

INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON STANCE, (INTER)SUBJECTIVITY & IDENTITY IN DISCOURSE (STANCEDISC'20)



Madrid 9-11 September 2020

Research project STANCEDISC (PGC2018-095798-B-I00) &

Departamento de Estudios Ingleses: Lingüística y Literatura

Facultad de Filología

Universidad Complutense de Madrid

<https://eventos.ucm.es/47292/detail/stance-intersubjectivity-identity-in-discourse-2020.html>

Organizing Committee & Coordination of Scientific committee

Jorge Arús
Marta Carretero
Elena Domínguez Romero
Sergio Ferrer Navas
Laura Filardo Llamas
Laura Hidalgo Downing - *Co-Chair*
Carmen Maíz Arévalo - *Treasurer*
Juana I. Marín Arrese - *Chair*
M^a Victoria Martín de la Rosa
Natalia Mora López
Begoña Núñez Perucha
Paula Pérez Sobrino
Yelena Petrovic
Juan Rafael Zamorano Mansilla – *Secretary*

Acknowledgement of financial support: The organizers of STANCEDISC2020 gratefully acknowledge financial support received from research project '*Posicionamiento y Subjetividad en el Discurso: hacia un modelo integrado de análisis de la epistemicidad, efectividad, evaluación e inter/subjetividad desde la perspectiva del análisis crítico*'. (STANCEDISC)/ '*Stance and Subjectivity in Discourse: Towards an Integrated Framework for the Analysis of Epistemicity, Effectivity, Evaluation and Inter/Subjectivity from a Critical Discourse Perspective*' (STANCEDISC), (Ref.: PGC2018-095798-B-I00), Proyectos de I+D de Generación de Conocimiento, Agencia Estatal de Investigación, Ministerio de Ciencia, Innovación y Universidades.

INDEX

Plenary speakers p. 3

General Session Papers p. 11

Theme panels:

Theme panel 1 p. 45

Theme panel 2 p. 57

Theme panel 3 p. 68

Theme Session 4 p. 78

Posters p. 91

Plenary speakers

Stance, scope and discourse prominence

Kasper Boye

Dept. of Nordic Studies and Linguistics, Univ. of Copenhagen

boye@hum.ku.dk

Abstract

The notion of *stance* covers a multidimensional range of phenomena. Along one dimension, which DuBois (2007) called “the stance triangle”, three different aspects of stance acts can be discerned: 1) evaluation of objects, 2) positioning of subjects, and 3) aligning with other subjects. Another dimension concerns conceptual types of stance. Along this dimension, a distinction can be made between epistemic stance, effective stance (e.g. Marin-Arrese 2011) and emotive or affective stance (e.g. Ochs 1989). In my talk, I will argue that two additional dimensions of stance must be identified.

One dimension has to do with the scope of stance – that is, with the type of objects being evaluated. Biber & Fingan (1989: 92) restricted stance to propositional content, and there are good arguments that epistemic stance applies only to propositions (Boye 2010, 2012). However, effective stance, as defined by Marin-Arrese (2009), pertains to states-of-affairs (or “events”) rather than propositions. Moreover, it seems that emotive stance has various scope options. For instance, propositions can be evaluated as ‘nice’ (1), but so can, among other things, states-of-affairs (2) and persons (3).

- (1) *It is nice that she started studying linguistics.*
- (2) *Studying linguistics is nice.*
- (3) *She is nice.*

The second dimension has to do with discourse prominence, more precisely with the relative prominence of the content being evaluated and the stance towards this content. As discussed in Boye & Harder (2007), complex stance-expressing clauses like (4) have two readings.

- (4) *I think she is nice.*

In one reading, the matrix clause expresses the main – or, discursively primary – point. In this case, the stance expressed by *I think* is communicatively more important than the content being evaluated (‘she is nice’). In the second reading, the content being evaluated is discursively primary, and the stance-expressing matrix clause is merely a secondary hedge. Boye & Harder (2012) define grammatical expressions as expressions that are by convention discursively secondary. Accordingly, we may define grammatical stance expressions as stance expressions that are by convention secondary.

I will argue that identifying the two aforementioned dimensions is important for understanding the notion of stance. In addition, the second dimension is important for

understanding how interlocutors use stance markers to strive for control of the conception of reality. The talk is based on functional-cognitive linguistic theory, but relies on psycholinguistic research to support some of the points it makes.

References

- Biber, D. and Finegan, E. (1989). Styles of stance in English: lexical and grammatical marking of evidentiality and affect. *Text* 9(1): 93-124.
- Boye, K. (2010). Evidence for what? Evidentiality and scope. *STUF – Language Typology and Universals*, 63(4): 290-307.
- ___ (2012). *Epistemic meaning: A crosslinguistic and functional-cognitive study*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Boye, K. and Harder, P. (2007). Complement-taking predicates. Usage and linguistic structure. *Studies in Language*, 31(3): 569-606.
- ___ (2012). A usage-based theory of grammatical status and grammaticalization. *Language*, 88(1): 1-44.
- DuBois, J. W. (2007). The stance triangle. In R. Englebretson (Ed.) *Stancetaking in Discourse*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 139-182.
- Marín Arrese, J. I. (2011). Effective vs. Epistemic stance and subjectivity in political discourse legitimising strategies and mystification of responsibility. In C. Hart (d.) *Critical Discourse Studies in Context and Cognition*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 193-224.
- Ochs, E. (1989). Introduction. *Text*, 9(1): 1-5.

Stance, Truth and Lies in a Post-Truth Discourse Environment

Paul Chilton
University of Warwick

Abstract

In this talk I would like to address some of the larger questions about how we as linguists and discourse analysts theorise the phenomenon of stance on the one hand and, on the other, how we use our models of stance to make sense of the various kinds of discourse we are confronted with in the contemporary world. Are our descriptive models of epistemic and effective stance, *qua* explanatory theories, in need of further development? Perhaps more pertinently, do they provide adequate tools for the analysis of changing discourse phenomena that beset our culture, particularly our political culture?

Without seeking to present new empirical research my aim is discuss some of the kinds of research issues that our research community may want to pick up, clarify and take further forward.

My talk will be broadly speaking in two parts. First, I would like to consider our existing theories of epistemic and effective stance. Currently, our present frameworks are predominantly classificatory, but I shall suggest that the cognitive element represented by the influence of Langacker is a promising way to go. I shall also briefly present my own theorising on modality in *Language, Space and Mind* (2014). Secondly, however, I would like to raise the question whether *any* of our current theories are up to the job of making sense of discourses that breach both norms of scientific truth and norms of communicative truthfulness.

Epistemic expressions index a speaker's degree of certainty in relation to a simultaneous truth claim; effective expressions index a speaker's desire to have a proposition realized or justified or his/her attitude toward an unrealised proposition. But philosophically and politically speaking, the difficult questions concern the truth claims and the propositions themselves, particularly concerning how hearers process them and pass them on in communicative networks. Moreover, epistemic modals themselves may serve to encourage doubt rather than express epistemic rigour as in scientific discourse.

During the course of the discussion I shall refer to examples from populist political discourse, such as Donald Trump's "birtherist" truth claims, Nigel Farage's "prediction" website, and other utterances from Brexit discourse. I shall conclude that both as linguists and as discourse analysts we need to review our theoretical framework, examine our toolkit and consider what instruments we need to get a handle on the wider and deeper discourse dynamics of contemporary culture.

References

Chilton, P.A. (2014). *Language, Space and Mind: The Conceptual Geometry of Linguistic Meaning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Allegory as Bodily Imagination in Diverse Discourse Contexts

Raymond W. Gibbs, Jr.
Independent scholar
raymondwgibbs@gmail.com

Abstract

Most scholarly studies of allegory view it as a distinct type of artistic or literary endeavor, one that aims to create larger symbolic messages. My claim in this presentation, however, is that allegory arises from ordinary bodily experience as people automatically seek to establish connections between the here and now of physical actions and larger, symbolic and figurative themes. In fact, many aspects of mundane bodily experience are inherently allegorical precisely because of people's impulse to interpret the here and now in broader symbolic terms. This hypothesis both explains the reason for why so many literary and artistic allegories refer to bodily actions, even greatly imaginative ones, and why people readily understand ordinary actions in allegorical ways. I specifically explore the hypothesis that understanding allegory requires people to engage in an "embodied simulation" process in which they imagine themselves participating in the events mentioned in texts. Several studies offer support for this idea within diverse discourse contexts, ranging from fiction, poetry, law, advertising, religion, politics and everyday conversations. I suggest how allegorical thinking is revealed within these varied forms of language which illustrates people's evaluations of contested concepts and serves as an important rhetorical tool when making persuasive arguments. Most generally, allegorical discourse in different contexts emerge from embodied, cognitive processes that are widespread throughout ordinary human experience as part of the "poetics of mind."

References

- Gibbs, R. (1994). *The poetics of mind: Figurative thought, language, and understanding*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- ___ (2011). The allegorical impulse. *Metaphor and Symbol*, 26: 121-130.
- Gibbs, R., & Okonski, L. (2018). Cognitive poetics of allegorical experience. In S. Csabi (Ed.) *Expressive minds and artistic creations: Studies in cognitive poetics*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Negotiating stances across speaker turns in everyday conversation

Carita Paradis
Lund University
carita.paradis@englund.lu.se

Abstract

In the process of compiling a new corpus of contemporary spoken British English, the London-Lund Corpus 2 (LLC-2) (Pöldvere, Johansson & Paradis, submitted a; <https://projekt.ht.lu.se/llc2>), we hit upon a number of stance phenomena that are unique to dialogue, and among them, we were particularly intrigued by how speakers reuse ideas and constructions from prior speaker turns. This engagement with previous speaker contributions appears to be a compelling type of meaning negotiation, dialogue management and stance coordination in everyday face-to-face conversation.

We see language as social action performed by speakers, where language production and comprehension in communication include forms of joint attention, action perception and interaction. When speakers engage in everyday conversation, they constantly negotiate and coordinate their stances to establish mutual understanding, and they do so in a turn-taking fashion (Brennan & Clark, 1996; Clark, 1996; Du Bois & Giora, 2014; Fusaroli & Tylén, 2012; Gibbs & Clark, *forthc.*; Linell, 2009; Pöldvere & Paradis, 2019a, 2019b; Rasenberg, Özyürek & Dingemanse, 2020). The social role is to affect the state of mind of other people in order to bring about cognitive changes (Gärdenfors, 2014; Paradis, 2015; Tomasello, 2010). Communicative acts are performed by language users through what Gärdenfors (2014) refers to as *meetings of minds*. This metaphor highlights the dynamic and emergent nature of interaction with meeting-points at which interlocutors have reached a sufficient degree of understanding of each other's contributions and stances.

Previous work on dialogue in the language sciences and psychology offers different approaches to and explanations of the underpinnings of human interaction and of the above-mentioned reuse phenomenon. Du Bois (2014) refers to it with the term *resonance* and argues that it is *socially motivated* and used for various communicative purposes. Pickering and Garrod (2004), on the other hand, see it as an *automatic cognitive process* that greases the conversational wheels. In this talk, I will take a closer look at dialogic resonance both in terms of social motivation and as a facilitating cognitive process. Before I go into this thorny issue, I give a brief description of the data, namely the brand new LLC-2, highlighting the usefulness of this spoken corpus equipped with text aligned audio files. This feature of LLC-2 makes various types of investigations of natural language production possible and is of particular interest for research on everyday face-to-face conversation.

The empirical focus is the role of dialogic resonance in stance sequences of convergent (agreement) or divergent (disagreement) views. Some 500 stance-taking sequences in everyday face-to-face conversation were compiled and analyzed in order to (i) establish their specific discursive stance functions (convergent or divergent), and (ii) measure the time lapse between the stance-taking turns in those stance sequences. This way both the social motivations for resonance through the functions (convergent *vs.* divergent) and the cognitive facilitation operationalized in terms of the time it takes for speakers to respond to the interlocutor's prior stance were pulled together (Pöldvere, Johansson & Paradis, submitted b).

We found that (i) resonance is more likely to occur when speakers express divergent views, and (ii) turn transitions are faster in resonating sequences than in non-resonating ones. From the point of view of social motivation, we suggest that resonance is intersubjectively cogent as a face-saver in mitigating the effect of the divergence between speakers where equilibrium and stability are at stake. The face-saving intersubjective motivation for resonance is facilitated by the already cognitively activated forms and meanings expressed by the prior speaker. Together, these results suggest that dialogic resonance used in speaker stance alignment fosters smooth and conciliate meeting of minds in everyday conversation, satisfies our adaptive needs and is therefore particularly helpful in situations of stance divergence.

References

- Brennan, S. E., & Clark, H. H. (1996). Conceptual pacts and lexical choice in conversation. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition*, 22(6): 1482-1493.
- Clark, H. H. (1996). *Using language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Du Bois, J. W. (2014). Towards a dialogic syntax. *Cognitive Linguistics*, 25(3): 359-410.
- Du Bois, J. W., & Giora, R. (2014). From cognitive-functional linguistics to dialogic syntax. *Cognitive Linguistics*, 25(3): 351-357.
- Fusaroli, R., & Tylén, K. (2012). Carving language for social coordination: A dynamical approach. *Interaction Studies*, 13(1): 103-124.
- Gärdenfors, P. (2014). *The geometry of meaning. Semantics based on conceptual spaces*. Cambridge MA: MIT Press.
- Gibbs, R. W., & Clark, N. (forthc.). No need for instinct. Coordinated communication as an emergent self organized process. *Pragmatics & Cognition*.
- Linell, P. (2009). *Rethinking language, mind, and world dialogically: Interactional and contextual theories of human sense-making*. Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.
- Paradis, C. (2015). Meanings of words: Theory and application. C. Paradis. In U. Hass & P. Storjohann (Eds.) *Handbuch Wort und Wortschatz* (Handbücher Sprachwissen-HSW Band 3). Berlin: De Gruyter. 274-294.
- Pickering, M. J., & Garrod, S. (2004). Toward a mechanistic psychology of dialogue. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 27(2): 169-225.
- Pöldvere, N. & Paradis, C. (2019a). Motivations and mechanisms for the development of the reactive *what-x* construction in spoken dialogue. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 143: 65-84.
- ___ (2019b). ‘What and then a little robot brings it to you?’ The reactive *what-x* construction in spoken dialogue. *English Language and Linguistics*, 24(2): 307-332.
- Pöldvere, N., Johansson, V., & Paradis, C. (submitted a). The London–Lund Corpus 2: Methodological issues and innovations in the compilation of a spoken corpus.
- ___ (submitted b). Intersubjective motivations and cognitive facilitation of dialogic resonance in everyday conversation.
- Rasenberg, M., Özyürek, A., & Dingemanse, M. (2020, January 24). Alignment in multimodal interaction: An integrative framework. <https://doi.org/10.31234/osf.io/pbw6f>
- Tomasello, M. (2010). *Origins of human communication*. Cambridge MA: The MIT Press.

Getting into the influencer’s head: Stance-taking in social media discourse

Vasiliki Simaki
Lund University, Sweden
vasiliki.simaki@englund.lu.se

Abstract

Stance and stance-taking in the broad sense are what people do with language to express their opinions and assess their own and other people’s messages. It has been studied in various contexts and a whole range of related aspects is involved such as modality (Facchinetti et al., 2003; Marín-Arrese et al., 2013), evaluation (Hidalgo-Downing, 2012; Martin & White, 2003) and subjectivity/intersubjectivity (Marín-Arrese, 2017). The aim of the present study is to account for challenges in stance identification and annotation, and discuss the results of our experimentation with different sets of data using different methods and tools. Identification of different stances and their expressions in social media text was at the core of our StaViCTA¹ project on semantics, computational linguistics and information visualization. In that project, we set up a stance framework consisting of ten notional categories, e.g., CONTRARIETY, HYPOTHETICALITY and UNCERTAINTY. We developed an annotation protocol for the identification of the stance categories. The data used were political blogs (Simaki et al., 2017b). The annotation results showed that our categories are present in this type of texts, but their frequency in the data varies. For the evaluation of our framework, we employed statistical and computational methods and tools, and a hybrid methodology that highlighted stance markers for six of our categories (Simaki et al., 2017a, 2018, 2019). Challenges during the annotation process and issues that turned out to be important for the identification of the stance categories in our data emerged, such as the identification of more than one stance type in the same text and there was divergence in the annotators’ decisions for some categories. In order to address these issues, another set of data consisting of texts from Twitter (Simaki et al., 2017c) was selected, annotated and analysed (Simaki & Paradis, 2019). This time we followed a slightly different annotation scheme, and we refined our protocol by adding a seventh NO LABEL category for “neutral” tweets, questions, tweets with more than one stance, etc. This category proved to be the largest, and tendencies such as the combination of opposing stance categories in the same tweet and statements that express stance but are formulated as questions appeared. The annotation results revealed that taking stance is very common in Twitter and stance types that are frequent in blogs are less frequent in tweets. New stance-taking practices supporting functions such as self-branding, expressing an attitude, supporting/promoting a movement are used in tweets in order for the users to become more visible and influential and their tweets viral. The analysis of ambiguous and problematic examples from our data set improved the annotation results, refined our framework and brought up solutions for the stance identification task as a whole. Finally, testing different measures for the calculation of the inter-annotator agreement was an important component of our work. Overall, experimenting with various corpus-, computational- and statistical-based methods and tools proved to add

1. <https://cs.lnu.se/stavicta/>

important value in the task of identifying stances and expressions of stances in social media texts.

References

- Facchinetti, R., Palmer, F., & Krug, M. (2003). *Modality in contemporary English*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Hidalgo-Downing, L. (2012). Grammar and Evaluation. *The Encyclopedia of Applied Linguistics*: 1-9.
- Marín-Arrese, J. I. (2017). Stancetaking and inter/subjectivity in journalistic discourse: The Engagement system revisited. In R. Breeze and I. Olza (Eds.) *Evaluation in Media Discourse: European perspectives*. Bern: Peter Lang. 21-48.
- Marín-Arrese, J. I., Carretero, M., Hita, J. A., & Van der Auwera, J. (2013). *English modality: Core, periphery and evidentiality* (Vol. 81): Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Martin, J. R., & White, P. R. (2003). *The language of evaluation* (Vol. 2): Springer.
- Simaki, V., & Paradis, C. (2019). *Annotating stance in Twitter data: methodology, challenges and results*. Paper presented at the ICAME 40.
- Simaki, V., Paradis, C., & Kerren, A. (2017a). *Stance classification in texts from blogs on the 2016 British referendum*. Paper presented at the International Conference on Speech and Computer.
- (2018). Evaluating stance-annotated sentences from the Brexit Blog Corpus: A quantitative linguistic analysis. *ICAME Journal*, 42(1): 133-166.
- (2019). A two-step procedure to identify lexical elements of stance constructions in discourse from political blogs. *Corpora*, 14(3): 379-405.
- Simaki, V., Paradis, C., Skeppstedt, M., Sahlgren, M., Kucher, K., & Kerren, A. (2017b). Annotating Speaker Stance in Discourse: The Brexit Blog Corpus. *Corpus Linguistics and Linguistic Theory*, 0(0). doi:10.1515/cllt-2016-0060
- Simaki, V., Simakis, P., Paradis, C., & Kerren, A. (2017c). *Identifying the authors' national variety of english in social media text*. Paper presented at the Proceedings of the International Conference Recent Advances in Natural Language Processing, RANLP 2017, Varna, Bulgaria.

General Session Papers

Fashioning a modern political persona: the analysis of a freshman Congresswoman's stancetaking moves across contexts and media

Jacqueline Aiello
University of Naples « L'Orientale »
jaiello@unior.it

Abstract

Since becoming the youngest female Congressperson in American history in 2019, thirty-year-old first-time Representative Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez has been defined by Time magazine as “the second most talked-about politician in America” and by the New York Times as “the most exposed and fixated-on House freshman in history.” Recruited in 2017 to run against an incumbent by a progressive political action committee intent on ushering in a new generation of diverse working-class Democrats, Ocasio-Cortez had to swiftly fashion a credible, coherent political self to rally supporters and withstand attacks. As a social media-savvy millennial woman of color who was catapulted into the political scene, it can be presumed that the discursive realization of her political persona has diverged from traditional approaches. Starting from this assumption, the present paper delves into Representative Ocasio-Cortez’s stancetaking moves and the discursive strategies she has employed to impute stances of alignment and disalignment (Jaffe, 2009) to provide novel insights into contemporary political identities and discourse. In line with other recent research (i.e., Wang, 2020), this study is principally concerned with the alignment dimension of stance. In order to investigate this dimension, in addition to taking heed of stance markers, this study also identifies how rekeying and reframing practices (Goffman, 1974; Sclafani, 2018; Tannen, 2006), recontextualizing principles – which explain how elements of social events are selectively ‘filtered’ in representations across contexts (Fairclough, 2003) –, and self- and/or other-positioning strategies (Bucholtz & Hall, 2005; Sclafani, 2018) are utilized by the Representative. Furthermore, in line with Johnstone’s (2009) recommendation to explore how stancetaking works across situations and audiences, this paper analyzes the Representative’s stancetaking trajectory in both the tweets she posted since winning the Congressional primary and in the remarks she delivered before the US House of Representatives. Specifically, it homes in on selected instances in which the Representative articulated responses – on her Twitter account, during hearings before the Subcommittee on the Environment, and in a House address on a point of personal privilege – to a range of attacks perpetrated by the media and/or political opponents against her political platform, her proposed legislation, her use of non-standard speech, and, (arguably) her position on crime. The results of this study do not only unveil the nature of Representative Ocasio-Cortez’s stancetaking moves that have highlighted her alignment with ‘the people’ and her disalignment with the opposition but it also unearths the strategies, processes, and practices that the Representative deploys in the attempt to maintain authenticity and legitimacy, to safeguard the coherence of her personal narrative and political self, and to situate herself within a larger (national and/or historical) storyline.

References

- Bucholtz, M. & Hall, K. (2005). Identity and interaction: A sociocultural linguistic approach. *Discourse Studies*, 7(4-5): 585-614.
- Fairclough, N. (2003). *Analyzing Discourse: Textual Analysis for Social Research*. London: Routledge.
- Goffman, E. (1974). *Frame Analysis*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Jaffe, A. (2009). Introduction: The sociolinguistics of stance. In A. Jaffe (Ed.) *Stance: Sociolinguistic Perspectives*. Oxford-New York: Oxford University Press. 3-28.
- Johnstone, B. (2009). Stance, style, and the linguistic individual. In A. Jaffe (Ed.) *Stance: Sociolinguistic Perspectives*. Oxford-New York: Oxford University Press. 29-52.
- Sclafani, J. (2018). Performing politics: From the town hall to the inauguration. In R. Wodak, B. Forchtner (Eds.) *The Routledge Handbook of Language and Politics*. Oxon-New York: Routledge. 398-411.
- Tannen, D. (2006). Intertextuality in interaction: Reframing family arguments in public and private. *Text & Talk*, 26(4): 597-617.
- Wang, P. H. (2020). Stance, framing, and the construction of reality in Facebook comments about Taiwan's same-sex marriage bills. *Discourse & Society*, 31(2): 218-234.

Category construction through discourse: Drag Queens' use of pronouns to define drag

Michael Barnes
Old Dominion University
michael.barnes0806@gmail.com

This research looks at how social groups are defined; in particular, how the group's own members construct meaning through their discourse. For this project, I analyzed the way drag queens use pronouns and copular constructions to produce a central definition of a category and their own identity simultaneously. In order to do this, I interviewed three drag queens using a conversation style method with open-ended questions which resulted in three hours of interviews. The personal pronouns 'we' and 'they' were pulled from this material to look at the adjectives and nouns that co-occurred with these pronouns, in particular within copular constructions. The results yielded a collection of features that the speakers either aligned with through the use of 'we' or distanced themselves from by using 'they'. Examples of the attributes appearing with 'we' were family, fun, male, and gay. In contrast, 'they' appeared with words like incestuous, dramatic, and racist. This data indicates a central drag queen image that the speakers relate with in order to construct their own identities through the use of 'we' which inherently includes the speaker. Through the use of 'they' though, they are acknowledging fringe features of drag that they themselves do not associate with. The speakers are thus creating the category 'drag queen' through their discourse and the way they interact with said category. This discourse makes use of both the evaluative stance and the affiliative in that the speakers both associate with being a drag queen and mark relevant features, as well. Their treatment of this category indicates that they view themselves as a source of authority on the subject reinforcing their connection to this social category. Through this discourse, we are able to see how people construct their own identities in conjunction with the social categories that exist relative to themselves.

