
| RESEARCH ARTICLE

A Critical Stylistic Analysis of Polarization in American President Joe Biden's Campaign in the Last American Elections

Qasim Obayes Al-Azzawi Ph.D.¹ and Hadi Abdul-Ameer Abbass² ✉

¹*Professor, University of Babylon, College of Education for Humanities, English Department, Iraq*

²*University of Babylon, College of Education for Humanities, English Department, Iraq*

Corresponding Author: Hadi Abdul-Ameer Abbass, **E-mail:** hadymh690@gmail.com

| ABSTRACT

The opposition between two persons, parties or groups is referred to as polarization. Such disagreement is interpreted using a variety of ideological techniques due to the detrimental effects of the polarizing strategy used in political debates, which have an impact on societies generally and the political stability of the countries in particular. The purpose of the current study is to explore this strategy used by U.S. President Joe Biden in his tweets to indicate his political and ideological intentions and goals during his last election. The research employs Jeffries' approach of critical stylistic analysis (2010). In order to make up for the fuzziness of CDA, Jeffries (2010) aimed to propose a collection of devices within the critical stylistics (CS). Text techniques used in literary and non-literary speech use language structures to describe the world, using linguistic forms leading to the generalization "that all texts are ideological. Thus, "all texts producers produce hidden ideologies to influence or manipulate.

| KEYWORDS

Stylistics, critical stylistics, critical discourse analysis, polarization, politics, and ideology

| ARTICLE INFORMATION

ACCEPTED: 01 December 2022

PUBLISHED: 11 December 2022

DOI: 10.32996/jhsss.2022.4.4.35

1. Introduction

People primarily understand the world through the medium of language (Barker et al., 2001: 1). It serves as a communication and a power tool (Reyes, 2011: 18). In political communication, politicians employ language to change people's perceptions of politics, attitudes toward politics, and behavior toward politics, or to change the general policy of the country and the state (Perloff, 2014: 30). Political polarization refers to the ideological divide between candidates, which encompasses the cultural and social tensions brought on by the widening gap between conservative and liberal trends in American culture (Hare and Poole, 2014: 1).

However, Bai (2017:6) argues that the use of social media platforms in electoral campaigns emerged because of their positive advantages at the political and public levels in terms of allowing politicians to communicate directly with the masses on the one hand and on the other hand allowing the public to engage in political issues. Twitter is among many types of social networks that have received wide attention from users, as short messages are sent to huge audiences.

Therefore, it is important to involve a critical stylistic study that sheds light on the strategy of polarization employed by Biden on the social networking platform Twitter, which discloses his ideology and hidden purposes.

1.1 The Problem

1. How is polarization achieved in Biden's tweets?
2. Which device is the most employed and which is the least?

1.2 The Aims

1. Exploring how polarization strategy is achieved in Biden's tweets.
2. Accounting which device is the most employed and which is the least.

2. Theoretical Background

2.1 Stylistics

Stylistics is ailing. It is on the wane, and its heyday, alongside that of structuralism, has faded to but a distant memory. More alarming again, few university students are 'eager to declare an intention to do research in stylistics'. By this account, the death knell of stylistics had been sounded, and it looked as though the end of the twentieth century would be accompanied by the inevitable passing of that faltering, moribund discipline. And no one, it seemed, would lament its demise. Stylistics in the early twenty-first century is very much alive and well. It is taught and researched in university departments of language, literature and linguistics the world over. The high academic profile stylistics is mirrored in its dedicated book-length publications, research journals, international conferences and symposia, and scholarly associations. Far from moribund, modern stylistics is positively flourishing, witnessed in a proliferation of sub-disciplines where stylistic methods are enriched and enabled by theories of discourse, culture and society (Simpson, 2004: 2).

