



DE GRUYTER  
OPEN

DOI: 10.2478/topling-2014-0009

# Newsworthiness, attribution and lexicogrammatical strategies in two types of news articles in English and Spanish

Izaskun Elorza

University of Salamanca, Spain

## Abstract

The contrastive analysis of two sets of newspaper articles has been carried out in order to observe how the reports of the same events are constructed in two different languages and cultures as represented by *El País* and *The Guardian* newspapers. The first set of texts consists of two science popularization articles dealing with the same scientific finding (Bee Texts), whereas the second set consists of all the articles covering the opening day of a world summit held in Rome (Summit Texts) which were published in the online versions of *El País* and *The Guardian* respectively. Newsworthiness (Bell, 1991), attribution and lexicogrammatical strategies have been studied in order to show how ideological construction has been developed in these two different kinds of report, one dealing with a non-controversial event (as represented in the Bee Texts) and the other with a controversial event (as represented in the Summit Texts).

## Keywords

Newspaper discourse, contrastive analysis, newsworthiness, attribution, lexicogrammatical strategies.

## Introduction<sup>1</sup>

This article focuses on the representation of ideology in newspaper discourse as a kind of (re)contextualisation of events which are reported (Verschuere, 2007) and, more specifically, in relation to the evaluative resources and metadiscursive strategies which are used by journalists and editors and which must be taken into consideration when translating culture-bound texts such as those typically found in media discourse. In the analysis carried out, attention has been especially paid to evaluative language and metadiscursive features of news articles<sup>2</sup> in

English and Spanish, which concern both the interactions between journalists and editors of the newspapers with their respective readers and also the construction of a news agenda in each case. This kind of contrastive analysis may help us gain insight into the representation of stance and the construction of evaluative meanings in newspaper discourse in both communities because by analysing the preferences of writers we can learn more not only about the approved rhetorical practices of a society, but more importantly about “the values, norms, understandings and institutional structures which they reflect and conjure up” (Hyland, 2005, p. 202). The main aim of the analysis is to reveal the resources used for the construal of ideological meaning in the reporting of the same events in *The*

<sup>1</sup> I would like to express my gratitude to Chris Moran and two anonymous reviewers for their thorough and excellent comments and suggestions to improve an earlier version of this article.

<sup>2</sup> In this paper the terms news article and news story are used interchangeably to refer to the texts compiled in the corpora, which fall within

the broad category of special-topic news, after Bell's division of press news (Bell, 1991).

*Guardian* newspaper (Great Britain) and *El País* (Spain).

Bearing this in mind, ideology is envisaged here from a cross-cultural communication perspective in which language use is described in terms of the resources each community and each group of journalists and editors make use of in order to construct and express their own individual and social identity, and also their personal roles and interpersonal relations with readers and with other participants in the communication who are brought into the text as sources of attribution. In recent years the relation between language and ideology has been a growing concern, particularly in reference to “the role of language in forming and transmitting assumptions about what the world is and should be like, and the role of language in maintaining (or challenging) existing power relations” (Hunston, 2002, p. 109). Ideology is understood as “the system of the ideas and representations which dominate the mind of a man or social group” (Althusser, 1994, p. 120) and, consequently, which are “accepted by the participant in a given stretch of discourse” (Valdeón, 2007, p. 101).

In relation to the study presented in this article, ideology refers to the construction and expression of individual and social behaviour among the different participants in communication. In the words of Hunston and Thompson, “ideologies are essentially sets of values – what counts as good or bad, what should and should not happen, what counts as true or untrue” (Hunston and Thompson, 1999, p. 8) and, consequently, as Žižek highlights, “the very notion of an access to reality unbiased by any discursive devices or conjunctions with power is ideological” (1994, p. 10). The most relevant consequence of this perspective for the study presented here is my assumption that, as Žižek reminds us when describing Ducrot’s theory of argumentation, we cannot draw a clear line of separation between description and argumentation as if they were different levels of language (1994, p. 11).

My contention in this respect is that ideological meaning is not only constructed in opinion newspaper discourse and bound to a specific context of situation, discourse, text type, register and genre. On the contrary, meaning construction is affected by the author’s choices on all occasions in such a way that metadiscourse and evaluative language may be encountered in

any kind of text, including news reporting, and especially when the news in question deals with issues which affect different peoples cross-culturally and, therefore, cross-linguistically.

Assuming that linguistically and culturally different newspapers are likely to construct different news agendas, the contrastive analysis of the construction of ideological meaning in special-topic news articles in English and Spanish here seeks to gain insight into whether, how and to what extent linguistically and culturally different newspapers construct *radically* different news agendas when dealing with controversial issues. In this sense, my hypothesis is that greater variation will be found in the ideological meanings constructed by *The Guardian* and by *El País* within the texts dealing with a controversial event than within the texts covering an uncontroversial event. My underlying assumption here is that this variation may be identified and described by studying the signalling devices used by journalists in producing their news stories. Consequently, in this article an analysis is presented of three of them, namely newsworthiness, attribution and some relevant lexicogrammatical strategies.

### **1. The construction and representation of ideological meaning in newspaper discourse**

Within discourse analysis from a systemic functional perspective, ideologies are interpreted as belonging mainly (but not solely) to the interpersonal dimension of language and are analysed as expressions of evaluation. Evaluation is considered to be “a highly complex linguistic function” (Hunston and Thompson, 1999, p. 176) which is studied by means of different linguistic models, the most important being the ‘stance’ framework developed by Biber and the ‘appraisal’ framework developed by Martin and White, and is considered a key concept in the study of ideology (Hunston and Thompson, 1999, p. 8). Evaluation is used as a broad term for “the judgement of good or bad” (Thetela, 1997), and it is considered to perform three functions: to express the writer’s opinion, thus reflecting the value system of him/her and his/her community, to construct and maintain relations between writer and reader, and to organize the discourse (Hunston and Thompson, 1999, p. 6). This conception is consistent with Althusser’s view of ideology as actions inserted into social practices

which are governed by the rituals in which those practices are inscribed (1994, p. 127). Evaluative language can be taken to signal ideological meaning and can thus be analysed in order to study the construction, expression and representation of ideology in discourse. The recognition of ideological meaning is not straightforward though. As Hunston and Thompson point out, “[i]deologies do not exist in silence, but neither are they usually expressed overtly. They are built up and transmitted through texts, and it is in texts that their nature is revealed” (Hunston and Thompson, 1999, p. 8). In this sense, evaluative language is analysed here within metadiscourse, which is taken as “a framework for understanding communication as social engagement” (Hyland, 2005, p. 4). As Hyland (2005, p. 16) points out, metadiscourse is a fuzzy term, which is used here to refer to an open category of meanings in text which are not propositional but which rather signal the presence of the text’s author in different ways, e.g. by his/her arguing, affirming, denying, doubting, qualifying, regretting or insisting upon the propositional content and, at the same time, directing a reader’s response to his/her opinions, attitudes and so on. The metadiscursive language used for the expression of the author’s evaluations is often presented as taken for granted or non-challengeable by means of a variety of linguistic devices, such as lexicogrammar strategies which present evaluations “in such a way that evidence is not required to support them” (Hoey, 1999, p. 34) (cf. Section 3.3).

According to Hunston and Thompson, evaluative language can be used to manipulate the readers, to persuade them to see things from a particular angle and also to adjust the truth-value or certainty attached to a statement (Hunston and Thompson, 1999, pp. 8-10). It is primarily because of this kind of language potential that linguists working within the field of Critical Discourse Analysis contend that language plays a crucial role in the establishment, maintenance, reinforcement or challenging of power relations within society and in what is considered to be true and false. They also assume, as Foucault explains, that this language potential is common to every social group or community:

Each society has its [...] types of discourse which it accepts and makes function as true; the mechanisms and instances which enable

one to distinguish between true and false statements, the means by which each is sanctioned; the techniques and procedures accorded value in the acquisition of truth; the status of those who are charged with saying what counts as true (Foucault, 1980, p. 131).