Setting up the meaning: bilingualism issues between Latin and other Italic languages looked through the verbal modal system

Anna Chiara Bassan
Università degli Studi di Roma "La Sapienza"
annachiara.bassan@uniroma1.it

Abstract

This paper aims to examine the interpretative issues arising from bilingualism between Latin and the other ancient Italic languages. One major topic among others will be handled in this work: the phenomenon of interference and borrowing in the verbal system and, more specifically, how syntax and modality deal with them in formal (bureaucracy, religious contexts) and informal frameworks. Consequently, particular attention will be given to evidential and epistemic modality as well as to deontic and directive modality expressed mainly through the moods. In this context, it seemed appropriate to pay special attention to Oscan and Umbrian as to say the group of Italic languages which, due to the breadth and variety of the documentation available, prove to be a fundamental key to the study of the wide contacts between Latin and other languages of the peninsula.

This corpus-based study could provide a good perspective to deepen the topic concerning the Italic considered 'in itself' and as a consequence, for the reconstruction of the Proto-Indo-European and 'nearby' Indo-European varieties (in particular, for Latin), notwithstanding the formation of this corpus presupposes facing some complications.

First, we refer to languages of fragmentary attestation whose knowledge must be acquired through the "deciphering" and interpretation of epigraphic findings. Second, the corpus being investigated includes religious/juridical documents that presume the potential presence of standardized phrases. Nevertheless, it is widely encountered by authors that standardized constructions of this type are in any case the result of possible grammatical constructions in a precise language, even though they are connected to a specific stylistic level.

These topics emphasize the importance of addressing the problem by interpenetrating linguistic analysis with sociolinguistic analysis. Hence, the reference to the spectacle of studies published to date is crucial. The set of these facts makes it necessary to premise some methodological questions. Since this proposal would like to present itself as a viewpoint that compares the major exegetical positions, it makes it essential to rely on a classification system that proffers a comparative evaluation of the extension of meanings and the semantic/syntactic relationship of linguistic signs. Accordingly, appropriate reference will be made to the manuals of Bybee, Perkins, & Pagliuca (1994), of Palmer (2001), the Auwera & Plungian's (1998) outline of a semantic map for modality integrated with what has been specifically illustrated for Latin by Magni (2013). This is because the functional approaches developed through those works seem to allow effectively to represent the scope, manner, and direction of the polysemy and polyfunctionality of Italic and Latin verbal moods in the context of synchronic/diachronic comparison.

As a preliminary result, two moods emerge, both in the Latin verbal system and in the Italic one, as major realizers of the four modal instances at the center of this work: the subjunctive and the imperative (present/future), which endure in a

relationship of correlation and competition. Therefore, the identification process must rise through the analysis of the distributional dynamics of these two ways. In other words, will be examined the specific linguistic (typology of utterance) and sociolinguistic (typology of text) settings in which these occurrences take shape.

References

- Adams, J. N. (2004). *Bilingualism and the Latin language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Aronoff, M. (1994). *Morphology by itself stems and inflectional classes*. Cambridge [Mass.]; London: MIT.
- Benveniste, E. (1969). *Le vocabulaire des institutions indoeuropéennes*. Parigi: Les Editions de Minuit.
- Benucci, F. (1996). *Studi di sintassi umbra. Il verbo nelle Tavole Iguvine e nelle iscrizioni minori*. Padova, Libreria Padovana Editrice.
- Bertocci, D. (2004). *Il congiuntivo e l'ottativo. Problemi di morfosintassi tra indoeuropeo e latino arcaico*. Alessandria: Dell'Orso.
- ___ (2006). I congiuntivi del tipo (ne) attigas in latino arcaico. *Atti dell'Istituto Veneto di Scienze, Lettere ed Arti, CLXIV*.
- Bybee, J. L., Perkins, R., & Pagliuca, W. (1994). *The evolution of grammar tense, aspect, and modality of the world*. Chicago; London: University of Chicago.
- Clackson, J., & Horrocks, G. (2007). *The Blackwell history of the Latin language*. Wiley-Blackwell. de Vaan, M. (2008). *Etymological dictionary of Latin and the other Italic languages*. Leiden-Boston: Brill.
- Garcia Castillero, C. (2000). *La formacion del tema de presente primario osco-umbr.* Vitoria - Gasteiz: Servicio editorial Universidad del Pais Vasco.
- Konneker, B. G. H. (1972). *Studies in Umbrian syntax*. Ph.D. Dissertation. Austin: University of Texas.
- Magni, E. (2010). Mood and Modality. In P. Baldi, & P. Cuzzolin (Eds) *New Perspectives on Historical Latin Syntax. Volume 2: Constituent syntax: Adverbial Phrases, Adverbs, Mood, Tense*. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter. 193-275.
- Mancini, M. (1984). Un caso di sandhi esterno in osco e l'interferenza tra congiuntivo e indicativo del presente nell'italico e nel latino. In W. Belardi, P. Cipriano, P. Di Giovine, & M. Mancini (Eds.) *Studi latini e romanzi in memoria di A. Pagliaro*, Roma. 30-62.
- ___ (2009). Il preterito latino tra continuità e discontinuità: facio, fēcī, fefaked. In A. Augusto Ancillotti, & A. Calderini (Eds.) *L'umbrò e le altre lingue dell'Italia antica. Atti del I Convegno Internazionale sugli Antichi Umbri (Gubbio 20- 22.9.01)*. Perugia: Jama. 67-96.
- Marinetti, A. (1985). *Le iscrizioni sudpicene. I. Testi*. Firenze: Firenze: Leo S. Olschki Editore.
- Meiser, G. (1986). *Lautgeschichte der umbrischen Sprache*. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck.
- Murano, F. (2013). *Le Tabellae defixionum osche*. Pisa; Roma: Serra.
- Palmer, F. R. (2001). *Mood and modality*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Planta, R. V. (1973). *Grammatik der oskisch-umbrischen Dialekte*. Berlin: W. De Gruyter.
- Pocchetti, P. (1993). Aspetti e diffusione del latino in età arcaica. In E. Campanile (Ed.) *Caratteri e diffusione del latino in età arcaica*. Pisa. 63- 96.
- Prosdocimi, A. L. (1984). *Le Tavole Iguvine*. Firenze: Leo S. Olschki Editore.
- ___ (2004). *Scritti inediti e sparsi. Lingua, Testi, Storia*. Padova.
- Prosdocimi, A. L., Marinetti, A. (1993). Appunti sul verbo italoico (e) latino. In AA.VV., *Oskisch-Umbrisch. Texte und Grammatik, I*. 219-280.
- ___ (1993). Appunti sul verbo latino e italoico. III. Sulla morfologia del tema-base del perfetto latino. In AA.VV., *Sprachen und Schriften des antiken Mittelmeerraums. Festschrift Untermann*. 297-328.
- Rix, H. (1976). Subjonctif et Infinitif dans les complétives de l'ombrien. *Bulletin de la Société Linguistique de Paris, 71*: 221-240.
- Trianatafillis, E. (2010). The Imperative mood between Latin and Indo-European: a morphosemantic analysis. In S.Schaffner, & W. Sowa (Eds.) *Greek and Latin from an Indo-European perspective. Proceedings of the Conference*. Bratislava, Comenius University.
- Thomason, S. G., & Kaufman, T. (1988). *Language Contact, Creolization and Genetic, Linguistics*. Berkeley Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Untermann, J. (2000). *Wörterbuch des Oskisch-Umbrischen*. Heidelberg: C. Winter.
- van der Auwera, J., & Plungian, V. A. (1998). Modality's semantic map. In *Linguistic Typology, 2*: 79-124.
- Vetter, E. (1953). *Handbuch der italischen Dialekte*. Heidelberg: C. Winter.

Stance attributions by research interview respondents: language instructors talk about teaching

Dmitri Detwyler
University of British Columbia
dmitri.detwyler@ubc.ca / ddetwyle@gmail.com

Abstract

Research interviews continue to be popular for data generation in qualitative research across the social sciences (Briggs, 2007). When interviews are acknowledged as an active social process (Holstein & Gubrium, 2016), we recognize that respondents inevitably take an agentive role in the management of intersubjectivity and co-construction of knowledge. Interactional agency may be exerted through a respondent's own stance-taking (Jaffe, 2009), as well as by their *attribution* of stances (Coupland & Coupland, 2009) to the interviewer. In research interviews with language instructors about the impacts of COVID-19 on their teaching practice, under what circumstances did respondents attribute stances to the interviewer? Which stances were attributed, and to what interactional (and subsequently, interpretive) effects did they point?

These questions will be explored in a discourse analysis (Nikander, 2008) of excerpts from two Skype interviews conducted with instructors of English as an additional language in Canada during May 2020 as part of a larger project on language teaching during the global pandemic. Early results suggest that as respondents worked to construct various identities in relation to the interview topic and the interaction itself (Rapley, 2001), they frequently attributed epistemic and other stances to the interviewer. These attributed stances themselves often became “stance objects” (du Bois, 2007) for respondents' and interviewers' stance-taking in subsequent turns. This investigation of interactional agency enacted through stance attribution and stance-taking offers renewed insights for connecting the “how” and the “what” (Holstein & Gubrium, 2016) of respondent talk in research interviews, as well as contributes to the growing literature on the methodography (Kasper & Ross, 2018) of qualitative research methods more generally.

References

- Briggs, C. (2007). Anthropology, interviewing, and communicability in contemporary society. *Current Anthropology*, 48(4): 551-580.
- du Bois, J. W. (2007). The stance triangle. In R. Englebretson (Ed.) *Stancetaking in Discourse: Subjectivity, Evaluation, Interaction*. John Benjamins Publishing Company. 139-182.
- Coupland, J., & Coupland, N. (2009). Attributing stance in discourse of body shape and weight loss. In A. M. Jaffe (Ed.) *Stance: Sociolinguistic Perspectives*. Oxford University Press. 227-250.
- Holstein, J. A., & Gubrium, J. F. (2016). Narrative practice and the active interview. In D. Silverman (Ed.) *Qualitative research* (4th ed.). SAGE Publications Ltd. 233-284.
- Jaffe, A. M. (2009). Introduction: The sociolinguistics of stance. In A. M. Jaffe (Ed.) *Stance: Sociolinguistic Perspectives*. Oxford University Press. 3-28.
- Kasper, G., & Ross, S. J. (2018). The social life of methods: Introducing the special issue. *Applied Linguistics Review*, 9(4): 475-486.
- Nikander, P. (2008). Constructionism and discourse analysis. In J. A. Holstein, & J. F. Gubrium (Eds.) *Handbook of Constructionist Research*. The Guildford Press. 413-428.
- Rapley, T. J. (2001). The art(fulness) of open-ended interviewing: Some considerations on analysing interviews. *Qualitative Research*, 1(3): 303-323.

Online reading responses to Julian Barnes's *The Sense of an Ending*: an APPRAISAL analysis.

Amélie Doche
Université Jean Moulin Lyon 3
amelie.doche@univ-lyon3.fr

Abstract

Theoretically informed by Bakhtin's concept of *dialogism* (1981), this study explores readers' online responses to Julian Barnes's *The Sense of an Ending* (2011) on Amazon.com. Specifically, it first seeks to examine the two-way intersubjective interaction between Barnes's novel and the Amazon book reviews. Then, it focuses on the linguistic realisation of interpersonal interactions between the book reviews – and, to a greater extent, the reviewers- and the real or imagined addressee within the online community.

The Engagement resource of APPRAISAL (Martin & White, 2005) within Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL: Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004) is used at an analytical level and serves a threefold purpose. First, it explores the interdiscursive space between Barnes' fictional world and its evaluation through a systemic analysis of *projections* (SFL). Secondly, it allows for a discussion on the intralocutory space negotiated within the reviews – and how one's reviewer's style shapes their reviewer's identity. Lastly, it addresses interlocutory issues arising from the invisible interaction between the reviews and the online community.

Although the review section is presented as a *field* (Bourdieu, 1993) that is open to a wide range of discourses, there are hidden rules of the game that determine what will be legitimized. This analysis uses insights from Legitimation Code Theory (LCT: Maton, 2014) to explore the hypothesis that these rules are structured around one's ability to control and manage the dialogic scope of the interaction.

References

- Bakhtin, M. (1981). *The Dialogic Imagination. Four Essays*. Austin: London: University of Texas Press.
- Bourdieu, P. (1993). *The Field of Cultural Production*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.
- Halliday, M., & Matthiessen, C. (2004). *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*. London: New York: Arnold; Oxford University Press.
- Martin, J., & White, P. (2005). *The Language of Evaluation: Appraisal in English*. Basingstoke: New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Maton, K. (2014). *Knowledge and Knowers: Towards a Realist Sociology of Education*. London: Routledge.

Who is an expert?

Expert identity and agentivity in Spanish online health fora

Carolina Figueras¹, Barbara De Cock²
Universitat de Barcelona¹, Université Catholique de Louvain²

Abstract

The use of online communication platforms for exchanging information and for providing support is rapidly increasing in the medical sector, in spite of parts of society and of the medical profession being rather wary as to this evolution. In this paper, we aim to contribute to this area of research by focusing on the role of the expert in interactive sites designed for patients' interactions. The focus of our investigation is how expertise is constructed and enacted in a corpus of advice exchanges performed in two different Spanish online support forums: one is dedicated to diabetes management, and the other is oriented towards recovery from eating disorders. The fora under scrutiny contain two types of threads: one in which only affected individuals with the illness contribute to the discussion, and the other in which a qualified healthcare professional (a doctor, a nurse, a nutritionist, etc.) actively participates and responds to questions.

In our study, we examine how the identity of being an 'expert' is articulated and what differences there are regarding epistemic asymmetry between advisee and advisor when coping with a physical *vs* a mental illness. We contrast the talk of healthcare professionals as experts with the talk of non-qualified laypersons acting as peer experts, who claim experiential expertise (because they have been living with the illness for quite some time) and, as such, try to legitimize their expertise by providing useful and sound advice to others.

First, we compare medical experts with peer experts focusing on the explicit references to the fact of acting as an expert for each category and for each forum (e.g. profession or title), as well as looking into other ways of constructing expert status (e.g. references to experience, use of terminology, claims of knowledge, etc.).

Second, we explore the ways in which both groups understand and make sense of the notion of agency regarding the treatment of the illness, namely whether they conceive the healthcare professional, the patient or the illness itself as being an agent in the process of recovery or management of the ailment. To do so, we examine the linguistic material deployed to construe agency in both forums (such as the reference of discourse persons or the type of verbs).

Finally, we delve into the strategies put in place in the discourse by and towards the qualified healthcare professionals *vs*. those in the discourse by and towards the non-qualified laypersons, as well as the strategies applied by forum users concerning diabetes *vs* forum users concerning eating disorders. This comparative approach seeks to shed light on whether the expert status of the different groups of participants is discursively constructed in a similar or dissimilar fashion. Likewise, we question whether the agentivity of the patient is articulated and enacted in interaction differently, or not, according to the specifics of the illness and the subject producing the message.

Metaphor and stance-attributing: representations of obesity in the *People's Daily*

Xiang Huang¹, Mario Bisiada²

Universitat Pompeu Fabra^{1,2}

xiang.huang01@estudiant.upf.edu¹, mario.bisiada@upf.edu²

Abstract

Obesity has become a pressing public health concern in China. The media are a central site for socio-political construction of obesity to negotiate body-related values, ideologies and beliefs. Despite being a frequent topic in the Chinese media, little is known about how obesity has been discussed in Chinese news. Even less is known about how obesity is conceptualised by Chinese authorities particularly via metaphor, one of the highly effective argumentative strategies in political communication (Charteris-Black, 2005). In this article, taking critical metaphor analysis (Charteris-Black, 2004), discourse approach to metaphor analysis (Kimmel, 2012) and recent research on stance (e.g. DuBois, 2007; Jaffe, 2009) as the theoretical framework, we illustrate how metaphor is used as a stance-attributing resource in representing obesity in Chinese official media. For this end, we analyse 90 obesity-related editorials, over the timeframe of 2010-2020, from the *People's Daily* (henceforth the Daily), one of the most authoritative media in China. Two research questions are addressed: In what ways is obesity metaphorically represented in the Daily? What stances have been attributed to obese individuals with the use of the metaphors in the Daily? By applying MIP (Metaphor Identification Procedure) (Pragglejaz Group, 2007) to our data, we have identified four preferred source domains, i.e., war-sport, journey, architecture and money. Based on the framing function of the metaphors, we further argue four stances have been attributed to obese individuals: OBESE INDIVIDUALS ARE ARMY DESERTERS; OBESE INDIVIDUALS ARE SLOW WALKERS; OBESE INDIVIDUALS ARE INCOMPETENT BUILDERS; OBESE INDIVIDUALS ARE CHEAP GOODS. The attributed stances have revealed that obesity has been extended from a biomedical issue to an eco-political one in the Chinese context. We support a combined analysis of metaphor and stance, especially in Mandarin Chinese, which has so far remained under-explored. We also argue stance-attributing provides an important framework and instrument for research on metaphor and illness given the increasingly medicalised global health.

References

- Atanasova, D. (2018). "Keep moving forward. LEFT RIGHT LEFT": A critical metaphor analysis and addressivity analysis of personal and professional obesity blogs. *Discourse, Context and Media*, 25: 5–12
- Cameron, L., Maslen, R., Todd, Z., Maule, J., Stratton, P., & Stanley, N. (2009). The discourse dynamics approach to metaphor and metaphor-led discourse analysis. *Metaphor and Symbol*, 24(2): 63–89.
- Charteris-Black, J. (2004). *Corpus Approaches to Critical Metaphor Analysis*. New York: Palgrave macmillan.
- (2005). *Politicians and Rhetoric: The Persuasive Power of Metaphor*. New York: Palgrave macmillan.
- DuBois, J. W. (2007). The stance triangle. In R. Englebretson (Ed.) *Stancetaking in Discourse*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 139-182.
- Jaffe, A. (Ed.) (2009). *Stance: Sociolinguistic Perspectives*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kimmel, M. (2012). Optimizing the analysis of metaphor in discourse: How to make the most of qualitative software and find a good research design. *Review of Cognitive Linguistics*, 10(1): 1–48.

- McEntee-Atalianis, L. J. (2013). Stance and metaphor: Mapping changing representations of (organizational) identity. *Discourse and Communication*, 7(3): 319–340.
- Pragglejaz Group. (2007). MIP: A Method for Identifying Metaphorically Used Words in Discourse. *Metaphor and Symbol*, 22(1): 1-39.

Evidential/modal particles in Basque

Kepa Korta¹, Larraitz Zubeldia²
ILCLI, UPV/EHU^{1,2}
kepa.korta@ehu.eus¹, larraitz.zubeldia@ehu.eus²

Abstract

Basque language is distinguished from its neighbouring languages, among other things, in having particles that encode the speaker's source of knowledge —evidential element— and/or her stance towards the truth of the proposition expressed —modal element, mainly epistemic or doxastic: *omen*, *bide*, *ote* and *al* among others. Hence, they have a common semantic/pragmatic feature, apart from their common syntactic grouping —they all appear before the conjugated verb, in their canonical use.

These particles have been analysed theoretically mainly from the syntactical point of view (Mujika 1988, Haddican 2004, Etxepare 2010, and Monforte 2018, inter alia), whereas there are less works on their meaning and use (Carretero & Cid-Abasolo 2014, Garmendia 2014, and Korta & Zubeldia 2014, among others). The present study adds to the latter. In particular, we argue that these particles are illocutionary force/point indicators and that *omen* contributes, in addition, to the propositional content of the utterance. Our conceptual arguments are supplemented with corpus study and experimental research.

About *omen*, we contend that it contributes to the propositional content of the utterance: the proposition p expressed by means of a bare utterance S and the proposition p_{omen} expressed by its *omen*-counterpart are both assertions, but they assert different things. *Omen* is also an illocutionary point indicator: *omen*-utterances always have the assertive illocutionary point, they cannot be utterances of interrogative, exclamative, or imperative sentences; *omen* signals that the illocutionary point is *assertive*. We hypothesize that it is the kind of element with a twofold status (see Caudal 2009; Jayez & Rossari 2001).

In contrast, *bide* is an illocutionary force indicator with no contribution to the truth-conditional content of the utterance. The *bide*-utterance and the utterance without *bide*, both are assertions, but they differ in the degree of strength of the belief that constitutes the sincerity condition. It looks like *bide* just constrains that the degree of strength has to be in the interval between 0.5 and 1.

With respect to the question particles *ote* and *al*, we maintain that they are also illocutionary force indicators. They both indicate that the utterance is a question. *Ote*, in addition, adds a kind of “indirectness” —the speaker believes that the hearer is not in the condition of answering the question.

References

- Caudal, P. (2006). Tenses, connectives and narration(s). *Cahiers Chronos*, 25: 69-89.
- Carretero, M., & Cid-Abasolo, K. (2014). The interaction between epistemic modality and evidentiality: a semantic-pragmatic analysis of Basque *behar* and *omen/ei*. *The International Conference on Evidentiality and Modality in European Languages 2014 (EMEL'14)*.
- Etxepare, R. (2010). *Omen* bariazioan. In B. Fernandez, P. Albizu, & R. Etxepare (Eds.) *Euskara eta euskarak: Aldakortasun sintaktikoa aztergai*. Bilbao: UPV/EHU. 85-112.
- Garmendia, J. (2014). *Ote*: hiztunaren ziurtasunik eza. *Gogoa*, 12-13: 7-26.
- Haddican, W. (2004). Sentence polarity and word order in Basque. *The linguistic review*, 21: 87-124.
- Jayez, J., & Rossari, C. (2001). The discourse level sensitivity of consequence discourse markers. *French*

- Cognitive Linguistics*, 12: 275-290.
- Korta, K., & Zubeldia, L. (2014). The contribution of evidentials to utterance content: Evidence from the Basque reportative particle *omen*. *Language*, 90-2: 389-423.
- Monforte, S. (2018). Question particles in Basque. *Isogloss*, 4/1: 29-53.
- Mujika, J. A (1988). Partículas modales de la flexión verbal. *ASJU*, XXII-2: 463-478.

Pragmatic functions of evidential hashtags on Twitter

Dorota Kotwica
Universitat de València / Universidad de Alcalá
dorota.kotwica@uv.es

Abstract

Twitter is a rich source of spontaneous linguistic data for analyzing the use of epistemic and evidential expressions (Mulder 2018; Helen de Hoop et al. 2018; Kittilä et al. 2018). Hashtags used on this platform are primarily related to the topic-marking and contextualizing (Zappavigna 2015), but they can also function as evaluative and stance markers (Page 2012; Wikström 2014; Scott 2015; Zappavigna 2015). In this paper we propose that there also exists a special (sub)category of *evidential hashtags* responsible for providing some cues about the source of information that appears in a tweet. An example of such use can be observed in (1):

(1) Dicen que fue en el motel de Santa Elena #dicen
They say it happened in Santa Elena motel #theysay

Evidentials are said to develop different pragmatic functions in Spanish (Albelda 2016, 2018, Briz 2016, Estellés 2020, etc.). However, the functioning of evidential hashtags on Twitter and the pragmatic strategies behind their use have not yet been described.