Stylistics is discovering language and, more specifically, revealing creativity in language use. Having stylistics thereby enriches our ways of thought about language and, as perceived, exploring language offers a substantial purchase on our understanding of (literary) texts. With the full array of language models at our disposal, an inherently illuminating method of analytic inquiry presents itself. This method of inquiry has a significant reflexive capacity insofar as it can shed light on the very language system it develops from; it tells us about the 'rules' of language because it often discovers texts where those rules are bent, distended or stretched to breaking point. Language is always at the fore in contemporary stylistic analysis, which is why you should never undertake to do stylistics unless you are interested in language (Simpson, 2004:3).

2.2 Critical Stylistics

It is a stylistic method of linguistic analysis that is concerned with how language conveys social meanings. 'Critical Stylistics' owes its origin and development to Jeffries in 2007 when she attempted the exploration of (a) the hegemonic discourses on the female body in society and (b) whether feminist ideologies have successfully been incorporated into these hegemonic discourses.

Critical Stylistics is concerned with bringing together the main general functions that a text has in representing reality, which is based on the fact that 'there is a level at which texts organize the world we experience and that this is demonstrable in the words and structures of the texts themselves (Jeffries, 2010).

Jeffries (2010) opines that 'language is essentially a finely balanced combination of rules and broken rules, where the fact that there is no one-to-one form-function relationship is the key to many of the most useful and life-enhancing aspects of language, such as the writing of poetry and the use of metaphor in daily life, as well as of the more negative aspects, such as lying and manipulation'.

Critical Stylistics bridges the gap between CDA and Stylistics by using and further developing the Critical Linguistics approach to text analysis. The major accomplishment of Critical Stylistics is the provision of a more comprehensive and systematic set of analytical tools. Therefore, it should be seen as another approach to CDA and should be grouped under Critical Language Studies since both CDA and Critical Stylistics work to reveal ideologies and power relations in discourse.

Critical Stylistics is not linked to any political outlook. It argues that all texts are ideologically based, whether these ideologies are part of a conscious or unconscious process. It is interested in uncovering and revealing hidden ideologies in texts and discourse. There are a set of analytical tools through which Critical Stylistics uncovers the ideologies hidden in the text, thereby saving the analyst from subjectively looking for them in an attempt to confirm preconceived assumptions. The tools of Critical Stylistics include the following: (a) Naming and Describing, (b) Representing Actions/Events/States, (c) Equating and Contrasting, (d) Exemplifying and Enumerating, (e) Prioritizing, (f) Implying and Assuming, (g) Negating, (h) Hypothesizing, (i) Presenting the Speech and Thoughts of other Participants, and (j) Representing Time, Space and Society (Olaluwoye, 2015:88).

2.3 Critical Discourse Analysis

The origin of critical discourse analysis (henceforth CDA) goes back to the Frankfurt school before the second world war in critical theory (Agger, 1992; Rasmussen, 1996 cited in Van Dijk, 2001a: 352). The contemporary concentration of CDA on language and discourse started with "critical linguistics", which arose in the UK and Australia at the end of 1970 (Fowler et al. 1979 cited in Van Dijk 2001a: 352).

CDA, from the viewpoint of Wodak (1995:24-25), is the analysis of vague and apparent constructional relations of hegemony, segregation, and power as shown in language. CDA stipulates that discourse is constitutive and conditioned socially. Discourse is a tool of power of growing significance in modern societies, and this tool is usually difficult to understand. Therefore, CDA works to facilitate this difficulty by making discourse more visible and apparent. Calds-Coulthard and Coulthard (1996: xi) argue that CDA is basically political in its practitioners' intention to work on the world to transform it and contribute to creating a world free from discrimination based on gender, race, age and social class. Moreover, critical analysis of discourse is a kind of research analyzing discourse in which issues such as inequality, hegemony and power are legislated, reproduced and confronted by talk and text in a political and social context. Analysts of critical discourse have a clear attitude toward understanding, uncovering and finally resisting inequality in society (Van Dijk, 2001 cited in Widdowson, 2004:89). Blommaert (2005:27) points out that CDA envisages discourse as a phenomenon of society, which seeks to develop the theoretical bases of the society for practising analyzing discourse and placing it in society.