The study of the assumptions which are taken for granted is extremely important for an account of ideology as “within texts, it’s implicitly evaluative meanings that are most coercive of the reader simply because they appear to pass beneath the threshold of conscious awareness” (Macken-Horarik, 2003, p. 314). However, this kind of analysis is problematic in methodological terms. If a set of ideas is taken for granted, language may not express it explicitly or the linguistic strategies employed to refer to them may not be easily observable and consequently, as Stubbs (1996, p. 97) points out, the analyst’s task is “to make visible” ideological meanings which may have been unseen previously. The problem is that, as evaluation and metadiscourse may make use of the whole potential of language for creating meaning, the set of resources employed in a text or in a register for evaluative purposes may include a wide range of strategies. These may even include strategies that in principle would be considered factual (and hence, neutrally valued or just descriptive), such as the naming strategies that, according to Jančaříková (2009), journalists use to create either a positive or a negative status which is communicated to the reader. In the case of newspaper discourse, these strategies are often intertwined with the use of reported language, which, according to Urbanová (2009, p. 88), is used in newspaper reports “for the reasons of newsworthiness, evidentiality, objectivity, authenticity and personalization of the report.

## 2 The analysis of ideology in newspaper discourse

In persuasive discourse, evaluation is expected to be predominant (Hatim and Mason, 1990, p. 160), whereas in informative discourse we may expect ‘detached’ narrations and descriptions of events which are typically associated with non-evaluative exposition, such as news stories, which are traditionally considered objective and impersonal (Bednarek, 2005). Newspaper readers may expect a clear predominance of propositional content rather than expressions of ideology in

informative discourse, thus reinforcing the idea that ideology will be found in editorials or other opinion articles rather than in news stories<sup>3</sup>. But fact and opinion are not so easy to separate (Bell, 1991, p. 15) and a closer look at newspaper discourse allows us to see that the expression of ideology is also present in news articles and not just restricted to opinion texts. For that reason, my contention here is that ideological meaning construction by means of evaluation and metadiscourse permeates every kind of text type, genre and discourse, although the strategies involved in its construction are idiosyncratic and sensitive to textual and contextual variation. In this sense, my analysis seeks to reveal which strategies have been employed for the construction of ideological meaning in the corpora studied, focusing especially on variation which may be due to cross-cultural mismatches, e.g. as a result of relying on different sources for giving credence to an argument.

The assumption that a text type belongs in a specific category of discourse (e.g. narrative, descriptive or argumentative) may explain why there has been a traditional distinction in the study of how we use language to inform and how it is used in the communication of opinions, judgements, and also affect and emotion (Bednarek, 2008). Although the distinction between the communication of information and the communication of judgement or affect is useful in order to be able to focus on a certain set of features when studying such a complex phenomenon as language use, this distinction also involves an oversimplification of how language is used in real communication. However, this oversimplification of the distinction between the communication of information and the communication of evaluations, opinions, attitudes, judgements, emotions or affect may be avoided by considering a dynamic model of language use in which both ways of communication are envisaged as integrated. Sinclair (2004<sup>4</sup>; cf. also Hunston, 1999 and Hyland, 2005) has proposed that rather than identifying two different ways of

communication, we distinguish between two different planes of discourse. Sinclair's assumption is that language in use has two aspects: "at one and the same time it is both a continuous negotiation between participants and a developing record of experience" (Sinclair, 2004, p. 52). He has called the negotiation aspect, which highlights interaction, the 'interactive plane' of discourse, reserving the term the 'autonomous plane' of discourse for the developing record of experience, which is "concerned with language only and not with the means by which language is related to the world outside" (Sinclair, 2004, p. 53) and which focuses on the organization and maintenance of text structure. This model is integrated in that, as Hyland explains, statements do not present a single plane but simultaneously "have an orientation to the world outside the text and an orientation to the reader's understanding of that world through the text itself" (Hyland, 2005, p. 8). My underlying assumption here is that, although evaluation tends to be identified with the interactive plane of discourse, the construction of ideology relies on devices common to both planes of discourse, as Hyland posits. One example of this can be seen when we find propositional content that is evaluative, as in the following headline from the *Sun* newspaper collected by Reah (2002, p.29):

*STUPID SOPHIE GAGGED BY THE PALACE*

The headline is constructed in such a way that the participant '*gagged by the Palace*' is not '*Sophie*' but '*Stupid Sophie*'. Calling Sophie 'stupid' cannot be challenged – it is non-negotiable because the referential expression encapsulates the evaluation made by the headline producer. What we are facing here is another example of the strategy described by Hoey (1999) (cf. Section 3.3): evaluation, again, appears in the 'given' part of the proposition. What Sinclair (2004, p. 55) suggests is that every sentence can be described on both the autonomous and interactive planes at the same time as being two intertwined dimensions of language in use, although, as Hunston emphasizes, "some sentences draw attention to their status on the interactive plane more explicitly than others" (1999, p. 183).

In order to try to get an overall insight into the strategies put in practice by journalists for the construction of ideological meaning, together with the textual features of special-topic news, I am also going to consider

<sup>3</sup> See for example the analysis of journalists' reporting of emotions by Stenvall (2008).

<sup>4</sup> This model is described in Chapter 3 ('Planes of Discourse') in Sinclair (2004), which was first published in 1982 in S. N. A. Rizvi (ed.) *The Two-fold Voice: Essays in Honour of Ramesh Mohan*, Pitambar Publishing Co., India.

some contextual features which are relevant for the description of this kind of newspaper discourse, all of which will be discussed in what follows.

### 3 Evaluation and metadiscursive strategies in special-topic news

Evaluative and metadiscursive resources are used for signalling “whether participants, agency and causation are explicit or hidden [...], and whether claims are being made as factual, certain, taken for granted, authoritative, categorical and part of the status quo, or as tentative and open to change” (Stubbs, 1996, p. 97). In this sense, the analysis of ideology depends “on an understanding of both the potential of the language and its realization in texts: both how the English language expresses such meanings and how this grammar is used in particular texts” (idem).

My analysis of the realization of evaluative language and of the construction of ideological meaning in special-topic news relies on a framework which considers language as social semiotic. This perspective involves, according to Halliday, that “[a] social reality (or a ‘culture’) is itself an edifice of meanings – a semiotic construct. In this perspective, language is one of the semiotic systems that constitutes a culture; one that is distinctive in that it also serves as an encoding system for many (though not all) of the others” (1978, p. 2), and in such a way that both textual and contextual features are interrelated in language. For this reason, several dimensions are studied in order to try to offer a multifaceted description. After scrutiny of the newspaper articles, the focus of the analysis is set on three main features: newsworthiness, attribution and lexicogrammatical strategies.

#### 3.1 Newsworthiness

At a contextual level, newsworthiness, i.e. the importance given to an event by the editors of the newspaper, is considered here to hold a direct relation with the length and position of its coverage in the paper. My underlying assumption is that the more important a topic is considered, the greater the coverage it will be given. Therefore, extensive coverage can indicate the relative importance of a topic in a certain newspaper at a given time, especially in relation to the coverage of the same topic by a different newspaper.

Topic is used here only to refer to what the news article or a part of the news article is

about. I assume that a news article is about a main topic and that, throughout the article, other less prominent local topics or subtopics are developed, which may be part (or not) of or related to the main topic.