This study focuses on a group of hashtags that contain constructions with *decir* (Spanish, ‘to say’): #dicen, #dicenporahí, #esodicen, #sedice. The data was collected manually from Twitter in a period of six months in 2019. The final sample for the qualitative analysis comprises 94 tweets containing one of the aforementioned hashtags. According to the results of the study, hashtags with *decir* are used for introducing indirect evidential meanings. Depending on the type of information transmitted in the tweet, they indicate either that there exists a particular source responsible for the information (reportative/quotative) or that the information is shared and widely known.

The latter, *folklore* meaning seems especially interesting, because evidential hashtags that suggest accessible or universal character of information collaborate in the creation of social-media common knowledge.

Regarding the pragmatic functions, according to our results, evidential hashtags are mostly used as mitigation mechanisms.

References

- Albelda Marco, M. (2016). Estableciendo límites entre la evidencialidad y la atenuación en español. In R. González Ruiz, D. Izquierdo Alegría, & Ó. Loureda Lamas (Eds.) *La Evidencialidad en Español: Teoría y Descripción*. Frankfurt am Main: Iberoamericana Vervuert. 75-100.
- (2018). ¿Atenuación del compromiso del hablante?: el caso de los evidenciales “por lo visto” y “se ve que.” *Rilce. Revista de Filología Hispánica*, 34(3): 1179–1214.
- Briz, A. (2016). Evidencialidad, significados pragmáticos y partículas discursivas en español. Sobre la intensificación tácticamente evidencial. In R. González Ruiz, D. Izquierdo Alegría, & Ó. Loureda Lamas (Eds.) *La Evidencialidad en Español: Teoría y Descripción*. Frankfurt am Main: Iberoamericana Vervuert. 103-127.
- Estellés, M. (2020). The evolution of parliamentary debates in light of the evolution of evidentials. *Al parecer* and *por lo visto* in 40 years of parliamentary proceedings from Spain. *Corpus Pragmatics*.

- De Hoop, H., Foolen, A., Mulder, G., & Van Mulken, V. (2018). 'I think' and 'I believe'. Evidential expressions in Dutch. In A. Foolen, H. De Hoop, & G. Mulder (Eds.) *Evidence for Evidentiality*. John Benjamins Publishing Company. 77-97.
- Kittilä, S., Jalava, L., & Sandman, E. (2018). What can different types of data tell us about evidentiality.pdf. In A. Foolen, H. De Hoop, & G. Mulder (Eds.) *Evidence for Evidentiality*. John Benjamins Publishing Company. 281-304.
- Mulder, G. (2018). (Yo) creo que as a marker of evidentiality and epistemic modality. Evidence from Twitter, in A. Folen, H. de Hoop, G. Mulder (eds.) *Evidence for Evidentiality*. 99-120.
- Page, R. (2012). The linguistics of self-branding and micro-celebrity in Twitter: the role of hashtags. *Discourse and Communication*, 6(2): 181-201.
- Scott, K. (2015). The pragmatics of hashtags: Inference and conversational style on Twitter. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 81: 8-20.
- Wikström, P. (2014). Srynotfunny: Communicative functions of hashtags on Twitter. *SKY Journal of Linguistics*, 27: 127-152
- Zappavigna, M. (2015). Searchable talk: the linguistic functions of hashtags. *Social Semiotics*, 25(3): 274-291.

The expressive function of the *ni que* in subordinate construction in Spanish

Elena Martínez Caro¹, Laura Alba-Juez²
UCM¹, UNED²
elenamc@ucm.es¹, lalba@flog.uned.es²

Abstract

In the past decades, there has been an increasing interest in the expressive function of language (as opposed to its referential function; cf. Foolen 2016) and the related areas of subjectivity and stance (cf. Englebretson 2007, Thompson & Alba-Juez 2014).

Authors such as Schnoebelen (2012: 12) suggest that in some languages (cf. Navajo) certain dependent clauses are frequently used independently to “mark emotional evaluation and background information”. Evans (2007) uses the term *insubordination* to refer to this phenomenon. Our study intends to broaden the present discussion of subjectivity and stance by focusing on a particular in subordinate construction introduced by the sequence *ni que* in Spanish, as in the example [¡Una carta cada día!] *Ni que yo fuese Umbral*. (CORPES), used as an independent clause with a particular pragmatic meaning which is different from its dyadically dependent (Sansiñena, de Smet & Cornillie 2015) subordinate counterpart (cf. *No escribiría una carta cada día ni que yo fuera Umbral*).

The fairly recent research on this phenomenon in Spanish offers some studies on in subordinate clauses mainly introduced by *que*, *como* and *si* (cf. e.g. Rodríguez Ramalle 2011, 2015; Sansiñena 2015; Sansiñena et al. 2015) but very little has been said to date about this sequence and its capacity as an expressive discourse marker (Porroche 2015) introducing an in subordinate sentence. Our main research question asks about the potential for the sequence *ni que* to be used as a discourse marker fulfilling an expressive function when it introduces this type of construction, and the derived hypothesis is then oriented to test whether Schnoebelen's (2012) observation about in subordinate constructions applies also to the Spanish construction introduced by *ni que*. In order to test this hypothesis, we performed a functional-discourse analysis of more than 2000 concordances (and their extended contexts) in the *Davies Corpus del Español*, the CORPES the CORLEC and the C-Oral ROM. Our findings allow us to accept the hypothesis and show that the in subordinate construction differs in function and meaning from its subordinate counterpart, the former fulfilling a stronger emotive function, often combined with other discourse functions, such as evaluation or the organization of discourse.

References

- Englebretson, R. (Ed.) (2007). *Stancetaking in Discourse: Subjectivity, Evaluation, Interaction*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins
- Evans, N. (2007). Insubordination and its uses. In Nikolaeva, I. (Ed.) *Finiteness. Theoretical and Empirical Approaches*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 366-431.
- Foolen, Ad. (2015). Expressives. In Nick Riemer (Ed.) *The Routledge Handbook on Semantics*. London & New York: Taylor and Francis. 473-490.
- Porroche, M. (2015). Sobre la función de las conjunciones en el discurso. *XLIV Simposio de la SEL*. Madrid, January 2015.
- Rodríguez Ramalle, T. (2011). Sobre *si* y la organización del margen preverbal en español. *Lingüística Española Actual* (LEA), 33(2): 199-222.

- ___ (2015). Las oraciones causales con *que* y *como que* y su interpretación en el discurso. *Lenguas Modernas*, 45: 127-148.
- Sansiñena, M. S. (2015). *The multiple functional load of que. An interactional approach to in subordinate complement clauses in Spanish*. Doctoral Thesis, Universiteit van Leuven.
- Sansiñena, M. S., De Smet, H., & Cornillie, B. (2015). Between subordinate and in subordinate. Paths towards complementizer-initial main clauses. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 77: 3-19.
- Schoebelen, T. J. (2012). Emotions are relational: Positioning and the use of affective resources. Stanford University. PhD. Dissertation.
- Thompson, G., & Alba-Juez, L. (Eds.) (2014). *Evaluation in Context*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Appraisal in TED talks about technology and entertainment

Viktorija Mažeikienė
Institute of Humanities
(Faculty of Human and Social Studies, Mykolas Romeris University)
vmazeikiene@mruni.eu

Abstract

TED (Technology, Entertainment and Design) talks is a portal of influential videos covering a diverse scope of important issues faced by the contemporary society. The portal offers valuable multimodal material for linguistic investigation. The *aim* of this research is to analyse manifestations of evaluative language in TED talks about technologies and entertainment. In her research, the author is trying to answer the *question*: How do language and technology impact each other? She builds on the *hypothesis* that users of language, consciously and/or unconsciously, “humanise” technologies through the attitudinal meaning and the linguistic choices we make when we talk about technologies and entertainment. This choice of two fields – technology and entertainment – stems from the author’s long-standing interest in the symbiotic relationship between human existence and the pervasiveness of technologies in both private lives of individuals and societal life in general. The analysis of the evaluative language in the selected corpus of 40 TED talks about technologies and entertainment is done within the framework of Systemic Functional Linguistics and the theory of appraisal (Martin and White 2005). Generally, appraisal is related with the interpersonal metafunction. Appraisal is evident in the speaker/writer’s expression of their attitude; the multi-layered manifestations of approval/disapproval of various phenomena, events, human decisions and actions; the positioning of audience by the author; the construction of shared values, feelings, emotions, responsibility and normative assessments through intricate linguistic mechanisms. Specifically, in this paper, appraisal is analysed from the perspective of attitudinal manifestations in language used to talk about technologies and their role in one of the most common spheres of human activity, i.e. entertainment. The corpus of texts compiled for the research has been analysed using the UAM Corpus Tool. As far as the research done by the author allows to conclude, the symbiotic co-existence of technologies and humans is increasingly more evident in the manifestations of the language we use to talk about technologies and entertainment.

References

- Bednarek, M. (2006). *Evaluation in Media Discourse. Analysis of a Newspaper Corpus*. London/New York: Continuum.
- Fuoli, M. (2018). A step-wise method for annotating APPRAISAL. *Functions of Language*, 25(2): 229 - 258. <https://doi.org/10.1075/foL.15016.fuo>
- Halliday, M. A. K., & Matthiessen, C. M. I. M. (2014). *Halliday’s Introduction to Functional Grammar*. 4th edition. London and New York: Routledge.
- Hunston, S., & Thompson, G. (Eds.) (2000). *Evaluation in Text: Authorial Stance and the Construction of Discourse*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Martin, J. R., & White, P. R. R. (2005). *The Language of Evaluation: Appraisal in English*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Taboada, M., & Grieve, J. (2004). Analyzing appraisal automatically. In *Exploring Attitude and Affect in Text: Theories and Applications Papers from 2004 AAAI Spring Symposium* Stanford. AAAI Technical Reports (<https://www.aaai.org/Papers/Symposia/Spring/2004/SS-04-07/SS04-07-029.pdf>).
- Thompson, G. (2014). *Introducing Functional Grammar*. 3rd edition. London and New York: Routledge.

Thompson, G., & Alba-Juez, L. (Eds.) (2014). *Evaluation in Context*. Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Immigration, multiculturalism and biopolitical projects on ‘difference’: negotiating intersecting social divisions from positions of privilege and disadvantage

Rusten Menard¹, Jukka Törrönen²
University of Portsmouth¹, Stockholm University²
rusten.menard@port.ac.uk¹, jukka.torronen@su.se²

Abstract

Finnish national identities and symbolism are based in large part on principles of equality, yet there can be significant disjoint in how these nationalisms play out in everyday practices. The category of Whiteness, for example, is so intricately linked with Finnishness that people of colour are effectively and consistently pushed to the constitutive outside of conceptualisations of Finnishness (e.g. Leinonen, 2012; Ratsas, 2005), as well as outside the dominant equality discourses associated with it. Normative Finnish discourses and practices around ‘diversity’ or ‘multiculturalism’ and particular discourses on ‘equality as sameness’ are in disharmonious relations (Menard, 2016). Our aim in this presentation is to examine how Finnish people that presumably occupy social positions of both disadvantage and privilege negotiate discourses on immigration, multiculturalism and notions of ‘difference’. The main research material was produced by Finnish citizens racialized as white, yet whose practices around sociability and gender/sex have been marked as ‘abnormal’ through biopolitical programmes, clinical interventions and psychiatric diagnoses: People with Asperger’s diagnoses and people with transgender life experiences. We elicited the research material using vignettes – a method that allows respondents to actively participate in and negotiate various and shifting orientations, perspectives and voices as regards particular conversational topics (Törrönen, 2018). We analyse the material in terms of intersecting ontological dimensions in which social divisions operate (Yuval-Davis, 2006, p. 198): the *organisational* level, the level of *representation*, the *interpersonal* level, and the level of *subjective experience*. These levels overlap with Fairclough’s (e.g. 2003, p. 27; 2010, p. 59) three major types of meaning: Action (organizational and interpersonal levels), representation (representational level) and identification (subjective experience and interpersonal levels). Our examinations are focused on, firstly, the ways in which us/them representations, viewpoints, and assumptions in relation to immigration, multiculturalism and difference are performed intersectionally in the vignettes themselves. Secondly, we analyse how respondents negotiate their own meanings and interpersonal positionings in relation to those performances. Our preliminary interpretations demonstrate how discourses on immigration and multiculturalism are readily available for respondents’ use in strategic discursive work on belonging in relation to viewpoints and assumptions around inclusivity on one hand, and unmarked categorical representations of Finnish language and Whiteness on the other.

References

- Leinonen, J. (2012). Invisible immigrants, visible expats? Americans in Finnish discourses on immigration and internationalization. *Nordic Journal of Migration Research*, 2(3): 213-223.
- Fairclough, N. (2003). *Analysing Discourse: Textual Analysis for Social Research*. London, New York: Routledge
- (2010). *Critical Discourse Analysis: The Critical Study of Language*. London: Longman

- Menard, R. (2016). Doing equality and difference; representation and alignment in Finnish identification. *Text & Talk*, 36(6): 733-755.
- Rastas, A. (2005). Racializing categorization among young people in Finland. *Young*, 13(2): 147-166.
- Törrönen, J. (2018). Using vignettes in qualitative interviews as clues, microcosms or provokers. *Qualitative Research Journal*, 18(3): 276-286.
- Yuval-Davis, N. (2006). Intersectionality and feminist politics. *European Journal of Women's Studies*, 13(3): 193-209.

Epistemic adverbs in Galician: between subjectivity and intersubjectivity

Vítor Míguez

Instituto da Lingua Galega / Universidade de Santiago de Compostela

vitor.miguez@usc.gal

Abstract

In conversation analysis and similar frameworks, epistemic markers are studied in actual contexts of use, paying special attention to their interactional dimension (e.g. Kärkkäinen, 2003). These works tend to assume that using expressions of (un)certainty either attenuates or reinforces the utterance, in other words, that epistemic expressions readily entail the presence of a mitigating or a strengthening discourse strategy. This paper claims that such standpoint is not adequate as it obscures the notions of epistemic modality and discourse strategy and blurs the line between subjectivity and intersubjectivity. Thus, the aim of this paper is to disentangle subjective and intersubjective uses of epistemic markers and show how they relate to each other on the basis of corpus data.

Empirical studies of epistemic and evidential markers show the benefits of distinguishing strategic from non-strategic uses: mitigating uses of Spanish evidential expressions are rare and highly dependent on discourse genres (Estellés Arguedas & Albelda Marco, 2017), whereas English *certainly* features strengthening as the most frequent use and epistemic modality as the most infrequent one (Byloo, Kastein, & Nuyts, 2007).

This contribution studies the sentential or ‘post-manner’ uses of six Galician epistemic adverbs (*certamente* ‘certainly’, *posiblemente* ‘possibly’, *probablemente* ‘probably’, *quizais* ‘maybe’, *se cadra* ‘perhaps’, and *seguramente* ‘surely’) in essayistic, journalistic, and narrative prose. Samples of 100 occurrences per adverb and genre were taken from CORGA, the biggest corpus for Present-day Galician. The resulting 1800 observations were coded for the relevant semantic-pragmatic categories. These include objective meanings (e.g. dynamic modality), subjective meanings (e.g. epistemic modality), and intersubjective meanings (e.g. mitigation and strengthening).

The results reveal clear differences between adverbs in terms of (inter)subjectivity: *certamente* is primarily an intersubjective device (namely, a strengthener) and, to a lesser extent, a subjective marker of epistemic certainty; *quizais* and *se cadra* convey epistemic possibility, being mostly subjective, and feature intersubjective uses of little quantitative significance; *posiblemente*, *probablemente* and *seguramente* are close to being pure subjective expressions of epistemic probability.

References

- Byloo, P., Kastein, R., & Nuyts, J. (2007). On *certainly* and *zeker*. In M. Hannay, & G. J. Steen (Eds.) *Structural-functional studies in English grammar: In honour of Lachlan Mackenzie*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 35-57.
- CORGA = Centro Ramón Piñeiro para a Investigación en Humanidades. (2017). *Corpus de Referencia do Galego Actual* [3.0]. Retrieved from <http://corpus.cirp.gal/corga/>
- Estellés Arguedas, M., & Albelda Marco, M. (2017). Evidencialidad, atenuación y descortesía en *al parecer* y *por lo visto*. Influencias del género discursivo. In B. Cornillie, & D. Izquierdo Alegría (Eds.) *Gramática, semántica y pragmática de la evidencialidad*. Pamplona: EUNSA. 169-201.

Kärkkäinen, E. (2003). *Epistemic stance in English conversation: A description of its interactional functions, with a focus on I think*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

***Siamo in cura, non in Guerra!* WAR metaphors, political discourse, and evaluation during the Covid-19 pandemic.**

Celeste Moreno Palmero
Hyll, Hybrid Language Learning
celeste.m.palmero@gmail.com

Abstract

In a recent article by the Washington Post, two political scientists showed their concerns about the employment of WAR metaphors to conceptualize the current COVID-19 crisis. In their opinion, “labeling something as ‘war’ provides those in power more leeway in their policy actions” (Blankshain and Lupton, 2020). More importantly, wartime rhetoric provides grounds for political measures that can be extreme, unfair, and, what is more, irreversible (Blankshain and Lupton, 2020). This paper aims to analyze appraisal evaluation in COVID-19 discourse through the use of WAR metaphors. While metaphors have a core role within political discourse (Lakoff and Johnson, 1980a, 1980b; Chilton, 1987, 2004; Kövecses, 2005, 2015; Musolff, 2004, 2016), we also believe that study of evaluation in language, particularly in this context, becomes paramount to unveiling the subjective stance writers and speakers may adopt regarding the COVID-19 pandemic (Hunston & Thompson, 2000; Martin and White, 2007). We will be looking at discourses from political leaders in Italy, Spain, the UK, and the USA. We will study WAR metaphors in their speeches, and analyze them under the lens of the MIPVU methodology (Steen et al. 2010). Once WAR metaphors have been identified, we will proceed to catalogue them regarding the appraisal items they contain. In order to do so, we will employ Martin and White’s principles (2007). We consider that, while the use of WAR metaphors may appear to be commonplace for health issues; our hypothesis is that they may mislead the audience when conceptualizing the current pandemic. For “using the war metaphor shuffles categorizations in insidious ways. For example, we are no longer citizens; we are now ‘soldiers’ in a conflict. As such, politicians call for obedience rather than awareness and appeal to our patriotism, not to our solidarity” (Musu, 2020). Our analysis will be carried out under the scope of a Critical Discourse Studies approach (Van Dijk, 1998, 2000, 2005); since a CDS study contributes to unveiling the dangers that an ideological agenda may entail in circumstances such as the one we are currently experiencing.

References

- Blankshain, J. & Lupton, D. (2020). This is the problem with calling it a ‘war’ against coronavirus. <https://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/2020/04/20/this-is-problem-with-calling-it-war-against-coronavirus/?fbclid=IwAR39IuXTJKxBfioA2sEuPdnLB4qlskxM65H95FWJ6s3Ef9OsR3PkTLOfOE8>
- Chilton, P. (1987). Metaphor, Euphemism, and the Militarization of Language. *Current Research on Peace and Violence*, 10(1): 7-19.
- ___ (2004) *Analysing Political Discourse: Theory and Practice*. London: Routledge.
- Dotti, G. (2020). Siamo in Cura, Non in Guerra! <https://www.humanamedicina.eu/2020/04/06/siamo-in-cura-non-in-guerra/>
- Hunston, S. & G. Thompson (Eds.) (2000) *Evaluation in text: authorial stance and the construction of discourse*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kövecses, Z. (2005). *Metaphor in Culture*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lakoff, G. and G. Johnson (1980a). *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

- ___ (1980b). Conceptual Metaphor in Everyday Language. *The Journal of Philosophy*, 77(8): 453-486.
- ___ (2006). *Language, Mind, and Culture: A Practical Introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- ___ (2015). *Where Metaphors Come From*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Martin, J., & White, P. (2007). *The Language of Evaluation: Appraisal in English*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Musolff, A. (2004). *Metaphor and Political Discourse: Analogical Reasoning in Debates about Europe*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- ___ (2016). *Political metaphor analysis: Discourse and scenarios*. London: Bloomsbury Academic, an imprint of Bloomsbury Publishing Plc.
- Musu, C (2020). War Metaphors Used For COVID-19 Are Compelling But Also Dangerous. <https://theconversation.com/war-metaphors-used-for-covid-19-are-compelling-but-also-dangerous-135406>
- Steen, J.G. et al. (2010). *A Method for Linguistic Metaphor Identification: From MIP to MIPVU*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Co.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (1998) *Ideology: A Multidisciplinary Approach*. London: SAGE
- ___ (2000) *Ideology and Discourse: A Multidisciplinary Approach*. Barcelona: Open University.
- ___ (2005). Contextual knowledge management in discourse production, in R. Wodak, & P. Chilton (Eds.) *A New Agenda in (Critical) Discourse Analysis*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company. 71-100.

From evidential to discursive and/or pragmatic markers: an insight on Romanian *cică* and Spanish *dizque*

Cecilia Mihaela Popescu¹ / Oana Adriana Duță²
University of Craiova^{1,2}
cecilia.popescu@edu.ucv.ro¹, oana.duta@edu.ucv.ro²

Abstract

The paper aims to present a comparative analysis of two lexical particles expressing reportative evidentiality, Romanian *cică* and Spanish *dizque* (see some American and Peninsular varieties), in order to emphasise the convergences and the divergences of their discursive and functional values.

Our approach is motivated first of all by the fact that both items have the same origin and a quasi-identical morphological structure: they are derived from Romance cognates of the Latin verb DICERE ‘to say’ – the 3rd person singular form, and an agglutinated complementiser, Rom. (*se*) *zice că*/ Sp. *dice* or *dicen que* ‘he/she says that’. Secondly, across the times, these two particles developed a range of similar values (frequently encountered in oral speech and in some complementary textual genres, such as legends, tall stories, rumours, jokes, etc.), that could be distributed, based on the recent frame proposed by [Sanromán Vilas](#) (2020), into three groups: (1) evidential, (2) epistemic and (3) discursive and pragmatic values. Hence, the prominent and most frequently used value of the two items is the evidential meaning of *hearsay*, expressing that the source of the asserted information is not the speaker. The epistemic value is connoted (often simultaneously with the evidential meaning) in different degrees, by the stance of the speaker, who takes a distance from his/her own propositional content, because s/he does not agree with the certainty of this propositional content. Finally, our corpus-based study demonstrates that another kind of values, of a pragmatic and discursive nature (functioning, for example, as objection markers), is emergent in all the linguistic varieties on which our comparative approach focuses. This third category could support the main hypothesis of our study (see also Pop 2017) concerning the existence of pragmaticalization processes that the evidential markers develop in time.

References

- Alcázar, A. (2018). *Dizque* and other emergent evidential forms in Romance languages. In Aikhenvald, A. (Ed.) *The Oxford Handbook of Evidentiality*, https://www.jcu.edu.au/__data/assets/pdf_file/0006/785751/16_Dizque.pdf. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 725-740.
- Cruschina, S., & Remberger, E.-M. (2008). Hearsay and reported speech: evidentiality in Romance. *Rivista de Grammatica Generativa*, 33: 95-116.
- Demonte, V., & Fernández-Soriano, O. (2014). Evidentials *dizque* and *que* in Spanish. Grammaticalization, parameters and the (fine) structure of Comp*. In A. Dufter y Á. S Octavio de Toledo (Eds.) *Left Sentence Peripheries in Spanish: Diachronic, Variationist, and Typological Perspectives*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 211-234.
- Dimitrescu, D. (2012). Rum. *cică* vs. esp. *dizque*: polifonía e intertextualidad. In C. U. L. Mur (Ed.) *Polifonía e intertextualidad en el diálogo*. Madrid: Editorial ARCO/LIBROS, S. L. 317-338.
- Florea, S. (2020). Reportative evidentiality and attribution in Romanian fairy tales. *Poznań Studies in Contemporary Linguistics*, 56(1): 1–33.
- López Izquierdo M. (2006). L'émergence de *dizque* comme stratégie médiative en espagnol médiéval. *Cahiers d'études hispaniques médiévales*, 29: 483-495

- Pichler Ciglič, B. (2018). ¿Cómo traducir la evidencialidad? La expresión de la fuente de información en algunas variantes del español de América y sus equivalentes en esloveno. *Colindancias*, 9: 249-267.
- Pop, L. (2017). Du marqueur discursif à marqueur textuel: *cică* ('on dit que, dit-on') du roumain. *Pragmalingüística monográfico*, 1: 171-185.
- Remberger, E.-M. (2009). The syntax of evidential markers: The Romanian hearsay marker *cică*. Communication *Tagung zur Generativen Grammatik des Südens* – Leipzig 22-24 Mai 2009 (handout). <<http://www.unileipzig.de/~asw/ggs/Handouts/Remberger.pdf>>.
- (2015). “I didn’t say it. Somebody else did.” – The Romanian hearsay marker *CICĂ*. *Redefining community in Intercultural context*, 4(1). Selection of papers presented within 4th RCIC Conference, Brasov, 21 May 2015.
- Sanromán Vilas, B. (2020). Do evidential markers always convey epistemic values? A look into three Ibero-Romance reportatives. *Lingua*, 238.

