “the Sussexes” implies a division. The phrase “*period of transition*” emphasizes a process of separation and adjustment, highlighting a change in the relationship between the two parties. This language reflects an underlying social division where the royal family is portrayed as the authority making decisions, while the Sussexes are positioned as the independent out-group with a distinct path.

2. Argumentation

Authority

The text contains authority arguments that assert the speaker's power and responsibility in making decisions and guiding the family. Such elements include the indication “*it has therefore been agreed*,” which implies a decision has been reached, the comment “*there will be a period of transition*,” which indicates the speaker's authority in determining the process, acknowledging the complexity of the situation, and the sentence “*I have asked for final decisions to be reached in the coming days*,” all of which demonstrate the queen's authority and control over the situation.

3. Style

Lexicalisation

The excerpt contains lexical items that portray the speaker as authoritative, responsible, and control. “*Been agreed*” emphasize the conclusion of a decision, conveying authority and control. “*A period of transition*” suggests a thoughtful approach, indicating responsibility in managing a change. “*Complex matters*” emphasizes the speaker's awareness of the situation, their leadership, and their responsibility. “*Final decisions*” suggests the speaker is steering the process towards closure, enhancing their authority. All these lexical items lead to positive self-presentation.

Extract (2)

“*And when, in the fullness of time, my son Charles becomes King, I know you will give him and his wife Camilla the same support that you have given me; and it is my sincere wish that, when that time comes, Camilla will be known as Queen Consort as she continues her own loyal service.*”

1. Argumentation

Authority

The expression “*I know you will give*” represents a strong argumentative expression based on declared social and political expectations of ongoing support for the coming royal

authority. This linguistic use highlights collective acceptance of authority and confirms the legitimacy of the inherited monarchy, forming a basic ground for argumentation built on collective commitment and formal respect, increasing the monarchy's institutional stability in society's consciousness.

2. Style

Lexicalisation

In this extract, the use of "*fullness of time*" and "*sincere wish*" implies a thoughtful and respectful acknowledgment of the future. The Queen's tone is formal and anticipatory, reflecting a respectful view of the future transition of power. The comment "*loyal service*" adds a sense of reverence and admiration for Camilla, presenting her as a dedicated and worthy figure.

Extract (3)

"It was with great pleasure that I had the opportunity to look through a number of the portraits that made the final selection for the Hold Still photography project. The Duchess of Cambridge and I were inspired to see how the photographs have captured the resilience of the British people at such a challenging time."

1. Argumentation

Authority

Mentioning "*The Duchess of Cambridge and I*" is a direct appeal to institutional and personal authority recognized within the royal institution. This strengthens the credibility and support for the mentioned cultural project. This appeal shows that the initiative is protected and backed by the highest levels of authority. It gives the speech strong argumentative influence based on official and culturally recognized references and enhances public confidence in the effectiveness of the speech.

2. Style

Lexicalisation

In this extract, the expressions "*great pleasure*," "*resilience*," and "*challenging time*" suggest praise and confidence and shared interest. These comments are an affirmation and a mark of consideration for the resilience of the people of Britain at this difficult moment. It helps build feelings of national unity, and because it is a positively spun vocabulary item, it is useful in making the public feel tied with the royals. Positive imagery is used in order to construct a positive image of the royal family and their relationship with the public.

5. Conclusions

The analysis of the selected data has shown that the Queen's speeches include different strategies and ideological perspectives such as, authority, lexicalization, empathy, victimization, polarisation, metaphor and disclaimer. Queen Elizabeth utilized the plural

pronoun "we" to create a sense of togetherness between her and the members of the royal family and British public. This paints a picture of the royal family as compassionate and part of the collective national grieving process. In alluding to the collective experience of loss, The Queen affirms her position as a monarch but also as the symbolic figure of the nation's grief. The positive presentation by the royal family is mention in terms of an emotional relation to the nation and there is no reference to a negative representation of others here (i.e. anyone outside the royal family). Encouraging the royals but using the word "we," it is a collective argument. It is the moment that brings the public and monarchy together in a shared emotional and experiential world. The Queen's moral authority as a field of contestation and symbolical authority is reinforced by the collective pronoun. The Queen's face shows signs of empathy with the public and her family. She shows empathy to the emotional reaction of the public and the lessons that may be taken from Diana's life by stating that people who did not meet Diana were still influenced by her death.

6. References

- Bhatia, V. K. (2004). *Worlds of written discourse: A genre-based view*. Continuum
- Bower, T. (2006). *The rebel prince*. HarperCollins.
- Chilton, P. (2004). *Analysing Political Discourse: Theory and Practice*. Routledge.
<https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203561218>
- Dixon, C. L. (2022, August 19). *The stunning transformation of Sophie, Countess of Wessex*. The List. Retrieved April 9, 2025, from <https://www.thelist.com>
- Fairclough, N. (1992). *Discourse and social change*. Polity Press. Blackwell Publishing.
- Fairclough, N. (2003). *Analysing Discourse: Textual Analysis for Social Research*, Routledge.
- Fauconnier, G., & Turner, M. (2002). *The way we think: Conceptual blending and the mind's hidden complexities*. Basic Books.
- Foucault, M. (1980). *Power/knowledge: Selected interviews and other writings, 1972–1977* (C. Gordon, Ed. & Trans.). Pantheon Books.
- Gyollai, D. (2022). The sociocognitive approach in critical discourse studies and the phenomenological sociology of knowledge: Intersections. *Phenomenology and the Cognitive Sciences*, 21(3), 539–558. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11097-020-09704-z>
- Hart, C. (2010). *Critical discourse analysis and cognitive science: New perspectives on immigration discourse*. Springer.
- Kintsch, W. (1998). *Comprehension: A paradigm for cognition*. Cambridge University Press.
- Kulik, R. M., & The Editors of Encyclopaedia Britannica. (2025). *Sarah, Duchess of York*. Encyclopaedia Britannica. Retrieved April 9, 2025, from <https://www.britannica.com>
- Moody, M. (2013). *Kate: A biography*. Michael O'Mara Books, Limited