Additionally, CDA plans to produce and transfer critical understanding, which enables people to release themselves through self-reflection from forms of dominance (Wodak & Meyer 2009:7). Therefore, CDA contributes to eliminating delusion on the one hand and increases awareness on the other hand. CDA intends to plan what is said and can be said in a certain society at a specific time with consideration of its qualitative spectrum and discover the procedures through which restrictions of discourse are expanded or narrowed down (ibid, 36).

2.4 Polarization

In general, polarization strategy is the range of differences and antagonism that occur on a particular issue; it is the increase of differences and antagonism that occurs over time (Dimaggio et al., 1996:4).

However, Van Dijk (1987: 204) says:

Polarization may take place in order to "see" people as Black, even when their skin color or other characteristics can hardly be distinguished from those of at least some of one's own group members. The same is true, of course, for appearance dimensions that are not primarily gradual but categorical in their own right (such as the male-female distinction).

Polarization emerges when there is an opposition or competition between two parties or groups (Van Dijk, 2006a: 49). Such opposition and competition are perceived through many discursive strategies under the overall ideological strategy of positive self-representation and negative other-representation (our good things and their bad things), these sub-strategies serve to perform various purposes (Van Dijk, 2006a: 49). It is worth mentioning that this definition will be the operational one adopted by the study.

On the other hand, there is an antagonism between undesirable polarization and desirable social cohesion since polarization undermines social cohesion (Fairclough 2003:57). Linguistically, polarization is created by classifying people and groups during discussions about others in terms of in-group and out-group, for example, discourses and texts related to ideological representations of immigrants (Van Dijk, 2006b: 738). It emerges and becomes clearer when the contradiction emerges clearly through the employment of the opposing pronouns of "us" and "them" and opposing qualities of good and bad (ibid). Chakravarty (2009:105) argues that politically, polarization divides public opinion and moves them to extremes, and these extremes are regarded as the measurement of polarization.

In its main treatments, polarization has two conclusions: **first**, the public realizes that the parties are more apart now; **second**, elite polarization is at the heart of whatever polarization has appeared in the mass public. Elite polarization is, of course, a significant issue for understanding the public's realizations of polarization (Hetherington & Weiler 2009:105). While Campbell (2016:16-17) sees polarization according to the degree of hostile political viewpoints and political differences. Furthermore, polarization is a strategy that refers to growingly aligning various differences in society to be at one dimension, and people growingly conceptualize society and politics in the sense of "us" and "them" (McCoy,2018:16). Moreover, McCarty (2019: 8) argues that the formal description of polarization is taken from the term polarity, which means the case of existing two reverse directions or viewpoints.

2.5 Polarization and Politics

Galderisi (2015:95) mentions that recently, in the U.S., the PD of Congress has been polarized. Hopkins and Sides (2015:5) argue that increasing party polarization decreased the extension of political competition. Polarization may absorb many issues, which are different from the dimension of party competition (ibid). In the voting of Congress, the parties are distinguished by a single dimension (ibid). This state is in contrast with the mid-twentieth century, where internal parties were divided into various issues, particularly issues associated with race and region (ibid).

The level of division in supporting the president can be used as a measurement for this polarization (Galderisi, 2015: 95). Members of Congress are classified according to the percentage of times they support the president. A large difference indicates a great

distance between parties and means increased polarization. In sum, polarization uncovers the different ideologies of different members of parties (ibid).

Carothers and O' Donohue (2019:1) mention that political polarization is increasingly evident in developed global democracies as a result of divisions between the conflicting political parties and disagreement to a unified political ground. Thurber and Yoshinaka (2015:1) assert that the harmful influence of partisan polarization cannot be exaggerated. Partisan polarization hinders compromise, creates gridlock, promotes distrust, and finally disturbs the functioning of institutions of government (ibid). Barber and McCarty (2015:16) point out that partisan polarization can be measured by accounting for the diversity of means used by political parties, wherein a large gap represents the polarization at its huge level.