Lecturer's expression of stance in English-Medium Instruction settings: the use of subject pronouns and modal verbs

Mercedes Querol-Julián
Universidad Internacional de La Rioja.
mercedes.querol@unir.net

Abstract

Due to the internationalisation of the university, English-Medium Instruction (EMI) is a common practice in many non-English speaking universities nowadays. Lecturers interact with an international audience using English as a lingua franca (ELF) (Mauranen, 2012). However, the exploration of classroom discourse in this educational setting is still in its infancy if compared with the bulk of research conducted on EMI which has largely focused on stakeholders' attitudes, perceptions and beliefs (Querol-Julián & Crawford Camiciottoli, 2019). Bearing in mind the heterogeneous nature of the evaluative dimension of language (Li, Lei, & Cheng, 2020), the aim of this research is to understand the expression of ELF lecturers' attitude through the use of two linguistic devices: subject pronouns (I, we and you) and modal/ semi-modal verbs (Dafouz, Nunez, & Sancho, 2007). A contrastive study was conducted between non-native English lecturers and native lecturers. Lectures from ELFA (English as a Lingua Franca in the Academia) and MICASE (Michigan Corpus of Academic Spoken English) conformed the corpus of the study. A total of 66 lectures and about 6,000 clusters were analysed. Results showed that the most frequent subject pronoun used by both groups of lecturers (non-native and native) was *you* and the most common modal verbs were *can* and *will*. Although the referent of *you* was mostly the audience, it was also noticeable the presence of a generic reference, which pragmatically speaking is nearly equivalent to *we* (Kamio, 2001). An analysis of the clusters "*I/ you/ we* + modal/ semi-modal verb" revealed that the differences between non-native and native lecturers were shaped by the subject pronouns. The most common modal meaning expressed by both type of lecturers was volition/ prediction (mainly through *will*) with the first person singular, openly showing lecturers' stance. Similarly, but to a lesser degree, they expressed permission/ possibility (mainly through *can*) with *you*, generally referring to the learners. Notwithstanding, a significant difference was found in the use of *we*. Whereas non-native lecturers expressed permission/ possibility (mainly through *can*) with this personal pronoun, native speakers did volition/ prediction (commonly through *will*).

References

- Dafouz, E., Nunez, B., & Sancho, C. (2007). Analysing stance in a CLIL university context: Non-native speaker use of personal pronouns and modal verbs. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 10(5): 647-662.
- Kamio, A. (2001). English generic we, you, and they: An analysis in terms of territory of information. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 33: 1111-1124.
- Li, J., Lei, L., & Cheng, L. (2020). Mapping evaluation, appraisal and stance in discourse (2000-2015): A bibliometric analysis. *Glottology*, 10(1-2): 31-55.
- Mauranen, A. (2012). *Exploring ELF: Academic English Shaped by Non-Native Speakers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Querol-Julián, M., & Crawford Camiciottoli, B. (2019). The impact of online technologies and English medium instruction on university lectures in international learning contexts: a systematic review. *ESP Today*, 7(1): 2-23.

Setting the scene for other voices: strategic stance-taking and the construal of objectivity in hard news reporting

Boitshwarelo Rantsudu
University of Botswana
rantsudub@ub.ac.bw

Abstract

The appearance of evaluative language in hard news reporting has been widely investigated and several studies have documented that within the context of hard news reports, explicit evaluative language is confined to the quoted words of external news sources. White (2000) and Thomson et al. (2008) point out that the attribution of explicit evaluative news content to external news sources is one way through which journalists assert the objectivity of their reports. However, attribution of evaluative content to external news sources is a complex resource, such that in some instances journalists succeed in strategically embedding their subjective opinions within an 'objective' hard news report, and in turn advancing the evaluative standpoint of the quoted news sources (Höglund 2008). The aim of this paper is to explore journalists' subjective opinions that are embedded within 'objective' hard news reports. This is done by critically examining news stories from a state-owned newspaper, the *Daily News*, and a privately-owned newspaper, *Mmegi*. The news stories cover the 2011 nationwide public sector workers' strike in Botswana. Of particular concern is how each of the newspapers uses evaluative language and adheres to the principle of objectivity at the same time. Using insights from Appraisal Theory and Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA), I examine the types of strategies that journalists use to downplay their own evaluative stance and how such strategies assist journalists to present a seemingly neutral point of view. Results that are drawn from an analysis of news stories from the *Daily News* and *Mmegi* indicate that the 'neutral' point of view that journalists present in their reports sets the scene for external news sources to express their evaluations about the people and events that are central to the news stories. By deferring to external news sources, journalists strategically align with evaluations that they attribute to external news sources while maintaining the objectivity ideal.

References

- Höglund, M. (2008). Using the words of others: 'reporter voice' and the construal of objectivity in the reporting of political conflict in Finland. In: Thomson, E. and White, P. R. R. *Communicating Conflict: Multilingual Studies of the News Media*. London: Continuum. 227 - 252.
- Thomson, E. A., White, P. R. R., & Kitley, P. (2008). "Objectivity" and "Hard news" reporting across cultures: Comparing the news report in English, French, Japanese and Indonesian journalism. *Journalism Studies*, 9(2): 212-228.
- White, P. R. R. (2000). Media Objectivity and the Rhetoric of News Story Structure. In: Ventola, E. (Ed.) *Discourse and Community: Doing Functional Linguistics*. Tübingen: Gunter Narr. 379-397.

Time after time: the mirative meaning of *No ir_{fut} a + infinitive* in Spanish

Susana Rodríguez Rosique
Universidad de Alicante
susana.rodriguez@ua.es

Abstract

This presentation deals with the construction *No ir_{fut} a + infinitive* in Spanish, as in (1):

- (1) Consuelo observa que Sandra no ha probado la pizza que tiene delante. Solo ha bebido un sorbito de vino, unas gotas. Consuelo abre el bolso, y saca un billetero.
–*No irás a darme dinero* –dice Sandra.
(RAE, CORPES XXI).

At first sight, this construction is integrated by two futures: on the one hand, the periphrastic future *ir a + infinitive*; and, on the other, the synthetic future in which the auxiliary of the periphrasis occurs. However, neither of them expresses future time anymore. The construction is rather interpreted as the expression of the speaker's surprise towards a contextually inferable information, which is then used to block the addressee's action, to cancel his potential objection, or to criticize his behavior. This interpretation is contributed by three components.

Firstly, the special intonation exhibited by the structure calls attention. In fact, this construction usually occurs either with question or with exclamation marks, which points to an underlying exclamative question (Alonso 1999). In turn, the constant presence of negation triggers a rhetorical question (Escandell 1999), which invokes the opposite proposition, as is shown in (2):

- (2) ¡¿No irás a darme dinero?! > Vas a darme dinero.

Secondly, the meaning of surprise is due to the occurrence of the synthetic future in a particular discursive situation. As the recent literature claims, the synthetic future in Romance languages is not only related to evidentiality (Squartini 2008; Escandell 2014), but also to mirativity (Squartini 2018). The conception of this verbal form as a deictic instruction of 'distance forward' that can be projected over different levels of meaning (Rodríguez Rosique 2019) seems relevant here. When the information occurring in future has been previously activated –as in this case, which contains inferable material (Dryer 1996)–, the 'distance forward' instruction is projected over the utterance: the speaker distances himself towards a piece of information showing that it does not form part of his integrated picture about the world (DeLancey 1997), as (3) paraphrases.

- (3) ¡¿No irás a darme dinero?! > No me puedo creer que vayas a darme dinero.

Finally, the periphrasis *ir a + infinitive* –which is used to express future when the event is considered imminent (RAE 2009)– does not necessarily convey here a coming situation.

Beyond the analysis of the construction, from a more general perspective this presentation vindicates the role of interrogatives in the appearance of the mirative future in Spanish. Furthermore, it explores the productivity of certain tempo-spatial based cognitive templates to project over different levels of meaning and to play different communicative functions.

References

- Alonso, Á. (1999). “Las construcciones exclamativas. La interjección y las expresiones vocativas”, in I. Bosque, & V. Demonte (dirs.) *Gramática Descriptiva de la Lengua Española*. Madrid: Espasa-Calpe. 3993-4050.
- DeLancey, S. (1997). “Mirativity: the grammatical marking of unexpected information”. *Linguistic Typology*, 1(1): 33-52.
- Dryer, M. S. (1996). “Forms, pragmatic presupposition, and activated propositions”. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 26: 475-523.
- Escandell, M. V. (1999). “Los enunciados interrogativos. Aspectos semánticos y pragmáticos”, in I. Bosque and V. Demonte (dirs.) *Gramática Descriptiva de la Lengua Española*. Madrid: Espasa Calpe. 3929-3991.
- ___ (2014). “Evidential futures: The case of Spanish”, in P. De Brabanter, M. Kissine, & S. Sharifzadeh (Eds.) *Future Times, Future Tenses*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 219-246.
- Real Academia Española [RAE] (2000). *Nueva Gramática de la Lengua Española*. Madrid: Espasa-Calpe.
- ___ *Banco de datos CORPES XXI. Corpus del español del siglo XXI*. <<http://www.rae.es>>
- Rodríguez Rosique, S. (2019). *El Futuro en Español. Tiempo, Conocimiento, Interacción*.
- Squartini, M. (2008). “Lexical vs. grammatical evidentiality in French and Italian”. *Linguistics*, 46(5): 917-947.
- ___ (2018). “Mirative extensions in Romance: evidential or epistemic?”, in Z. Guentchéva (Ed.) *Epistemic Modalities and Evidentiality in Cross-Linguistic Perspective*. Berlín / Boston: De Gruyter. 196-214.

Manifestations of authorial stance in research article introductions in two medical subdisciplines

María Paula Roverso¹, Julia T. Williams Camus²
Universidad de Cantabria¹, Universidad de Cantabria²
paula.roverso@unican.es¹, williamsj@unican.es²

Abstract

Writing introductions is one of the most challenging tasks for professionals and students when they want to publish their Research Articles (RAs) (Swales, 1990). One especially problematic aspect is for writers to decide how much to express their voice and authorial stance (Flowerdew, 1999; Pho, 2012). This study explores and analyses the use of authorial stance in RA introductions in two medical subfields (Neurology and Pediatrics) looking for any variation between the two subdisciplines. The study was based on a corpus of 60 RA introductions taken from six different journals: three for Pediatrics and three for Neurology. The introductions were analysed with a slightly modified version of Swales' Create-a-Research-Space model (1990, 2004) and the linguistic realizations of authorial stance were identified with the software AntConc 3.5.8 (Anthony, 2019). The findings show that overall the frequency of the linguistic realizations denoting authorial stance was similar in the two subdisciplines, but the expressions varied according to their rhetorical function. The most frequent manifestation was the use of the first-person pronoun 'We' in Move 3 to express the aims and/or the general design of the study. The results have pedagogical implications and may serve as a preliminary guide to the use of authorial expressions of stance in medical RAs.

References

- Flowerdew, J. (1999). Problems in writing for scholarly publication in English: The case of Hong Kong. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 8(3): 243-264.
- Pho, P. D. (2012). Authorial stance in research article abstracts and introductions from two disciplines. In N. Baumgarten, I. Du Bois and J. House (eds.), *Subjectivity in Language and in Discourse*. Bingley: Emerald. 97-114.
- Swales, J. M. (1990). *Genre Analysis: English in Academic and Research Settings*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- (2004). *Research Genres: Explorations and Applications*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Relating in computer mediated team work before and after the COVID-19 crisis

Carmen Santamaría-García
University of Alcalá
carmen.santamaria@uah.es

Abstract

In the last decades, we have been witnessing an increase in virtual team work, with team members from geographically distant places challenged to both relate and deal with work tasks through computer mediated discourse (CMD). The COVID-19 crisis is also triggering new ways of working online, which could change the way many workers relate and communicate in the near future. This context calls for deeper research on the ways we relate and constitute face in online team work. My study presents empirical work on a corpus of email interaction between team members of several international higher education projects. The sample was collected in 2 different periods, one before and the other after the onset of the COVID-19 crisis. It attempts to show that the discursive realisation of facework reveals the construction of different relational dynamics (Spencer-Oatey 2013) before and after the COVID-19 crisis, mainly derived from behavioural expectations, face sensitivities, and interactional goals (Spencer-Oatey 2005). A social constructionist discursive approach has been adopted, (Arundale 2020, Grainger and Mills 2016; Haugh 2007), although concepts of non-discursive pragmatics are incorporated when offering fundamental insights of language in interaction, as proposed in Grainger (2013), together with interactional sociolinguistics. The face(t)s of self and their relationship with identity (Arundale 2020, Bousfield 2018; Garcés-Conejos Blitvich 2013; Spencer-Oatey 2007) are combined with self-aspect model of identity and levels of self-representation in the exploration of relational dynamics. My preliminary results show different relational dynamics resources in the discursive realisation of facework before and after the COVID-19 crisis, mainly in the use of sweeteners related to health and commitment levels to action by team members.

References

- Arundale, R. (2020). *Communicating and Relating*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bousfield, D. (2018). Face(t)s of self and identity in interaction. *Journal of Politeness Research*, 14(2): 225–243.
- Haugh, M. (2007). The discursive challenge to politeness research: An interactional alternative. *Journal of Politeness Research. Language, Behaviour, Culture*, 3(2): 295–317.
- Grainger, K. (2013). Of babies and bath water: Is there any place for Austin and Grice in interpersonal pragmatics? *Journal of Pragmatics*, 58: 27-38.
- Garcés-Conejos Blitvich, P. (2013). Introduction: Face identity and im/politeness Looking backward moving forward: From Goffman to practice theory. *Journal of Politeness Research*, 9(1): 1–33.
- Mills, S., & Grainger, K. (2016). *Directness and indirectness across cultures*. Springer.
- Spencer-Oatey, H. (2005). (Im) Politeness, face and perceptions of rapport: unpackaging their bases and interrelationships. *Journal of Politeness Research*, 1(1): 95-119.
- (2007). Theories of identity and the analysis of face. *Journal of pragmatics*, 39(4): 639-656.
- (2013). Relating at work: Facets, dialectics and face. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 58: 121–137.

Spoiler alert, this is no spoiler: assumption, irony and intersubjectivity at play

Mario Serrano-Losada
Universidad Complutense de Madrid
mario.serrano@ucm.es

Abstract

Pragmatic markers (PMs) are a particularly valuable category for the study of language change (see Brinton 2017). The present paper zooms in on a relatively recent innovation hitherto unexplored: the PM *spoiler alert*, exemplified in (1):

- (1) Four orcas chase a penguin and spoiler alert, it doesn't end well.
(NOW:NZ:2020)

In (1), *spoiler alert* is used as a humorous device to underscore the obvious nature of the statement, by acknowledging that the information expressed is expected or self-evident. This corpus-based study traces the history of this expression, which originates as a disclaimer to warn readers of potential plot revelations in online discussions about films and television:

- (2) the following is a sample of what we received. (Spoiler alert! Many of the following responses contain key plot points.) (COCA:News:2002)

It also explores the meanings and pragmatic functions that the PM has acquired over its short history. Data for this paper were drawn from COCA and NOW. While COCA is used to trace the development of *spoiler alert* from literal instances like (2) to PMs like (1), NOW is used to analyze the functions of this new PM in greater detail.

My findings reveal that, albeit its specialized origins in online film discussions, the expression has attained a surprisingly wide dispersion, appearing across all text genres in COCA. Its meaning, which originally invoked a warning, has acquired evidential extensions. Thus, *spoiler alert* in (1) is used as an *assumed evidential* (see Aikhenvald 2004: 63), i.e., it has come to express evidence based on assumption, logical reasoning or general knowledge. Moreover, this PM usually conveys a humorous or an ironic twist: despite its literal meaning, the PM does not introduce revealing information, but a predictable fact. In this sense, *spoiler alert* has an interactional and intersubjective function.

Sources

COCA = *Corpus of Contemporary American English*, 2008-. Compiled by Mark Davies. <http://corpus.byu.edu/coca/>
NOW = *Corpus of News on the Web: 3+ billion words from 20 countries, updated every day*, 2010. Compiled by Mark Davies. <http://corpus.byu.edu/now/>

References

Aikhenvald, A. Y. (2004). *Evidentiality*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Brinton, L. J. (2017). *The Evolution of Pragmatic Markers in English: Pathways of Change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Modal adverbs and discourse structure

Daisuke Suzuki¹, Takashi Fujiwara²
Setsunan University^{1, 2}
suzuki0213@gmail.com¹, elf3201@gmail.com²

Abstract

The aim of this study is to understand in detail the properties of English modal adverbs used in the medial position, especially their pragmatic features. We take up as a case study the use of parenthetical *perhaps* in writing, as illustrated in Examples (1a, b):

- (1) a. The most important factor, *perhaps*, was the changing status of West Germany.
(BNC: CLR)
b. The middle range, *perhaps*, was where a comfortable, accomplished actor could exist and grow. (BNC: CL2)

Based on data drawn from the British National Corpus (BNC), we provide a thorough description of its behavior and characteristics on functional grounds. We further argue that in addition to conjunctions such as *however*, *nevertheless*, and *moreover*, as in Example (2) below, *perhaps* in parentheticals also shares the function of “partitions,” putting emphasis on particular elements in the clause (cf. Halliday 1967, 1970, Halliday and Hasan. 1976, Halliday and Matthiessen 2014).

- (2) John, *however*, was painting the shed. (Taglicht 1984: 22)
(Theme) (Rheme)

Parentheticals, which come at any position in the clause, can be seen as one example of a typical interface phenomenon (i.e., syntax–pragmatics). As previous studies discuss, the relationship between word order and discourse is important from a functional point of view; in a similar vein, we offer the results of an in-depth study of *perhaps* especially in the medial position in the clause, and try to interpret them in light of discourse structure (theme–rheme).

References

- Halliday, M. A. K. (1967). Notes on transitivity and theme in English: Part 1. *Journal of Linguistics*, 3: 37–81.
— (1970). Functional diversity in language as seen from a consideration of modality and mood in English. *Foundations of Language*, 6: 322–361.
Halliday, M. A. K., & Hasan, R. (1976). *Cohesion in English*. London: Longman.
Halliday, M. A. K., & Matthiessen, C. M. I. M. (2014). *Halliday's Introduction to Functional Grammar*, 4th edn. Abingdon: Routledge.
Taglicht, J. (1984). *Message and Emphasis: On Focus and Scope in English*. London: Longman.

Theme panels

Theme panel 1: EPSILOne. Evidentiality, Perspectivisation and Subjectivisation at the Interfaces of Language²

Convenors: Aoife Ahern, UCM, José Amenós Pons, UCM & Pedro Guijarro-Fuentes, Universidad de las Islas Baleares.

Abstract

The knowledge basis used by speakers, upon which the content of their assertions relies, is an essential component of communication. Such knowledge can be shown to have been derived from their own experience, obtained from others or mere speculation. Establishing the source or mode of access to information in language production can be key to modulating the illocutionary force of the utterance or to showing different degrees of commitment or attitudes towards the propositional content (endorsement, distancing, incredulity). Likewise, in interpreting utterances there are many aspects that definitively rely on the source or mode of access of the information expressed, such as the cognitive effects it may create, its potential to update the common ground, the identification of its relevance or the speaker's reliability, among others.

All languages allow for a way to express the source or mode of access of the information on which the speaker bases the content of their assertions; although some have developed specific grammatical paradigms, called evidentials. In these languages, the indication of the information source or mode of access is encoded in systematic distinctions that appear obligatorily: every assertion must include a mark indicating this linguistic content. However, in other languages, including Romance languages, this kind of information is generally expressed by means of lexical-conceptual resources, such as discourse markers (*Por lo visto, aparentemente...*), or by way of compositional means, combining lexically expressed concepts.

Between these two poles (that of full grammaticalization and that of free compositionality based on lexical expressions), a range of intermediate formal resources are identifiable, which, though not fully grammaticalized nor dependent on the concatenation of concepts, provide the means for systematic expression and interpretation of additional source or mode of access information. In Spanish, as well as other Romance languages, there are indeed expressions and structures in which content related to the “speaker's trace” also emerges; that is, content related to the information source, mode of access, point of view, propositional attitude or epistemic commitment.

The general goal of this panel is to host talks that bring up problems related to when, and under what conditions, languages that lack grammaticalized evidential paradigms, like Spanish, use grammatical mechanisms (i.e., those that, as opposed to lexical means, are characterised by non-cancellability and by not being context-dependent) to systematically convey the information which is only expressed through evidentials in other languages.

We propose to bring together talks that revolve around four general research questions:

- 1) In what form is evidentiality represented in grammar? Or, in other words, what is the place of evidentiality in the grammars of languages that lack evidential paradigms? (Such as Romance languages).
- 2) What is the relationship between evidentiality and other surrounding notions, such as perspectivisation and subjectivisation?
- 3) What relationships exist between evidential and non-evidential interpretations associated with a single linguistic unit or mechanism?
- 4) In consideration of cross-linguistic contrasts in the means for encoding evidential meaning, what can data on the native and non-native speaker's understanding and production of evidential meaning contribute to the understanding of the previous questions?

2. The organization and part of the research for this panel has been financially supported by the Spanish Ministerio de Ciencia e Innovación, EPSILone project, ref. PID2019-104405GB-I00.

Conjectural future in L2 Spanish by L1 French, Italian and English learners of Spanish: acquisition by way of L2 feature re-assembly

José Amenós-Pons¹, Aoife Ahern², Pedro Guijarro-Fuentes³
Universidad Complutense de Madrid^{1,2}
Universidad de las Islas Baleares³
jamenos@ucm.es¹, akahern@ucm.es², p.guijarro@uib.es³

Abstract

In many languages, including English and most Romance varieties, both future simple (FUT) and future perfect (COMP-FUT) can receive conjectural interpretations, which are linked to evidentiality (Squartini 2001, Escandell-Vidal 2014). However, different cross-linguistic restrictions apply. In French and English, those interpretations require stative verbs, while in Spanish and Italian they are merely favoured by (but not limited to) states. Conjectural FUT in Spanish and Italian may appear in concessive environments, while concessive constructions in FUT are ungrammatical in French and in English. COMP-FUT conjectural interpretations are less restricted by lexical aspect in all of these languages.

This presentation considers to what extent L1 French, Italian and English learners of L2 Spanish at upper intermediate and advanced levels can interpret and produce L2 combinations of semantic features that differ from their L1 in the degree to which they restrict conjectural FUT. Other related questions are: to what extent do the L2 judgments rest on the L1 competence? Are L2 learners capable of detecting constraints in a combination of L2 features, when they differ from those of L1? Is there progression as L2 learners develop general proficiency?