Newsworthiness is used here as an umbrella term referring to the value the news is given by editors, thus reflecting a priority held in society (Bell, 1991, p. 156). In this sense, this feature covers a variety of contextual factors which influence the media’s selection of news. My aim here is not to offer or make use of a comprehensive account of all factors affecting this dimension of news reportage but to take into account only the most relevant aspects for the analysis. In both sets of texts, I understand that the importance of the news covered is related to the type of event (scientific finding and world summit) and participants (scientists and global leaders) involved, so the aspects considered for the description of this feature include those which Bell (1991, pp. 156-158) refers to as recency, proximity, consonance, novelty<sup>5</sup>, relevance, eliteness of the news actors, eliteness of the story’s sources and facticity respectively, and which have been described in detail elsewhere (Elorza, 2010).

#### 3.2 Attribution

According to Hunston, the study of attribution – when a piece of language is “presented as deriving from someone other than the writer” (Hunston, 1999, p. 178) – is also relevant when analysing evaluative language, because attribution can be used “to position the reader to attach more or less credence to the various pieces of information” (idem). The underlying assumption in this case is that, as Tadros explains, readers (and analysts) attribute by default the ideas and opinions in the text to the text producer unless otherwise stated:

The basic assumption is that the writer avers the opinions and ideas of the text so long as s/he does not specifically detach him/herself from the embedded propositions expressed. The writer detaches him/herself from propositions by attributing them to others. This detachment predicts involvement, which means that the writer will come again into the text in order to declare his/her state

<sup>5</sup> In the analysis, *novelty* is applicable to the Bee Corpus especially, as the scientific finding is valued as a breakthrough. According to Bell, “[s]cience is a low-priority news area, but gains coverage when there is a ‘breakthrough’ to report” (Bell, 1991, p. 157).

of knowledge as regards what s/he is reporting (Tadros, 1994, p. 74).

The study of attribution often focuses on the expression of opinions and ideas of an evaluative kind. Evaluation in this sense has to do both with the expressions of opinion, attitude, value, etc. formulated in the text as well as with the people who formulate them or to whom the propositional content is attributed. As Don (2007) explains, the subsystem called 'attitude' within the appraisal framework is concerned with identifying all types of evaluative assessments which may appear in texts, either negative or positive, distinguishing three subtypes of 'attitude', i.e. the assessments of human behaviour and social norms ('judgement') involved in the meaning construction of "our attitudes to people and the way they behave" (Martin and White, 2005, p. 52); the assessments of objects, events and artefacts in terms of aesthetic and social value ('appreciation') involved in the meaning construction of "our evaluations of 'things'" (Martin and White, 2005, p. 56), and the assessments based on emotional responses or 'affect' (which is not studied here). In addition to this, the framework also distinguishes between the attitudes which are made explicit, as in "Australia's foreign minister, Stephen Smith, said Mugabe's attendance was obscene" (Text SCTG1 from the Summit Texts; cf. Section 4), and those invoked in the text by means other than explicitly evaluative lexis or implied, as in "A British official said he would leave the chamber when Mugabe spoke" (Text SCTG1 from the Summit Texts; cf. Section 4).

In a data-driven study of a small-scale corpus of journalistic texts, Martin and White (2005, pp. 164-184) were able to distinguish three groupings of texts depending on the presence or absence of explicit authorial judgement (*unmediated inscribed judgement*), i.e. evaluation in «unattributed contexts where responsibility for the proposition is unambiguously being taken by the journalistic author» (Martin and White, 2005, p. 168), and have called what distinguishes each of those groupings 'the reporter voice', 'the correspondent voice' and 'the commentator voice' respectively. From their study, they conclude that the 'reporter voice' is found in texts where all judgements are attributed to some external, cited source, whereas the 'correspondent voice' is found in texts where authorially-sourced judgement also occurs with some regularity, and the 'commentator voice' is

present in texts where there is free occurrence of authorially-sourced judgement. Apart from judgements, instances of authorial appreciation are also considered to be "part of the more general attitudinal environment in which the judgements operate" (Martin and White, 2005, p. 170).

The patterns of the attribution of judgement and appreciation in the news articles analysed help to reveal the journalists' and editors' positioning, as well as the positioning expected in the readers. In this way, these patterns help us analyse how the construction of ideological meaning has been carried out in each case.

### 3.3 Lexicogrammatical strategies

All the potential of the lexicogrammatical systems to construct meaning in English and Spanish is considered here. For this reason, the strategies of this kind used by text producers are diverse. By means of corpus linguistics methodology and discourse analysis we can study how word choice contributes to the *lexical cohesion* (Halliday and Hasan, 1976) of texts and also study the structural organization of different ranks (clauses, sentences, paragraphs and so on). As Tribble points out, "keywords can help us better understand the kinds of evaluations that journalists and editors make as they construct a news agenda" (Scott and Tribble, 2006, p. 161), so the study of salient words in terms of frequency (keywords) may be productive to study ideological meaning construction. Keywords are obtained by comparing the frequency of a word in the text or the corpus being analysed with its frequency in a reference corpus. Once we have listed the keywords in the text or corpus<sup>6</sup>, we can focus on the words which accompany them in order to see which lexicogrammatical strategies have been used. The analysis of keywords may also help us identify the main topics in the text or corpus or also see lexicogrammatical patterns, such as collocations, colligations, semantic preference or also semantic prosody (Louw, 1993, as described by Sinclair, 2004)<sup>7</sup>.

<sup>6</sup> Saliency occurs when the word has a higher frequency than expected (*positive keyness*) but also when it has a lower frequency than expected (*negative keyness*). However, negative keyness is not relevant for our analytical purpose so it will not be considered.

<sup>7</sup> These concepts are dealt with in Chapter 2 ('The search for units of meaning') in Sinclair (2004),

In order to study the construction of ideological meaning, we can analyse the referring expressions chosen to name participants, as this kind of word choice is a way of enacting relationships with interlocutors (Martin and Rose, 2003, p. 6) and may therefore signal the position taken by the text producer with respect to the participants<sup>8</sup>. An analysis of the kind of participants appearing in thematic position can also shed light on the narrative focus used by the writer. For example, in relation to the use of evaluative resources of a coercive kind, Hunston and Thompson mention the grammatical strategic use of transitivity in relation to the hierarchical functionality of the elements within the clause revealed by Hoey (1999) when analysing the rhetorical strategies used by Chomsky in some of his writings:

Evaluation is particularly difficult to challenge, and therefore is particularly effective as manipulation, when it is not the main point of the clause. One way that this may be the case is when information that is 'given' in a clause is expressed evaluatively [...] The reader is not positioned to make a decision as to whether or not to agree with these evaluations; instead, the reader's acceptance of the evaluation is simply assumed (Hunston and Thompson, 1999, p. 8).

This description of different aspects or dimensions is by no means a corollary of the lexicogrammatical strategies we may encounter when analysing the construction of ideological meaning in newspaper discourse; rather, the strategies described above are illustrative of a focus on the use of word and grammar choice in an integrated fashion to fulfil the pragmatic purpose of positioning readers.

which was first published in 1996 in *Textus* IX: 75-106.

<sup>8</sup> As Reah points out, "naming is an aspect of language surrounded with social rules and pitfalls. In most cultures, it is possible to cause offence by adopting the wrong naming strategy towards people" (Reah, 2002, p. 55). This is the case in the example of '*stupid Sophie*' (cf. Section 2).

#### 4 The Bee Texts and the Summit Texts:

##### Methodology, analysis and description

The construction and representation of ideology in newspaper discourse is analysed here by examining in some detail two samples of special-topic news. According to Bell, special-topic news articles usually appear in sections of the paper "explicitly flagged for their subject matter" which are "generally produced by separate groups of specialist journalists under the control of their own editor" (Bell, 1991, p. 15).