2.6 Polarization, Ideology and Linguistic Levels

Van Dijk (1998:69) mentions that in groups of the community, polarization may act as an instrument of ideology, where ideologies are social representations. These groups institute ideological images for themselves and others. They present polarized representations such as positive self-presentation and negative other-presentation. In this sense, ideology works as a self-serving schema for groups' representation. Furthermore, Van Dijk (2004:7) points out that ideology as a negative concept is the main component of the political discourse; it is a false system or misleading principles. For example, the ideology of anti-communism, which for many years governed politics in much of Western countries, ideology was usually related to communism. This use as a negative concept presupposes a polarization process between Us and Them: We have real information, while they have ideologies.

On the other hand, Freedman et al. (2013:180) explain that ideologized discourse generally offers polarized constructions of tacit ideologies and attitudes; these constructions commonly focus on positive aspects of us (ingroup) and negative aspects of them (outgroup). This polarization may influence exterior levels of discourse, such as sounds and visible structures, syntax, and lexicon, as well as the interior level of discourse, such as the levels of meaning in pragmatic and semantic and different levels of rhetoric, such as alliteration, hyperboles, and metaphor as well (ibid).

2.7 Polarization in U.S. PD

Hawkesworth and Kogan (1992: 435) explain that during the 1950s, the voters of the working class and middle class divide their votes more equally between Republicans and Democrats. This asserts that American politics witnessed a very decrease in class polarization at that time. Hetherington and Weiler (2009: 174) mention that in the U.S. in 2006, journalists and politicians became comfortable with the concept of polarization for describing the competition between the two parties. In 2008, the polarization concept was used by politicians and journalists to refer to the conflict between democrats and Barack Obama on one side and Hillary Clinton on the other side, who were fighting for the presidential nomination of the party (ibid). A significant case of polarization is the case of Obama-Clinton, which represents a clear case with no ideological or issue differences (ibid: 175).

Campbell (2016:3) argues that:

America is polarized. Our political parties are highly polarized, and the American electorate is highly polarized. By highly polarized, I mean there are substantial differences in political perspectives across a single ideological dimension. The polarization of the American electorate is real and widespread.

3. Methodology

The study has collected five tweets of Biden from the period before the last American elections from the website: <https://polititweet.org/tweets?account=939091PolitiTweet>

The study adopts Jeffry's (2010) model of critical stylistic analysis to analyze the data qualitatively and quantitatively.

3.1 Adopted Model

3.1.1 Jeffries's Critical Stylistic Model (2010)

Jeffries (2010) has tried to present a set of devices within the critical stylistics (CS) to compensate for the fuzziness of CDA. Text methods of literary and non-literary discourse depict the world using linguistic forms leading to the generalization "that all texts are ideological (Jeffries, 2010:6). Thus, "all texts producers produce hidden ideologies to influence or manipulate"(Jeffries, 2010:7).

All members of the daily communicative context have access to the collection of tools for embedding ideologies. She has included in her model (2010: 14) the essential roles that texts play in providing reality. Despite the fact that CDA develops text-based analysis techniques, the world we experience can still be organized at the level of words and other textual creations. These are always ideologically charged and operated terms (Jeffries, 2010:3).

Jeffries (2010) proposes that this set is more inclusive than those adopted with CDA. She assures that there could be other devices that can be added to her list. In planning her set of devices for CS, she is motivated by the vagueness and the lack of tools for analysis of literary studies (Jeffries, 2010: 1). These devices are explained as follows:

1. Naming and Describing

How language is used in an ideological fashion to name referents; This textual function is linguistically achieved by picking a certain ideological nominal reference from a list of options, enclosing a specific ideological idea inside the noun phrase, and changing the constituents of a proposition into a nominal.