We consider that the L2 learning task consists in re-assembling features, i.e., the learners must detect where the features in the L2 are, and their operational restrictions (Lardiere 2008, 2009). Results are presented of two linguistic tasks probing the acceptability of conjectural FUT and COMP-FUT forms, completed by L1 French, Italian and English learners of L2 Spanish, at CEFR B2 and C1 levels (N= 15 per level and L1), and by 29 monolingual European Spanish speaker controls. The tasks consisted of 1) an acceptability judgement task targeting lexical aspect feature violation in conjectural and concessive FUT; 2) a judgement task contrasting the acceptability of FUT vs. COMP-FUT. Our results display clear L1 effects: the L1 Italian speakers, at C1, provide answers close to those of the controls, while the L1 French and the L1 English groups show long-lasting difficulties in mastering the general use and the specific aspectual restrictions of the Spanish conjectural FUT. The findings provide a more fine-grained description of the semantic representation and access of interpretable features in L2 Spanish, aiding in understand how second language learners cope with the cross-language presence of different language systems.

References

- Escandell-Vidal, V. (2014). Evidential futures: The case of Spanish. In P. De Brabanter, M. Kissine & S. Sharifzadeh (Eds.) *Future times, future tenses*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 219-246.
- Lardiere, D. (2008). Feature-Assembly in Second Language in Second Language Acquisition. In J. Liceras, H. Zobl & H. Goodluck (Eds.) *Features in Second Language Acquisition*. Mahwah, NJ, Lawrence Erlbaum. 106-140.

- (2009). Some thoughts on a contrastive analysis of feature in second language acquisition. *Second Language Research*, 25(2): 173–227.
- Squartini, M. (2001). The internal structure of evidentiality in Romance. *Studies in Language*, 25(2): 297-334.

Spanish ‘mirative future’

Victoria Escandell-Vidal¹, Manuel Leonetti²
Universidad Complutense de Madrid^{1,2}
victoria.escandell@ucm.es¹, mr.leonetti@ucm.es²

Abstract

In Spanish, future tense displays a variety of non-temporal readings (see RAE 2009, Escandell-Vidal 2014, Laca 2017, Rodríguez Rosique 2019). One of these non-temporal uses is the so-called ‘mirative’ use illustrated in (1), where the speaker communicates surprise or exceeded expectation about the high degree of a property observed in a certain individual:

- (1) ¡Tendrá caradura el tío!
‘This guy has got a lot of cheek

What it is about this sort of construction that induces a mirative interpretation? This question can be broken down into the following more specific ones: i) What is the role of the future verbal form in the mirative reading, given that this interpretation does not arise with any other means for expressing future time reference?; ii) What is the role of grammatical structure?; and iii) What is the role of context, as utterances like (1) are typically a speaker’s reaction to unexpected events?

The aim of this presentation is to answer such questions without assuming that there is something inherently mirative in the semantics of the future. Our starting point is the analysis of the future as an inferential evidential (Escandell-Vidal 2010, 2014; see also Mari 2010). The mirative interpretation arises under very specific conditions, including syntactic and prosodic restrictions, and aspectual requirements on the predicate -it must be Individual-Level, gradable and express some kind of negative/critical evaluation. There must be also a mismatch between the evidential condition encoded in the future and the context, which makes it clear that the speaker does in fact have direct experience of the eventuality in question.

Given these conditions, examples like (1) must be seen essentially as rhetorical questions. Mirativity with the simple future is thus achieved by simulating a conjecture against strong evidence. In short, mirativity is contextually inferred as a result of a combination of multiple factors that constrain interpretation.

References

- Escandell-Vidal, V. (2010). Futuro y evidencialidad. *Anuario de Lingüística Hispánica*, XXVI: 9-34.
— (2014). Evidential futures. The case of Spanish. In P. de Brabanter, M. Kissine & S. Sharifzadeh (Eds.) *Future Tense(s)/Future Time(s)*. Oxford: OUP, 219-246.
Laca, B. (2017). Variación y semántica de los tiempos verbales: el caso del futuro. In B. Almeida Cabrejas et al. (Eds.) *Investigaciones actuales en Lingüística*. Alcalá: Servicio de Publicaciones de la UAH. 159-192.
Mari, A. (2010). On the evidential nature of the Italian future. <ijn 00678549>
RAE (2009). *Nueva Gramática de la Lengua Española*. Madrid: Espasa.
Rodríguez Rosique, S. (2015). Spanish future in evaluative contexts: A case of mirativity? *eHumanista. Journal of Iberian Studies*, 8: 500-516.

The expression of events in progress in Spanish: a communicative approach

Martín Fuchs
Yale University
fuchs@yale.edu

Abstract

The Simple Present marker and the Present Progressive marker can alternatively convey the event-in-progress meaning in Spanish; both *Ana canta* and *Ana está cantando* can mean ‘Ana is singing’. I argue that the availability of each marker to convey this meaning ultimately responds to communicative and cognitive pressures that are reflected in features of the contexts that affect the interpretation of these markers.

I claim that the choice of marker is dependent on the contextual circumstances available: the “poorer” the context, the more likely that the Present Progressive marker is used. Through experimental and corpus data, I show that the use of the Simple Present marker to convey an event-in-progress meaning is restricted to contexts in which speaker and hearer share perceptual access to the event described by the predicate. By contrast, the Present Progressive marker does not need this kind of contextual support.

Shared perceptual access is a perceptual means to attain Perspective Alignment, a fundamental communicative goal manifested as the speaker’s need to bring the hearer’s point of view closer to her own. I claim that this goal is grounded on two complementary cognitive capacities: Common Ground and Theory of Mind. While Common Ground between speaker and hearer affords the speaker greater reliance on context, Theory of Mind forces her to be linguistically explicit, because the hearer may not experience context exactly like her. Thus, on the one hand, a speaker may use the Simple Present marker to convey an event-in-progress meaning only when Perspective Alignment is achieved by non-linguistic means, such as shared perceptual access. On the other hand, she may use the Present Progressive marker regardless of contextual conditions, evidencing that this marker is the preferred linguistic means to achieve this communicative goal.

The system of evidentiality in present-day Ibero-Romance

Víctor Lara Bermejo
UCA
viktoresc@hotmail.com

Abstract

The future and the conditional tenses in Ibero-Romance can convey time, modality and conjecture. The choice for either of them depends on an array of parameters, such as the dialect variety, the written and oral genre or the age of the speaker. In this communication I will analyse the current usage of both tenses in the Romance languages of the Iberian Peninsula, by comparing the data from four sociolinguistic corpora: CORIDAL-SIN, CORILGA, COSER and COD. The results show that the future and the conditional have become morphological evidential markers in Spanish, Galician and Portuguese, and they are gradually displacing the temporal nuance in Catalan too.

Additionally, the current data show the different stages that the birth of evidentiality usually undergoes. In the first place, the future tense is more inclined to turn itself into an evidential strategy, followed by the conditional. Secondly, these tenses adopt in a first stage inferential evidentiality and only later can they develop a reportative one. Furthermore, the geolinguistic distribution allows for pinpointing the evolution of the system of evidentiality throughout the Iberian Peninsula: to begin with, the future and the conditional acquire conjectural nuances as a secondary meaning, but they still convey mainly time. This is the stage in almost all of Catalan. Then, they start expressing conjecture as a primary meaning and, every now and then, they can also be used for time references. This is what happens in the Catalan of Valencia and, based upon the literature, in this phase, the future and the conditional are really morphological markers of evidentiality. Lastly, they only express conjecture and, in a very few cases, they can also emerge for other readings such as time or modality. This stage has been accomplished in the rest of the Iberian Peninsula.

L2 acquisition of evidential marking in French and English

Pascale Leclercq
Université Paul Valéry Montpellier 3
pascale.leclercq@univ-montp3.fr

Abstract

Evidentiality, i.e. the linguistic encoding of the mode of access to information (direct perception, inference, hearsay, (see Aikhenvald, 2004; Schenner, 2010, *inter alia*)), despite not being a fully grammaticalized notion in English and French, is expressed through a variety of means: perception verbs (*see/voir*), copular verbs (*seem/sembler*), cognition verbs (*I guess/j' imagine*), epistemic modals, adverbs (presumably, *apparemment*), mood (conditional in French). Bergqvist (2017: 10) believes that “evidentials cannot be satisfactorily described without taking into account the context of their use in a communicative and social sense”. This is particularly challenging in the context of second language acquisition, as learners have to learn a new set of expressions (and their discursive functions) to convey a semantic domain that is never taught in the classroom, that is relatively non-salient in the L1 and L2 input, and yet may be selected so as to provide information relative to the source of knowledge (Narita, 2011; Mushin, 2013).

In this study, we adopt a functional and developmental perspective to find out (a) what evidential markers are used by native speakers of French (n=10) and English (n=10) as well as by French learners of English and English learners of French, at 3 proficiency levels (lower intermediate, upper intermediate, advanced, n=10 per group), in an elicited oral narrative task, (b) at which level their use emerges and (c) whether there are translinguistic influences in learners’ choice of markers. Given the nature of the task, which featured viewing a 5mn silent cartoon and providing a subsequent retelling, we expected the use of direct perception markers as well as inferential markers, especially since the speakers had to reconstruct the event based on their memories of the stimulus. In our presentation, we first provide a detailed analysis of the use of direct perception and inferential markers in the narratives of French and English native speakers, with a special focus on the discursive functions (presentative and evidential) of direct perception markers *see/voir*, before analysing the way learners adopt (or not) the target language patterns. Our general results point to slightly different patterns of direct perception and inference marking in French and in English, and to a late emergence of evidential markers in the speech of learners, who display sensitivity to their discursive functions, with types and tokens increasing as a function of proficiency level.

References

- Aikhenvald, A. Y. (2004). *Evidentiality*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bergqvist, H. (2017). The role of ‘perspective’ in epistemic marking. *Lingua*, 186-187: 5-20. doi: 10.1016/j.lingua.2015.02.008
- Mushin, I. (2013). Making knowledge visible in discourse: Implications for the study of linguistic evidentiality. *Discourse Studies*, 15(5): 627 –645.
- Narita, R. (2011). The effects of pragmatic consciousness-raising activity on the development of pragmatic awareness and use of hearsay evidential markers for learners of Japanese as a foreign language. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 44(1): 1-29.

Schenner, M. (2010). Embedded evidentials in German. In G. Diewald & E. Smirnova (Eds.), *Linguistic realization of evidentiality in European languages*. Berlin, Boston: De Gruyter Mouton. 157-185.

Futurity and probability in Spanish as a heritage language

Diego Pascual y Cabo
University of Florida

Abstract

In this presentation, I will examine Spanish heritage speaker knowledge and use of temporal and conjectural interpretations, related to evidentiality, in the context of the United States. Focusing on future morphology as the property under investigation, this study contributes to the literature by exploring whether adult Spanish heritage speakers are able to distinguish between its two possible interpretations: temporal and conjectural. To this end, I will present production and comprehension data from adult heritage speakers (N=39) as well as from dialect-matched adult immigrants (N=5) living in the United States. While both groups show robust knowledge of future morphology to express temporal futurity, the data reveal significant differences in their access to and production of the conjectural interpretation. I will argue that these findings represent a case of convergent simplification whereby the outcome observed constitutes a reduction of the possibilities associated with future tense morphology to make Spanish more similar to English.

Repetitions as general knowledge evidentials³

Elena Vilinbakhova
St Petersburg University
e.vilinbakhova@spbu.ru

Abstract

This paper aims to contribute to the discussion of evidentiality strategies in languages lacking evidential paradigms. More specifically, I focus on the evidential meaning of common or general knowledge, which involves all members of a speech community, see Hintz and Hintz (2017: 89), Aikhenvald (2018: 31). I analyse cases when the evidential meaning of general knowledge ascribed to the proposition is expressed by the use of repetitions, such as nominal tautologies. Based on the collection of English examples of repetitions from COCA and web-sources, I address the following research questions: (i) under which conditions the meaning of general knowledge systematically arises; (ii) how a speaker can manipulate it to achieve the desired rhetorical effect; (iii) what implications the chosen perspective has for the existing analyses of repetitions. Taking as a starting point the descriptions of general and mutual knowledge evidentials found in Mamaindê (Eberhard, 2018) or Quechua (Hintz and Hintz, 2017), and considered the most reliable source of information, I show that repetitions perform similar roles in discourse, framing individual knowledge as if it were shared knowledge, or inviting the interlocutor ‘to become an insider’. What is more, in the collected data repetitions are commonly used along with the overt verbalization of the evoked properties, as in (1).

- (1) Obviously, Boris Johnson is Boris Johnson – an overgrown child who delivers speeches about tax cuts like he's doing improve comedy at a school assembly – and that is inherently repellent.
(https://www.vice.com/en_uk/article/439dyd/thank-god-the-uks-sexiest-politicians-list-is-here)

Such uses contradict the standard assumption found in literature that the main function of tautologies is the evocation of a property without its explicit mention to avoid possible disagreement (Fraser, 1988; Miki, 1996), and hence, appear unreasonable. However, if repetitions are regarded as general knowledge evidentials, their role is to mark the veracity of the statement in a discourse fragment which falls under their scope, and examples like (1) are fully justified.

3. The research for this study was financially supported by the Spanish Ministerio de Ciencia e Innovación, grant no. PID2019-104405GB-I00 to the EPSILone project (evidentiality), and by the Russian Science Foundation, grant n. 19-78-10048 (repetitions).

References

- Aikhenvald, A. Y. (Ed.) (2018). *The Oxford Handbook of Evidentiality*. Oxford: OUP.
Eberhard, D. (2018). *Evidentiality in Nambikwara Languages*. In A. Y. Aikhenvald (Ed.) *The Oxford Handbook of Evidentiality*. Oxford: OUP. 333-356.

- Hintz, D. J. & Hintz, D. M. (2017). The evidential category of mutual knowledge in Quechua. *Lingua*, 186-187: 88-109.
- Fraser, B. (1988). Motor oil is motor oil: An account of English nominal tautologies. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 12: 215-220.
- Miki, E. (1996). Evocation and tautologies. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 25: 635-648.

Theme panel 2: El Posicionamiento y la Dialogicidad en la Expresión Escrita de Estudiantes Universitarios

Convenors: David Sánchez Jiménez, NYC College of Technology, CUNY & Paulina Meza, Universidad de La Serena.

Abstract

La identidad del escritor en el discurso académico se construye en los textos en relación a los escritos de los otros (Hyland, 2012a), ya que los patrones retóricos que se utilizan para establecer la posición del autor en el escrito definen al individuo y lo diferencian del resto de las fuentes utilizadas para componer su discurso. Los estudios sobre el posicionamiento del autor en el texto y la interacción que este mantiene con su audiencia han florecido a lo largo de las últimas décadas, mostrando una cara distinta y disidente de la concepción tradicional del discurso escrito (Biber et al., 1999; Conrad y Biber, 2000; Hyland, 2005, 2008; Castelló et al., 2011). Si bien es cierto que la presencia de la voz del escritor en el discurso científico ha tendido a una mayor impersonalización y objetividad en el último siglo (desde la comunicación personal que realizaban los investigadores en épocas precedentes), la innegable realidad es que el escritor experto publica sus textos con la finalidad de persuadir al lector, y utiliza para ello una serie de estrategias que tratan de convencerle de la certeza de sus juicios, a la vez que promueven un diálogo inclusivo con el destinatario.

Estas publicaciones condensan el conocimiento en un área temática determinada, y son utilizadas en la formación de los estudiantes universitarios, muy especialmente en el nivel de posgrado, con el propósito de transmitir unos determinados contenidos centrales en la disciplina, pero también para introducir progresivamente a los futuros miembros de la comunidad discursiva en las convenciones académicas compartidas por su grupo social. Sin embargo, numerosos estudios empíricos (*vid.* Arnoux et al., 2005; Hyland y Sancho-Guinda, 2012) evidencian las carencias y la vacilación de los estudiantes universitarios al utilizar estrategias para posicionar su voz en el texto escrito y para facilitar la comunicación dialógica con el lector siguiendo las convenciones sociales que impone su disciplina. Otros trabajos (Cadman, 1997; Ivanič, 1998; Carlino, 2003; Di Stefano, 2003; Hyland, 2009, 2012a, 2012b) muestran también cómo en la composición de un escrito académico de la envergadura y la complejidad de los géneros compuestos en el posgrado se exigen cambios incluso en la identidad de quien emprende esta tarea, en el sentido de que el escritor deja de ser un consumidor de conocimiento para adoptar una posición activa en la transformación del saber (Arnoux et al., 2005). Tales modificaciones se manifiestan en el escrito por medio de los recursos metadiscursivos que el autor utiliza para comunicar el contenido proposicional.

En este panel se presentan una serie de contribuciones que tienen por objetivo profundizar en las características que singularizan la comunicación escrita producida por estudiantes universitarios, concretamente en lo relacionado con las técnicas y las estrategias que estos utilizan para posicionarse en el texto y mantener interacciones con sus potenciales interlocutores en el diálogo diferido. Del mismo modo, se tendrán en cuenta las dificultades que encuentran para sortear estos aspectos del discurso en la escritura académica y las deficiencias identificadas en sus producciones, así como los modelos didácticos propuestos que se emplean en el aula para mejorarlos y adaptar su uso al nivel experto.

References

- Arnoux, E., Borsinger, A., Carlino, P., Di Stefano, M., Pereira, C., & Silvestre, A. (2005). La intervención pedagógica en el proceso de escritura de tesis de posgrado. *Revista de la Maestría en Salud Pública*, 3(6): 1-16.
- Biber, D., Johansson, S., Leech, G., Conrad, S., & Finegan, E. (1999). *The Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English*. Londres: Longman.
- Cadman, K. (1997). Thesis writing for international students: a question of identity? *English for Specific Purposes*, 16(1): 3-14.
- Carlino, P. (2003). La experiencia de escribir una tesis: contextos que la vuelven más difícil. *II Congreso Internacional Cátedra UNESCO Lectura y Escritura*. Valparaíso: Universidad Católica de Valparaíso. [En línea] Disponible en: <http://www.escrituraylectura.com.ar/posgrado/articulos.htm> [7/2/2012].
- Castelló, M. Corcelles, M., Iñesta, A., Bañales, G., & Vega, N. (2011). La voz del autor en la escritura académica: una propuesta para su análisis. *Revista Signos*, 44(76): 105-117.
- Conrad, S. & Biber, D. (2000). Adverbial marking of stance in speech and writing. En S. Hunston & G. Thompson (Eds.) *Evaluation in text: Authorial stance and the construction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 56-73.
- Di Stefano, M. (2003). Escritura y producción de conocimiento en las carreras de posgrado. *IIº Congreso Internacional Cátedra UNESCO Lectura y Escritura*. Valparaíso: Pontificia Universidad Católica de Valparaíso. [En línea] Disponible en: <http://www.escrituraylectura.com.ar/posgrado/articulos.htm> [3/6/2012].
- Hyland, K. & Sancho-Guinda, C. (2012). *Stance and voice in academic writing*. Londres: Palgrave-MacMillan.
- Hyland, K. (2005). Stance and engagement: a model of interaction in academic discourse. *Discourse Studies*, 7(2): 173-192.
- (2008). Disciplinary voices: interactions in research writing. *English Text Construction*, 1(1): 5-22.
- (2009). *Academic Discourse*. Londres: Continuum.
- (2012a). *Disciplinary Identities*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- (2012b). Undergraduate understandings: stance and voice in final year reports. En K. Hyland & C. Sancho-Guinda (Eds.) *Stance and voice in academic writing*. Londres : Palgrave-MacMillan. 134-150
- Ivanič, R. (1998). Writing and identity: the discursal construction of identity in academic writing. Ámsterdam: John Benjamins.

Uso de marcadores metadiscursivos interaccionales en los abstracts de TFG

Bach Carme¹, Cañada Maria Dolors²,
Universitat Pompeu Fabra¹, Universitat Pompeu Fabra²
carne.bach@upf.edu¹, mariadolors.canada@upf.edu²

Abstract

La exigencia de un trabajo final de grado (TFG) es un requisito a nivel español para todos los candidatos a egresados, según el RD 1393/2007 de ordenación de las enseñanzas universitarias oficiales. Además, todos estos trabajos deben incluir obligatoriamente un resumen, cuya redacción no se acostumbra a enseñar en los grados. Aunque sí que existen numerosas publicaciones sobre los resúmenes de artículos de investigación (Bondi y Lorés, 2014; dos Santos, 2014 y Hyland, 2000a y 2002) o sobre resúmenes en otros géneros académicos (Parodi et al. 2014), son muy escasos los trabajos sobre este género discursivo (da Cunha, 2006 y Díez Prados, 2018).

El objetivo de esta comunicación es analizar los marcadores metadiscursivos interaccionales que aparecen en los abstracts en español de los TFG. Para ello analizamos un corpus de 90 textos en español (19691 palabras) escritos por estudiantes de cuarto curso del grado en Lenguas Aplicadas de la Universitat Pompeu Fabra, de distintos cursos académicos.

Se aborda el análisis a dos niveles: macrotextual (movimientos retóricos observados, siguiendo a Swales (1990) y Bathia (1993)) y microtextual: elementos metadiscursivos interaccionales (Hyland, 2000b, 2005a y 2005b), a saber, atenuadores, enfatizadores, marcadores discursivos actitudinales, automenciones y marcadores relacionales. Para el análisis utilizamos el programa QDA Atlas.ti, que nos permite extraer datos cuantitativos y cualitativos y poder cruzar el análisis macrotextual con el microtextual.

Los resultados muestran la presencia de cinco movimientos básicos en este tipo de resúmenes redactados por los estudiantes (tema, motivación, objetivos, metodología y resultados), y tres elementos metadiscursivos interaccionales destacados (automenciones, atenuadores y marcadores discursivos actitudinales). Asimismo, destaca la poca presencia de enfatizadores en los textos de los estudiantes, hecho que demuestra que, en el momento de la redacción del TFG, aún no han alcanzado una identidad como especialistas en la disciplina.

References

- Bhatia, V. K. (1993). *Analysing Genre: Language Use in Professional Settings*. Londres: Longman.
- Bondi, M. & Lorés, R. (2014). *Abstracts in Academic Discourse: Variation and Change*. Berna: Peter Lang.
- Chafe, W. (1986). Evidentiality in English conversation and academic writing. En W. Chafe & J. Nichols (Eds.) *Evidentiality: the linguistic coding of epistemology*. Norwood, N.J.: Ablex, 261-272.
- da Cunha, I. (2006). *El trabajo de fin de grado y de máster: redacción, defensa y publicación*. Barcelona: UOC.
- dos Santos, M. B. (1996). The textual organization of research paper abstracts in applied linguistics. *Text* 16: 481-499.
- Hyland, K. (2000a). *Disciplinary discourses: Social Interactions in academic writing*. Harlow, Essex: Pearson Education.
- (2000b). Hedges, boosters and lexical invisibility: Noticing modifiers in academic texts. *Language Awareness*, 9, 179–197. 285

- (2002). Authority and invisibility: authorial identity in academic writing. *Journal of Pragmatics* 34: 1091-1112.
- (2005a). *Metadiscourse*. Londres: Continuum.
- (2005b). Representing readers in writing: Student and expert practices. *Linguistics and Education*, 16: 363–377.
- Parodi, G., Ibáñez, R. & Venegas, R. (2014). ¿Cómo escribir un buen resumen? En Montolío, E. (Dir.) (2014) *Manual de escritura académica y profesional. Estrategias discursivas*. Barcelona: Ariel. [Volumen 2]. 93-119.
- Swales, J. (1990). *Genre Analysis: English in Academic and Research Settings*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

La apropiación del discurso en estudiantes universitarios de primer ciclo

Claudia Fernández Silva

Universidad Nacional Arturo Jauretche. Instituto de Lingüística, UBA
claudiafernandez@filo.uba.ar

Abstract

Como docente de talleres de escritura en diferentes contextos educativos (pregrado, grado y postgrado), hemos podido constatar cierta dificultad de los estudiantes en constituirse como enunciadores de sus propios textos, sobre todo cuando se pasa de un yo narrativo (de experiencias personales), a un yo explicativo- argumentativo (de textos de otros autores). Se percibe una dificultad de anclaje del texto en una situación enunciativa concreta. Los textos parecen “flotar” en la hoja en blanco, y el profesor lector, un navegante a la deriva.

