Foreword

This volume brings together a series of chapters which illustrate the research aims and the work of the group *'Discourse and Communication in English: Cognitive and Functional Perspectives'* (DISCOM-COGFUNC). The group was created and validated positively in the 2004 call for research group proposals GR201/04. From 2005 the group has been awarded funding in the various calls for research proposals of the Programme for the Creation and Consolidation of Research Groups UCM-CAM. At present the group is one of the consolidated research groups at the UCM, and in 2018 was evaluated as Excellent by the Spanish *Agencia Estatal de Investigación* (AEI). From the initial stages of the *Campus de Excelencia Internacional-Moncloa*, the group has formed part as a member of the Cultural Patrimony Cluster.

The purpose of the group DISCOM-COGFUNC (930160) is the description, analysis and interpretation, and ultimately the explanation of diverse phenomena in the discourse from different theoretical perspectives (Cognitive Linguistics, Functional Linguistics, Critical Discourse Studies, Multimodal Discourse Analysis) and methodologies (Corpus Linguistics, Contrastive Linguistics), with special attention to diverse socio-cultural issues (Interculturality, Gender, and others). The aim is to study the various modes, resources and strategies of communication and representation through which we create meaning and we communicate it, very often in an indirect way, or through ambiguous or opaque forms or expressions, and which may be an effective means of producing and reproducing particular ideologies, and using various types of (de)legitimisation strategies in discourse domains and genres as diverse as the discourse of advertising, political and journalistic discourse, or the discourse of social media.

The objective of the volume is the transfer of knowledge and dissemination of the research carried out by the members of the group concerning the relation between language, discourse and society and its application in the teaching-learning process. The volume contains a series of practical proposals to analyse diverse forms of discourses and texts in English from various perspectives. The volume is divided in three parts. Section

I focuses on the analysis of various discourse domains and genres and includes four chapters: the expression of stance in political and journalistic discourse, the persuasive use of metaphors in journalistic discourse, and the analysis and teaching of persuasive resources in informational-persuasive discourse. Section II focuses on the analysis of digital and multimodal discourses and includes four chapters: online fora on gender violence, persuasion in the discourse of tourism and the exploitation of gender stereotypes in advertising campaigns, and im/politeness in digital communication. Finally, Section III looks at various software tools, which may be applied to the analysis of both digital and non-digital discourses. In sum the volume aims to familiarize the reader with various theoretical perspectives, Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA), Critical Metaphor Analysis (CMA), the study of persuasion in discourse, Forensic linguistics, and Im/politeness strategies in communication, among others. The volume has a marked didactic approach, in that it illustrates the above issues through practical activities based on authentic language use in English in a wide variety of discourses and texts. It is thus particularly relevant to those readers and students who initially approach the field of discourse analysis in English.

Carmen Maíz Arévalo & Juana I. Marín Arrese
Research group *'Discourse and Communication in English: Cognitive and Functional Perspectives'* (DISCOM-COGFUNC). (Ref. 930160). <https://www.ucm.es/discom-cogfunc/>
Department of English Studies: Linguistics and Literature
Universidad Complutense de Madrid

Section i

Discourse domains & genres

Exploring stance and identity construction in political discourse

Juana I. Marín-Arrese

1. Introduction

This chapter explores the use of epistemic and effective stance expressions as legitimisation strategies and in identity construction in political discourse. The multifaceted nature of stance, the expression of beliefs, evaluations or value judgements, attitudes or emotions, or 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), *affect* and *emotion* (Ochs & Schieffelin 1989; DuBois & Kärkkäinen 2012), *evaluation* (Thompson & Hunston 2000; Thompson & Alba-Juez 2014), *attitude* and *engagement* (Martin & White 2005), *stance-taking* and *dialogicality* (DuBois 2007; Englebretson 2007), and the sociolinguistics of stance (Jaffe 2009).

Biber & Finnegan (1989: 92) define stance as "the lexical and grammatical expression of attitudes, feelings, judgments, or commitments concerning the propositional content of a message". Ochs (1990: 2) considers stance a fundamental dimension of culture and has characterized the notion as "a socially recognized disposition that includes both epistemic stance: a socially recognized way of knowing a proposition, such as direct (experiential) and indirect (e.g., second hand) knowledge, degrees of certainty and specificity; and affective stance: a socially recognized feeling, attitude, mood or degree of emotional intensity".

According to Englebretson (2007: 17), stance can be subdivided into the following categories: evaluation (value judgements, assessments and attitudes), affect (personal feelings), and epistemicity (commitment). For his part, DuBois (2007: 163) describes stance in the following terms: "Stance is a public act by a social actor, achieved dialogically through overt

11

communicative means, of simultaneously evaluating objects, positioning subjects (self and others), and aligning with other subjects, with respect to any salient dimension of the sociocultural field".

In characterising the domain of stance, two macro categories of stance are posited: the **epistemic** and the **effective** (Marín-Arrese 2011, 2013, 2015, 2021a, 2021b). These two categories draw on Langacker's (2008) distinction between the epistemic and the effective level in the grammar. As Langacker (2009: 291) notes, "Epistemic relations are those which hold at the level of knowledge, and thus involve conceptions of reality. By contrast, effective relations hold at the level of reality per se". In terms of the discourse these categories reflect the systematic opposition between striving for control of conceptions of reality and striving for control of relations at the level of reality (Langacker 2013).

