

## ENDNOTE

SUSAN HUNSTON  
UNIVERSITY OF BIRMINGHAM

The question of how communities of individuals form opinions and how they are influenced by what they read and hear is a key issue of our time. Whether the topic is belief in a political message or acceptance of a vaccine, and whether the source of information is the press, live speeches, or social media, how the public is informed and influenced is a crucial question. It is a political question (are voters informed, persuaded or manipulated) and a commercial one (which products do consumers trust), and the answer is based on the study of language.

The studies in this issue elucidate how discourse strategies are used to persuade individuals and communities to adopt particular views of the world. Each paper addresses a specific topic and gives detailed information about how issues such as economic inequality (Incelli), or international trade (Bowker), or scientific malpractice (Nikitina), are constructed in discourse. The papers also, however, advance discussions about the integration of a variety of approaches to the study of argument and attitude and exemplify how the combined approaches might be applied in specific contexts.

As the papers in this issue demonstrate, the interest in how language influences opinion goes back as far as Aristotle (see Bowker); Aristotle's insight into how speakers achieve influence rested then, as with researchers today, on the categorisation of strategies (into *logos*, *ethos* and *pathos*). The most obvious heirs of Aristotle's concerns are proponents of argumentation theory (see Bowker and Degano), who similarly categorise, and assess the effectiveness of, strategies of argument. Substantial contributions to the discussion from Linguistics had to wait for the recognition that language is a social, meaning-based phenomenon – a social semiotic in Halliday's words – as well as a mental one. Halliday's theory of language explicates how language both reflects and constructs our understanding of the social and physical world (Halliday 1978; 1994). He modelled the systems of resources available to a language community as a whole, showed the intersection of those systems with context in the theory of register, and demonstrated the consequences of language choices in individual texts. Halliday's theory of Systemic-Functional Linguistics provided a framework for Critical Discourse

Analysis, providing a mechanism for connecting the lexico-grammatical features of individual texts with the ideology, values and assumptions of societies and communities (Fowler 1991; Fairclough 1995).

Most of the papers in this issue make use of corpus linguistics, either as the main methodology used (e.g. Tessuto) or alongside other methods (e.g. Prosperi Porta). Both quantitative and qualitative aspects of corpus linguistics are used. Quantitative corpus studies indicate the statistical salience of words or categories of words in sets of texts. For example, Prosperi Porta identifies the most significantly frequent nouns in a corpus of Annual Reports issued by Europol. She shows how these nouns collectively present a particular impression of the organisation. Incelli quantifies the collocates of the word *inequality* in UK news reporting, again demonstrating that these reflect the preoccupations and assumptions of the newspapers concerned. Qualitative work reveals typicality and variation in patterning. Tessuto, for example, obtains instances of *we* and *our* (or ‘self-mention’) in academic texts, and notes that they are used with a limited set of rhetorical functions, such as stating a research goal or implying positive evaluation of a research procedure. Of particular importance to the papers in this issue is the role of corpus studies in identifying attitude in text. This is both a quantitative process, where the frequency of markers of stance are compared across corpora (e.g. Tessuto), and a qualitative one, where the gradual accumulation of attitudinal meaning is observed through concordance lines (e.g. Degano).

A key feature of most of the papers in the issue is that they articulate a dialogue between approaches. Tessuto’s paper is based on both quantitative and qualitative Corpus Linguistics in the study of metadiscourse. The papers by Bowker and by Degano integrate Corpus Linguistics and argumentation theory. Those by Prosperi Porta and by Incelli combine Corpus Linguistics with Critical Discourse Analysis. Nikitina’s paper uses the Appraisal framework from Systemic-Functional Linguistics along with Corpus Linguistics. The papers by Mottura and by Moschini explore concepts of intertextuality and genre that are crucial to the complementarity of corpus and discourse. In terms of the topics covered, the papers focus on the politics of the international community (Prosperi Porta; Bowker), national politics (Degano, Incelli, Mottura), science and society (Nikitina), social media (Moschini), and academic discourse (Tessuto).