2. Representing Actions/Events/States

The clause's ability to convey the textual (ideal) meaning is the main subject of the analysis. The meaning is connected to what is being done (actions), what is happening (events), and what is merely the case (states). The verb that is used to characterize the circumstance as an action, an event, or a state is the main component of this function. Each of these choices could have an ideological effect depending on how the recipients perceive them.

3. Equating and Contrasting

How equivalence and opposition are used in textual composition to represent the world in writing. According to Jeffries (2010), the ideological impact of the usage of particular synonyms or antonyms while constructing a text

4. Exemplifying and Enumerating

Consider the potential ideological effects of the text's usage of list structures for the purposes of exemplifying and enumerating. They consider any potential ideological implications of the text's usage of the linguistic functions of exemplifying and enumerating.

5. Prioritizing

Prioritizing is the study of the ways in which ideological effects can be achieved by moving the focus information to a different position inside a phrase using different syntactic prioritization techniques, such as information structure, transformation, and subordination.

6. Assuming and Implying

Using assumptions and implications to create naturalized ideologies cannot be asked as they are represented as shared knowledge. The ideological effect of the implicit meaning is related to two notions: presupposition and implicature, which have their theoretical origins in semantics and pragmatics, respectively.

7. Negating

This textual practice is founded on ' the pragmatic force of negating ', which makes the reader/hearer conscious of scenarios that are not taking place, but presumably might have done in other circumstances. In other words, create an alternative reality which is considered to be unreal.

8. Hypothesizing

How a hypothetical situation can be produced through modality, which reflects the text producer's point of view explicitly; A device refers to the process through which the text makers do not always provide the view of the world as it is.

9. Presenting the Speech and Thoughts of other Participants

This textual conceptual function gives consideration to how the speaker/ writer employs the power of language as Jeffries describes it 'as potentially very manipulative of their ideologies as well as those of the reader.

10. Representing Time, Space and Society.

This device of analysis deals with how the text producers construct the world in space, time and society dimensions. To access such dimensions, Jeffries depends on the model of deixis. The significance of deixis lies in the information that it produces a particular interpretation of a particular utterance in a particular context of a situation; on the contrary, the lack of this information yields misinterpretation (Jeffries, 2010: 17-146).

4. Data Analysis

Tweet 1

Joe Biden @JoeBiden

As president, I'll impose a tax penalty on companies that ship jobs overseas and sell products back to the U.S. — and I'll create millions of good-paying jobs here at home. We're going to make sure the future is made in America — by all of America's workers. <https://t.co/8smOm5MGx1> — PolitiTweet.org

Posted Sept. 12, 2020

The verb **will** is used twice in this tweet to emphasize the **hypothesis** of reforming the American economy. The verbs **impose** and **create represent** actions that repair what is corrupted previously. He uses the word **future** to **represent** a better time of the future. These employments reflect the ideological purposes of Biden in affecting recipients' minds in order to win their votes. The adverb of space **here** is used to **represent** the place, sharing his people in the homeland. This tweet **implies** the **contrast** with Trump

Tweet 2

Joe Biden @JoeBiden

More than 1,000 people died from COVID yesterday. @realDonaldTrump watched eight hours of TV. If I'm president, you might not always agree with me. But I promise you I will always show up and fight for you. <https://t.co/HvVJLS83TZ> — PolitiTweet.org

Posted Sept. 11, 2020

In this tweet, Biden uses **enumerating** ideology in order to criticize Trump regarding his carelessness about Covid 19, using the verb **watched** to **represent** the action of Trump, which caused the death of people. Biden also tries to make a **contrast** between himself and Trump, claiming that if he is president, he will fight for the people, **hypothesizing** his argument by employing the modal verb **will**. Further, he used the adverb **yesterday** to **represent time**, trying to exaggerate the number of deaths in one day. He also tries to **prioritize** Covid to win the sympathy of the audience. The **contrast** here is very clear, where Trump tries to make a comparison by showing Trump's carelessness and his concern. The adverb of time **yesterday** is used to represent time, comparing short time with huge deaths.