In addition to this, the importance of what the news story is about (e.g. death penalty in China vs. George Clooney's latest love affair) can be expected to vary from one culture to another as well as from one newspaper to another. If newsworthiness were solely dependent on the kind of readership of a newspaper, we would not generally expect very high variation when comparing *The Guardian* and *El País*. But we assume that some topics are more newsworthy in one culture than in another irrespective of the newspaper's readership and that this cultural mismatch can explain an imbalance in news reporting (e.g. coverage of The Six Nations Championship in Great Britain as opposed to in Spain, where rugby has far fewer supporters). For this reason, I have chosen two samples for the analysis of events which could reasonably be expected to receive the same interest in both cultures. The first of them (Bee Texts) consists of the report of a scientific finding by third parties (there were no British or Spanish scientists involved), whereas the second one deals with the coverage given to a summit held in Rome in June 2008 (Summit Texts), a global event organized by the UN's Food and Agricultural Organization (FAO) in a third European country (neither Great Britain nor Spain). The reasons for this choice are based on the fact that both topics can be considered to have had equal potential newsworthiness in both newspapers and, therefore, my expectations were that both would receive a similar kind of coverage by *The Guardian* and *El País*. As already mentioned (cf. Section 2), the main relevant difference between the samples is that, whereas the scientific finding could not be considered a controversial issue, the summit was a UN call to all countries for solutions to the global food crisis to which countries gave different responses, so it was considered overtly controversial. Apart from the contrastive comparison between newspapers, a comparison of the news

articles *within* the same newspapers has also been carried out to see if the analysis could reveal the strategies used for evaluation in relation to the controversy (or lack of it) of the news reported in terms of interpersonal positioning.

The two corpora analysed in this case are small compilations of articles appearing in the digital editions of *The Guardian* and *El País* newspapers (in <http://www.guardian.co.uk> and <http://www.elpais.com> respectively). These newspapers were chosen because they are two of the most widely read quality newspapers in the United Kingdom and Spain respectively (Pérez Blanco, 2013, p. 245), both representing a liberal stance and often catering for comparable language corpora in cross-cultural discourse analyses (e. g. Martín, 2008) as left-wing broadsheet newspapers. Another reason for choosing them is that their digital editions have open access, which favours corpus compilation greatly. The main topic in the Bee Texts is the scientists' finding that bees from different species can communicate, whereas the Summit Texts deals with a world summit on the food crisis, organized by the UN's Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO), held in Rome in June 2008.

Discourse analysis and corpus linguistics methodology have been used with the two corpora. However, corpus methodology has not been applied in the same way. The Bee Texts consists of only two texts (one of 629 running words in English and one of 513 running words in Spanish) and therefore it is not possible to distinguish patterns corresponding to large-scale regularities. For this reason, qualitative analysis has been favoured, limiting quantitative analysis to listing keywords in order to compare the topics and participants in each text. In the Summit Texts, both quantitative and qualitative analyses have been carried out. Quantitative methodology has been applied more extensively to this corpus, identifying some collocations and polarity patterns involving keywords. The most revealing features of these analyses are summarized and discussed in the following sections.

#### 4.1 The Bee Texts

The Bee Texts corpus consists of only two science popularization texts. One of them was published in *The Guardian* (BCTG

henceforth)<sup>9</sup>, whereas the other was published in *El País* (BCEP onwards)<sup>10</sup>. Both texts report on the findings of experimental research on the communication strategies used by bees of different species and from different geographical areas, and therefore the analysis was carried out by contrasting the features of each single text. The scientific finding reported in the Bee Texts was made public in the open-access electronic scientific journal *PLoS One* (<http://www.plosone.org>), in an article titled "East learns from West: Asiatic honeybees can understand dance language of European honeybees" (Su, et al., 2008)<sup>11</sup>.

The explicit attribution and the quotations appearing in BCTG and BCEP allowed me to establish an intertextual sequence of co-reference. In BCTG, Ian Sample – science correspondent and writer of the article – cites the article by Sue et al. (2008) as his information source. By contrast, in BCEP the anonymous journalist (probably from an international wire or news service) not only cites the article by Su et al. (2008) but also the one by Sample as explicit attribution sources. A comparison of BCTG and BCEP shows that their intertextual relationship is not one of multitextual production from a triggering event taken from Su et al. (2008), but rather of BCEP relying heavily on the summarized account of the finding narrated in BCTG, which is recognized explicitly as the main information source on three occasions. Bearing this in mind, my analysis tried to establish the contextual importance of both news articles as represented by the concept of 'newsworthiness' and, in order to do so, several factors were studied.

<sup>9</sup> This text can be retrieved from <http://www.guardian.co.uk/science/2008/jun/04/animalbehaviour.wildlife>

<sup>10</sup> The science popularization text from *El País* newspaper can be retrieved from the URL [http://www.elpais.com/articulo/sociedad/lenguaje/universal/abejas/elpepusoc/20080604elpepusoc\\_6/Tes](http://www.elpais.com/articulo/sociedad/lenguaje/universal/abejas/elpepusoc/20080604elpepusoc_6/Tes)

<sup>11</sup> Although the article by Su et al. (2008) can be considered the 'trigger' of BCTG and BCEP, in general I am not considering it for the analysis as my interest is not focused on the mechanisms of science popularization. However, it is worthy of note that the three articles were made public on the internet the same day (June 4, 2008), which suggests that – apart from constituting a good example of the immediacy of the electronic medium for the diffusion of information – there might be some sort of contact among the writers involved in the news articles.



#### 4.1.1 Analytical factors and textual features.

Newsworthiness accounts for the fact that editors select systematically what information will be considered important and what kind of coverage it will receive. In order to compare the coverage given to the scientific finding in both newspapers, a set of factors was studied. These factors include the length of the text in running words, its location in the newspaper, as well as a number of factors identified and described

in detail by Bell (1991), namely recency, proximity, consonance, novelty, relevance, facticity, eliteness of the news actors and eliteness of the story's sources. In order to keep to a reasonable size the number of variables studied, five of them were taken as control variables. Table.1 below contains a summarized description of both texts along these parameters<sup>12</sup>.

<sup>12</sup> A more detailed description and analysis of these texts is given in Elorza (2010).

Bee Texts	BCTG	BCEP
<b>Length</b>	<u>629</u>	<u>513</u>
<b>Location</b>	<u>Science section</u>	<u>Society section</u>
<b>Recency</b> (control variable)	June 4, 2008	
<b>Proximity</b> (control variable)	No direct proximity, no British scientists or previous findings involved	No direct proximity, no Spanish scientists or previous findings involved
<b>Consonance</b>	<u>Linguistic learning capacity found</u> (bees can learn to interpret other bees)	<u>Linguistic universality assumed</u> (bee universal language)
<b>Novelty</b> (control variable)	Scientific finding	
<b>Relevance</b> (control variable)	General interest, no direct relevance to readers	General interest, no direct relevance to readers
<b>Eliteness of the news actors</b> (control variable)	Scientists	
<b>Eliteness of the story's sources</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Journal <i>PLoS One</i></li> <li>• Nobel prize</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Nobel prize</li> <li>• <u><i>The Guardian</i></u></li> <li>• Journal <i>PLoS One</i></li> </ul>
<b>Facticity</b>	<u>Higher accuracy</u>	<u>Lower accuracy</u>

Table.1 Features of newsworthiness (Bee Texts)