- Morton, A. (2017). *Diana: Her true story--in her own words*. Simon & Schuster.
- Muntigl, P. (2010). Cognition: A missing link in mainstream CDA? In R. Wodak & P. Chilton (Eds.), *A new agenda in (critical) discourse analysis* (pp. 117–143). John Benjamins.
- Scobie, O., & Durand, C. (2020). *Finding freedom: Harry and Meghan and the making of a modern royal family*. HarperCollins.
- Scollon, R., & Scollon, S. W. (2001). *Intercultural communication: A discourse approach*. Blackwell Publishers.
- Swales, J. M. (1990). *Genre analysis: English in academic and research settings*. Cambridge University Press.
- The Editors of Encyclopaedia Britannica. (2025). *Elizabeth II: Queen of United Kingdom*. Encyclopaedia Britannica. Retrieved April 8, 2025, from <https://www.britannica.com>
- Van, Dijk T.A. (1992) *Discourse and Cognition in Society*. University of Amsterdam, Program of Discourse Studies.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (1993). *Elite discourse and racism*. Sage Publications.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (1995). *Ideological discourse analysis*. *New Courant*, 4.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (1998). *Ideology: A multidisciplinary approach*. Sage.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (2000). *Ideology and Discourse: A Multidisciplinary Introduction*. Retrieved from <http://www.discourses.org/download/books>
- Van Dijk, T. A. (2002). Ideology: Political discourse and cognition. In P. Chilton & C. Schäffner (Eds.), *Politics as text and talk: Analytic approaches to political discourse* (pp. 33–58). John Benjamins. <https://doi.org/10.1075/dapsac.4.04dij>
- Van Dijk, T. A. (2005). Politics, ideology and discourse. In R. Wodak (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of language & linguistics* (Vol. 8, pp. 728-740). Elsevier Ltd.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (2006) “Ideology and Discourse Analysis,” *Journal of Political Ideologies*, 11(2), pp. 115–140. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1080/13569310600687908>.
- Van Dijk, T.A. (2008). Discourse and racism, *A Companion to Racial and Ethnic Studies*, pp. 145–159. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1111/b.9780631206163.2002.00017.x>.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (2009). Critical discourse studies: A sociocognitive approach. *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*, 2(1), 62–86.

- Van Dijk, T. A. (2011). Principles of critical discourse analysis. In M. Wetherell, S. Taylor, & S. J. Yates (Eds.), *Discourse theory and practice: A reader* (pp. 300–317). Sage.
- Van Dijk, T.A. (2013) “Discourse, Power and Access,” *Texts and Practices*, pp. 93–113.
Available at: <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203431382-11>.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (2014a). *Discourse and knowledge: A Sociocognitive approach*. CUP.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (2016). Sociocognitive discourse studies. In J. Richardson & J. Flowerdew (Eds.), *Handbook of discourse analysis*. Routledge.
- Van Dijk, T.A. (2017) “Sociocognitive Discourse Studies,” *The Routledge Handbook of Critical Discourse Studies*, pp. 26–43. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315739342-3>.
- Van Leeuwen, T. (2008). *Discourse and Practice: New Tools for Critical Discourse Analysis*. SAGE Publications.
- Wodak, R., & Meyer, M. (2016). *Methods of Critical Discourse Studies*. SAGE Publications.

تحليل اجتماعي معرفي للمكونات على المستوى الجزئي في خطابات مختارة للملكة إليزابيث

الباحثة: بنين عدنان جعفر

جامعة كربلاء، كلية التربية للعلوم الإنسانية

إيميل:

المستخلص

تُعنى هذه الدراسة بدراسة خطابات الملكة إليزابيث الثانية عن زوجات أبنائها من منظور اجتماعي معرفي. عادةً ما تُخاطب الملكة إليزابيث أفراد عائلتها في خطاباتهما وتتحدث عنهن في مناسبات عديدة. وعادةً ما تستخدم بعض الاستراتيجيات اللغوية والاجتماعية-المعرفية عند مخاطبة زوجات أبنائها. لذلك، تهدف الدراسة إلى الكشف عن الاستراتيجيات اللغوية والبلاغية في الخطابات المختارة. الدراسة نوعية بطبيعتها وتستند إلى نموذج انتقائي يستند إلى كتاب م. فان دايك (2006) "تحليل الأيديولوجية والخطاب". وقد تم اختيار ثلاثة مقتطفات كعينات لغرض التحليل. بعد تحليل البيانات المختارة، أظهرت بعض النتائج أن الملكة استخدمت المعجمية وبدأ أنها تستخدم الأسلوب الرسمي والمفردات الانتقائية بطريقة جيدة تتناسب مع البروتوكول الملكي. كما استخدمت السلطة لدعم حججها، وبهذا العنصر اعتمدت الملكة على مكانتها ومكانتها بين الجمهور وأفراد الأسرة لتعزيز الحجج.

الكلمات المفتاحية: المعرفي_ الاجتماعي، الملكة إليزابيث الثانية، الأيديولوجية، التحليل على المستوى الجزئي.