Tweet 3

Joe Biden @JoeBiden

Donald Trump is holding a rally in Michigan today—while also refusing to fully fund their National Guard. These are frontline workers against COVID-19, responsible for testing and distributing food and medical supplies. Mich.iganders need a pandemic response—not a pep rally. — PolitiTweet.org

Posted Sept. 10, 2020

The polarization is clear in this tweet. Biden **names** Trump and criticizes him in that he is holding a rally in Michigan, using the expression "**is holding**" to **represent** action and using **negation** by the words **refusing** and **not** to serve his argument. This use of verbs and negation is employed ideologically to undermine his opponent Trump in the elections. In this tweet, Biden tries to **prioritize** the issue of the National Guard over what Trump wants to do. The adverb of time **today** is used to represent time.

Tweet 4

Joe Biden @JoeBiden

Make no mistake: Climate change is already here — and we're witnessing its devastating effects every single day. We have to get President Trump out of the White House and treat this crisis like the existential threat that it is. <https://t.co/NXzkpaRVsY> — PolitiTweet.org

Posted Sept. 10, 2020

Biden here uses the verb **make** and the verb phrase "**we're witnessing**" to **represent** action and state; they are selected here to show the carelessness of Trump in crucial issues of the country, **assuming** that Trump should not be re-elected. In this regard, employing the verb "**have to**" to **hypothesize** the important role of getting Trump out. The word **day** is employed to represent the time of a hard situation. By presenting the disadvantages of Trump, Biden tries to show himself as a good man, and this involves a **contrast**.

Tweet 5

Joe Biden @JoeBiden

Donald Trump knew that COVID-19 was dangerous. He knew it was deadly. And he purposely downplayed it. Now, nearly 200,000 Americans are dead. It's unconscionable. <https://t.co/SLqghmWy8E> — PolitiTweet.org

Posted Sept. 10, 2020

Biden, in this tweet, **names** former president Trump by his real name so that the **contrast** between them is clear. He employs the verb *knew* twice in order to emphasize **representing** the state of danger of COVID-19 and his indifference to Trump for that. He also employs the strategy of **enumerating** by using the number 200,000 in order to exaggerate the carelessness of Trump towards crucial country issues. He also uses the **deixis** of time *now* to exaggerate the difficulty of the current situation. All these devices **imply** Trump's disqualification for the presidency.

6. Statistical analysis

This section shows the devices that are employed and that are not employed in each tweet.

Tweet 1

Due to the data analysis, the devices, which are employed in this tweet as follows:

Table (1)

Representing Actions/Events/States
Hypothesizing
Assuming and Implying
Equating and Contrasting
Representing Time, Space and Society

The devices which are not employed in this tweet are as follows:

Table (2)

Naming and describing
Exemplifying and Enumerating
Prioritizing
Negating
1. Presenting the Speech and Thoughts of other Participants

Tweet 2

The devices, which are employed in this tweet as follows:

Table (3)

Naming and Describing
Representing Actions/Events/States
Equating and Contrasting
Exemplifying and Enumerating
Prioritizing
Hypothesizing
Representing Time, Space and Society

The devices which are not employed in this tweet are as follows:

Table (4)

Assuming and Implying
Negating
Presenting the Speech and Thoughts of other Participants

In this tweet, Biden employs seven devices, as they are mentioned in table (3) above. Three devices are not employed, as in table (4) above.

Tweet 3

The devices, which are employed in this tweet as follows:

Table (5)

Naming and Describing
Representing Actions/Events/States
Prioritizing
Negating
Representing Time, Space and Society

The devices which are not employed in this tweet are as follows:

Table (6)

Equating and Contrasting
Exemplifying and Enumerating
Assuming and Implying
Hypothesizing
Presenting the Speech and Thoughts of other Participants

Tables (5) and (6) show that Biden employs five devices, and he does not employ the other five devices.