Significant dissimilarities in newsworthiness have been underlined in the table, showing that BCTG is about 20% longer than BCEP and that it is located in a specific section devoted to science (a section which was non-existent in *El País* at that time). Consonance refers to the compatibility of a story with 'the preconceptions about the social group or nation from which the news actors come' (Bell, 1991, p. 157), and so the main aspect involved is the journalists' and readers' expectations and beliefs. This factor was described and located within the structural dimension of the texts under scrutiny (headlines), showing that BCTG highlights the scientific finding that honeybees can learn to interpret other bees (which is the main topic and also in agreement with the reporting of the finding by Su et al.), whereas the BCEP headline concentrates on the underlying idea that bee language is

universal, which is not treated as a topic in the text. In relation to the eliteness of the story's sources used, the main differences between the texts are that the order of appearance of the sources in text is not the same (as outlined in the table) and that BCEP explicitly cites BCTG as one of the sources used, as explained above. The emphasis, though, is on the use of those sources to add credibility to the information given by the text producer (on the 'eliteness' of the source), so my conclusion is that *The Guardian* is presented as a reliable or as a prestigious source to *El País* readers by the text producer of BCEP. Finally, facticity (the presence and accuracy of factual information) is higher in BCTG than in BCEP. Although BCTG presents similar information, this is more accurate in certain cases (as in BCTG "the banks of the Da-Mei canal in

Fujian province, China vs. BCEP “the region of Da-Mei, China”<sup>13</sup>).

On the other hand, an analysis of the keywords, combined with a study of which participants tend to function as syntactic subjects, showed that the narrative of events is approached from a different angle in each text. In BCTG, the focus is on the honeybees and the processes related to them (i.e. their dances), whereas in BCEP the perspective is on the researchers and the processes related to the research (i.e. the conclusions arrived at). In addition to this, the use of attribution in the Bee Texts shows that BCEP uses profuse externally mediated attribution (in capitals below) but that BCTG tends to rely more on unmediated appreciation (underlined in the example below).

EXAMPLE:

BCEP [Paragraph 3] *The RESEARCHERS have found that one of the most important dances is the waggle dance [...]*<sup>14</sup>

BCTG [Paragraph 2] *One of the most important moves is the waggle dance [...]*

Evaluative language is scarce in the Bee Texts, apart from a few cases of appreciation of the importance of the finding narrated in the text or of the bee dances themselves but, even so, it is possible to observe differences between the texts in the use of attribution. In the example above, the appreciation that the waggle dance is important is attributed to the researchers in BCEP, i.e. to an external source, but in BCTG the attribution is not made explicit within the sentence or the paragraph. Therefore, in this part of the text (the first four introductory paragraphs) the information can only be implicitly or indirectly attributed to the writer or to the scientists (the only human participant who has been introduced so far). “Scientists” are introduced in the first paragraph by means of the pattern “[...], scientists have found.” in sentence-final position.

<sup>13</sup> My translation from the original “la región de Da-Mei, China”.

<sup>14</sup> My translation from the original “los investigadores han encontrado que uno de los bailes más importantes es el meneo”.

The attribution of the information to the scientists seems to function as a ‘default’ interpretation throughout this first part of the text in two ways. Firstly, the pattern seems to be used to encourage the interpretation that it is the scientists (and not the text writer) who are identified as the source of the information given in all the first part, even if this information is two paragraphs below. In this sense, the attribution of information to the scientists appears to function at the interpersonal level.

At the same time, the pattern of attribution also seems to be used to organize the discourse by signalling the beginning of a structural frame which I have referred to as the ‘first part’. Even if further research on this pattern is needed in order to be able to give more than a tentative plausible explanation, it is a fact that in BCEP those two features do not co-occur. The BCEP writer is anonymous and, consequently, the reliance on the credibility of the source can only be considered in terms of the prestige of the newspaper. Besides, scientists are not the only participants activated in the first paragraph, so there is no clear identification between what the writer reports and what the scientists say and, probably for this reason, BCEP relies more often on external attribution. In this respect, BCEP can be said to conform better to the ‘reporter voice’, whereas BCTG represents better the ‘correspondent voice’ described by Martin and White (cf. 3.2).

#### 4.2 The Summit Texts

The Summit Texts deal with the press coverage of the UN world food summit held in Rome in June 2008 in *The Guardian* and *El País* on its opening day (June 3, 2008), so this set consists of the news articles which were uploaded that day in the digital editions of both newspapers. A first overall comparison between the *El País* texts (SCEP onwards) and *The Guardian* texts (SCTG onwards) revealed that there was a clear imbalance in the coverage of the summit between both newspapers.

Summit Texts	SCTG	SCEP
<b>Length</b>	2,344 running words	3,924 running words
<b>Text → Section → Subsection</b>	<p>SCTG1 → World news → Zimbabwe (710 running words)</p> <p>SCTG2 → Environment → Food (950 running words)</p> <p>SCTG3 → Environment → Biofuels (684 running words)</p>	<p>SCEP1 → International → <i>La crisis alimentaria</i> [food crisis] (362 running words)</p> <p>SCEP2 → International → <i>La crisis alimentaria</i> [food crisis] (806 running words)</p> <p>SCEP3 → International → <i>La crisis alimentaria</i> [food crisis] (926 running words)</p> <p>SCEP4 → International → <i>La crisis alimentaria</i> [food crisis] (692 running words)</p> <p>SCEP5 → International → <i>La crisis alimentaria</i> [food crisis] (371 running words)</p> <p>SCEP6 → International (767 running words)</p>
<b>Recency</b> (control variable)	Opening day of the summit (June 3, 2008)	
<b>Proximity</b>	<u>Representative from UK Government: UK international development secretary (Douglas Alexander)</u> <u>ACTIVE SAYERS</u>	<u>Representative from Spanish Government: PM (José Luis Rodríguez Zapatero)</u> <u>ACTIVE SAYERS</u>
<b>Consonance</b>	<p>SCTG1: <i>"This is like inviting Pol Pot to a human rights conference"</i></p> <p>SCTG2: <i>Rich nations must drop 'beggar thy neighbour policies'</i></p> <p>SCTG3: <i>US biofuel subsidies under attack at food summit</i></p>	<p>SCEP1: <i>Zapatero anuncia que España destinará 500 millones de euros a la seguridad alimentaria</i></p> <p>SCEP2: <i>Ban Ki-moon: "Las políticas alimentarias no deben empobrecer al vecino"</i></p> <p>SCEP3: <i>La ONU reclama el fin del proteccionismo</i></p> <p>SCEP4: <i>Un planeta de famélicos y obesos</i></p> <p>SCEP5: <i>Lula defiende el etanol y culpa al petróleo de la carestía</i></p> <p>SCEP6: <i>La UE pide una respuesta "coordinada" a la crisis alimentaria</i></p>
<b>Novelty</b> (control variable)	UN food crisis summit	
<b>Relevance</b> (control variable)	Rising price of staple foods, collateral effects of the use of biofuels on food prices and the environment, financial help for fighting hunger	
<b>Eliteness of the news actors</b>	<p>Heads of state (&gt; 50);</p> <p>Ministries of agriculture (150);</p> <p>Representatives of international institutions and NGOs (20)</p> <p><u>ACTIVE SAYERS</u></p>	<p>Heads of state (&gt; 50);</p> <p>Ministries of agriculture (150);</p> <p>Representatives of international institutions and NGOs (20)</p> <p><u>ACTIVE SAYERS</u></p>
<b>Eliteness of the story's sources</b>	<u>SOURCE SAYERS</u>	<u>SOURCE SAYERS</u>

Table.2 Features of newsworthiness (Summit Texts)

The digital edition of *El País* devoted more texts to covering the event (the subcorpus compiled is about 40% bigger than *The Guardian* subcorpus). The news articles were located in an *ad hoc* subsection (*La crisis alimentaria*) within the International section, whereas *The Guardian* located the three texts in three subsections (Zimbabwe, Food and Biofuels) within two different sections (World News and Environment). Recency was a control variable in the analysis, as well as novelty and the relevance of the event.