Según la teoría de la enunciación (Benveniste, Maingueneau, Ducrot, Kerbrat Orecchioni), el enunciador siempre deja huellas que muestran su relación con la enunciación y con el enunciado, al hacerse cargo de la organización del texto y hacer referencia al propio discurso, al asumir la responsabilidad del tema del que trata aunque sea con distintos grados de explicitud, al citar otras voces, y al establecer una relación con su alocutario. La inscripción de la persona en el discurso es un concepto clave porque articula la tensión subjetividad - objetividad en el discurso académico: el estudiante tiene que escribir un texto objetivo, científico, y a la vez, construir su propia voz. Además, a los estudiantes universitarios de los inicios se les suma en muchas ocasiones, el desconocimiento de los géneros académicos y un bajo dominio de la lengua formal académica.

Para estudiar cómo los estudiantes universitarios se apropian de la lengua y se inscriben como autores en sus propios discursos, seleccionamos una serie de 40 trabajos prácticos y de respuestas a exámenes y analizamos las marcas de enunciador en el enunciado. Para ello, consideramos, por un lado, las marcas de persona (primera persona, singular y plural), y las estrategias de desagentivación (se impersonal, estructuras impersonales, pasivas, nominalizaciones, infinitivos, gerundios), y por otro lado, las marcas de organización del discurso (marcadores discursivos) y las formas de cita (directa, indirecta y mixta, uso de comillas, referencias bibliográficas).

Creemos que conocer las particularidades del discurso académico es necesario para diseñar aplicaciones didácticas pertinentes. Confiamos en que los resultados obtenidos permitan formular sugerencias para la intervención didáctica.

Estrategias de posicionamiento en Derecho : comparación entre estudiantes y abogados en el género Demanda

Paulina Meza¹, Jadranka Gladic², Renato Valenzuela³
Universidad de La Serena, Chile¹, Pontificia Universidad Católica de Valparaíso,
Chile², Departamento Jurídico de la Ilustre Municipalidad de Quintero, Chile³.
pmeza@userena.cl¹, jadranka.gladic@pucv.cl², renato.alejandro.vp@gmail.com³

Abstract

Diversas investigaciones han dado cuenta de las dificultades que tienen los estudiantes universitarios al utilizar estrategias para posicionar su voz en el texto escrito (Hyland y Sancho-Guinda, 2012; Meza, 2013; Uccelli, Dobbs y Scott, 2013; Jiang, 2015; Meza y da Cunha, 2019; entre otros). Esta dificultad aumenta aún más en áreas altamente especializadas como Derecho. En este marco, los objetivos de esta investigación son: a) identificar las estrategias de posicionamiento utilizadas por estudiantes de Derecho y abogados titulados en el género jurídico Demanda; b) determinar la variación en el uso de estrategias de posicionamiento en el género jurídico Demanda entre estudiantes de Derecho y abogados titulados. Para ello, desarrollamos una investigación cualitativa con un enfoque de análisis inductivo-deductivo en paralelo (Tognini-Bonelli, 2001). El corpus de la investigación está constituido por 12 Demandas producidas por estudiantes de Derecho de dos universidades chilenas y 12 Demandas producidas por abogados titulados que se desempeñan en Chile. La elección de la Demanda obedece a que es el género más frecuente en el corpus de la investigación mayor en la que se enmarca este trabajo (Proyecto FONDECYT N°11170128). El análisis se realizó con apoyo del software Atlas.ti (v.7.5.18) e incluyó diversos procesos de validación. Los resultados centrales indican que existen diferencias entre estudiantes de Derecho y abogados titulados en el tipo, frecuencia y finalidad del uso de estrategias de posicionamiento en el género Demanda. Por tanto, el nivel de experiencia sería una variable que influye en el uso de dichas estrategias en el género analizado. Los resultados obtenidos confirman, además, que los autores no solo intentan participar en una comunidad discursiva, sino que también pretenden ser alguien en ella (Meza, 2018). Esta investigación puede ser un aporte para los interesados en la producción de géneros jurídicos, como también en la didáctica de la escritura jurídica.

References

- Hyland, K. & Sancho-Guinda, C. (Eds.) (2012). *Stance and Voice in Written Academic Genres*. Nueva York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Jiang, F. (2015). Nominal stance construction in L1 and L2 students' writing. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 20: 90-102.
- Meza, P. (2013). La Comunicación del Conocimiento en las Secciones de Tesis de Lingüística: Determinación de la Variación entre Grados Académicos. Tesis doctoral. Pontificia Universidad Católica de Valparaíso, Valparaíso, Chile.
- (2018). Estrategias de posicionamiento del autor en artículos de investigación de Ciencias Sociales, Humanidades e Ingeniería: Novatos versus Expertos. *Información tecnológica*, 29(2): 3-18.
- Meza, P. & da Cunha, I. (2019). Comunicación del conocimiento propio y relaciones discursivas en el género Tesis. *Sintagma*, 31: 103-130.
- Tognini-Bonelli, E. (2001). *Corpus linguistics at work*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Uccelli, P., Dobbs, C. & Scott, J. (2013). Mastering academic language: Organization and stance in the persuasive writing of high school students. *Written Communication*, 30(1): 36-62.

Apropiándose de las convenciones del discurso académico: el posicionamiento del autor y la interacción con el lector de universitarios de grado

Alba Naroa Romero¹, Manuela Álvarez²
IES Axular¹, Universidad de Deusto²
alromer@opendeusto.es¹, manuela.alvarez@deusto.es²

Abstract

El posicionamiento del autor y la interacción con los hipotéticos lectores son dos aspectos de las convenciones del discurso académico que los estudiantes universitarios deben aprender a lo largo de su trayectoria formativa. En este marco, este estudio se plantea los siguientes interrogantes: ¿cómo se sitúan y se posicionan en el texto los estudiantes universitarios de grado?, ¿cómo interactúan con los potenciales lectores?, ¿cómo construyen su voz como autores académicos a lo largo de los cuatro años de la titulación? y ¿hasta qué punto esa configuración está vinculada con el tipo de prácticas escritoras que realizan? Para dar respuesta a estos interrogantes, se asume la teorización del metadiscurso propuesta por Hyland que, entendiendo el discurso como un medio de acción social, analiza el texto desde su dimensión intertextual fijándose en las actitudes y el nivel de compromiso que muestra el autor y las interacciones que establece con el lector. El corpus se compone de 96 reseñas producidas *ad hoc* por los estudiantes de los cuatro cursos del grado en Lenguas Modernas (Universidad de Deusto) en el curso académico 2015/2016; y se complementa con 17 reseñas producidas también *ad hoc* en el curso 2018/2019 por los estudiantes de cuarto que estaban en primero en la anterior recogida, y que vienen a confirmar los resultados. Además, se toma en consideración la información recogida de las entrevistas a los 28 docentes del mismo grado acerca de las prácticas escritoras que les exigen a los estudiantes. Entre los resultados más destacados, por un lado, se constata la inconsistencia y escasa complejidad de los posicionamientos que realizan los estudiantes; y, por otro lado, un diálogo con el lector que está más próximo a la oralidad que a las especificidades del discurso académico escrito.

Referencias

- Alzari, I. (2012). La reseña como género de formación en la carrera de Historia. *V Congreso Internacional de Letras* (148-154). Buenos Aires: Facultad de Filosofía y Letras de la Universidad de Buenos Aires.
- Alzari, I., D'Alessandro, J. y Radiminski, M. (2014). La reseña de formación en historia. En F. Navarro, *Manual de escritura para carreras de humanidades* (pp. 287-302). Buenos Aires: Facultad de Filosofía y Letras de la Universidad de Buenos Aires.
- Bajtín, M. (1982). El problema de los géneros discursivos. En M. Bajtín, *Estética de la creación verbal* (pp. 248-293). México: Siglo XXI.
- Bathia, V. (2002). Applied genre analysis: a multi-perspective model. *Ibérica*, 4, 3-19.
- Camps, A. y Castelló, M. (2013). La escritura académica en la universidad. *REDU, Revista de docencia universitaria*, 11(1), 17-36.
- Hyland, K. (2005). *Metadiscourse*. Nueva York: Continuum.

- Hyland, K. (2007). *Disciplinary discourses: social interactions in academic writing*. Michigan: Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Llamas, C. (2014). Escribir en el contexto académico: conocimientos y estrategias. En I. Ballano e I. Muñoz, *Escribir en el contexto académico* (pp. 13-33). Bilbao: Universidad de Deusto.
- Swales, J. (1990). *Genre Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Swales, J. (2004). *Research genres: explorations and applications*. Cambridge: University of Cambridge.

La dialogicidad en el género de la tesis doctoral escrita en inglés y español en Medicina

David Sánchez-Jiménez⁴
CUNY, New York City College of Technology
dsanchezjimenez@citytech.cuny.edu

Abstract

Esta investigación presenta una perspectiva intercultural (español e inglés) en el ámbito de la escritura científica médica sobre la interacción que ocurre entre el escritor y la audiencia que recibe el texto. De modo más específico, se estudian las diferencias dialógicas que ocurren en las secciones de la Introducción, la Discusión y la Conclusión en el género de la tesis doctoral en Medicina desde el modelo metadiscursivo interpersonal propuesto por Hyland (2005a, 2005b, 2008). El corpus se compone de 30 textos, divididos en 15 tesis doctorales escritas en inglés y otras 15 en español. Se analizan los rasgos pragmatolingüísticos que contribuyen a la construcción y la negociación de las relaciones sociales en los textos científicos de la disciplina médica, los cuales inciden en la proyección del posicionamiento de la voz del autor en el escrito y el rol activo que mantiene en la comunicación mediante el uso estratégico de elementos atenuantes, intensificadores, marcadores de actitud, autorreferencias, pronombres personales, directivos, evidenciales y preguntas (Hyland, 2005a, 2005b). Los resultados del estudio señalan similitudes y diferencias evidentes entre la forma de usar estos recursos discursivos en las lenguas analizadas en el estudio.

References

- Hyland, K. (2005a). *Metadiscourse: Exploring Interaction in Writing*. Londres: Continuum.
— (2005b). Stance and engagement: A model of interaction in academic discourse. *Discourse Studies*, 7(2): 173-192.
— (2008). Disciplinary voices: interactions in research writing. *English Text Construction*, 1(1): 5-22.

⁴ El proyecto pudo ser realizado gracias a una beca otorgada por PSC-CUNY, en conjunción con The Professional Staff Congress y The City University of New York.

Resquicios autoriales: ¿Qué margen queda en textos con convenciones estilísticas muy restrictivas?

Authorial crevices: How much margin is left in texts with highly restrictive stylistic conventions?

Carmen Sancho Guinda
Universidad Politécnica de Madrid
carmen.sguinda@upm.es

Abstract

En esta ponencia, que presentaré de modo bilingüe, exploro las estrategias de posicionamiento adoptadas por mis estudiantes de la Universidad Politécnica de Madrid al describir procedimientos técnicos estándar, redactados en lengua inglesa y con un registro académico. La población objeto de estudio cursa el último año del Grado en Ingeniería Aeroespacial, y el género de la descripción procedimental, tradicionalmente escueto, impersonal y con una progresión esencialmente cronológica y tiempos verbales limitados, ha sido elegido por plantear todo un desafío para la identificación y producción de cualquier impronta autorial. Por sus características particulares, este género restringe muchos de los recursos que se emplearían en otros tipos de texto académico escrito menos sujetos a convenciones estilísticas (e.g. ensayos, diapositivas para presentaciones orales, preguntas de examen, e incluso informes).

Partiendo del modelo de metadiscurso de Hyland (2005) y con ayuda de las teorías del Posicionamiento (*Positioning Theory*) de Harré y Van Langenhove (1999) y de la Proximización (Cap, 2013), analizo lo que denomino *di(stance)* (Sancho Guinda, 2019); esto es, la toma de postura con respecto al mensaje y a la audiencia mediante la regulación de cuatro aspectos relacionados con la distancia figurada que puede establecer un escritor como parte de su “voz”: *formalidad, subjetividad, deferencia, y ubicación espaciotemporal*. Dichos aspectos dejan entrever los “roles” asumidos por los autores en la interacción con sus lectores. El corpus utilizado comprende 364 muestras, de las cuales 288 son de autoría individual y 76 resultado de tareas de escritura colaborativa. Los resultados preliminares parecen apuntar hacia la “usurpación” de los roles de experto y docente por parte de los estudiantes.

This communication, which I will present bilingually, explores the positioning strategies adopted by my students at the Universidad Politécnica de Madrid when describing technical standard procedures in academic English. The subjects under study are in their last year of Aerospace Engineering, and the textual genre chosen, traditionally concise, impersonal, chronologically structured and using a very limited range of verbal tenses, poses quite a challenge as to the identification and production of any authorial imprint. Due to its particular features, the procedural description genre restricts many of the resources usable in other written academic genres less constrained by stylistic conventions (e.g. essays, oral presentation slides, exam questions and even technical reports).

Taking Hyland’s (2005) metadiscourse model as point of departure and leaning on the theories of Positioning (Harré & van Langenhove, 1999) and Proximization (Cap, 2013), I analyse what I have come to term as *di(stance)* (Sancho Guinda, 2019); that is, the stance towards the message and the audience by means of the regulation of four aspects related with the symbolic distance writers may establish as part of their

‘voice’: *formality, subjectivity, deference and spatio-temporal location*. Such aspects give a glimpse of the ‘roles’ undertaken by authors in the interaction with their readers. The corpus used in this study comprises 364 samples, of which 288 are solo-authored and 76 result from collaborative writing tasks. Preliminary results suggest a ‘usurpation’ of expert and teacher roles by students.

References

- Cap, P. (2013). *Proximization: The Pragmatics of Symbolic Distance*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Harré, R. & van Langenhove, L. (Eds) (1999). *Positioning Theory: Moral Contexts of Intentional Action*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Hyland, K. (2005). *Metadiscourse: Exploring Interaction in Writing*. London: Continuum.
- Sancho Guinda, C. (2019). Networking Engagement in Professional Practices: Towards an Integrative View. In C. Sancho Guinda (Ed.) *Engagement in Professional Genres*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 1-26.

Theme panel 3: Epistemicity and Effectivity in Discourse

Convenor: Juana I. Marín Arrese, UCM.

Abstract

The multifaceted nature of stance, the expression of beliefs, attitudes or emotions, and the way we align or disalign with particular positions or information advanced by others in social interaction, has been addressed from diverse and often overlapping perspectives and frameworks, such as the work on stance (Biber & Finegan 1989; Biber 2015; Biber & Zhang 2018; Simaki, Paradis & Kerren 2019), affect (Ochs & Schieffelin 1989; Kärkkäinen & DuBois 2012), evaluation (Hunston & Thompson 2000; Thompson & Alba-Juez 2014; Breeze & Olza 2017), hedging (Hyland 1998), attitude and engagement (Martin & White 2005), stancetaking and dialogicality (DuBois 2007; Englebretson 2007), and the sociolinguistics of stance (Jaffe 2009).

This panel focuses on two distinct dimensions in the conception of stance and stancetaking strategies, epistemic stance and effective stance (Marín-Arrese 2011). The paper by Marta Carretero focuses on the expression of epistemic stance in discussion fora; Elena Domínguez and M^a Victoria Martín de la Rosa present a contrastive study on epistemic stance in newspaper and political discourse; Sergio Ferrer and Natalia Mora centre on effective stance in newspaper and political discourse; Anna Ruskan and Audronė Šolienė focus on epistemic and effective stance in Lithuanian political discourse, and Juana I. Marín Arrese discusses epistemic and effective stance in newspaper, political and scientific discourse. The papers in the panel present results within the research project STANCEDISC (Ref. PGC2018-095798-B-I00, Ministerio de Ciencia, Innovación y Universidades).

References

- Biber, D. (2015). Stance and grammatical complexity: an unlikely partnership discovered through corpus analysis. *Corpus Linguistics Research*, 1: 1–19.
- Biber, D. & Finegan, E. (1989). Styles of stance in English: Lexical and grammatical marking of evidentiality and affect. *Text*, 1: 93–124.
- Biber, D. & Zhang, M. (2018). Expressing evaluation without grammatical stance: informational persuasion on the web. *Corpora* 13 (1): 97–123.
- Breeze, R., & Olza, I. (Eds.) (2017). *Evaluation in Media Discourse*. Bern: Peter Lang.
- DuBois, J.W. (2007). The stance triangle. In R. Englebretson (Ed.), *Stancetaking in Discourse*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 139-182.
- Englebretson, R. (2007). Introduction. In R. Englebretson (Ed.), *Stancetaking in Discourse*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 1-26.
- Hart, C. (2011). Legitimising Assertions and the Logico-Rhetorical Module: Evidence and Epistemic Vigilance in Media Discourse on Immigration. *Discourse Studies*, 13 (6): 751-769.
- Hunston, S., & Thompson, G. (Eds.) (2000). *Evaluation in Text: Authorial Stance and the Construction of Discourse*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hyland, K. (1998). *Hedging in Scientific Research Articles*, Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Jaffe, A. (Ed.) (2009). *Stance: Sociolinguistic Perspectives*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kärkkäinen, E., & DuBois, J.W. (Eds.) (2012). *Stance, Affect, and Intersubjectivity in Interaction: Sequential and Dialogic Perspectives*. Special Issue. *Text & Talk*, 32(4).
- Marín-Arrese, J.I. (2011). Effective vs. Epistemic Stance and Subjectivity in Political Discourse: Legitimising Strategies and Mystification of Responsibility. In C. Hart (Ed.), *Critical Discourse Studies in Context and Cognition*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 193-223.
- Martin, J.R. & White, P.R.R. (2005). *The Language of Evaluation. Appraisal in English*. Basingstoke & New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

- Ochs, E., & Schieffelin, B. (1989). Language has a heart. In E. Ochs (Ed.), *The Pragmatics of Affect*, special issue of *Text*, 9: 7-25.
- Thompson, G. & Alba-Juez, L. (Eds.). (2014). *Evaluation in Context*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Simaki, V., Paradis, C., & Kerren, A. (2019). A two-step procedure to identify lexical elements of stance constructions in discourse from political blogs. *Corpora*, 14(3): 379-405.

The expression of epistemic stance in discussion fora in English

Marta Carretero
Universidad Complutense de Madrid
mcarrete@ucm.es

Abstract

This paper presents part of the results of the STANCEDISC project, aimed at the annotation and analysis of stance in five socio-cultural varieties of discourse. The paper focuses on epistemic stance and the subcorpus of internet discussion fora in English, which comprises 30 threads that address topics of social interest such as climate change, family, economy, education or cultural products (e.g. books and films), and totals approximately 100,000 words.

The approach to epistemic stance and the annotation procedure agrees with the procedure adopted in the STANCEDISC project, mainly based on Marín-Arrese (2011) and Boye (2012). Epistemic stance concerns the linguistic expression of justificatory support for the communicated proposition, and is divided into three subcategories: epistemic modality, which concerns the estimation of the chances for (or against) the truth of the proposition (Nuyts 2001; Carretero and Zamorano-Mansilla 2013); factivity, which pertains to the factual status of a proposition; and evidentiality, which concerns the kind or source of evidence that language users (claim to) have for or against the proposition (Willett 1988; Aikhenvald 2004; Wiemer and Stathi 2010; Boye 2012; Marín-Arrese 2013 *inter alia*). The three categories are divided into subcategories, based on subjectivity and degree of commitment in the case of epistemic modality and factuality, and on mode of access to evidence in the case of evidentiality (cf. Marín-Arrese 2011).

The discussion fora corpus will be subjected to a quantitative analysis of a wide range of epistemic expressions belonging to different categories and subcategories. The results will be discussed and compared to the results of similar research on another two socio-cultural varieties, namely opinion newspaper articles and political speeches. The differences may be interpreted as resulting from the higher degree of informality and less demanding nature of the internet discussion forum compared to the other varieties.

References

- Aikhenvald, A. Y. (2004). *Evidentiality*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Boye, K. (2012). *Epistemic Meaning: A Crosslinguistic and Functional-Cognitive Study*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Carretero, M. & Zamorano-Mansilla, J.R. (2013). Annotating English adverbials for the categories of epistemic modality and evidentiality. In J.I. Marín-Arrese, M. Carretero, J. Arús Hita & J. van der Auwera (Eds.) *English Modality: Core, Periphery and Evidentiality*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. 317-355.
- Marín-Arrese, J. I. (2011). Effective vs. epistemic stance and subjectivity in political discourse: Legitimising strategies and mystification of responsibility. In C. Hart (Ed.) *Critical Discourse Studies in Context and Cognition*. Amsterdam: Benjamins. 193-224.
- Marín Arrese, J. I. (2013). Stancetaking and Inter/Subjectivity in the Iraq Inquiry: Blair vs. Brown. In J.I. Marín-Arrese, M. Carretero, J. Arús Hita & J. van der Auwera (Eds.) *English Modality: Core, Periphery and Evidentiality*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. 411-445.
- Nuyts, J. (2001). *Epistemic Modality, Language and Conceptualization: A Cognitive-Pragmatic Perspective*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

- Wiemer, B. & Stathi, K. (2010). The database of evidential markers in European languages. A bird's eye view of the conception of the database (the template and problems hidden beneath it). *STUF* 63 (4): 275-289.
- Willett, T. (1988). A cross-linguistic survey of the grammaticalization of evidentiality. *Studies in Language* 12: 51-97.

Epistemic stance and the expression of ideology in newspaper opinion articles and political speeches: an English-Spanish contrastive study

Elena Domínguez Romero¹, Victoria Martín de la Rosa²
Universidad Complutense de Madrid^{1,2}
elenadominguez@filol.ucm.es¹, mvmartin@ucm.es²

Abstract

This paper focuses on one subtype of stance, namely the epistemic, which includes those linguistic devices used to provide justificatory support for the proposition (Marín-Arrese 2011a, 2011b; Boye 2012). Epistemic stance comprises the two categories that constitute the general domain of epistemicity: epistemic modality and evidentiality (Chafe & Nichols 1986; Willett 1988; Aikhenvald 2004; Wiemer and Stathi 2010; Boye 2012; Marín-Arrese 2013; *inter alia*).

We aim to determine the similarities and differences in the distribution and use of the epistemic stance realisations found in newspaper and political discourse from an English-Spanish contrastive perspective. Additionally, the study looks into the extent to which these linguistic realisations may reflect similarities and differences in the expression of ideology in these discourse domains and genres. Pursuing this line, one of our guiding questions will be to determine, first, how the parameter of ideology is linguistically encoded in opinion newspaper articles and political speeches, and, second, whether ideology is invoked differently in English and Spanish as a culture-specific issue.

The paper sets forth an English-Spanish contrastive analysis of epistemic stance carried out on a 400,000-word corpus comprising two socio-cultural varieties of discourse, namely opinion newspaper articles and political speeches, differing in language and ideological orientation.

We expect results to shed light on the expression of epistemic stance in English and Spanish newspaper opinion articles and political speeches based on linguistic and ideological similarities and differences.