Tweet 4

The devices, which are employed in this tweet as follows:

Table (7)

Representing Actions/Events/States
Equating and Contrasting
Assuming and Implying
Hypothesizing
Representing Time, Space and Society

The devices which are not employed in this tweet are as follows:

Table (8)

Naming and Describing
Exemplifying and Enumerating
Prioritizing
Negating
Presenting the Speech and Thoughts of other Participants

In this tweet, there are also five devices employed, and the other five are not employed, as mentioned above.

Tweet 5

The devices, which are employed in this tweet as follows:

Table (9)

Naming and Describing
Representing Actions/Events/States
Equating and Contrasting

Exemplifying and Enumerating
Assuming and Implying
Representing Time, Space and Society

The devices which are not employed in this tweet are as follows:

Table (10)

Prioritizing
Negating
Hypothesizing
Presenting the Speech and Thoughts of other Participants

Here, there are six devices employed, and four devices are not employed, as mentioned above.

Table (11) below shows the total frequencies of the devices that are employed in the five tweets

Table (11)

Representing Actions/Events/States	5
Representing Time, Space and Society	5
Equating and Contrasting	4
Naming and Describing	3
Assuming and Implying	3
Hypothesizing	3
Exemplifying and Enumerating	2
Prioritizing	2
Negating	1
Presenting the Speech and Thoughts of other Participants	0

6. Results

According to the qualitative and statistical analysis, the study reveals the following results:

1. The devices of *representing actions/ events/ states* and *representing time, space and society* are the most employed ones, where they have (5) frequencies. This means that they appear in all tweets.
2. The device of *equating and contrasting* is employed less than the previous one; it occurred (4) times.
3. *Naming and describing, assuming and implying; and hypothesizing* are achieved (3) times.
4. Two devices of *exemplifying and enumerating, and prioritizing* are employed two times.
5. The device *negating* is the least employed that appears one time.
6. The device *Presenting the Speech and Thoughts of other Participants* is not employed.

7. Discussions

1. Biden focuses much more on employing verbs, especially action verbs and adverbs of time. They might enhance his ideological purposes, and they make the argument more dynamic and more influential.
2. The device, which is also most employed but less than the previous one, is *equating and contrasting*. This device seems very useful in achieving hidden political aims by making a comparison between the two opponents.
3. The devices *Naming and describing; assuming and implying; hypothesizing; exemplifying and enumerating, and prioritizing* are less employed because they might have less direct effects.
4. *Negating* device is the least employed one.

Biden tends not to use the speech and thoughts of others to prove his independence; therefore, he doesn't employ the device of *Presenting the Speech and Thoughts of other Participants*

8. Conclusions

The study concludes that Biden employs different ideological devices unevenly, with an emphasis on some of them according to what he intends to convey. Through this employment, Biden tries to undermine his opponent Trump in the last American presidential elections; on the contrary, he portrays himself as a good man for his audience

Funding: This research received no external funding.

Conflicts of Interest: The authors declare no conflict of interest.

Publisher's Note: All claims expressed in this article are solely those of the authors and do not necessarily represent those of their affiliated organizations, or those of the publisher, the editors and the reviewers.