Each of the papers in this issue offers an independent response to the challenge of identifying persuasiveness in emerging discourses. Although each makes a unique contribution to the whole, some overall messages emerge. I shall focus on three here.

The first and most obvious point is the mutual enrichment of corpus and other approaches to the study of persuasion. The practice of using corpus methods to support Critical Discourse Analysis is well established (Baker

2006), as is the use of corpora in the study of appraisal (O'Donnell 2014), stance (Conrad, Biber 2000; Hyland 2005) and evaluation (Hunston 2011). Both are well illustrated in this collection.

Bowker articulates the debate between approaches most explicitly. She contrasts argumentation theory, which operates at a relatively high level of abstraction, and linguistics, which identifies markers of stance. Comparing texts on the same topic from three genres (legal treaty drafts, Wikileaks, and Friends of the Earth International), she uses corpus-based semantic profiling as a starting point for the analysis of argumentation patterns. Degano similarly bases her study of UK newspaper articles about the 2016 EU referendum on argumentation theory, using frequent lexis to identify recurring arguments or topoi. Incelli adopts the observation by van Dijk (1994) that micro-phenomena such as linguistic choices are integral to social macro-phenomena such as inequality. She uses an exploratory, sometimes 'serendipitous', corpus-based methodology to identify the argumentation strategy of concede-counter pairs and the manipulation of statistical data. Nikitina links corpus searches with the Appraisal framework (Martin and White 2005) in comparing broadsheet and tabloid newspapers and news reporting with editorials. From normalised word frequency she notes that tabloids are most likely to cite evaluative comments and that editorials are most like to employ concur-counter patterns. Prosperi Porta examines lexical frequency in a corpus of reports by a Europe-wide law enforcement agency to support her argument that the reports discursively construe the agency as a collaborative, expert organisation that works effectively to protect citizens. In all these papers, corpus techniques such as finding frequent words, phrases and collocations permit large amounts of text to be processed. They also encourage the recognition of patterns that might remain hidden if the data were not investigated in this way. Corpus methodologies thus provide evidence for conclusions drawn about the discourses under investigation and lead to new conclusions.

Secondly, the issue illustrates the value of different methods and approaches within corpus linguistics itself. Many of the papers combine quantitative and qualitative techniques, but there is considerable variation within them. Tessuto's paper builds on the corpus tradition of comparison between corpora. He calculates the frequency of a set of lexical resources that express interactional metadiscourse (Hyland 2005) in corpora of empirical research articles taken from Law and Economics. Information about the proportional frequencies of the different categories of metadiscourse and the frequency of their different exponents is used to argue that these disciplines are similar to one another and that both draw on a natural sciences model to construct persuasive rhetoric. This in turn implies the primacy of natural science research methods even in a social science context. In contrast,

Mottura traces a phrase that was introduced into the constitution of the People's Republic of China in 2018 – translated as ‘the defining feature of socialism with Chinese characteristics’ – through a multi-genre corpus including newspaper articles from 2013-19. A quantitative point is made, as the phrase is shown to increase dramatically in frequency up to 2018. However, Mottura's main point is to establish a sequential chain of texts and a dialogue between genres, which links ‘socialism with Chinese characteristics’ to ‘leadership of the Communist Party’. She demonstrates how an interlocking chain of statements prepares the ground for the new wording of the constitution. Moschini's paper sets a single 6,000 word text known as the Facebook ‘manifesto’ in its generic context. By discussing this text in relation to others she goes beyond the individual instance to argue for the ‘neo-Puritanism’ of social media. Like Mottura, Moschini emphasises the importance of intertextuality and multiglossia in the construction of a persuasive message.