Proximity is a broad term which may cover not only geographical closeness but also the familiarity and similarity of one country with regard to another (Bell, 1991, p. 157), so the analysis of this factor is concerned with abstract concepts such as affinity and alignment. In my analysis I expected the delegates taking part in the summit to show some kind of textual prominence in the corpus as participants<sup>15</sup>, e.g. by fulfilling the textual role of 'sayers'. In transitivity, according to systemic functional linguistics (Halliday, 1985; Thompson, 2004), 'sayers' are participants in verbal processes, typically the syntactic subjects of verbs of 'saying'. The analysis revealed that *The Guardian* subcorpus (SCTG) and *El País* subcorpus (SCEP) did not align with the same

participants. However, the analysis also revealed that not all the sayers were participants who really took part in the summit, so the potential sayers who spoke at the summit, such as Ban Ki-moon, were labelled 'active sayers' to differentiate them from those sayers who were text participants but who either did not speak at the summit or whose role could not be inferred from the textual information, such as Mark Malloch Brown. This second group, labelled 'source sayers', function textually as information sources.

It is assumed that each newspaper chose whom to report on because of political relevance as well as cultural or political alignment. In Table.3 below, a contrastive summary is presented of the active sayers in each subcorpus. The frequency of appearance of each participant's name is detailed, as well as the question whether the participant had been reported on through rephrasing in indirect speech (IS) (as in SCTG1 "A British official said he would leave the chamber when Mugabe spoke."), through a direct speech (DS) quotation (as in SCTG1 "This is like Pol Pot going to a human rights conference," Mark Malloch Brown, the Foreign Office minister for Africa, Asia and the UN, told the Guardian.") or just by mention of the participant's name (as in SCTG1 "Robert Mugabe made a surprise appearance yesterday at a world food summit in Rome").

<sup>15</sup> 'Participant' is used here in the systemic functional linguistics sense that "we can express what we have said about the 'content' of clauses in terms of processes involving participants in certain circumstances" (Thompson, 2004, p. 87).

ORGANIZATION AND PROTOCOLARY ATTENDANCE	LEADERS ATTENDING THE CONFERENCE	FREQUENCY IN THE GUARDIAN SUBCORPUS	TYPE OF ATTRIBUTION (indirect speech IS / direct speech DS / MENTIONED)	FREQUENCY IN EL PAÍS SUBCORPUS	TYPE OF ATTRIBUTION (indirect speech IS / direct speech DS / MENTIONED)
UN (general secretary)	Ban Ki-moon	5	IS DS	8	IS DS
FAO (general director)	Jacques Diouf	6	IS DS	3	IS DS
EU president (president of Slovenia)	Danilo Turk	0		1	IS DS
President of Italy (summit venue)	Giorgio Napolitano	0		1	MENTIONED
COUNTRY	HEADS OF STATE / REPRESENTATIVES				
Argentina	Cristina Fernández	0		2	IS DS
Brazil	Luis Inázio Lula da Silva	1	MENTIONED	5	IS DS

Egypt	Hosni Mubarak	0		2	DS
France	Nicolas Sarkozy	0		1	DS
Iran	Mahmud Ahmadinejad	3	DS	2	IS DS
Italy (prime minister)	Silvio Berlusconi	1	MENTIONED	1	MENTIONED
Japan	Yasuo Fukuda	0		1	DS
Spain	José Rodríguez Zapatero	1	MENTIONED	4	IS DS
United Kingdom	Douglas Alexander (UK international development secretary)	2	MENTIONED	0	
Zimbabwe	Robert Mugabe	17	IS DS	6	MENTIONED
	MINISTRIES OF AGRICULTURE				
United States of America	Ed Schafer (US agriculture secretary)	4	IS DS	0	
	OTHER				
Head of Catholic Church	Pope Benedict XVI	1	IS	1	MENTIONED

**Table.3 Active sayers in the Summit Texts**

Apart from the expected textual treatment of the UN and FAO representatives, and considering the countries of the sayers rephrased or quoted or both, it can be observed that in the coverage of the summit there is an intercultural difference in alignment. *The Guardian* pays greater attention to (i.e. cites and quotes) Zimbabwe and the United States of America, and to a lesser extent (i.e. only quotes or rephrases) Iran and the Pope, although the United Kingdom, Brazil, Italy and Spain are also mentioned. For its part, *El País* focuses mainly (i.e. rephrasing and quotes) on Brazil, Spain, Argentina, Iran and the European Union but also quotes the representatives from Egypt, France and Japan, mentioning also Zimbabwe, Italy and the Pope.

These alignments signal two aspects worth discussing. Firstly, there is a contrast in the attention devoted to Robert Mugabe when compared to other sayers in the corpus, which is even more striking when compared with the marginal attention given to the UK representative, Douglas Alexander (especially when comparing the treatment given to the British representative by *The Guardian* with the attention given by *El País* to the Spanish representative). Secondly, the

high frequency of reference to Ed Schafer in *The Guardian* signals the attention given by the United Kingdom to the US position in the use of corn as a biofuel and on protective policies. A comparison with the treatment given to Luis Inácio Lula da Silva in *El País*, who promotes the use of sugar cane instead, and especially when compared to the marginal references to him in *The Guardian*, suggests differences in the proximity of the position of the UK and Spain on the controversial issue of biofuels.

Differences in alignment also extend to the eliteness of the information sources. Each newspaper relies on sources whose main function is to add credence to the information given. Those sources are mainly quoted or rephrased, sometimes through another newspaper (*The Times*, *The Guardian* and *El País*) as external sources of attribution. In Table 4 below, the features of the source sayers present in the corpus are outlined<sup>16</sup>.

<sup>16</sup> The sources considered for the analysis are only those whose name is mentioned, thus ignoring non-identified sayers, such as "UN officials said yesterday..." (SCTG2).

COUNTRY / INSTITUTION / ORGANISATION	SOURCE SAYERS	FREQUENCY IN <i>THE GUARDIAN</i> SUBCORPUS	TYPE OF ATTRIBUTION (indirect speech IS / direct speech DS / MENTIONED)	FREQUENCY IN <i>EL PAÍS</i> SUBCORPUS	TYPE OF ATTRIBUTION (indirect speech IS / direct speech DS / MENTIONED)
Australia (Foreign minister)	Stephen Smith	1	IS	0	
European Food Safety Authority (chairman)	Patrick Wall	2	IS (SOURCE: <i>The Times</i> )	0	
FAO (Spanish representative)	Alberto López	0		1	DS
United Kingdom (UK Foreign Office minister for Africa, Asia and the UN)	Mark Malloch Brown	2	DS	2	IS (SOURCE: <i>The Guardian</i> )
REPRESENTATIVES OF INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTIONS AND NGOS					
ActionAid (head of trade and corporates)	Claire Melamed	1	DS	0	
Ayuda en Acción (Italian general secretary)	Marco de Ponte	0		1	MENTIONED
Council of Foreign Relations	Ford Runge and Benjamin Senauer	0		1	DS
Crocevia (member)	Antonio Onorati	0		1	DS
Human Rights Watch (deputy director of the Africa division)	Carolyn Norris	1	DS	0	
Médicos Sin Fronteras	Javier Sancho	0		1	DS
Oxfam (biofuels expert)	Rob Bailey	2	IS DS	0	
Oxfam (spokesman)	Alexander Woollcombe	1	IS DS	0	
World Food Program (spokesman)	Greg Barrow	2	DS	0	
TEXT PARTICIPANTS NOT ATTENDING THE CONFERENCE					
Cambodia (ex- dictator)	Pol Pot	3	MENTIONED	1	MENTIONED (SOURCE: <i>The Guardian</i> )
United Kingdom (Prime Minister)	Gordon Brown	2	DS IS (QUOTED SOURCE: <i>El País</i> ) [?]	1	MENTIONED
Zimbabwean opposition leader	Morgan Tsvangirai	3	MENTIONED	0	

Table.4 Source sayers in the Summit Texts

As can be observed, each newspaper aligns with different source sayers. Only three sources are present in both subcorpora, namely Mark Malloch Brown, Pol Pot and Gordon Brown, and their presence is related to a controversial topic broadly covered by *The Guardian* and only marginally

mentioned by *El País*: the attendance of Robert Mugabe at the summit and Gordon Brown's public protest. Pol Pot's presence in the corpus is due to the fact that Mark Malloch Brown equates the value of Robert Mugabe's attendance at the summit to the value of a hypothetical attendance of Pol Pot

at a conference on human rights, thus expressing a negative evaluation which is emphasized in *The Guardian*.