References

- Aikhenvald, A.Y. (2004). *Evidentiality*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Boye, K. (2012). *Epistemic Meaning: A Crosslinguistic and Functional-Cognitive Study*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Chafe, W.L., & Nichols, J. (Eds.) (1986). *Evidentiality: The Linguistic Coding of Epistemology*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Marín-Arrese, J.I. (2011a). Effective vs. Epistemic stance and subjectivity in political discourse: Legitimising strategies and mystification of responsibility. In C. Hart (Ed.) *Critical Discourse Studies in Context and Cognition*. Benjamins: Amsterdam. 193-224.
- Marín-Arrese, Juana I. (2011b). Epistemic legitimising strategies, commitment and accountability in discourse. *Discourse Studies* 13 (6): 789-797.
- Marín-Arrese, J. I. (2013). Stancetaking and inter-subjectivity in the Iraq Inquiry. Blair vs. Brown. In J.I. Marín-Arrese, M. Carretero, J. Arús Hita & J. van der Auwera (Eds.) *English Modality Core, Periphery and Evidentiality*. Mouton De Gruyter: Berlin & New York. 411-445.
- Wiemer, B. & Stathi, K. (2010). The database of evidential markers in European languages. A bird's eye view of the conception of the database (the template and problems hidden beneath it). *STUF - Language Typology and Universals Sprachtypologie und Universalienforschung*, 63 (4): 275-289.
- Willett, P. (1988). Recent trends in hierarchical document clustering. *Information Processing and Management* 24 (5): 577-597.

An English-Spanish contrastive analysis of effective stance in newspaper and political discourse

Sergio Ferrer Navas¹, Natalia Mora López²
Universidad Complutense de Madrid^{1,2}
sferrer@ucm.es¹, nataliamora@ucm.es²

Abstract

The aim of this paper is to determine the similarities and differences in the distribution and use of the effective stance realisations found in newspaper and political discourse from an English-Spanish contrastive perspective. Additionally, the study does also look into the extent to which these linguistic realisations may also reflect discourse strategies specific to these discourse domains and genres. The corpus collected consists of opinion columns from newspapers of both centre-left (*The Guardian* and *El País*) and centre-right (*The Times* and *ABC*), and political speeches of politicians from the Conservative Party and Partido Popular (PP), on the one hand, and the Labour Party and Partido Socialista Obrero Español (PSOE), on the other hand. With an even distribution of about 50,000 words from each domain and language, the complete corpus analysed consists of about 400,000 words. The corpus was annotated manually and classified into several categories inside Effective Stance, namely deonticity, directivity, intentionality, normativity and potentiality (cf. Marín-Arrese 2011), which cover the different cases where speakers position themselves with respect to the realisation of events and try to determine or influence the course of reality itself (Langacker 2013). Expected results include a higher amount of effective stance expressions in political discourse in comparison to press discourse, although a similar use of effectivity is expected with respect to ideological positioning and language.

References

- Langacker, R. W. (2013). Modals: Striving for control. In J.I. Marín-Arrese, M. Carretero, J. Arús & J. van der Auwera, (Eds.) *English Modality: Core, Periphery and Evidentiality*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. 3-55.
- Marín Arrese, J. (2011). Effective vs. epistemic stance and subjectivity in political discourse: Legitimising strategies and mystification of responsibility. In C. Hart (Ed.) *Critical Discourse Studies in Context and Cognition*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 193-224.

The expression of epistemic and effective stance in journalistic and political discourse

Juana I. Marín Arrese
Universidad Complutense de Madrid
juana@filol.ucm.es

Abstract

This paper brings together work on epistemicity and effectivity (Marín-Arrese 2011), and on stance strategies in the discourse (Englebretson 2007; DuBois 2007). From a critical discourse perspective, it has been argued that stance resources serve the strategic functions of legitimisation and coercion (Chilton 2004; Hart 2011; Marín-Arrese 2011).

The paper draws on a model for the analysis of stancetaking in discourse on the basis of two macro categories of stance, the epistemic and the effective (Marín-Arrese 2011). Epistemic stance pertains to speaker/writer's striving for control of conceptions of reality (Langacker 2013), which involves the expression of their estimation of the veracity of the event designated and the likelihood of its realization, and/or their specification of the sources whereby they feel entitled to make an assertion (Marín-Arrese 2011, 2015), thus providing justificatory support for a proposition (Boye 2012). Effective stance strategies are aimed at controlling hearers/readers' acceptance of action plans and events, and exert a direct persuasive function by claiming the obligation, intention or commitment to carry out those actions, or by arguing in favour of their desirability, normativity or requirement, or their feasibility (Marín-Arrese 2011). The interplay of epistemic and effective expressions of dialogical positioning serve the joint strategic purposes of legitimation of knowledge and of action goals (Marín-Arrese 2011, 2015).

The paper addresses the following research issues: variation in the deployment of epistemic and effective stance markers in newspaper and political discourse, and how they encode or index features of (inter)subjectivity in these discourse domains (Nuyts 2012). It is hypothesized that the expression of epistemicity and effectivity will vary in the two discourse domains, as will the writers' expression of (inter)subjectivity in these types of discourse.

The paper presents a contrastive corpus study on the use of stance expressions in political speeches, Conservative vs. Labour, as representatives of centre-right and centre-left ideologies, and in opinion columns of both right-wing and left-wing leanings, *The Guardian* and *The Times*. Variation is expected across discourse domains due to differences in the presence of the authorial voice in the text and to the different styles of persuasion. Variation is also expected within each discourse domain, as a result of ideological differences which permeate the styles of persuasion.

References

- Boye, K. (2012). *Epistemic Meaning: A Crosslinguistic and Functional-Cognitive Study*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Chilton, P. (2004). *Analysing Political Discourse*. London: Routledge.
- DuBois, J.W. (2007). The stance triangle. In Englebretson, R. (Ed.) *Stancetaking in Discourse*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 139-182.

- Englebretson, R. (2007). Introduction. In R. Englebretson (Ed.), *Stancetaking in Discourse*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 1-26.
- Hart, C. (2011). Legitimising assertions and the logico-rhetorical module: Evidence and epistemic vigilance in media discourse on immigration. *Discourse Studies*, 13 (6): 751-769.
- Langacker, R.W. (2013). Modals: Striving for control. In J.I. Marín-Arrese, M. Carretero, J. Arús, & J. van der Auwera (Eds.) *English Modality: Core, Periphery and Evidentiality*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. 3-55.
- Marín Arrese, J.I. (2011). Effective vs. epistemic stance and subjectivity in political discourse: Legitimising strategies and mystification of responsibility. In C. Hart (Ed.) *Critical Discourse Studies in Context and Cognition*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 193-223.
- Marín Arrese, J.I. (2015). Epistemic legitimisation and inter/subjectivity in the discourse of parliamentary and public inquiries: A contrastive case study. *Critical Discourse Studies*, 12 (3): 261-278.
- Nuyts, J. (2012). Notions of (inter)subjectivity. *English Text Construction*, 5 (1): 53-76.

Realizations of epistemicity and effectivity in Lithuanian political discourse

Anna Ruskan¹, Audronė Šolienė²
Vilnius University^{1,2}
anna.ruskan@flf.vu.lt¹, audrone.soliene@flf.vu.lt

Abstract

Much attention has been devoted to the realizations of epistemicity and effectivity in English and Spanish journalistic and political discourse (Hidalgo-Downing 2006; Marín-Arrese 2006, 2009, 2011, 2015). The present study aims to explore the expression of epistemicity and effectivity in Lithuanian political discourse by comparing the distribution of epistemic and effective stance markers in the speeches of right-wing and left-wing Lithuanian politicians.

Drawing on the framework for epistemicity and effectivity developed by Marín-Arrese (2011), the study focuses on modal verbs, complement-taking predicates (CTPs) and adverbials. Epistemicity is realized by markers of epistemic modality, evidentiality and factivity, whereas effectivity is expressed by predicates and modal verbs denoting obligation, requirements, desirability, and intentionality. The study provides the frequencies of the epistemic and effective stance markers and their (inter)subjective functions in the political speeches of right-wing and left-wing Lithuanian politicians. The data have been drawn from the self-compiled corpus of political speeches containing about 100,000 words. The speeches were collected in the years 2009-2019.

The preliminary results show that both right-wing and left-wing Lithuanian politicians tend to employ markers of epistemicity expressing degrees of the author's epistemic commitment (high, medium, low), cognitive attitude (e.g. *manau* 'I think'), inferences based on perceptual or conceptual evidence (e.g. *matyt* 'evidently', *akivaizdu* 'evident'), reports (e.g. *sako* 'they say') and reality/actuality comments (e.g. *tiesa* 'in fact') as well as markers of effectivity denoting deonticity and possibility (e.g. *būtina* 'necessary', *galima* 'possible'). In their speeches, politicians do not only express the assessment of the factuality and sources of knowledge of the proposition (epistemicity) or actualization of the events (effectivity) but also engage the addressee into a dialogue and thus display the intersubjective dimension of stance taking (Marín-Arrese 2011). The present study adds to research into epistemic and effective stance markers in political discourse across languages and cultures (Marín-Arrese 2009; 2011; Hidalgo-Downing & Hanawi 2017).

References

- Hidalgo-Downing, L. (2006). The expression of writer stance by modal adjectives and adverbs in comparable corpus of English and Spanish newspaper discourse. In A. M. Hornero, M. J. Luzón, and S. Murillo (Eds.) *Corpus Linguistics: Applications for the Study of English*. Bern, Berlin: Peter Lang. 125–140.
- Hidalgo-Downing, L. & Hanawi, Y. (2017). Bush and Obama's addresses to the Arab World: Recontextualizing stance in political discourse. In K. Aijmer & D. Lewis (Eds.) *Contrastive Analysis of Discourse-pragmatic Aspects of Linguistic Genres*. Switzerland: Springer International Publishing. 187–209.

- Marín-Arrese, J. I. (2006). Epistemic stance and commitment in the discourse of fact and opinion in English and Spanish: A comparable corpus study. In A. M. Hornero, M. J. Luzón, and S. Murillo (Eds.) *Corpus Linguistics: Applications for the Study of English*. Bern, Berlin: Peter Lang. 141–157.
- Marín-Arrese, J. I. (2009). Effective vs. epistemic stance, and subjectivity/intersubjectivity in political discourse: A case study. In A. Tsangalidis & R. Facchinetti (Eds.) *Studies on English Modality. In Honour of Frank Palmer*. Berlin, New York: Peter Lang. 23–52.
- Marín-Arrese, J. I. (2011). Epistemic legitimizing strategies, commitment and accountability in discourse. *Discourse Studies*, 13 (6): 789–797.
- Marín-Arrese, J. I. (2015). Epistemicity and stance: a cross-linguistic study of epistemic stance strategies in journalistic discourse in English and Spanish. *Discourse Studies*, 17 (2): 210–225.

Theme Session 4: Stance, Evaluation and Metaphor in Discourse

Convenor: Laura Hidalgo Downing, UAM.

Abstract

In this theme specific panel, we present the results of the analysis of evaluative stance and metaphor across discourse types, as developed within an ongoing funded research project on stance (see Marín-Arrese & Hidalgo-Downing 2019). Over the last two years, our work has focused on the definitions of the evaluative stance categories, the development of a procedure for the identification and annotation of the categories in different discourse types and the annotation and analysis of the categories in five corpora (scientific discourse, political discourse, press, fora and advertising discourse). In our current development of the model, evaluation and metaphor are categories which contribute to the expression of stance (Marín-Arrese and Hidalgo-Downing 2019). With regard to the way in which we address the concept of evaluative stance, we use the terms ‘evaluation’ and ‘evaluative stance’ as a subcategory of stance which is inspired in the definitions of Evaluation by Thompson and Alba-Juez (2014), of Attitude in Martin and White (2005), and of evaluation as a function of language related to persuasion as social practice in CDA and in (Critical) Discourse Approaches to Conceptual Metaphor Theory (Charteris-Black 2004, 2006; Koller 2014; van Leeuwen 2008; van Dijk 1998). Following views on stance as a process which involves both an act of positioning and an act of evaluation (see Du Bois 2008), more specifically, of social actors and events (see Marín-Arrese 2011, 2015), we define evaluative stance as a discursive macro-strategy which expresses a speaker’s or writer’s positioning towards a topic while at the same time expressing an evaluation of social actors and events related to the topic in question. Within the dimension of evaluation, we focus on the identification of those strategies which express evaluation by means of classifying, predicational and attitudinal strategies and metaphoric and non-metaphoric evaluation. We also analyze the value, positive, negative or other, which arises in the evaluative stance taking act.

In a previous stage of the present research project (see Hidalgo-Downing *et al.* 2019; Maiz-Arévalo *et al.* 2019) we annotated and analysed the frequency and distribution of evaluative stance categories in samples of corpora from scientific discourse, fora on social issues and advertising discourse. In the present stage our objectives are the following: (1) To present the refined and revised annotation procedure and classification of stance categories; (2) to present the results of the frequency, distribution and analysis of our evaluative stance categories in the complete corpora of five discourse types: political discourse, scientific discourse, press, fora and advertising discourse. We expect to find differences in the frequency and distribution of evaluative stance categories across the different discourse types. In this sense, our study on evaluative stance aims to contribute to current research in this area by showing how choices related to evaluative stance strategies can be said to be related to the communicative purpose, persuasive practices and the genre specific conventions which govern the different discourse types.

References

- Charteris-Black, J. (2004). *Corpus Approaches to Critical Metaphor Analysis*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Hidalgo-Downing, L. (2015). Grammar and evaluation. In C. A. Chapelle (Ed.) *The Encyclopedia of Applied Linguistics*. Oxford: Wiley. Online publication.
- Hidalgo-Downing, L., Filardo-Llamas L., Pérez-Sobrino, P., & Williams-Camus, J. (2019). Evaluation across discourse domains. Metaphorical uses in advertising, fora and scientific discourses. Paper presented at the *43rd AEDEAN Conference* held at the University of Alicante. November 13.
- Koller, V. (2014). Applying social cognition research to critical discourse studies. The case of collective identities. In C. Hart & P. Cap (Eds.) *Contemporary critical discourse studies*, London: Bloomsbury. 147-166.
- Maíz-Arévalo, C., Núñez-Perucha, B. & Sánchez-Moya, A. (2019). Evaluation and attitude across discourse domains: Advertising, fora and scientific discourses. Paper presented at the *43rd AEDEAN Conference* held at the University of Alicante. November 13.
- Marín-Arrese, J. (2011). Effective vs. epistemic stance and subjectivity in political discourse: Legitimising strategies and mystification of responsibility. In C. Hart (Ed.) *Critical Discourse Studies in Context and Cognition*. Amsterdam: Benjamins. 193-224.
- Marín Arrese, J. (2015). Epistemic legitimisation and inter/subjectivity in the discourse of parliamentary and public inquiries: A contrastive case study. *Critical Discourse Studies* 12 (3): 261-278.
- Marín-Arrese, J. & Hidalgo-Downing, L. (2019). Stancetaking in discourses: epistemicity, effectivity, evaluation”. Paper presented at the *43rd AEDEAN Conference* held at the University of Alicante. November 13.
- Martin, J.R. & White, P. (2005). *The Language of Evaluation. Appraisal in English*. New York: Palgrave.
- Thompson, G. & Alba-Juez, L. (2014) The many faces and phases of evaluation. In G. Thompson & L. Alba-Juez (Eds.), *Evaluation in Context*. Amsterdam, NLD: John Benjamins Publishing Company. 3-23.
- Van Dijk, T.A. (1998). *Ideology: A Multidisciplinary Approach*. Sage Publications.
- van Leeuwen, T. (2008). *Discourse and Practice: New Tools for Critical Discourse Analysis*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

***'I know, he has a voletrousered air.'* Stance, Evaluation and Metaphor in a corpus of British Political Discourse**

Laura Filardo-Llamas
University of Valladolid
laura.filardo@uva.es

Abstract

Following recent studies (Berlin 2020; Spencer-Bennett 2018) on stance and politics, this paper aims at analysing the linguistic mechanisms which are arguably typically found in Political Discourse (PD) to express a politician's stance, or positioning, towards something. PD has been widely described in the literature as a strategy resource aimed at achieving political goals (Thompson & Hunston 2000). This attempt to modify people's perceptions and social action is related to the two main functions performed by political discourse: interaction and representation (Chilton 2004; Chilton & Schäffner 1997; Filardo-Llamas & Boyd 2018), which are, in turn, related to the use of both referential and evaluative strategies (Hart 2010).

Although much work has been done in Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) and Political Discourse Analysis (PDA) in relation to specific evaluation strategies, like metaphor (Hart 2008; Charteris-Black 2005, 2019, among others) or the analysis of epistemic and effective stance (Marín-Arrese 2015), no comprehensive analysis has focused on the study of how different evaluative strategies (Thompson & Hunston 2000; Marín-Arrese & Hidalgo-Downing 2019) are used in this type of text. In this paper, both a quantitative and qualitative approach are followed in order to identify the most frequent evaluative strategies – be them lexical, grammatical or metaphorical – that are used in PD. This will be tested in a corpus of contemporary British PD built ad hoc for the purpose of this research. This work is framed within an on-going research project (Marín-Arrese & Hidalgo-Downing 2019) aimed at developing a comprehensive model for the study of stance across genres. In this paper, the model for the analysis of evaluative stance will be tested in PD bearing in mind not only the general principles of the model, but also the specific features of PD. Hence, the study will not only seek to assess quantitatively the kind of categories that are most frequently used, but will also try to explain the evaluative function of the identified categories in relation to the representation and interaction functions of PD.

References

- Berlin, L. N. (2020). *Positioning and Stance in Political Discourse: The Individual, the Party, and the Party Line*. Wilmington: Vernon Press.
- Charteris-Black, J. (2005). *Politicians and Rhetoric: The Persuasive Power of Metaphor*. Basingtoke: Palgrave.
- Charteris-Black, J. (2019). *Metaphors of Brexit: No Cherries on the Cake?* Basingtoke: Palgrave.
- Chilton, P. (2004). *Analysing Political Discourse: Theory and Practice*. London: Routledge.
- Chilton, P. & Schäffner, C. (1997). Discourse and politics. In T. A. van Dijk (Ed.) *Discourse as Social Interaction*, Vol. 2. London: SAGE. 206-230.
- Filardo-Llamas, L. & Boyd, M. (2018). Critical Discourse Analysis and Politics. In J. Richardson & J. Flowerdew (Eds.) *The Routledge Handbook of Critical Discourse Studies*. London: Routledge. 312-327.
- Hart, C. (2008). Critical discourse analysis and metaphor: toward a theoretical framework, *Critical Discourse Studies*, 5:2: 91-106.

- Hart, C. (2010). *Critical Discourse Analysis and Cognitive Science: New Perspectives on Immigration Discourse*. Basingtoke: Palgrave.
- Marín Arrese, J. (2015). Epistemic legitimisation and inter/subjectivity in the discourse of parliamentary and public inquiries: A contrastive case study. *Critical Discourse Studies* 12 (3): 261-278.
- Marín-Arrese, J. & Hidalgo-Downing, L. (2019). Stancetaking in discourses: epistemicity, effectivity, evaluation”. Paper presented at the *43rd AEDEAN Conference* held at the University of Alicante. November 13.
- Spencer-Bennet, J. (2018). *Politics of Language*. London: Routledge.
- Thompson, G. & Hunston, S. (2000). Evaluation: An introduction. In Hunston, S. & G. Thompson (Eds.) *Evaluation in Text: Authorial Stance and the Construction of Discourse*. Oxford: OUP. 1-26.

Towards a model of evaluative stance and metaphor in discourse: analyzing evaluation in a corpus of British newspaper discourse

Laura Hidalgo-Downing
Universidad Autónoma de Madrid
laura.hidalgo@uam.es

Abstract

The present paper presents the model of Evaluative stance and metaphor developed within the UCM STANCEDISC project (Marín-Arrese & Hidalgo-Downing 2019) and applies this model to the study of the categories in a corpus of British newspaper discourse. In previous studies of stance in newspaper and political discourse, I have addressed the study of markers of epistemic and deontic modality (Hidalgo-Downing 2004; Hidalgo-Downing & Núñez-Perucha 2013; Hidalgo-Downing & Hanawi 2017; Marín-Arrese, Hidalgo-Downing & Molina 2004). In the present study, I focus on evaluative stance and metaphor from a Critical Discourse Analysis perspective (van Dijk 1998; van Leeuwen 2008). Following Marín-Arrese (2011, 2013), the point of departure of the present study is the assumption that repeated stance patterns produced by individual and collective groups of speakers or writers may be indexical of specific social and cultural identities. From this, it follows that an examination of the choices of markers of evaluative stance may allow us to explore what these choices reveal regarding the shaping of social identities and, more specifically, the ideological positionings of different newspapers. For this purpose, two comparable corpora of opinion articles from the British newspapers *The Times* (50,592 words) and *The Guardian* (50,601 words) were collected. The objectives are the following: (1) to identify and compare the frequency and distribution of the categories of Evaluative stance and metaphor in the two newspapers; (2) to discuss the preferences for specific categories in each of the newspapers, and (3) to discuss how the different choices contribute to the shaping of specific identities and ideologies in the two newspapers. Differences in the frequency and distribution of markers of evaluative stance are expected, more specifically, that evaluative stance markers will be used more frequently in the conservative newspaper *The Times*.

References

- Hidalgo-Downing, L. (2004). Non-verbal markers of modality and evidentiality and the expression of writer stance in a comparable corpus of English and Spanish editorials and news articles. In J. Marín Arrese (Ed.) *Perspectives on Evidentiality and Modality*. Madrid: Editorial Complutense. 205-222.
- Hidalgo-Downing, L. & Núñez-Perucha, B. (2013). Modality and personal pronouns as indexical markers of stance: Intersubjective positioning and construction of public identity in media interviews. In J.I. Marín-Arrese, M. Carretero, J. Arús & J. van der Auwera (Eds.) *English Modality: Core, periphery and Evidentiality*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. 379-410.
- Hidalgo-Downing, L. & Hanawi, Y. (2017). Bush and Obama's addresses to the Arab World: Recontextualizing stance in political discourse. In K. Aijmer & D. Lewis (Eds.) *Contrastive Analysis of Discourse-pragmatic Aspects of Linguistic Genres*. Switzerland: Springer International Publishing. 187-209.
- Marín-Arrese, J.I. (2011). Effective vs. epistemic stance and subjectivity in political discourse: Legitimising strategies and mystification of responsibility. In C. Hart (Ed.) *Critical Discourse Studies in Context and Cognition*. Amsterdam: Benjamins. 193-224.
- Marín-Arrese, J.I. (2013). Stancetaking and Inter-subjectivity in the Iraq Inquiry. Blair vs. Brown. In J.I. Marín Arrese, M. Carretero, J. Arús & J. van der Auwera (Eds.) *English Modality: Core, Periphery and Evidentiality*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. 411-445.

- Marín-Arrese, J.I, Hidalgo-Downing, L. & Molina, Silvia. (2004) Evidential, epistemic and deontic modality in English and Spanish: The expression of writer stance in newspaper discourse. In R. Facchinetti & F. Palmer (Eds.) *English Modality in Perspective. Genre Analysis and Contrastive Studies*. Frankfurt: Peter Lang. 121-139.
- Marín-Arrese, J. & Hidalgo-Downing, L. (2019). Stancetaking in Discourses: Epistemicity, Effectivity, Evaluation. Paper presented at the *43rd AEDEAN Conference* held at the University of Alicante. November 13.
- Van Dijk, T.A. (1998). *Ideology: A Multidisciplinary Approach*. Sage Publications.
- van Leeuwen, T. (2008). *Discourse and Practice: New Tools for Critical Discourse Analysis*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Sunken Ships and Screaming Banshees: Metaphor and Evaluation in Film Reviews

Matteo Fuoli¹, Jeannette Littlemore², Sarah Turner³
University of Birmingham¹, University of Birmingham², Coventry University³
m.fuoli@bham.ac.uk¹, j.m.littlemore@bham.ac.uk², sarah.turner@coventry.ac.uk³

Abstract

It has been suggested that evaluation is often expressed by metaphor, and that metaphor often performs some sort of evaluative function (Simon-Vandenberg *et al.*, 2003: 237). In Systemic Functional Linguistics, metaphor is considered as a resource for expressing evaluative meanings covertly rather than explicitly (e.g. Liu 2018; Martin & Rose 2007), and Martin & White's (2005) Appraisal framework treats metaphor as one of the fundamental strategies for invoking evaluation and includes a dedicated category for it, i.e. provoked appraisal. However, there have been few empirical studies of the extent to which metaphor performs evaluation or indeed of the extent to which evaluation is performed by metaphor. Moreover, little is known about the extent to which a metaphor needs to be creative in order to perform an evaluative function, or whether there are differences according to the type of evaluation, such as its degree of explicitness and its polarity.