2. Epistemic Stance

Epistemic stance pertains to **control of conceptions of reality** (Langacker 2009; 2013). Speakers will strive for '**epistemic control**' in the discourse, by providing '**justificatory support**' ('epistemic support' & 'epistemic justification', Boye 2012: 2-3) for their assertions or claims, in order to legitimise the truth or validity of the communicated information, and overcome hearers' cognitive mechanisms for epistemic vigilance (Sperber et al. 2010; Hart 2011; Marín-Arrese 2011). Speaker/writer's striving for control of conceptions of reality involves 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, 2013, 2015).

Stance resources comprise a variety of lexico-grammatical elements or 'devices' which "overtly express an evaluative frame for some other proposition" (Biber et al. 1999: 967). The conceptual domain of epistemicity, as Boye (2012: 2-3) consistently argues, comprises the "subcategories evidentiality and epistemic modality". Epistemic modality has been defined in the literature in terms of speaker's degree of certainty or degree of commitment concerning the proposition, or as Boye (2012: 21) argues, the degree of "epistemic support" for a proposition. Evidentials have been characterized as primarily indicating the source of information (Aikhenvald 2004), and the evidence on the basis of which the speaker feels entitled to make a claim (Anderson 1986), or as "epistemic justification" for the proposition (Boye 2012: 2-3).

Within epistemic stance resources we also include verbs of mental state or cognitive attitude, which indicate speakers/writers' reflective attitudes

or beliefs regarding the described event (Cappelli 2007), and cognitive factive predicates, which are generally defined as presupposing the truth of the proposition designated by their complement clause (Kiparsky & Kiparsky 1970).

2.1. Epistemic stance expressions

Epistemicity comprises the domains of epistemic modality, evidentiality, cognitive attitude and factivity.

(a) Epistemic modality (EM): expression of degree of certainty concerning the reality of the event designated, its actual occurrence or the likelihood of its realization, or 'epistemic support' for the proposition (cf., Boye 2012). Linguistic resources include epistemic modals, adverbs, predicative adjs. and nominals: *must, should, will, could, may, might, …, perhaps, maybe, possibly, probably, certainly, surely, …, possible, likely, bound to, …*

(1) When I say "the greatest place on earth", I am conscious that some **may** <EP, EM> accuse me of hyperbole, but it is useful to imagine the trajectory on which we **could** <EP, EM> now be embarked. By 2050, **it is** more than **possible** <EP, EM> that the United Kingdom will be the greatest and most prosperous economy in Europe, at the centre of a new network of trade deals, which we have pioneered. (Johnson, PM's statement to Parliament, 25 July 2019)

(b) Evidentiality: Speaker/writer's reference to the sources of evidence and modes of knowing on the basis on which s/he feels entitled to make a statement or claim (cf., Anderson 1986) or 'epistemic justification' for the proposition (cf., Boye 2012). Within the domain of evidentiality, we focus here on indirect-inferential evidentiality (cf., Marín-Arrese, Carretero & Usoniene, 2022, for a detailed study on evidentiality in English).

   Indirect-inferential evidentiality (IIE): Perception-based, conception-based and communication-based **inferences** (cf. Marín-Arrese 2017) (modes of knowing), triggered through access to perceptual evidence, conceptual sources (logical reasoning, assumption or general knowledge), or knowledge acquired through social communication sources (reports, documents, other speakers, etc.) (sources of information). Linguistic resources include: *It seems, appears, looks (like), …, It is clear, evident, obvious, …, apparently, seemingly, clearly, obviously, palpably, …*

(2) I have listened very carefully to what has been said, in this chamber and out of it, by members from all sides. From listening to those views **it is clear** <EP, IIE> that while there is broad support for many of the key aspects of the deal, on one issue –the Northern Ireland backstop– there remains widespread and deep concern. (May, PM's statement to Parliament, 10 December 2018)

Interpretation/Reformulation of information (**IIR**): Inferences or deductions based on evidence or information previously referred to by the speaker/writer. Linguistic resources include a number of lexical verbs typically with a deictic subject element: *That suggests, it indicates, it shows, …*

(3) There are more British people living in Australia than in the whole of the EU, more in the US and Canada. As I have just discovered we have more than a million people who go to Thailand every year, where our superb consular services deal with some of the things that they get up to there. The statistical trajectory **suggests** <EP, IIR> that this wanderlust is most unlikely <EP, EM> to abate. (Johnson, Foreign Secretary, *Uniting for a Great Brexit* speech, 14 February 2018)

(c) Cognitive attitude (CGA): Expression of subjective beliefs and epistemic evaluations regarding the reality of the event designated ('epistemic support', Boye 2012). Expressions include non-factive mental predicates, indicating speakers' expression of reflective attitudes or beliefs regarding representations (cf., Cappelli 2007). Linguistic resources include epistemic complement-taking predicates and adverbs of cognitive attitude: *I/we think, believe, suppose, suspect, assume, imagine, expect, guess, doubt, …, I am sure/certain, I have no doubt, I am confident, …, It seems to me, …, supposedly, presumably, no doubt, undoubtedly, doubtless, …*

(4) **I am convinced** <EP, CGA> there is now a real wish across the world to push this process forward and I hope <EF, INT> we can <EF, POT> take further steps on this issue soon. **I believe** <EP, CGA> it is of fundamental importance not just to peace in the Middle East but to the peace of the world. (Blair, PM's statement to Parliament, 3 February 2003)

(d) Factivity: Expression of knowledge about events, and assignment of factual status to the complement proposition ('strong epistemic support',