Finally, it is also worth mentioning that Gordon Brown is reported in SCTG through *El País* as an external source. Technically speaking, he is an active sayer, as he is the subject of 'said' in "Gordon Brown, who is not attending the summit, said today in the Spanish newspaper *El País* that the world "cannot afford to fail" to deal with the crisis" (SCTG2), so his being included in the source sayers list needs an explanation.

The contextual function of his scarce presence in the corpus seems to be better explained by relating it to his absence from the summit, which greatly contrasts in the analysis with the active role of the Spanish Prime Minister reported by *El País*. Gordon Brown's words are cited and quoted by *The Guardian* from a joint article produced with the Spanish PM and allegedly published by *El País* that same day, but, as Table.4 shows, there is only a single marginal mentioning of Gordon Brown in *El País* and no mention at all of the joint article mentioned by *The Guardian* in either the paper or the digital editions of the newspaper. In this sense, Brown's textual function seems to be only to pretend he has an active role in some way. This interpretation is reinforced by the justification used for the absence of Gordon Brown, denying that the attendance of Mugabe had any relation to it and relying instead on the relative significance of the summit, according to some unspecified governmental source: "British officials said the final decision not to attend was not the result of Mugabe's appearance, but because it was felt that Brown's presence would be more critical at other summits in the coming months" (SCTG1). As the UK representative Douglas Alexander also has a marginal presence in the corpus, the conclusion is that the emphasis of the summit coverage by *The Guardian* is not placed on the role played by the UK in the summit or on giving to readers an insight into the discussions and agreements, but rather on positioning readers on the greater (negative) value of Mugabe's attendance instead. The interpretation that the focus of *The Guardian* is not on supplying its readers with a general report of the summit but mainly on specific topics (mainly Mugabe's attendance and biofuels) is also corroborated by the fact that its coverage of the summit relies more on the external sources of information included

than on the active participants of the summit reported (as is the case with *El País*).

## 5. Discussion of results

The analysis of the Bee Texts reveals that the coverage of the scientific finding conforms better in *The Guardian* than in *El País* to the expectations that readers may have in relation to science popularization articles. However, as there was no 'science' section in *El País* at the time of publication, it is possible to argue that BCEP conforms better to the expectations of readers of the 'society' section, with a narration centred on people doing or saying things, rather than on the behaviour of honeybees (as in BCTG). In spite of the dissimilarities discussed, and bearing in mind the potential differences of what readers can expect in one section of the newspapers or the other, it is not possible to conclude that one of the newspapers has considered the finding much more newsworthy than the other. It seems more reasonable to conclude that both newspapers attribute similar newsworthiness to the finding but that they use different strategies to give similar coverage to the news. It is interesting to note, in any case, that there is directionality in the intertextual relationship between the newspapers in the coverage of the finding, with *The Guardian* acting as an accredited source of information for BCEP to the extent that BCEP attributes explicitly to the researchers information which in BCTG is only indirectly attributed to them, as in the example presented in Section 4.1.1. In this sense, even if the Bee Texts corpus represents a case of non-controversial narrative, the analysis of evaluative and metadiscursive resources and strategies has allowed us to identify differences in the way of narrating the scientific finding. These differences include a subtle positioning of readers to interpret the importance of the finding by means of different frames (reinforcing the idea of the universality of language in BCEP in contrast to the idea of the possibility of bee learning for mutual understanding which is given in BCTG and in Su et al.).

As expected, higher variation between *The Guardian* and *El País* has been found within the Summit Texts than within the Bee Texts in the strategies used by journalists and editors for the construction of ideological meaning. In this respect, there seems to be some kind of variation in the evaluative language and metadiscursive strategies

among the texts analysed which can reasonably be ascribed to the nature of the events reported, producing different alignments which signal a greater diversity of reactions to the summit, which was the event identified as controversial in the analysis, by the journalists and editors of the two newspapers.

In the Bee Texts corpus, the dissimilarities observed have been related to the use of a different 'voice' in each case (a 'reporter voice' in BCEP and a 'correspondent voice' in BCTG). One possible explanation for this is that, as the texts have been produced for two different sections, they belong to different subtypes within newspaper discourse. However, the different voices might also represent different degrees or ways of popularization, which should be further explored. Apart from the different 'voices' used, the most revealing contrast in relation to evaluative and metadiscursive features is found in the perspectives adopted on the findings as they are expressed in the headlines and which have been analysed as consonant with the readers' expectations in each case. Finally, the differences found in the elite nature of the sources used, as well as in the attributions of the judgements and appreciations expressed cannot be taken as an intention to position readers but rather as a strategy to add credence to the information given. However, the different bias used in the headline of each text has been taken as a way of positioning readers by reinforcing the activation of different frames in order to interpret the importance of the scientific finding, favouring (in the case of BCEP) the idea that the finding serves to consolidate a preconception relating to the universality of (bee) language.

In spite of this, there are some factors which could not be clearly measured, such as the influence of the variation of the newspaper subsections where the event was reported in the Bee Texts or the degree of facticity in the Summit Texts. Nor can we overlook the fact that the comparability of the reference corpora used is far from ideal. In the case of the Summit Texts, the lack of an optimum balance between the reference corpora has hindered the possibility of obtaining evidence about the use of evaluative patterns in contrastive terms, which is of critical importance for the study of the construction of ideological meaning in different cultures through media discourse.

Even if it is true that now it is possible to access massive quantities of authentic linguistic data to inform and attest our descriptions of language, in practice the availability of corpora depends greatly on the relative global power of each language, making the compilation of the data extremely time-consuming or even out of the reach of the researcher when working with languages other than English.

## Conclusion

To conclude, we have seen that the analysis of evaluation and metadiscourse is a useful tool for the study of the construction of ideological meaning. However, evaluative resources and strategies cover a wide range of contextual, cognitive and interpersonal dimensions. For this reason, a multilayered analysis is more productive than the intensive analysis of a single aspect, such as lexis, in order to gain a wider insight into ideology as it is constructed and represented in real texts. Newspaper discourse can also be better described by focusing on a set of variables, as I have done here, rather than only on a single textual or linguistic feature and, in this sense, using the potential controversy of the topic covered by the newspaper articles seems to have been productive. However, much more research is still needed in order to gain an appropriate insight into this type of discourse in all its manifestations along the continuum of subgenres belonging to it. With regard to the research presented here, and even if it seems intuitively that this is not the case, it is still to be established from evidence whether the strong protest against Mugabe's attendance at the summit is part of an inferential pattern in *The Guardian*, or if this question has any particular position by *El País* newspaper, or if it receives any attention from public opinion within Spanish culture. In this sense, when dealing with cross-cultural studies such as the one presented here, the unavailability of or the difficulties in compiling equivalent parallel corpora is a serious hindrance which should be overcome as quickly as possible. Not to do so implies that our control over the results will remain at a lower level than desired because, as Moreno points out, even if we may observe cross-cultural differences in relation to a given feature, "we will not be able to attribute them to the effect of the writing culture, or language code" (Moreno, 2008, p. 38). Thus, enhancing the availability and design of equivalent parallel



corpora will allow the research community to improve the reliability and the possibilities of replication of contrastive studies whose descriptive results may benefit all those working with language at a professional level, as is the case of journalists and translators.