In order to investigate these issues, 94 film reviews from the Internet Movie Database (IMDB) were annotated for creative and conventional metaphor, and for positive and negative, inscribed and invoked evaluation. Overlaps between the different annotation categories were analysed in order to answer four research questions:

1. Is metaphor more likely to be used to convey invoked or explicit evaluation?
2. Is it the case that creative metaphors are more likely to perform evaluative functions than conventional metaphors?
3. Is metaphor more likely to be used to convey negative or positive evaluation?
4. Are there any interactions between these relationships?

Metaphor was found to be involved in 36.21% of the cases where evaluation was being expressed. Furthermore, 49.98% of the metaphors performed an evaluative function. Creative metaphors were significantly more likely to perform an evaluative function than conventional metaphors. Metaphorical evaluation was found to be significantly more negative than non-metaphorical evaluation. Creative metaphors and conventional metaphors behave similarly when performing evaluative functions, with both performing slightly more negative than positive evaluation. When metaphor is being used evaluatively, even though both creative and conventional metaphors are used more frequently to perform inscribed evaluation, the tendency towards inscribed evaluation is significantly stronger for conventional metaphors than for creative metaphors. For creative metaphors, the behaviour is more balanced.

These findings help us to understand the different communicative resources that people draw on when expressing different kinds of evaluation. They also provide insights into how metaphor functions in communication, and how and why people use language creatively in everyday contexts.

References

- Liu, F. (2018). Lexical metaphor as affiliative bond in newspaper editorials: A systemic functional linguistics perspective. *Functional Linguistics*, 5(1), 2.
- Martin, J. R., & White, P. R. (2005). *Appraisal in English. The Language of Evaluation*. Hampshire & New York: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Martin, J., & Rose, D. (2007). Interacting with text: The role of dialogue in learning to read and write. *Foreign Languages in China*, 4(5): 66–80.
- Simon-Vandenberg, A.-M., Taverniers, M., & Ravelli, L. J. (2003). *Grammatical Metaphor: Views from Systemic Functional Linguistics*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing.

‘Histrionic, appalling, a major turkey’: the expression of evaluative stance in the discourse of online forums

Carmen Maíz-Arévalo¹, Alfonso Sánchez- Moya²
Universidad Complutense de Madrid¹, Harvard University²
cmaizare@ucm.es, asanchezmoya@fas.harvard.edu²

Abstract

This paper aims to explore the discursive mechanisms in which evaluative stance is instantiated in the discourse of online forums. In contrast to the discursive manifestations around different text types, such as press or advertising, certain affordances of online contexts allow users to discuss diverse topics and the social actors involved therein. Digital communication is characterised, *inter alia*, by the possibility of user anonymisation, a de-centralised dialogicity among participants and the lack to perceive any type of censorship when sharing personal opinions and judgments (Janssen & Kies 2005; Morrow 2006; Boyd & Ellison 2007). Undoubtedly, these features have an impact on the specific ways in which evaluative stance is transmitted. Previous research has examined the multiple possibilities through which Internet users engage in the expression of digital stance. In fact, evaluative discourse has been investigated in a wide array of online practices and speech acts (Page 2012; Maíz-Arévalo and García-Gómez 2013; Drasovean and Tagg 2015). However, the main objective of this paper is to provide a contrastive analysis in the light of the model for the expression of stance we are currently developing (Marín-Arrese and Hidalgo-Downing 2019; Maíz-Arévalo *et al.* 2019), in which both evaluation and metaphor play a central role. To this end, this paper relies on a 100,000-word dataset of forum posts collected from publicly available online spaces which deal with a plethora of social issues, ranging from discussions on gay marriage to climate change. Findings present the frequency, distribution and analysis of evaluative strategies in discourse of forums and offer a comparative approach resulting from the application of the annotation system developed for these purposes. Broadly speaking, in line with related research (Cooper *et al.* 2019; Jaki *et al.* 2019) and in line with results from earlier stages of this project (Maíz-Arévalo *et al.* 2019), the expression of stance in the online forum threads under scrutiny is predominantly instantiated through negative evaluation.

References

- Boyd, D. M., & Ellison, N. B. (2007). Social network sites: Definition, history, and scholarship. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 13(1): 210-230.
- Cooper, T., Stavros, C. & Dobeles, A.R. (2019). Domains of influence: exploring negative sentiment in social media. *Journal of Product & Brand Management*, 28(5): 684-699.
- Drasovean, A., & Tagg, C. (2015). Evaluative language and its solidarity-building role on TED. com: an appraisal and corpus analysis. *Language@ Internet*, 12.
- Janssen, D., & Kies, R. (2005). Online forums and deliberative democracy. *Acta política*, 40(3): 317-335.
- Jaki, S., De Smedt, T., Gwózdź, M., Panchal, R., Rossa, A., & De Pauw, G. (2019). Online hatred of women in the Incels. me forum: Linguistic analysis and automatic detection. *Journal of Language Aggression and Conflict*, 7(2): 240-268.
- Maíz-Arévalo, C., & García-Gómez, A. (2013). ‘You look terrific!’ Social evaluation and relationships in online compliments. *Discourse Studies*, 15(6): 735-760.
- Maíz Arévalo, C., Núñez Perucha, B. & Sánchez Moya, A. (2019). Evaluation and attitude across discourse domains: Advertising, fora and scientific discourses. Paper presented at the 43rd AEDEAN Conference held at the University of Alicante. November 13.

- Marín-Arrese, J. & Hidalgo-Downing, L. (2019). Stancetaking in Discourses: Epistemicity, Effectivity, Evaluation. Paper presented at the 43rd AEDEAN Conference held at the University of Alicante. November 13.
- Morrow, P. R. (2006). Telling about problems and giving advice in an Internet discussion forum: Some discourse features. *Discourse Studies*, 8(4): 531-548.
- Page, R. E. (2012). *Stories and Social Media: Identities and Interaction*. London: Routledge.

Evaluation, metaphor and gender in advertising discourse: a comparative study

Begoña Núñez-Perucha
Universidad Complutense de Madrid
begonia@filol.ucm.es

Abstract

This presentation examines the expression of evaluation in three sets of contemporary adverts of perfumes, beauty and convenience products. Drawing on the model of evaluative stance developed as part of the STANCEDISC Project (Marín Arrese & Hidalgo Downing 2019), this paper elaborates on previous work carried out by the author (see Maíz et al. 2019) by addressing the following research questions: i) how is the evaluation of social actors and entities expressed by means of discursive strategies and metaphoric or non-metaphoric choices? ii) what similarities and differences are found across advertising sub-genres?, and, iii) how does evaluation differ across gender categories?. In order to answer these questions, twenty contemporary popular adverts containing text and image were collected for each set of commodities using Google Search and the website “Advertising Archives”; in the case of perfumes and beauty, where gender was relevant, 10 adverts were gathered for each gender category. The evaluative strategies were first identified and manually tagged according to their type (classifying, predicational, attitudinal and metaphoric/non-metaphoric) and to the meaning conveyed (positive, negative or neutral). Second, the frequency of each strategy was examined using the MonoConc Programme. The results show that predicational and positive evaluative expressions were by far the most frequent ones in the three sets. Linguistic differences emerged primarily in the adjectival forms whereby predicational strategies were realised and in the use of metaphoric expressions. For instance, comparative and superlative forms were only present in convenience and female beauty advertising. Further, the percentage of metaphoric expressions was higher in perfume advertising. In terms of metaphors, differences were also found in the source domains invoked in each subcorpus. Whereas perfume and beauty adverts showed a higher use of container and war metaphors, though unevenly distributed across genders, convenience adverts displayed more personification metaphors. As a result, the three sets of adverts rely on a similar use of non-metaphoric evaluative strategies to emphasise the positive and novel qualities of the product, as expected in advertising discourse, but differ in the use of metaphoric evaluation, which either seems to reinforce traditional gender stereotypes, as in perfume adverts, or to highlight the product uniqueness, as is the case of convenience advertising.

References

- Maíz Arévalo, C., Núñez Perucha, B., & Sánchez Moya, A. (2019). Evaluation and attitude across discourse domains: Advertising, fora and scientific discourses. Paper presented at the 43rd AEDEAN Conference held at the University of Alicante. November 13.
- Marín-Arrese, J. and Hidalgo-Downing, L. (2019). Stancetaking in Discourses: Epistemicity, Effectivity, Evaluation. Paper presented at the 43rd AEDEAN held at the University of Alicante. November 13.

Multimodal metaphor as a tool for evaluation in creative advertising

Paula Pérez Sobrino
University of La Rioja
paula.perezs@unirioja.es

Abstract

In this presentation, we analyse the role of multimodal metaphor - a metaphorical mapping at the intersection of text and picture (Forceville 2009: 34) - as a tool for evaluation in advertising. In advertising, a number of features (usually borrowed from a different domain) are mapped onto a product or service. Whereas it has been traditionally assumed that advertising portrays a positive image of the promoted product by evoking a well-connoted scenario, recent creative trends have also shown the persuasive potential of constructing negative narratives in advertising. In order to address the relationship between metaphor and evaluation (positive and negative) a corpus of 109 creative advertisements (65 in English and 44 in Spanish) was collected from the online database Ads of the World (www.adsoftheworld.com). Three broad categories of products/services were targeted: beauty, cars and watches. All the advertisements were annotated for metaphor (following the step-by-step process laid out in Pérez-Sobrino 2017) and for positive and negative evaluation. Additional figurative meaning-making strategies (such as metonymy, irony, and hyperbole) were also annotated. Overall, we observed that there was a higher incidence of metaphor for positive evaluation (44 adverts) than for negative (13 adverts). More specifically, this trend was stronger for car advertisements (30 out of 39 advertisements) than for beauty and watches, where positive evaluation was more likely to be conveyed through other types of figurative language, especially through metonymy in the case of watches, where the advert highlights the attributes of the celebrity wearing the promoted watch, and hyperbole enhancing the effects of beauty products.

References

- Forceville, C. J. (2009). Non-verbal and multimodal metaphor in a cognitivist framework: Agendas for research. In C. J. Forceville & E. Urios-Aparisi (Eds.) *Multimodal Metaphor*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company. 19-44.
- Pérez-Sobrino, P. (2017). *Multimodal metaphor and metonymy in advertising*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Evaluative stance in science popularizations in the English press

Julia T. Williams Camus
Universidad de Cantabria
williamsj@unican.es

Abstract

Contrary to the canonical view of popularisation, which considered the role of journalists as mere translators of scientific “facts” for the lay public, current approaches generally acknowledge a much more active role played by journalists in the reporting of science in the press. In fact, popularisation is best regarded as a recontextualisation of knowledge, which has been previously constructed in specialised contexts, and is recreated in another communicative situation for a different audience and with different purposes (Calsamiglia & van Dijk, 2004). In the new context, the role of the resulting piece is not only to transmit scientific information, but also to entertain and to inform the public of both the relevance and value of a given scientific achievement to their lives (Fahnestock 1986; Radford 2009). In this way, press popularisation articles cannot be regarded as completely neutral accounts of scientific achievements and a degree of evaluation on the part of the writer can be expected in these texts. In fact, previous discourse-oriented studies on science popularisation articles indicate that evaluation is achieved through a number of linguistic strategies such as attribution of source (Elorza & Pérez-Veneros, 2014) and use of metaphor (Williams Camus 2016). As part of a broader project investigating evaluative stance categories in five different discourse domains, this presentation reports on some preliminary research on the role of evaluative stance and metaphor in a comparable corpus of science popularisation articles. The corpus, which was drawn from the English press, namely *The Guardian* (57,760) and *The Times* (52,026), includes articles reporting on scientific advances. The corpus was analysed to identify the evaluative expressions which were tagged for function (classifying, predicational or attitudinal), grammatical category (noun phrase, adjective phrase, adverb phrase), metaphoricity, and value (positive or negative). The study addresses the following research questions: 1) What is the most frequent category used for evaluation? 2) Is there a preference for metaphorical or non-metaphorical evaluative language? 3) Do the evaluative strategies used by the two newspapers point towards a specific ideological positioning?

References

- Calsamiglia, H. & van Dijk, T. (2004). Popularization discourse and knowledge about the genome. *Discourse and Society*, 15(4): 369–389.
- Elorza, I. & Pérez-Veneros, M. (2014). Constructing stance by means of attribution: How is the ‘space for evaluation’ filled in science popularization articles in English? In D. Glynn & M. Sjölin (Eds.) *Subjectivity and Epistemicity. Corpus, Discourse and Literary Approaches to Stance*. Lund: Lund University Press. 281-301.
- Fahnestock, J. (1986). Accommodating science: The rhetorical life of scientific facts. *Written Communication*, 3(3): 330–350.
- Radford, T. (2009). A workbench view of science communication and metaphor. In B. Nerlich, R. Elliott & B. Larson (Eds.) *Communicating Biological Sciences. Ethical and Metaphorical Dimensions*. Surrey: Ashgate. 145–152.
- Williams Camus, Julia T. (2016). Get the metaphor right! Cancer treatment metaphors in the English and Spanish press. *ALFINGE*, 28: 109-138.

Posters

Semantic values and contextual meanings in performative evaluations: effects on the stance

Gaetano Natale Battaglia,
Universidad Pompeu Fabra
gaetanonatale.battaglia@upf.edu

Abstract

In this survey, we define as performative a mental act of evaluation of a state of affairs performed with speaker commitment. We attribute to the notion of performativity a gradual nature that helps us distinguish between deontic values, related to the level of acceptability or moral necessity and considered performatives, and directives values with accentuated characteristics of descriptivity. The performative and attitudinal character represents the property suitable for circumscribe the semantic field of the attitudinal qualifying categories identified by Nuyts (2001a, 2006), Nuyts *et al.* (2010), namely the inferential evidentiality, the epistemic modality and the deontic modality. That kind of performative evaluations characterizes the stance of the conceptualizing subject, defined as his particular point of view or his positioning in the discourse that reflects his attitudes, evaluations and knowledge regarding an event or proposition, placing in an epistemic or effective level (Langacker 2009, Marín Arrese 2011a).

The linguistic resources used to perform the stance include modal, evidential, attitudinal and evaluative expressions. Especially, we analyze propositional attitude verbs and modal auxiliaries used in the comments on opinion columns in Spanish to explore to what extent the primary semantic values of each class of verbs and to what extent the contextual items are determining factors in the formation of effective meaning and in the consequent classification as a type of stance. We apply an analysis scheme based on five criteria related to the source and on two others corresponding with the characteristics of the evaluation. The results show how the source of the attitude (Depraetere & Verhulst 2008, Depraetere and Reed 2011) represents an enlightening factor for the explanation of the meaning of the verbal form and the characterization of the stance in terms of the level of performativity and the degree of speaker involvement (Cornillie, 2017).

References

- Cornillie, B. (2017). On speaker commitment and speaker involvement. Evidence from evidentials in Spanish talk-in-interaction. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 128: 161-170.
- Depraetere, I. & Reed, S. (2011). Towards a more explicit taxonomy of root possibility. *English Language and Linguistics*, 15 (1): 1-29.
- Depraetere, I. & Verhulst, A. (2008). Source of modality: a reassessment. *English Language and Linguistics*, 12 (1): 1-25.
- Langacker, R. W. (2009). *Investigations in Cognitive Grammar*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

- Marín-Arrese, J.I. (2011a). Effective vs. epistemic stance and subjectivity in political discourse: Legitimising strategies and mystification of responsibility. In C. Hart (Ed.) *Critical Discourse Studies in Context and Cognition*. Amsterdam: Benjamins. 193-224.
- Nuyts, J. (2001a). *Epistemic Modality, Language, and Conceptualization: a Cognitive-pragmatic perspective*. (*Human Cognitive Processing* 5). Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Nuyts, J. (2006). Modality: overview and linguistic issues. In W. Frawley (Ed.) *The Expression of Modality (The Expression of Cognitive Categories)*. Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter. 1-26.
- Nuyts, J., Byloo, P., Diepeveen, J. (2010). On deontic modality, directivity, and mood: the case of Dutch *mogen* and *moeten*. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 42 (1): 16–34.

The problem of subjectivity and standing in news discourse

Viktoryia Chalahayeva
Minsk State Linguistic University
viviviminsk@gmail.com

Abstract

The requirement of journalism to be unbiased and factually accurate is traditionally problematic. The prevailing view of modern media discourse is that journalists should convey news as objectively and dispassionately as possible. However, this supposition is argued claiming that such a required truthful news reporting conflicts with the separation of facts and personal opinion which are indispensable of rendering news or story telling.

This abstract aims at making an attempt to 1) distinguish such terms as subjectivity and stance; 2) to examine stancing in modern news discourse. In the course of research we put forward the following research questions: 1) Is stancing indispensable of modern news discourse?; 2) How are the terms subjectivity and stance interconnected and distinguished? The methods of research include componential, contextual and comparative methods.

Some linguists do not distinguish the terms subjectivity and stancing defining both as personal perspectives, feelings, or opinion. In our turn, we do separate them. In Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary subjectivity is defined as an attitude, idea or supposition caused by a feeling. In regard with its definition, subjectivity is connected and related to feelings or an emotional sphere of a sender /receptient. Thus, any piece of news can be identified as objective (Coronaviruses are a group of related RNA viruses) or subjective (Death rate from coronavirus is shocking) (Pozzi 2016). Therefore, we follow the idea that a piece of news is apt to subjectivity only on condition that it employs lexemes related to feelings or emotions.

Let's have a closer look at the linguistic nature of the term stancing. Following the definition of D. Perrin we understand stancing as «the practice of taking and encoding a particular position. On a practical level stancing results in using or omitting specific linguistic or semiotic means such as markers or reported speech» (Perrin, 2012). We agree with the idea of F. Harbers that journalist's 'self' is anyway presented in news reporting through the filters of personal experience, moral judgment, individual reporter's prior knowledge, values, convictions, etc. (Harbers; Broesma, 2014).

Even the practice of quoting the source of information in news discourse could be perceived as stancing on a macro level as journalists (media managers, chief editors) prefer one source to others, select the necessary quotation among speech flow and offer it to a target audience to arouse particular emotions and feedback as well as generate value in information market. Therefore, stance extends beyond linguistic means and might be identified on meta, macro, meso and micro levels.

In conclusion, we can't but admit that stance is indispensable of news discourse and is reflected on each level on news processing (collecting, choosing, editing, presenting a piece of news). A characteristic feature of modern journalism is presenting facts through author's 'self', though it may not influence factual accuracy.

References

- Hornby, A. S. (1995). *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary of Current English* / A. S. Hornby ; Ed. J. Crowther. – 9th ed. – Oxford : Oxford University Press.
- Harbers, F., & Broersma, M (2014). Between engagement and ironic ambiguity: Mediating subjectivity in narrative journalism . *Journalism*, Vol. 15 (5): 639–654.
- Perrin, D. (2012). Stancing: strategies of entextualizing stance in newswriting. *Discourse, Context and Media*, Vol. 1, 2/3. 135–147.
- Pozzi, F.A, Fersini, E. & Liu, B. (2016). *Sentiment Analysis in Social Networks*. Amsterdam: Morgan Kauffman.

A Muslim odyssey – subjectivity in news articles on Arabs and Muslims

Irene Elmerot
Stockholm University
irene.elmerot@slav.su.se

Abstract

When 30 years of data from any discourse are analysed together, the trends shown can help us better understand a society at large. The timespan of this presentation covers the first democratic 30 years of a Central European country after the fall of the Soviet-led communism. Three dimensions of discourse (Fairclough 2015: 58–59) are deployed to get a picture of how mainstream news press over time describe others than the majority – out-groups described by in-groups (e.g. van Dijk 1987: 12). The studied data is extracted from the Czech Subjectivity Lexicon (Veselovská, Hajič, & Šindlerová, 2014), combined with a sub-corpus of newspapers from the Czech National Corpus (www.korpus.cz). The Lexicon's 773 adjectives are combined with 68 nouns for Arab and majority Muslim nationalities and countries. Their co-occurrences in the sub-corpus are then analysed within a theoretical framework about inequalities and social power being reproduced in the media institutions, but often in an opaque way (Fairclough, 2011: 54; Fidler 2016: 38).

Research questions:

- Are the 68 nouns for Arabs and Muslims mainly modified by negative or positive adjectives in the dataset, compared to the reference group of 1 928 humans and countries in general?
- Are there fluctuations over time, and if so, do they reflect any of four contemporary conflicts involving muslims and their countries?

The results show both that there is a difference between how Arab and Muslim countries are depicted compared to persons, and that there is a clearly distinguishable difference between these persons and the reference persons of the material. The conflicts in Bosnia and Syria, as well as the Intifadas of Palestine, are clearly distinguished in the studied news. It is also clear how the word “muslim” – especially in eventful times – is used for all kinds of muslim others, instead of their national origin.

The focus on Czech Republic – a part of Europe that has often been described as the bridge between east and west – may add insights into the linguistic othering of a Central European member of the European Union, but the methodology may also be used in any country where a similar corpus already exists or can be created.

References

- Fairclough, N. (2011). *Media Discourse*. Bloomsbury Academic.
Fairclough, N. (2015). *Language and Power* (Third Edition). Routledge.
Fidler, M. (2016). The Others in the Czech Republic: Their image and their languages. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 238 : 37–58.

- van Dijk, T. A. (1987). *Communicating racism: Ethnic prejudice in thought and talk*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Veselovská, K., Hajič, J., & Šindlerová, J. (2014). Subjectivity lexicon for Czech: Implementation and improvements. *Journal for Language and Computational Linguistics*, 29(1): 47–61.

Metaphor and disease: the use of metaphor in patients' narratives from a double linguistic approach

Jennifer Moreno Moreno
Universitat Jaume I
moreno.jen@hotmail.com

Abstract

In the medical context, the need to humanise clinical methods and strengthen professional relationships between patients and doctors has led to the emergence of writing as a new way to complement conventional therapies to foster patient-centred attention. Such approach has been called Narrative-based medicine and it includes narratives written by patients, health professionals or even people whose relatives are suffering from a certain disease.

However, although writing can be a useful tool to anyone who wishes to express feelings and emotions while facing a difficult situation, when referring to disease, it is worth to mention its role when patients become authors; writing can help them to express how a certain disease afflicts them giving, thus, voice to pain in what is known as patients' narratives.

From a multilingual perspective, is important to highlight how linguistic and cultural differences can have an impact on how we face a situation and the way we express it, which may be reflected as well in the way we write. Such idea can be seen, for example, in Lakoff and Johnson's work published in 1980, *Metaphors We Live By*, where the conceptual metaphor theory proposes that the use of metaphors depends on the speaker's perception of the world.

Since both the Spanish and German languages and cultures are very different, it has been assumed that such differences would be reflected on the way patients use metaphors. Therefore, the aim of the present paper is to draw the main connection and deviation points between Spanish and German narratives, for which a small corpus has been compiled in order to offer a general view of the main metaphors used by patients in each language when talking about their disease.

References

- Lakoff, G. & Johnson, M. (1987 / 2003 Second edition). *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Narrative based Medicine. Dialogue and Discourse in Clinical Practice. London: BMJ Books, 1998.
- Shannon, M.T (2011). Giving Pain a Voice: Narrative Medicine in the Doctor-Patient Relationship. *Journal of General Internal Medicine*.
- Robertson, C., & Clegg, G. (2017). *Storytelling in Medicine. How Narrative can Improve Practice*. NewYork: Taylor & Francis Group.
- Semino, E. (2008) *Metaphor in Discourse*. Cambridge University Press.