This use of corpora to trace the development of an idea through intertextuality and the replication of a small chunk of text is somewhat in the tradition of Teubert's (2010) highly qualitative approach to corpora as discourse, which places emphasis on the integrity of each constituent text and its unique context. Like Teubert, Mottura demonstrates how meaning accrues to a phrase based on all the contexts in which it is used. The contrast between Tessuto and Mottura is not simply between quantitative and qualitative emphases but between different ideas of what a corpus is. For Tessuto (and Hyland), a corpus is a ‘bag of texts’; corpus software manipulates the data, for example in concordance lines or word frequency lists, removing each instance from its original context. For Mottura (and Teubert), a corpus is an ordered chain of texts, each of which maintains its integrity as a text.

The final point to be made about this collection of papers is the opportunity it affords for reflection on the issue of interdisciplinarity. This is because most of the papers have an element of ‘meta-disciplinarity’ about them, as they discuss the task of combining theories, methods and approaches to achieve the most valuable account of the data. Two of the papers at the workshop at which the papers in this issue were presented (Hunston 2019, Sarangi 2019) focused on interdisciplinary research. Sarangi examined the importance, benefits and challenges of interdisciplinary research. He discussed models that seek to account for variation in how disciplines related to one another. A key point of his paper was the difficulty of achieving equality between disciplines when it is common for one discipline to subsume or exploit another. The papers in this issue demonstrate the possibility of complementarity rather than competition; they illustrate the potential ‘non-duality’ of interdisciplinary research, where there is no ‘better’ and ‘worse’ approach. This means partly that theories and methods from

different research perspectives can be combined. It also means that different accounts of the same data – a ‘corpus’ account, an ‘argumentation’ account, and an ‘appraisal’ account, for example – can be held to be equal in truth and in value, so that insights from each can be obtained. As Klein (2008) among others has noted, interdisciplinary research is often collaborative. The papers in this issue demonstrate the value of a single researcher drawing on and respecting a range of models and methods.

## References

- Baker P. 2006, *Using Corpora in Discourse Analysis*, Continuum, London.
- Conrad S., Biber D. 2000, *Adverbial marking of stance in speech and writing*, in Hunston S., Thompson G. (eds.), *Evaluation in Text: authorial stance and the construction of discourse*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, pp. 57-73.
- Fairclough N. 1995, *Critical Discourse Analysis: The Critical Study of Language*, Longman, London.
- Fowler R. 1991, *Language in the News*, Routledge, London.
- Halliday M.A.K. 1978, *Language as Social Semiotic: the social interpretation of language and meaning*, Edward Arnold, London.
- Halliday M.A.K. 1994 [1985], *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*, Second Edition. Edward Arnold, London.
- Hunston S. 2011, *Corpus Approaches to Evaluation: phraseology and evaluative language*, Routledge, London.
- Hunston S. 2019, Plenary paper “Researching Interdisciplinary Discourse” presented at the PRIN Colloquium, *Exploring the discursive creation of argumentation and ideology in evolving specialized knowledge Domains*, Faculty of Economics, Sapienza University of Rome, 13-14 June, Rome.
- Hyland K. 2005, *Stance and Engagement: A Model of Interaction in Academic Discourse*, in “Discourse Studies” 7 [2], pp. 173-192.
- Klein J.T. 2008, *Evaluation of interdisciplinary and transdisciplinary research: A Literature Review*, in “American Journal of Preventive Medicine” 35 [2S], pp. 116-123.
- Martin J.R., White P.R.R. 2005, *The Language of Evaluation: Appraisal in English*, Palgrave, London.
- O’Donnell M. 2014, *Exploring identity through Appraisal Analysis: a corpus annotation methodology*, in “Linguistic and the Human Sciences” 9 [1], pp. 95-116.
- Sarangi S. 2019, Plenary paper “The ‘holy grail’ of interdisciplinarity: Challenges in negotiating ‘interpretive repertoires’ and sustaining ‘communities of interest’” presented at the PRIN Colloquium, *Exploring the discursive creation of argumentation and ideology in evolving specialized knowledge Domains*, Faculty of Economics, Sapienza University of Rome, 13-14 June, Rome.
- Teubert W. 2010, *Meaning, Discourse and Society*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Van Dijk T.A. 1994, *Discourse and Inequality* in “Lenguas Modernas” 21, pp.19-37.