## References

- ALTHUSSER, L., 1994. Ideology and ideological state apparatuses (Notes towards an investigation). In: S. Žižek, ed. *Mapping ideology*. London and New York: Verso, pp. 100-140.
- BEAUGRANDE, R. A. DE., 1980. *Text, discourse and process*. Norwood: Ablex.
- BEAUGRANDE, R. A. DE., 1996. The story of discourse analysis. In: T. Van Dijk, ed. *Introduction to discourse analysis*. London: Sage, pp. 35-62. [online] [Accessed 24 April 2014].
- Available at:  
<http://www.beaugrande.com/StoryDiscAnal.htm>
- BEDNAREK, M., 2005. 'He's nice but Tim': Contrast in British newspaper discourse. In: P. Danielsson and M. Wagenmakers, eds. *Proceedings from the Corpus Linguistics Conference Series* [Accessed 23 September 2014].
- Available at:  
<http://bit.ly/1wvGf4>
- BEDNAREK, M., 2008. *Emotion talk across corpora*. Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan.
- BELL, A., 1991. *The language of news media*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- BROWN, G. and YULE G., 1983. *Discourse analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- DON, A., 2007. An approach to the analysis of textual identity through profiles of evaluative disposition. Paper presented at the *ASFLA 2007 Conference*. [Accessed 31 July 2014]
- Available at:  
<http://www.asfla.org.au/category/asfla2007/>
- ELORZA, I., 2010. A cross-cultural analysis of popularizations in English and Spanish newspaper discourse. *ES: Review of English Studies*, vol. 31, pp. 85-109.
- FOUCAULT, M., 1980. *Power / knowledge: Selected interviews & other writings 1972-1977*. Ed. C. Gordon. New York: Pantheon Books.
- HALLIDAY, M. A. K., 1978. *Language as social semiotic*. London: Arnold.
- HALLIDAY, M. A. K., 1985. *An introduction to functional grammar*. London: Arnold.
- HALLIDAY, M. A. K. and HASAN, R., 1976. *Cohesion in English*. London: Longman.
- HATIM, B., 2007. Intervention at text and discourse levels in the translation of 'orate' languages. In: J. Munday, ed. *Translation as intervention*. London: Continuum, pp. 84-96.
- HOEY, M., 1999. Persuasive rhetoric in linguistics: A stylistic study of some features of the language of Noam Chomsky. In: S. Hunston and G. Thompson, eds. *Evaluation in text: Authorial stance and the construction of discourse*. London: Oxford University Press, pp. 28-37.
- HUNSTON, S., 1999. Evaluation and the planes of discourse: Status and value in persuasive texts. In: S. Hunston and G. Thompson, eds. *Evaluation in text: Authorial stance and the construction of discourse*. London: Oxford University Press, pp. 176-207.
- HUNSTON, S. and THOMPSON G. eds., 1999. *Evaluation in text: Authorial stance and the construction of discourse*. London: Oxford University Press.
- HYLAND, K., 2005. *Metadiscourse*. London: Continuum.
- JANČAŘÍKOVÁ, R., 2009. Naming strategies in newspaper discourse: Means of communicating identity of the participants to the reader. *Topics in Linguistics*, vol. 4, pp. 41-45.
- LOUW, B., 1993. Irony in the text or insincerity in the writer? The diagnostic potential of semantic prosodies. In: M. Baker, G. Francis and E. Tognini-Bonelli, eds. *Text and technology. In honour of John Sinclair*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp. 157-176.
- MACKEN-HORARIK, M., 2003. Envoi: Intractable issues in appraisal theory? *Text*, vol. 23, no. 2, pp. 313-319.
- MARTÍN, E., 2008. The verbal expression of belief and hearsay in English and Spanish: Evidence from newspaper discourse. In: A. M. Hornero, M. J. Luzón and S. Molina, eds. *Corpus linguistics: Applications for the study of English*. Bern: Peter Lang, pp. 159-175.
- MARTIN, J. R. and ROSE, D., 2003. *Working with discourse*. London: Continuum.
- MARTIN, J. R. and WHITE, P. R. R., 2005. *The language of evaluation: Appraisal in English*. Houndmills, Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan.

- MORENO, A. I., 2008. The importance of comparable corpora in cross-cultural studies. In: U. Connor, E. Nagelhout and W. Rozycki, eds. *Contrastive rhetoric: Reaching to intercultural rhetoric*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp. 25-41.
- MYERS, G., 1990. Making a discovery: narratives of split genes. In: C. Nash, ed. *Narrative in culture. The uses of storytelling in the sciences, philosophy, and literature*. London: Routledge, pp. 102-126.
- PÉREZ BLANCO, M., 2013. The use of epistemic adverbs in English and Spanish newspaper opinion discourse: A corpus-based study. In: I. Elorza, O. Carbonell i Cortés, R. Albarrán, B. García Riaza and M. Pérez-Veneros, eds. *Empiricism and analytical tools for 21st Century applied linguistics*. Salamanca: Universidad de Salamanca, pp. 243-253.
- REAH, D., 2002. *The language of newspapers*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- SCOTT, M., 2004. *WordSmith tools*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- SCOTT, M. and TRIBBLE, C., 2006. *Textual patterns*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- SINCLAIR, J., 2004. *Trust the Text. Language, corpus and discourse*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- STENVALL, M., 2008. On emotions and the journalistic ideals of factuality and objectivity – Tools for analysis. *Journal of Pragmatics*, vol. 40, pp. 1569-1586.
- STUBBS, M., 1996. *Text and corpus analysis*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- TADROS, A., 1994. Predictive categories in expository text. In: M. Coulthard, ed. *Advances in written text analysis*. London: Routledge, pp. 69-82.
- THETELA, P., 1997. Evaluated entities and parameters of value in academic research articles. *English for Specific Purposes*, vol. 16, no. 2, pp. 101-118.
- THOMPSON, G., 2004. *Introducing functional grammar*, 2nd edition. London: Arnold.
- URBANOVÁ, Z., 2009. The function of reported language in the discourse of newspaper reports. *Topics in Language*, vol. 4, pp. 82-89.
- VALDEÓN, R. A., 2007. Ideological independence or negative mediation: BBC Mundo and CNN en Español's (translated) reporting of Madrid terrorist attacks. In: M. Salama-Carr, ed. *Translating and interpreting conflict*. Amsterdam: Rodopi, pp. 99-118.
- VERSCHUEREN, J., 2007. The interventionist role of (re)contextualization in translation. In: J. Munday, ed. *Translation as intervention*. London: Continuum, pp. 71-83.
- ŽIŽEK, S., 1994. The spectre of ideology. In: S. Žižek, ed. *Mapping ideology*. London and New York: Verso, pp. 1-33.

#### **Author's address and contact details**

Izaskun Elorza  
Associate Professor  
University of Salamanca  
C/ Placentinos 18  
E- 37008 Salamanca  
Spain  
Phone: +34 923294568  
E-mail: [iea@usal.es](mailto:iea@usal.es)