

References

- Brookes, G. and McEnery, T., 2020. Correlation, collocation, and cohesion: A corpus-based critical analysis of violent jihadist discourse. *Discourse & Society*, 31(4) 351-373.
- Charteris-Black, J., 2004. *Corpus approaches to critical metaphor analysis*. Springer.
- O'Regan, J. and Betzel, A., 2015. *Critical Discourse Analysis: A Sample Study of Extremism*. Blackwell: London.
- Patterson, K. J. (forthcoming, 2021) Under the Shadow of Swords: The Rhetoric of Jihad. A corpus based critical analysis of religious metaphors in jihadist magazines *Pragmatics and Society*, Special issue: Approaches to Discourse of Terror. John Benjamins.
- Pace-Sigge, M. & Patterson, K. J. (forthcoming, 2021) 'The idea of power-relations. How forced primings appear in jihadist magazines. *Pragmatics and Society*, Special issue: Approaches to Discourse of Terror. John Benjamins.
- Prentice, S., Rayson, P. and Taylor, P.J., 2012. The language of Islamic extremism: Towards an automated identification of beliefs, motivations, and justifications. *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics*, 17(2), 259-286.

Developing a Protocol for the Identification of Evaluative Metaphor and Stance in Discourse

Paula Pérez Sobrino
Universidad de la Rioja, Spain

Julia T. Williams Camus
Universidad de Cantabria, Spain

Laura Hidalgo Downing
Universidad Autónoma de Madrid, Spain

Keywords: *evaluative metaphor, stance, discourse variation, inter-rater reliability protocol*

The evaluative function of metaphor has been pointed out in previous research (Cameron 1999, Goatly 1997, Semino 2008, Musolf 2004, Deignan 2010) and has been gaining attention in recent years (Demjén and Hardaker 2016, Cai and Deignan 2019, Littlemore and Turner 2020). However, to date, no study has looked at the evaluative function of metaphor across different genres in detail. In this paper we present a protocol for the identification of evaluative metaphors in a corpus of four discourse types (press-opinion, press-science,

politics and fora). From a theoretical standpoint, we approach evaluative metaphor as a subtype of evaluative expressions. Our framework of evaluation brings together insights from Appraisal Theory (Martin and White 2005), stance (du Bois 2007) and critical discourse analysis (van Leeuwen 2008, Wodak and Meyer 2015). According to this protocol, evaluative expressions are annotated for four dimensions: grammatical category (noun phrase, adjective phrase, adverb phrase), function (classifying, predicational or attitudinal), metaphoricity (metaphoric and non-metaphoric), and value (positive or negative). The process of annotation of the last two dimensions is the focus of the present paper.

The corpus consists of four 100,000-word sets of data from opinion articles (*The Guardian*, *The Times*), British political speeches, forum posts on social issues (Reddit) and science popularization articles (*The Guardian* and *The Times*). Three researchers individually annotated samples from the corpora in 4 rounds. A joint discussion followed each round to discuss conflicting annotations and refine the protocol for the ensuing round. The goal of this series of annotations was to know whether there was any variation in the inter-rater reliability with which evaluative metaphor was identified across researchers, rounds and genres. The results of the inter-rater reliability tests show a consistent increase in the kappa scores for the value category (positive vs negative evaluation), and to a lesser extent, for metaphoricity (although, in both cases, kappa scores showed moderate to high agreement). There are two potential reasons to explain this: (1) the difficulty to discern evaluative metaphors from those that only have a textual or pedagogical role (2) the genre specificities that may influence the type of evaluative metaphors at work. Representative examples from the four corpora will be discussed to show that genre has an influence in the variation of evaluative metaphor across text types.

References

- Cai, Dongman and Alice Deignan (2019) Metaphors and evaluation in popular economic discourse on trade wars. In Ignasi Navarro i Ferrando (Ed.) *Current Approaches to Metaphor Analysis in Discourse*. (pps. 57-78). Berlin, Mouton de Gruyter.
- Cameron, L. (1999), Operationalising metaphor in applied linguistics research. In Cameron, L & Low, G. *Researching and Applying Metaphor*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Deignan, Alice (2010) The valuative properties of metaphors. In Z. Todd, A. Deignan & L. Cameron (Eds.) *Researching and Applying Metaphor in Use*. (pps. 357-373). Amsterdam/Philadelphia, John Benjamins.

- Demjén, Z. and C. Hardaker (2016) Metaphor and offense online. In Elena Semino and Zsófia Demjén (Eds.) *The Routledge Handbook of Metaphor and Language*. (pps. 353-376). London, Routledge.
- Du Bois (2007). The Stance Triangle. In R. Englebretson (Ed.), *Stancetaking in Discourse: Subjectivity, Evaluation, Interaction* (pp. 139-182). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Goatly (1997) *The Language of Metaphors*. London: Routledge.
- Littlemore, J, Fuoli, M. and S. Turner (2020) 'Sunken Ships and Screaming Banshees: Metaphor and evaluation in film reviews'. Paper presented at the International Conference on Stance, (Inter)Subjectivity, Identity in Discourse, Universidad Complutense de Madrid, 9-11 September 2020.
- Martin and White (2005) *The Language of Evaluation: Appraisal in English*. London: Palgrave Macmillan
- Musolff, Andreas (2004) Metaphor and Political Discourse. *Analogical Reasoning in Debates about Europe*. Basingstoke, McMillan.
- Semino, E. (2008). *Metaphor in Discourse*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- van Leeuwen, T. (2008) *Discourse and Practice: New Tools for Critical Discourse Analysis*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Wodak, Ruth and Michael Meyer (2015) Critical discourse studies: history, agenda, theory and methodology. In Wodak, Ruth and Michael Meyer (Eds.) *Methods of Critical Discourse Studies* Edition: 3rd revised edition. (pps. 2-21) London, Sage.

Disciplinary Terminology, Basic Meanings, and Cognitive Processes: Problems in Identifying Metaphors in English-Medium Instruction Seminars

Gill Philip

University of Macerata, Italy

Keywords: EMI, metaphor, terminology, cognitive processes, construals

In a disciplinary context, where all participants are non-native speakers of English, metaphors can be identified using the MIPVU protocol (Steen et al. 2010). But although researchers can infer the potential for metaphor to be activated, is this justification enough to code words as metaphors? When does a sense distinction become a metaphor?