References

- [1] Bai, Y. (2017). *Tweets Win Votes: A Persuasive Communication Perspective on Donald Trump's Twitter Use during the 2016 US Presidential Election Campaign*. Master Thesis, Uppsala University
- [2] Barker, C., Galasinski, D., & Galasinski, D. D. (2001). *Cultural Studies and Discourse Analysis: A Dialogue on Language and Identity*. London: Sage.
- [3] Blommaert, J. (2005). *Discourse /A Critical Introduction*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- [4] Caldas-Coulthard, C. & Coulthard, M. (1996). *Texts and Practices: Readings in Critical Discourse Analysis*. New York: Routledge.
- [5] Campante, F. R., Hojman, D. A. (2010). *Media and Polarization: Evidence from the Introduction of Broadcast TV in the United States*. Journal of Public Economics, NO.100, (PP.: 79-92).
- [6] Campbell, J. E. (2018). *Polarized: Making Sense of a Divided America*. New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- [7] Carothers, T., O'Donohue, A. (2019). *Democracies Divided: The Global Challenge of Political Polarization*. Washington: Brookings Institution Press.
- [8] Chakravarty, S. (2010). *Inequality, Polarization and Poverty: Advances in Distributional Analysis*. New York: Springer.
- [9] DiMaggio, P., Evans, J., & Bryson, B. (1996). Have American's Social Attitudes Become More Polarized? *American Journal of Sociology*, vol. 102, NO. (3). (PP.: 690-755).
- [10] Fairclough, N. (2010) *Critical Discourse Analysis: The Critical Study of Language*. New York: Routledge.
- [11] Fairclough, N. (2003) *Analysing Discourse /Textual Analysis for Social Research*. New York: Routledge Taylor and Francis Group.
- [12] Freeden, M., Sargent, L. and Stears, M. (Eds.). (2013). *The Oxford Handbook of Political Ideologies*. London: Oxford University Press.
- [13] Galderisi, P. (2015) *Understanding Political Science Statistics Observations and Expectations in Political Analysis*. New York: Routledge.
- [14] Hare, C., and Poole, K. T. (2014). The polarization of contemporary American politics. *Polity*, Vol.46, No.(3), (pp.:411-429).
- [15] Hawkesworth, M. Kogan, M. (1992) *Encyclopedia of Government and Politics*. London: Routledge.
- [16] Hetherington, M. J., & Weiler, J. D. (2009). *Authoritarianism and Polarization in American Politics*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- [17] Hyland, K. and Paltridge, B. (2011). *Continuum Companion to Discourse Analysis*, London: Continuum International Publishing Group.
- [18] Hey! We couldn't handle your request. (n.d) <https://polititweet.org/tweets?account=939091PolitiTweet>
- [19] McCarty, N. (2019). *Polarization: What Everyone Needs to Know*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- [20] McCoy, J., & Somer, M. (2019). *Toward a Theory of Pernicious Polarization and How it Harms Democracies: Comparative Evidence and Possible Remedies*. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, Vol. 681, No. (1), (pp.: 234-271).
- [21] Reyes, A. (2011). *Voice in Political Discourse: Castro, Chavez, Bush and their Strategic Use of Language*. New York: Continuum Publishing Group.
- [22] Simpson, P. (2004). *Stylistics: A resource book for students*. Psychology Press.
- [23] Thurber, J. A., & Yoshinaka, A. (Eds.). (2015). *American gridlock: The Sources, Character, and Impact of Political Polarization*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- [24] Van Dijk, T. A (1998). *Ideology: A Multidisciplinary Approach*. London: Sage.
- [25] Van Dijk, T. A (2001a). *Critical Discourse Analysis*. In Schiffrin, D, Tannen, D and Hamilton, H, (eds.). *The handbook of Discourse Analysis*. Malden: Blackwell.
- [26] Van Dijk, T. A (2006a). *Ideology and Discourse: A Multidisciplinary Introduction*. Barcelona: Pompeu Fabra University.
- [27] Van Dijk, T. A (2006b). (2006b). "Politics, Ideology, and Discourse". In R. Wodak (ed.). *Elsevier Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics*. Volume on Politics and Language. (pp: 728-740).
- [28] Van Dijk, T. A. (1987) *Communicating Racism: Prejudice in Thought and Talk*. London: Sage
- [29] Wodak, R. (1995). *Critical Linguistics and Critical Discourse Analysis*